
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Greetings, everyone. Welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group, meeting number 78, on May 13th, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Joining today's call, from the working group, is ... Let's see here. We have Tom, Vanda, Cheryl. And from the ICANN staff, we have Kristy, Larisa, Teresa, and myself.

We'd like to remind everybody the call is being recorded today. So please state your name, before you make a comment or a question, for the record. Also, I'd like to ask. Does anybody have any updates to their SOI? No? Okay. I think we're good there. And Chantelle also just joined us as well. Okay. So to go over the agenda and things, Tom, I'll turn it over to you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Yvette. So today, we'll go over our summary of the community consultation that staff has put together in response to our meeting with the OEC. And then talk about Recommendation 1 implementation as well. So I know the summary was just sent out. Can you share that on the screen, Yvette? Does ICANN staff want to just give us a quick preface before we jump into this?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. Hi, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Hi, Kristy.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I'm just going to share my screen since Yvette is managing a few other things here. So you should be able to see this window okay, yeah?

TOM BARRETT: Perfect.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Would you like me to just quickly walk through the major sections here and what we've done so far?

TOM BARRETT: That'd be great. Yep.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Great. Well, hello, everyone. As you may have recalled from the last meeting, ICANN Org offered to just draft a summary of the community consultation feedback on Recommendation 10 with rebalancing. This first section here just reminds the reader of what the recommendation was, noting that this is very much a draft and it was a first attempt at aggregating and summarizing the processes that this working group went through to engage the community around Recommendation 10.

We also note, of course, that some of these efforts are described in the last status report from December. So this first section here is just a reminder to the reader, what were the steps for the detailed

implementation plan on this recommendation. It also includes the metrics to measure a successful implementation, in case that's a helpful reference for folks.

And then, this next section ... Originally, we grouped this into correspondence, and engagement in webinars, and plenary group calls. But it was a little bit confusing because the dates were all over the place. So we ended up reorganizing it into a chronology, starting with the oldest all the way down to the most current.

So what you see here is a mix of correspondence, webinars, engagement, conversations, calls for action, and plenary calls. And we were mining the wiki pretty heavily for this but it's possible that we may have missed a few things. So it would be great to just hear the institutional memory from this group. If you have any questions or comments or anything that you think is missing or not fully characterized in the right way, it would be great to hear that. So I'll turn it over to you, Tom, and we can walk through any comments or questions. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Kristy. Let me just start with asking a question in terms of our follow-up to the OEC. I know we want to do this document. Is there any other follow-up, do you think, we owe or we want to do back to the OEC? That's a [inaudible] one. Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. That's a good question. Larisa, did you have any other action items from your side that you thought would be helpful in terms of follow-up with the OEC?

LARISA GURNICK: Not just yet. I don't believe so because there are several action items that we're working on as ICANN Org to provide information and updates and input to the working group. And I can speak to that later, perhaps, after we get through Rec 10. So no. I can't think of anything specific just yet. There may be, based on input that you'll get from ICANN Org on the definition of independent and affiliated—that item, as well as some thoughts and ideas for the standing committee charter. But we haven't delivered on those items to you yet so I there's nothing to follow up with the OEC just yet. And apologies for my background noise here.

TOM BARRETT: That's all right. Thanks, Larisa. That's helpful. I was able to do a quick review of this so I do have some comments. And I guess I'll start with mine and if anyone else wants to chime in.

Right after the first paragraph, where we basically talk about what Recommendation 10 consists of, I thought I would insert two paragraphs in here. One is to summarize the different times that the ICANN Board has approved this recommendation. So I would say, "This recommendation was approved by the full ICANN Board on xxx. That was following the IE report. After the feasibility and implementation planning phase, the resulting implementation plan was approved by the ICAN Board on," whatever the timestamp is. So I'll stop there and see if

anyone has any thoughts or comments to that. I could actually paste them in, if you'd like, into chat. Is everyone okay with that addition?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. For me, yes.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, Cheryl and Vanda. So then, I was going to have another paragraph—sorry for the background noise here—that basically summarized what the implementation of this recommendation was. I've pasted a paragraph into the chat. Maybe if you can cut and paste that, everyone can read it in the document.

So I'll read it out loud for your benefit, "The implementation plan for this recommendation calls for the GNSO—" and that might be incorrect terminology there— "to conduct the rebalancing exercise themselves. Thus, the NomCom Working Group is proposing a change to the ICANN Bylaws to facilitate this GNSO process, whereby the GNSO is allocated the same number of NomCom seats as it holds today but is able to revise how those seats are allocated without requiring a future change to the ICANN Bylaws. This is particularly desirable to allow the GNSO to continue to evolve how it allocates its NomCom seats in response to changing composition of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups." And the word "allocate" should be singular there, not past tense.

So I know I shouldn't be referring to the GNSO itself but the SO/ACs of the GNSO. But I'd like to get some feedback on this proposed edition.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe it, for now, is just an explanation because it was not for each constituency to change this allocation but the GNSO to make an agreement among them and then decide who it's going to put there or not. So I believe it's correct in that way it's written here.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's an SO issue so I'm happy with that, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Any edits to this paragraph.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Just a point of clarification.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Down below, we do have the steps from the implementation plan.

TOM BARRETT: I'm actually suggesting we remove that entire section.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. So we're going to remove this implementation plan?

TOM BARRETT: That's what I'm suggesting but we can come back to that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. And we would replace it with this paragraph?

TOM BARRETT: I think it's very important that we explain what the implementation of this recommendation is. Even though it's called rebalancing, that's not what we're doing. So we need to make sure that's crystal clear.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I see. Okay.

TOM BARRETT: But yeah. Is everyone comfortable with this particular paragraph?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. I'm okay with that because it's clear now. We have this special [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep. Very comfortable.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Vanda. Thanks, Cheryl. So the next paragraph, I guess we can remove the word “draft.” We’ll work towards a conscious, “This document is intended to ...” And then, in the last sentence of this paragraph, I’ve rephrased it. I’ll paste it in. Okay. Larisa has a comment, “Call the explanation of rebalancing as a NomCom implementation proposal.” So I guess the question is are you suggesting, Larisa, that we haven’t received approval for how we’re implementing this.

LARISA GURNICK: I’m just trying to clarify that it’s “proposal,” in the sense that this is how you propose to implement it. But obviously, other steps need to happen. You need OEC’s agreement with the proposal, based on the discussions or some input from them, as well as eventual guidance as to how it moves toward Bylaws amendments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Tom. It’s more that this is our proposal to the OEC for what needs to be changed from our initial planning. Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: I want to be clear, though, that the approach we’re taking for implementation for this recommendation has already been approved by the OEC in a prior phase, yes? So it’s no longer a proposal. We’re now implementing what we propose that was approved earlier.

LARISA GURNICK: Tom, I'm not sure that it was what you would consider OEC's approval of the proposal because this was included in the December implementation update and, admittedly, it's taken a while. But the conversation with the OEC and this group a couple of weeks ago was to try and get clarity around what the proposal is and your rationale for it. So I think that we'd probably aim to still call it a proposal at this stage.

TOM BARRETT: Can we go back, then, to the implementation plan to see what was approved by the OEC?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Tom, I don't believe that OEC is a step that allows approval. They agree with us but approval is not the instance in the process that they are allowed to—

TOM BARRETT: Let's just be clear what we're—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on. Sorry Tom.

TOM BARRETT: I just want to make sure we're clear on what we're trying to get approval of. We're not trying to get approval of the Bylaw change. We're trying to get approval of our proposed implementation of this recommendation, yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. The OEC needs to sign off on alterations from our originally-accepted implementation plan. And as we noted, there are a couple of steps in our original plan that we are now, for very good reasons, with a new design, which we all understand, because it's not rebalancing, yadda, yadda, yadda, not going to do. Therefore, that tweak needs to be signed off on. And Larisa's point is at this stage, the toing and froing with the OEC is a hopefully penultimate step in the understanding of that and the agreement of the OEC for our modification. I hope I've done justice to that, Larisa.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl.

LARISA GURNICK: You have, Cheryl. And I put my hand down because you absolutely did it justice. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: So obviously, I guess maybe we're jumping ahead and trying to get the OEC to move forward on these ICANN Bylaws. What I'm hearing is that we have to step back and get a revised implementation plan approved first, before we even ask for approval of the ICANN Bylaw changes. Is that what I'm hearing? So we need to resubmit the implementation plan for this recommendation and ask for approval?

LARISA GURNICK:

I'm not sure if you directed that question to me. But my suggestion would be that that steps that we're going through right now bring clarity to several things, more explicit documentation of the rationale that this working group had gone through in making the proposal. And it's really not for rebalancing but for whatever you want to call that effort, as well as all the documentation that Kristy will walk through a little bit further down in the document of the engagement with the community.

This is all to answer some of the questions that came out of the OEC discussion as to, is the community on board with the approach that you're taking? Has there been sufficient outreach and engagement and are they on board? And also, does everybody have a clear understanding of what the proposal is and how it's changed from what was originally approved by the Board?

So the steps toward that resolution, if you will, I think is exactly what you're going through now, which is to have this documentation, which could then be sent to the OEC, either as a standalone document or it could certainly be incorporated into your implementation update that's coming up next month. There's a variety of ways that we could provide that response to the OEC for them to then look at it, circle back with you potentially, and close out their thoughts on what you have proposed. Does that make sense?

TOM BARRETT:

It does, Larisa. Thank you. Can I suggest ...? I said earlier I wanted to delete this whole section on implementation plans. I'll take that back. What I would like to do, however, is to redline this plan into what we're

currently saying is our implementation. So if anything—if you could scroll up a little bit—I think this section should appear right after the last paragraph I inserted. I would cut and paste the next two paragraphs and move them after the implementation plan piece. So before we even talk about outreach, let’s talk about what our current implementation is with a redline. Yeah. Put it right there.

So now, let’s go through our current implementation plan and say what’s different that we need to get approval from the OEC. Can we do that?

So step one, “Propose relevant terms.” I don’t think there’s any changes to that. Raise a hand if you disagree. Step two, “Assess what principles and other factors were used.” We did that so no changes there.

Three, “In consultation with the community, propose what principles and other factors should apply to determine the optimal NomCom composition based on the current ICANN community.” So this is where people might debate about what we’ve done. We clearly did some outreach, as we’ll describe later. And we decided that that GNSO would be the only place where we would suggest any rebalancing. So I guess that’s fine the way it is.

Four is fine the way it is. Five, again, we propose to ... Keep scrolling down. We’ve done all this. So on 5a, we obviously decided that the GNSO is the only group impacted. B, we decided the GAC gets to keep their seat. C, we envisioned a future where there might be more SO/ACs. Just needs a space in there. And d, “ensure that a rebalanced NomCom can continue working effectively as detailed in the Bylaws.” Okay. So all those plans aren’t changed. Let’s keep scrolling down.

Number six, "Draft one or more rebalanced seat allocation scenarios and present this to the Board and the community for input." So we tweaked this a little bit. I guess we did, as part of our outreach, did discuss the different scenarios. So we did do number six. Seven's okay.

So I guess I would only change number nine here because after the Bylaw change, there is no rebalancing as a result. "So Bylaw change is accepted, facilitating future rebalancing by the GNSO." And then we can get rid of "and NomCom is rebalanced." Yeah. Don't delete the entire rest. Just delete "and NomCom is rebalanced." "Or Bylaw change is rejected," and I would get rid of "and status quo is maintained," because I think we maintain the status quo with our Bylaw change.

So that's the only tweak I would make to this plan. Does anyone want to comment on that?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Maybe only in that sentence, I would maybe add, "any future rebalancing," because "facilitating future" looks like they rebalance once.

TOM BARRETT:

Got you. Yep. Okay. That's good. We'll change to metrics in a second. Go ahead Kristy.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Sorry. I can't find my hand raising when I'm screen sharing for some reason. Just a point. We haven't gotten to this section yet, below, where

we're laying out all of the chronology of those. But I would say that, just off the top of my head, I don't recall finding a resource that just points to some of these steps under ... I guess it would be number five. So it would be good if we have access to the gap analysis. And I can work with Yvette to try and identify that but I just wanted to flag that I don't think that those materials are below. So that could be a gap.

TOM BARRETT:

Okay. Any other thoughts? Can we scroll down to the metrics? So the metrics are, again, obviously, "Complete a process to amend the Bylaws to facilitate rebalancing by the GNSO." So just change, "rebalance the NomCom" to, "to facilitate rebalancing by the GNSO." Yeah. I wouldn't change anything else there.

So if I'm hearing correctly, we want to get approval from the OEC to this revised implementation plan. We can talk about whether or not we can document it. I guess if we can't find examples of a gap analysis, then we should go up and modify that language, too. But this is what we're asking for approval of, these edits? I got a thumbs up from Cheryl.

So let's scroll up, Kristy, to your point. Maybe we can tweak the gap analysis. We've certainly discussed so, certainly, you should be able to find minutes where we used the words "gap analysis." In terms of consulting with the ICANN Board and ICANN community about which principles should apply, I don't think we can say that. I think we decided on our own which principles. So why don't we just delete the rest? If we want to just say, "and decide," yeah. Sure. Get rid of the word "and."

All right. Scroll down. So then, we get into the paragraphs we had moved down from above. I have a few edits here. We're no longer calling this a draft. You can get rid of, "This is a draft document," so, "This is a document." On the last sentence, I'll paste it in. Rather than say, "Raise questions about the extent of community consultation," I'm proposing that they ask for a summary. Okay. Sorry. This cut and paste doesn't work. You can't see what I struck. Or, "a summary of community consultations." All right?

And then, on the next sentence, I would again paste this in, see if I can make sure it shows the edits correctly. On the next sentence, I would start with, instead of "some of," I would say "The outreach efforts were described in the progress report." I'll paste this right in. Yes. So, "The outreach efforts described below are also included in the status and progress report, as well as minutes of plenary meetings." You can get rid of that next sentence, "The working group may have additions and modifications to this summary." You can delete that. "The information will be repeated—" so get rid of the word "included—" "in the upcoming and third progress and implementation status report."

Any thoughts or comments on those edits? Cheryl, Christine, Larisa, it look okay? Okay, Kristy. Okay.

And then, we have the chronology, which I'm fine with until the last one. Any other comments on the chronology here? June 17th, I've got some minor edits and July 20th. The last three, I've got some edits. Does anyone have any comments before that?

So on June 17th, I would change the word “decided” to be “concluded that.” And where it says “the parties,” say “the best parties.” Insert the word “best” in front of the word “parties.”

And then, for the next section, I would strike, “There was some clear resistance.” And I’m going to paste in a sentence for that. So it’s the first bullet of July 22nd, where it says, “There was some clear resistance.” Just get rid of, “There was clear resistance.” And I’m saying, “There appeared to be confusion that the implementation was resulting in a rebalancing, resulting in ...” What did I say? “Resulting in resistance.” So I guess I kept the word “resistance.” And I’m being generous here. I’m assuming they were confused and not deliberately being misleading. But obviously, the Bylaw change doesn’t rebalance anything. Thanks, Cheryl. So that’s my comments for July 22.

And then, on the last one, I thought it would be good to make it clear, as part of this March 10th—I’ll just paste in another sentence—that we highlighted the proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws to facilitate a GNSO-led rebalancing exercise. I thought it might be helpful somewhere in this document—maybe now is a good time to do it—to actually repeat a redline in Bylaws specific to the recommendation so people can see, “Here’s what the current ICANN Bylaws say and here’s what we’re proposing.” So it becomes a complete document.

Any thoughts or comments? Too much? Too little? Are we missing anything? Larisa or Kristy, do you think this helps address some of the concerns that the OEC was asking for?

LARISA GURNICK:

Tom, thanks. I think that it'll be helpful for you go to through the totality of all this and determine whether you think this clarifies the intent of your proposal and why it was different from what the original implementation plan was.

Whatever your reasons are, they are your reasons. But I just want to make sure that that is clearly articulated here because that will be something that the OEC, I think, will want to understand, as well as the overarching question do you feel that the community understands the nature of your implementation proposal or however you want to characterize it? Do they understand what's being proposed and why it's different than what was intended originally in the rebalancing?

TOM BARRETT:

Okay. Thanks, Larisa. I see Cheryl's comment. So if you go back up to the top, Kristy, maybe we should make it clear what we're asking for from the OEC. Thanks, Vanda. We're asking for ... You have an intro here. All right. So after that first sentence, why don't you add another paragraph between the two that we added earlier? So here, we want to say that, "There have been some revisions to the approved implementation plan that are redlined below and we would like the OEC to approve these changes—" something to that effect.

So that makes it clear to the OEC we've made some changes to the plan, listed below. Take a look at those. And then, of course, we can proceed the way we've done. So I'm trying to make it clear. We set the right expectations with the OEC in terms of what we're asking them to do at this point. We're asking them to approve this revised implementation

plan. And if they do, then we're asking them to proceed with the ICANN Bylaw change.

Cheryl says, "Once completed, we can send to the OEC and see if they come back." Do we need to underline this sentence? Why don't we underline it, just to emphasize it, or bold it? That way people have a ... Underlining, I guess, would do.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: All right, Tom. You want to underline this sentence?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Yep.

TOM BARRETT: All right. I'm done with this. Any thoughts or comments? Do we need another review? Thanks, Vanda. Do we need to look at this again next week or ICANN staff want to think about it and maybe come back with some comments? Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're not meeting weekly anymore so it'll be next meeting. I think I'd like to see a final and have another. So maybe the final can be sent to the list. And we're not overly-subscribed in today's meeting, for

example. Other members would, perhaps, be able to make their opinions on the clarity of the final document, intersessionally, and then we can sign off at the next meeting. That would be what I'd do, anyway.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Yeah. I'm fine with that. Hi, Dave. All right. We done with this item?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think so. Just to confirm, ICANN Org will do a clean version of this to send around, yeah?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Kristy. All right. The next agenda item, which is Recommendation 1, job descriptions. This is, I guess, finishing up the loose end on Recommendation 1, in terms of implementation. This has the staff sending a request to the SO/ACs that they need to select a NomCom delegate for the 2022 NomCom.

So launch the job description in two phases. This year, under the current Bylaws, modify the draft NomCom job description to reflect the current

Bylaws. NomCom operations team to distribute and be able to implement this recommendation this year. It says job descriptions will be distributed this week. Going forward, the revised Bylaws. Revise the NomCom job description when the Bylaws have been revised. NomCom Operations Team to implement going forward. Who from ICANN staff wants to talk more about this?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Hi, Tom. I can just say a few words. This is basically just to close the loop and let the working group know what's transpired since the last time it was raised on the call. I think that's just about it, as an update. But I'll see, maybe, if Larisa or Teresa want to add anything.

TOM BARRETT:

Okay. So I would make some tweaks to this. First of all, what's your thinking, how this process changes between ... It says "current Bylaws" and "revised Bylaws." This recommendation didn't really result in any Bylaw changes. I wasn't sure what that's referring to.

LARISA GURNICK:

I can explain that. I believe that several meetings ago, we discussed the fact that until the Bylaws are changed in relation to other recommendations, the things that would be implemented as part of those Bylaw changes are not technically currently in place. So that's why we have the bifurcated approach.

The job description, as it's been distributed and what we're reporting back, is the one that's in-line with the way the Bylaws are stated right

now. So, for example, standing committee is not in the Bylaws yet and various other things like that. But once those things move forward, then the job description would be updated to reflect those changes when appropriate. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Larisa. Just a high-level overview of the process. We take last year's job description that was used by the SO/ACs and we sent it off to them saying ... First of all, someone here will revise it. They'll send it off to the SO/AC, saying, "Do you have any updates?" They approve it and then they use that to run their selection process for whatever openings they have.

So I guess the question is, is there something in the job description that is going to change because of the ICANN Bylaw changes? I don't know. We'd have to look at a job description to see if any of it would actually change. The only change might be two-year terms might change? But we could write the job description so it was term-agnostic so it would have no impact. Go ahead, Teresa.

TERESA ELIAS:

Can I input here?

TOM BARRETT:

Yeah. Please.

TERESA ELIAS: So the reason that it's two parts is the current job description that we'll be posting is what is currently in the Bylaws. The second part is the term adjustment that's being requested. So we're not reflecting that. If that becomes approved and that is implemented, the job description would change to reflect the term limit change.

TOM BARRETT: Right. I'm suggesting maybe we have a job description that doesn't mention term and so would be agnostic to the Bylaw change.

TERESA ELIAS: I think it's important, in the job description, to have the term of it so that whoever is looking at the job description understands the time commitment expectation.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Are there any other changes that we envision to the job description because of other recommendations?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I believe that the job description that we will suggest after the revised Bylaws will be a little different from what we've got right now. We have discussed this a lot. So I do believe that the current job description cannot be much similar to the next one because it will depend on the Bylaws. So I do believe that what we have from the current description is a repetition of what we have in the past. So the new ones need to be quite different from this one. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Is that a new hand, Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Sorry. Old hand.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So part of this recommendation, we're supposed to write those job descriptions, right? I'm not sure we've actually completed those job descriptions, then. Is that something we want the working group to do or is someone else going to do those?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, that was completed. That's why this job description—the one you have now—is done. That was a task that this working group's staff, Jean-Baptiste—and I'm sure the other staff members helped—developed it according to the requests of the group, which was you wanted the term limit added in the job description in the initial draft and that's why we haven't moved forward. Now it's been drafted back up and brought back out. That's why this particular job description has now been put forward as completed.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I'm being dense. I understand now what this is about. Okay. Makes sense. So we'll say we're done with Recommendation 1. We can go ahead and have a drink.

TERESA ELIAS: Yes, sir.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Cool. Sweet. Any other thoughts or comments on this? So are we going to publish these job descriptions somewhere? Is that the plan? Cheryl says yes.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe, yes. People need to know what is expected. And the candidates to that position should know if they are aligned with this job description or not in the next year.

TOM BARRETT: So I guess the NomCom staff will publish them on the 2022 NomCom page, which probably doesn't exist yet, right?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead.

TERESA ELIAS: We're actually sending out the job description to the selecting bodies. So they will have this information. The call for interest goes to the

selecting bodies. So now we have a job description that we can send the selecting bodies and the selecting bodies can use that to move forward.

TOM BARRETT: Yep.

TERESA ELIAS: So that's what NomCom staff is doing.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So we're relying on the appointing bodies to publish it or share it in some way.

TERESA ELIAS: That's correct.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. They vote and—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. That's where the responsibility lies, Tom. That is where the responsibility lies, with the appointing bodies.

TOM BARRETT: So did we come up with ...? My memory is fading but are there any differences in the job descriptions for SO/ACs?

TERESA ELIAS: I'm sorry. Say that again, Tom.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I don't remember that we have different proposals for different constituencies.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. That's what I'm asking. Is it one job description or has any SO/AC asked for unique differences, tweaks to it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In addition to the overarching ones, which is these job descriptions that are promulgated by our current process and the processes that have gone before, there are the abilities for each appointing body to add on some of their own specificity. What we're dealing with is the overarching characteristics, requirements, qualifications, etc. But if they want to have, for example, some particular gender balance out of a constituency of the GNSO, that's their business. They can add that in.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. For instance, in LACRALO, we have a rotation for subregion that, even if we have a qualified person from the Andes region, for instance, but it's not their time to apply, in addition to the request we're going to send for job description, if they are aligned, they need to follow this

rotation, subregions, to be allowed to be elected. So other communities maybe have different other requisites for a person to apply.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I see Dave and Cheryl adding things in the chat. You have a hand, Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Yes. Just really quickly. So yes. Plus one on everything that everyone's just said. But just to clarify or just to reiterate, it's one job description that goes out to the selecting bodies. We're putting a deadline on it of 30 July to get a response. And each selecting body, as Cheryl said, they add their own requirements or necessities that they see fit during the selection process.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa. And I assume that they are then required to provide those revisions back to the NomCom staff so that we have transparency to it.

TERESA ELIAS: Yes, sir.

TOM BARRETT: So as I do envision it, somewhere these should be published on the NomCom wiki, yes?

TERESA ELIAS: We've never published the job description for this particular item because this call goes internally to the selecting bodies. It does not go outside.

TOM BARRETT: Right. But it's no different than ... I still think for transparency, we should know what changes an SO/AC has added to a job description.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, I think we're going out of our remit just a little bit here. That might be a really valuable thing for the upcoming work on inter-and intra-transparency between the ACs and the SOs, which is more of a holistic ICANN-reviewy-type aspect and a Work Stream 2 implementation of accountability work implementation. That's where that would come in. But I don't think we need to do that.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So can we bring up the implementation plan for this and make sure we've got all the steps?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yvette, do you want me to do that or do you have it?

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I'm just checking if Yvette has that or if she'd like me to do that.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: If you have it, Kristy. I don't have it handy at the moment. I can look for it. But if you've got it—

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I do have it handy. Yeah. Let me just—

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I will stop sharing and I will let you go ahead bring that up.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you. Let's see here. Can you all see that?

TOM BARRETT: Yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So let's see. Remind me which recommendation you're on.

TOM BARRETT: Number one.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Number one. There we go. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So if you scroll down to the steps, we have number one, "Complete the timetable for selecting members." Two, "Inquire with all bodies that appoint members if they have a job description." Three, "Inquire with current and former NomCom leadership what they want to see in their job description." Four, "Inquire with ICANN Org." Five, "Create an overview doc." Six, "Ask for a review and summary documents from HR professionals, ICANN and/or others." I assume we'll run by ICANN staff who know about HR.

Seven, "Draft proposed job descriptions based on input received." Eight, "Provide draft document to the bodies that appoint and ask for feedback." Nine, "Finalize job descriptions." Ten, "Post job descriptions on the ICANN Org and send document to bodies that appoint members to the NomCom." So we're definitely posting these, guys, on ICANN Org. 11, "Ensure the standing committee provides revisions in cooperation with the bodies that appoint members to the NomCom."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, what is published is the overarching JDs, not any tweaks and local stuff from the ACs and SOs.

TOM BARRETT: I disagree, Cheryl. Number eight says we ask for feedback and number nine says, "Finalize job descriptions." They're final.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ask for feedback on the overarching job descriptions. We only have responsibility for the overarching, all-encompassing, overall criteria job descriptions, not for the tweaks that happen in the—

TOM BARRETT: None of that language is in here, Cheryl. The word “overarching” is not anywhere in the implementation. It’s the final job description.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Tom. We only have control over the job descriptions that are applicable to all of the ACs and the SOs.

TOM BARRETT: I’m agreeing that we don’t control it, Cheryl. But I am saying we should publish the final job description.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You know what, Tom?

TOM BARRETT: We should publish it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is not worth dying in a ditch over. Let’s put up a little wiki that no one will read and we’ll publish it. That’s fine. And if they don’t send them

back to us, that's equally fine. It's out of our remit and I don't believe it is required. Until the AC and SO stuff on the Work Stream 2 cross-accountability, yes. Then it's relevant. But if you want to grow our job to take into that, fine.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. No. I think it belongs in the NomCom wiki for the year. We can put it on the standing committee wiki as well. But for this year, we should know what job descriptions each SO/AC are using to select their candidates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Always happy to see another billboard in a desert, Tom. Go ahead.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl.

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, can I jump in here, please?

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Teresa. Yeah.

TERESA ELIAS: So if we publish it on the NomCom wiki, it's going to create a confusion that these are positions that are open out in the public, versus to the selecting bodies. In my humble opinion, I would say that if the selecting

bodies want to post the job descriptions on their pages, then it's their responsibility to do so. But if we do it on the NomCom page, it's going to create confusion.

TOM BARRETT: I don't know why we can't—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, Teresa.

TOM BARRETT: Oh, please guys. I trust NomCom staff to be able to distinguish between the job description for NomCom members and the job descriptions for open NomCom positions. I don't buy that this is going to create confusion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not the staff, Tom. It's the readers.

TOM BARRETT: Right. So it's just a matter of how you organize your NomCom page. I guess I don't see this causing confusion. But if you want to do that, we should change the implementation plan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, we will find a way to publish.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, we'll find a way to publish. No problem. You can rest assured. And, in fact, we'll note, perhaps, that that is part of—when we open our Work Stream 2 implementation that this is part of the inter- and intra-AC/SO accountability. And that's fine, too. But it's not our job to do it now but let's do it anyway.

TOM BARRETT: No. It's very clear in number 10, this is what we proposed to do. Now, if you want to change that, we can. But this is exactly what number 10 refers to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 10 refers to the job descriptions that we have completed, not any tweaks added onto by the appointing bodies. And the feedback from the appointing bodies was on the job descriptions we have completed. But if you want to add the bells and whistles and bows that changes at regular intervals, that's fine. We'll find a place that is puce background and flashing lights to say, "This only refers to what the current appointing bodies have added to the overarching," or whatever word we want to say, "primary criteria for appointments to the NomCom, not from NomCom." [Finally], we can move on.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Normally, the communities publish their requisites. So it's for them to do that.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, everybody. We've agreed that we will publish whatever final job description the SO/ACs are using to fill their positions. All right. It's 4:00, guys. Anything else? Next meeting in two weeks. Thanks, everybody.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Okay. Just note that we haven't agreed. It's not consensus. There's not a lot of us here but, certainly, Vanda and I are simply standing back, hands in the air, going, "Fine. Publish it. Don't worry. We'll try and make it as unconfusing as possible." It will probably be published after the appointments are made but anyway. Whatever. There's not consensus [for now].

TOM BARRETT: All right. Noted. Thanks, everybody.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye. Thank you for your time. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]