

---

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Greetings, everyone. Welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group Meeting #81 on June 24, 2021 at 19:00 UTC.

Joining today's call from the working group, we have Tom, Cheryl, and Remmy. Joining from ICANN staff, we have Kristy, Larisa, Betsy, and myself, Yvette Guigneaux, and Teresa Elias.

We'd like to remind you today's call is being recorded so please state your name clearly and distinctly for the record. And also let me ask if there are any updates to anyone's SOI. Also, here comes Vanda from the Review Working Group so put her in that as record. Okay. No updates. All right. I think that about does it for me. So, Tom, I will go ahead and turn it over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi, everyone.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, Vanda.

TOM BARRETT: Hi, Vanda. How are you doing? Thanks, Yvette. The agenda today we'll talk about—again, gearing up for the mid-year report, we have a follow up on the working group participation. And then we have a summary of the community consultation and feedback that has been reorganized and made more coherent by Kristy. Then I guess we'll talk about the

---

*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.*

---

status in Progress Report, and we might as well talk about proposed blog post as well.

All right. So you want to start with the factsheet? Did you want to give some color to this or who wants to talk to this?

LARISA GURNICK:

I'm happy to talk to this, Tom. Following up on the conversation from last meeting, I think we alluded to the fact that we were assembling some data to make it kind of at a snapshot. Cheryl will probably recognize some part of this. This is a format that we typically use for specific review teams' community-led reviews. So it's a format that we already have in place. And the idea, obviously, is transparency but also insight with the data.

So what this essentially does is it considers the number of calls that are available, and then it just counts participation based on the attendance that Yvette so efficiently takes at the beginning of the call. The idea here is big picture. We don't split details. When folks join a little bit later or whatever the case is, when someone comes to a call, it's considered participation. So that's what you're seeing here for the several members that resigned officially. We adjust the total number of calls that are available for them to attend based on their resignation date and so on and so forth.

Then what you see here is a couple of different slices of information. It's summarized by the constituency group where that one is available for the participant who they represent or which group they come from. There is also kind of a trend line showing quarterly activities which,

---

probably based on the conversation last week, not a big surprise that we see lots more interest at the beginning and then kind of a tapering off for this group, much as is the case for many other groups. I'm delighted to see that the numbers for this call seem to be growing, so that's excellent.

On the right side, where like the bulk of the content is, that is a view by individual participant since the beginning of this group. So you can see participation percentages are basically the number of meetings attended as divided by the total number of meetings available for attendance. So that's how we get the percentage. It's all based on the records that are captured here.

The factsheet is exactly what it purports to be. It's just a reporting out of the facts and, obviously, it's possible that if we missed someone's attendance or if something got missed because it is a manual capture process, we're happy to make fixes such as the one for Tom. Thank you for pointing out a couple of things that got missed. But on the whole, this represents a pretty accurate picture of participation as registered by joining the various call. So let me pause here and see if there's any questions.

TOM BARRETT:

That's great. Thanks, Larisa. Are we going to take any steps? Are we content with the fact that we have declining participation? I know we talked about this last time. I promise I will reach out for a few other groups within the GNSO. But I assume we're fine with the current level

---

of participation. We're just going to try to conduct more outreach to the community. I'll let Cheryl chime in as well. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Tom. As you would have heard from me last time, yes, I think that's the way forward. I think this, sadly, in my opinion, is a fairly natural pattern that we see in these various review implementation stages but also in far too many reviews overall. That being said, the regular attendees are not too shabby at the regular attendance and that is actually slightly better than I thought it might be, so yay us. And I think this is a very generous mechanism, as all of the staff who work with us know I'm a great fan of this sort of process and I think they should be published from the moment we start work. But I think transparency is a key here.

But I do think if we were to just remind everybody on the list before this is in any way, shape, or form published that they do have an opportunity to look at this and see whether or not they had intended to formally resign, and perhaps we could be generous perhaps to some people if that's the case. But that's just me actually trying to be kind for once. The other thing is why I think this is generous is because, as Larisa noted, if you log in whenever in the meeting, you marked as attendance. And in many of these processes I'm used to and I have no problem with, login and logout time and all that sort of thing, and none of this actually translates directly to interventions, but I note those who are active are also those that are intervening in general. So I think that's important. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Just to clarify one of your comments, are you suggesting that we ask—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me give you an example. Nadira, who was active, when she resigned from positions in the At-Large community, she probably thought she was also resigning from this because that's the role she was holding. Now, just because the mechanism she let the At-Large community know due to particular circumstances she was no longer able to continue her work in many roles, including vice chairing a whole region, she probably thought at that time that that would have constituted a withdrawal with grace from this request as well. That's just one that struck me. It may not be the ideal one, it's just one I know of.

TOM BARRETT: I think Nadira did specifically e-mail us about withdrawing from the NomCom.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: She did contact us and I tried to persuade her.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As long as those sorts of ones are captured, then that's fine.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. I thought perhaps you were suggesting that we ask some of the no-shows to formally resign.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll put the no-shows up against the wall and flog them with a brown boot lace, so probably not.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Maybe this could be a general rule for any working group that if you do not show up for whatever, depends on the time length of the group but a number, and so you're going to be advised that you are forced to resign. We ignore the participation and do not say anything. This is not so interesting, so I do believe that that should be encouraged. Yeah, that's the best word. Encourage to withdraw because it's not good, in general, not to show up and not say anything. Because if we are seeing there that they just ignore, don't say that they will not participate and so on, so it's something that we need to rethink for a kind of proceedings in any working group, just to make it more professional, I believe. Because people that do not want to participate are welcome to go out, no problem, but it's not mandatory. But you need to not just

---

ignore. I don't think it's a good practice, not to formally withdraw of the group if you're not participating.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Larisa?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, just before Larisa speaks, because I've got to say something at the GNSO meeting in microseconds, I assume we are going to make this a public document because some use of it I think is important, not just internal, but in terms of remediation, we're very late in the game for remedially working with people. And that's why I'm not overly keen on bringing too many new people in. But then you're right, we missed the opportunity to reach out to poor performers in the process. Talk to them, see what the issue was, and I'll encourage them to withdraw or do better in their attendance. And I'm getting my cue. Sorry.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, Cheryl. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tom. A suggestion and observation. I suppose since this is the first time this type of data has been assembled and I think the intent, as I understood it from your discussion last time, was to make it public. But since it has not been made public up until now, perhaps a note from the chair or co-chairs with an invitation to look over this and encouragement to indicate either desire to come back and get engaged

---

or if other obligations get in the way to resign or however that could be worded might be good before this is public. So that might be a good way to go before this is posted more officially.

Another point that I wanted to raise, to speak to Vanda's recommendation that there'd be some sort of suggested process for how to deal with this, I think we established some time ago that when this group was kicked off, there was not that level of formality implemented, but perhaps given that the work has gone on for two years and there's more time, this could be something to be considered.

I think I mentioned at the last meeting my team, myself, and various colleagues do have a time set up to meet with some of our Policy colleagues who obviously have far more extensive experience dealing with community working groups and just practices that across the board might be helpful, useful, something for you all to consider, whether it makes sense to bring some of those practices into the work of this group even though it's been in existence already for some time. So there are probably a couple of options that we'll come back to you with at the next meeting based on our discussion. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Larisa. Let me just make a correction. We have published this before, at least one or two of our reports. So this is actually not new for us to publish participation. Maybe, Yvette, you can go back and look at the older reports we submitted to the OEC. But we have included this, I would say, at least two times in the past, if not more in our reports to the OEC. So it's not the first time we've done this, so we're not



---

surprising anyone by this. As I say, we've published this before, and we should certainly include it in our mid-year report to the OEC.

I'd like to propose—I'm willing to send out an e-mail to a segment of people on this list and say, "Hey, we noticed that you haven't attended a meeting for 2021. If you don't plan to participate this year, please formally resign from the working group." I'm arbitrarily picking 2021. If you think that's too harsh, we can go back 12 months and say, "If you haven't participated since July 2020," but I don't think we need to overthink this. I would just identify some sort of cut-off, start 12 months ago, then at the end of the year we'll do the same thing for people who don't participate in 2021. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's all about tidying up the data, which is why I support you in that. Because one of the things that I'm sure Larisa and her team would hear about from the Policy staff support, at least in some parts of ICANN community, it is not at all unusual to have an annual renewal or even topic transitional renewal of members, whereby everybody, whether you've been attending 100% or 10% in a given period of time, is e-mailed, is asked to reconfirm the continued interest in the activity, and what's more, to re-sign onto the GDPR requirements that's certainly in a number of our spaces in even just e-mail lists come in to line.

So I fill out so many Google forms. It's almost I should have a virtual stamp to say, "Yes, leave me in the group and, yes, I give you permission to use this data." But it's not an unusual way forward, and going forward, we could certainly do something. It's still light touch, it's still in

---

“informal,” but it does allow us to tidy up the data and get rid of those that don’t want to be here anymore off our data capture material. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. So what do you think about using January 1, 2021 as the threshold, they haven’t participated since that date? We send them a letter. Anyone have thoughts on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You got a green tick from me.

TOM BARRETT: Larisa says 12 months.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. It could be at 12 months.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My only problem with 12 months is that we report 6 months late. And I for one, I’m keen to tidy up this data so that the next reporting of this data is different, the differences explained, and it goes into the mid-year reporting. So I’m happy with the January or end of December will do.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, because it's the next and next week. Okay. I agree, Cheryl.

TOM BARRETT: So there'll be one of three responses. Either people will decide to formally resign or, two, they won't respond at all and still participate or, three, they'll start participating, which is obviously the desired—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No response and withdraw are treated the same in terms of the data capture.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tidies up the data nicely.

TOM BARRETT: You're saying if you do not respond either way—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Any route, you're removed. You don't need to get removed from the mailing list. Many of us use this as an Observer status. That is not the case in some PDPs. Depending on the design of the PDP, with it, people

---

have access, read access or no access to e-mail list, so that is variable, but that is not at all unusual across ICANN.

TOM BARRETT:

So what if we do this? Because we don't know, for example, if our e-mail is not delivered for some reason. So what if we say, "If you want to formally resign, please let us know. Obviously, we want you to participate." If we do not get any response, we change their status to Observer status.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We've got that flexibility in our group because it's more informal. So yeah, we'll definitely do that. But regardless then we tidy up our data.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah.

TOM BARRETT:

That way, we're not dropping people who claim they never got an e-mail.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. We can try some ideas here, but what we really need is some kind of formal document establishing how it will formally proceed in the other groups in general, just to make everything think is participating and they represent that [inaudible] for some kind of group. You know, bring some obligations.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Perhaps, hearing this discussion, what we could take on board is coming back to this group with some ideas for how to add some practical like touch ideas and also ways to remind people and re-engage and something for you all to consider. So perhaps that could be an action for staff to come back with some ideas at the next meeting for how to do that, in addition to what Tom has already suggested which is to contact people that haven't been active in the last 12 months.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. It's two different things. So one is our group, the other is suggestion another point for the general working groups to consider those rules and make it public and to alert everyone that there is a process to participate and stop to participate and become just an observer. If you don't have time, you can read the mails. There is a lot of things. But once you become a representative, you need to understand your obligations on that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I'm fine with being more aggressive in saying the last 6 months instead of the last 12. Just to say, "This is a critical point and if you're not going to participate, just to say so." All right. Let's move on to the next topic.

---

Yeah. I agree, Larisa. The idea is to re-energize those who want to participate and call the list.

All right, Recommendation 10. So there has been a lot of work here and bring some better clarity to our document for the OEC in terms of where we are in Recommendation 10. I assume we're going to share the screen in a sec. There we go. Perfect.

I put a last-minute edit today just suggesting up front that we provide the current status of the recommendation because I think most people are not according to read through this whole document. They'll read the first page and probably be done. But other than that, I thought it was a great document. Kristy, did you want to talk to this a bit?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Sure. Yeah. That'd be two things, Tom. You can see, basically, the outline. It's a longer document now, but these bullets here show the outline of what's included here, which is the original recommendation. And then because there were multiple iterations of the detailed implementation plan, it was starting to get a little bit confusing about which changes happened when, and there were some edits on the call where we discussed Recommendation 10 that we just laid out each version of that so that it's really clear to the reader how it evolved over time, which led to that proposal that you are currently having. And then to back that proposal up, we also show the chronology of all the community consultation that the working group has done on Rec 10. Then at the very end, we've got placeholders in case the working group wants to add rationale for the revisions to the implementation steps, and then

---

conclusion on to the OEC's question about whether the proposal to amend Bylaws has been sufficiently socialized and it's well understood.

And then you'll see here just some notes. These are kind of explainer notes to the working group just in terms of what was changed. So all of this is just copied and pasted text from previous versions of the detailed implementation plan. So, Tom, this is a paragraph that you had proposed during one of the last plenary calls, and we just suggested that we put it here to fit within the section on changes to the implementation plan. And then again, this shows the next iteration of the implementation plan, the December 2020 Progress Report Implementation Plan steps and showing the changes there, so it's very clear to the reader. Then these were some edits that you proposed during that call, Tom, which we're doing in real times. We wanted to reflect those here as well because that was in response to the discussion you had with the OEC and we didn't want those to get lost or confused with previous changes in the implementation plan so we added those here separately, and then similarly with the proposed changes to the Bylaws. This is all just a copy and paste from your Progress Report. This section, as I said, writes the chronology to just document in all the places where the working group is engaged with the community, linking where appropriate to those publicly available resources in case anyone wants to see further with the exchange covered.

Then this section is the rationale. We did have some rationale on the version that we looked at previously but it was sort of mixed in different places, and so we put a placeholder here to have rationale all in one spot. Obviously, feel free to modify this language but this was what was previously provided as rationale. So we put that here, and then we left a

---

placeholder in case the working group would like to come to any sort of conclusion in its response to the OEC in any next steps you want identify. I think if you want to have a discussion on these last pieces, that's probably where it's going to be most interesting. The rest of it is just kind of historical record, so to speak.

TOM BARRETT: Great. This is great, Kristy. Thank you. So why don't we handle your action items first instead of general question about the beginning? So Section 4, Rationale for Changes. Again, the audience for this obviously is we're trying to demonstrate to the OEC that we followed a process, we've conducted outreach, and explained how we've evolved our implementation steps over time, right?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: So you've already put in a placeholder here for number four, which I'm fine with. I don't know if you feel like it needs more, Kristy.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think this is adequate. It is a sort of an aggregation of various points that spoke to the rationale in the previous version. And I think some of them were in different places so we just put them in one spot so that it's really clear against the readers of what the rationale is behind it. So if there's anything that you wanted to add or modify here, we can do that.



TOM BARRETT:

I think there's two objectives here, overall. One is to provide some clarity about exactly how we've decided to implement this recommendation because the recommendation itself leads people to assume a certain thing is happening when it's not. So we want to provide clarity about the fact that we're not actually doing a rebalancing. We want the GNSO to do it. So that's Objective 1.

Objective 2 is to put out a paper trail or audit trail basically explaining the changes we've made to the implementation plan as we've refined our approach to this implementation. So I think that, to that second point, you've done a good job here. Not many people will make it to page 15, I think. I think what you've done over these X number of pages is you've laid out exactly the evolution of our thinking and how we've arrived at how to implement this recommendation. So I'm satisfied with what you have here for Section 4. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm sorry. Maarten's just speaking in my other ear. Very distracting. It's very loud, my apologies. [Inaudible] falling down. That's better. Now I can pay attention to all input.

I'm just picking up on Larisa's point about the specificity of addressing the question on whether we feel sufficient engagement for consideration by the community to accomplish broad support, which obviously if they weren't listening to us in the meeting when we said yes, we need to write it down. So let's start with a sentence that says,

---

“Yes, we do.” Let’s just turn Larisa’s comment in the chat into a question we answer and say, “And this is why.”

TOM BARRETT:

Okay. There actually was a point I was going to bring up, which is again we’re on page 15 here, no one’s ever going to see this, so we can certainly see it here but I think it probably needs to be said in the intro as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

To be done in both places, Tom. I mean, I agree with you. Not everyone is going to dig all the way through the document, but these documents form an archive and I’m always a fan of not short cutting the fulsomeness in the body text. And, of course, if indeed everyone who joins a committee, including the OEC, had some magic wand that could bring them up to speed on everything that’s been said and everything that’s been reported on, we wouldn’t have to do these sorts of things. But that’s not the case and so we do need to have it explicit in this sort of documentation.

TOM BARRETT:

One observation I have is that we hear from people who oppose it, we don’t necessarily hear from people who support it. So it’s not like we’re taking a poll of the entire community here. We certainly have several vocal parties in opposition and I can tell you every time they met with the OEC and the Board, they have brought this up. They’ve brought it up multiple times to the Board. So that’s what the Board is hearing is from

---

two or three of these groups who oppose it. People who support it don't bother to bring it up. It's just not on their priority list.

But I guess the thing I was going to talk about is this idea—I guess I'm stumbling over the word that this needs broad support. This is a recommendation. We want to make sure that there's a lot of awareness and understanding of what we're suggesting. Again, I think the people who are opposing it are either misunderstanding what we're recommending or misrepresenting what we're recommending. I'm not sure we're doing a good job of articulating that. Does that make sense?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yes. Just to your point about broad support, yes, I think that's probably not the best way to characterize it. It's in the question here, down to the notes is that whether it's sufficiently socialized and well understood which is different from supporting it, right? So I added that language up here.

TOM BARRETT:

Okay. I think that in the intro we talked about is there support, which I guess I want to rephrase what's in the intro as well to have this type of language.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Okay. I'll just remove this placeholder then. Did you want to add any next steps?

---

TOM BARRETT: So the next steps are really—we're back to the OEC looking at I guess a variety of other potential Bylaw changes and whether or not they want to—the question is do we have anything else for us to do or are we simply providing this and trying to encourage the OEC to move forward?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I believe that that is just to change. Put in their shoulders to decide if they will change the Bylaws or whatever. It's not for us to do anything else, in my opinion.

TOM BARRETT: Should we be explicit about the fact that we feel the opposition to this as misunderstood, the implementation of this recommendation?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, I gauge [inaudible], if not at all down that pathway. Because if you're not going to change this as I sit and chat, we're not going to change the hearts and minds of everybody. Just once people have said things in public, even if you do change their hearts and minds, they won't change their public opinions. So I don't think telling them that they don't understand is going to be helpful. I think we just say it has been well socialized and broadly understood.

TOM BARRETT: Cheryl, thanks for that. What about making a comment that the opposition that we've heard appears to misunderstand the recommendation?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we could say things like the limited opposition in a section of a Support Organization appears to not understand fully the intent of the Review Implementation Working Group in its recommendation, which is not quite the same as saying, "You idiots, you don't understand."

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's not exactly not understand. It's do not want to understand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, Vanda. But they're Tom's lot. I mean, if he hasn't been able to win them over.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: I think they know exactly what they're doing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure they do, which is why I worded what I worded the way I did.

TOM BARRETT: I'm being generous.

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I guess just to pose a question here because—

TOM BARRETT: Kristy, I guess what I'm saying is let's acknowledge there is some opposition. Let's acknowledge that there are some people who do oppose this but we believe that they've misunderstood the nature of this recommendation.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Is there anything that the working group could do to help ameliorate that challenge, considering the OEC wasn't asking about, as far as I understood, whether there was support for it but it was again sufficiently socialized and it was well understood. So if you're then saying in the next sentence that a portion of the community doesn't fully understand then it might look a little bit contradictory.

TOM BARRETT: It's like playing chess. These groups, the BC, the IPC will say things like, "ATRT3 says you must have a holistic review so stop all the other review recommendations until that holistic review is completed." So they'll also go down that track. They do not want to do anything that might result in what they see is diminishing their voice in any process.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: For the other hand, others—

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're protecting their two seats.

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're protecting the seat relations that are there now. But, Tom, this is why I would still not go down misunderstood. I still think recognizing limited opposition doesn't equate to the misunderstanding but it does equate to limited opposition. But the concepts have been well socialized and well understood. I think they understand it absolutely perfectly and the choices are thoughtful and intended. And therefore, Kristy, nope, can't do a damn thing.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I will suggest that put just "It's well understood by the community and we recognize the limited opposition." Point. Stop. Because there is no reason that we say that they don't understand or they understand but don't want or whatever. It's not for us to do this or to judge this.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Okay. So you got to put that here, Kristy, and let's also repeat it in the intro as well where we talked about support in the intro.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure, yeah.

TOM BARRETT:                   Awesome. And then next steps, I know we left that you're hanging in there. Next Steps is in the hands of the OEC. There's nothing that we're doing for next steps. We're done, right, unless you feel we need to do more outreach.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:               I think yeah, that's up for the working group to decide that we wanted to at least put a placeholder here. I think the next step that was discussed, if I recall correctly, was once the summary is finalized and the working group is good with it, then it goes over to though OEC. And I don't know. Maybe there's a continued conversation with them to follow up on this one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Kristy, can I follow up on that? And I'm sorry to jump in because, as you know, I'm splitting my attention. I'm switching, I'm not splitting my attention. I'm switching my attention. But I would recognize that we believe, once this, as you just said, is gathered together and sorted out that it is over to the OEC. And what we can then say is, "And we, as the Review Implementation Working Group, stand ready to assist in any way they see fit." That sort of opens that doorway of interaction but says, "Guys, this is your job now."



---

TOM BARRETT: That sounds good. I agree. Do we anticipate any movement on these Bylaw changes before the AGM? Or are we going to be doing pre-ICANN—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh no. We can't say before the AGM happening. I can't see it happening before the AGM.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So if we do a pre-ICANN webinar in October, we're talking about the same thing we talked about a year ago.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. We continue to explain it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll give it another pitch. Tom, it's a relatively lengthy process to get the Bylaw changes through all of its public comments, reactions, responses, then doing what Legal wants to do anyway because Legal will have dotted the I's and cross the T's, so it's pretty watertight by then. So other paralegal and non-legal suggestions on wording probably isn't going to make much in the way of changes. We've already had the experts running through it by the time it gets let out into the wild for responses, but there's still a whole processes to go through. But we certainly can do our bit to then even in that process, continue to socialize and promote and explain.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, great. Are we done with this? Anything else you want to discuss?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Not for me.

TOM BARRETT: All right.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Can I just clarify. And I'm sorry, I can't figure out how to raise my hand while I'm also screen sharing. I don't know if I can.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I'm sorry to jump in. Just to confirm, I can clean up this document. I'll remove the comments. I'll add that language in the front which is near what's here in Section 5 around the sufficiently socialized piece, and then we can send out a clean version.

TOM BARRETT: Great. That sounds great, Kristy. You know the intro there's the word "support," I guess.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Exactly, yeah. I put a placeholder to that.

TOM BARRETT: That's first paragraph. Yes, further up we talk about broad support, why reword that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Perfect.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, great. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you. That's great. Should we talk about the blog post real quick? Do you want to talk about mid-year report?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The blog will be going out first so maybe cover that first.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Larisa?

---

LARISA GURNICK: I'm sorry. I didn't quite hear. Cheryl, did you want to cover a blog post? Because I raised my hand to give an update on the mid-year report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do it in any order you like. We've got time. It's all right.

TOM BARRETT: Which one is happening first? Are we talking about the blog post for the next week or two, or the blog post happening later?

LARISA GURNICK: Well, we were thinking that the blog post could happen as soon as possible, right, because the idea about it was to get people re-energized about the work that's going on. So yeah, we can talk about the blog post first. So, Kristy, I'm going to turn it over to you and then I'll pick it up on the report.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. I can share my screen again if that would be helpful, so you can see the version.

TOM BARRETT: I think only Cheryl and I have seen this.

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's right.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Can you see that okay? Or do you need me to zoom in a bit more?

TOM BARRETT: Maybe you can enlarge it a bit.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: So just for everyone's benefit, this just talks about three recommendations, just an update on rebalancing the Standing Committee and the unaffiliated directors, and just basically summarizes those three recommendations.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Tom, I did have a look. If you are suggesting to add in the unaffiliated, the only thing I added here was just, as I understand, that this is still kind of in discussion with Legal and so it might be a bit sensitive to mention here. And just for brevity as well, that these sort of two pieces of work around Rec 10 Rebalancing and the Charter are probably attention grabbing enough in terms of here are some really interesting pieces of

---

work that the working group is focused on right now. So that was my only feedback on that.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Kristy. So the unaffiliated directors is not new. It's been in the past two reports to the OEC at all of our ICANN webinars. So it may not be final yet but it's certainly a new idea. So what do you think might be sensitive here? Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

If I could just jump in. I think the sensitive part, maybe it's not really sensitive, it's just that we know—and I think Sam mentioned that when she came to give you all some thoughts on the Standing Committee—that there are some legal concerns that they have with the proposed wording and they are looking at it. The Legal team is looking at it. So if the topic of unaffiliated directors is included in here, if you decide that it should still stay in here, I think it would be important to indicate that the definitions are still under consideration by Legal for input for the various reasons that I know that the OEC and Sam had articulated.

TOM BARRETT:

Sure. Why don't we add that? But certainly we've already talked it in several webinars. So we can't take back what we've said.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I think the point, though, Tom, and I respect that point that the staff had made to us is that the stuff around the rest are not on affiliated members. I'm going to keep using non-affiliated to look its carriage. It's not as ready as the other bits. So to do this blog focus just on the ready-to-get-out-the-gate stuff, and then do another blog when we've got more feedback from Legal with this sort of tagline of, "And you know you've heard about this non-affiliated directors business. This is what we've got to now and just focusing on that." I'm actually very comfortable with that. I think from a snappiness point of view, that's probably quite wise. Just do another blog in short order, probably shortly after Legal gets the feedback to us.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. That works for me too. You like that, Vanda? Okay?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. So I can clean up this piece and just remove those references.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just park it in a scratch pad document so you can start with it when we do the next blog, Kristy.

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Good starting place. Thanks. I think I had one comment here just because we are actively working on that charter, right? Based upon our last call, we've done a redline of that and we've sent it over to Sam for review. And we've said maybe we have a quick chat about it next week to do that iterative approach that she suggested. But I wasn't sure since the blog I think is intended to go out in pretty short order, if you wanted to reference the charter here since it's probably not going to be ready to publish.

TOM BARRETT: I think, again, we've already published it. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not in its almost pending form. I think that's Kristy's point. Why not say a recently modified draft charter will soon be published after review.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. That's better.

TOM BARRETT: We could make three different blog posts here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We could do a series here, Tom. We could be the social media gurus.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I'm fine with whatever changes you want to make there.



KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. I'll just update the language. I think it might be confusing if we point to an older version of the charter, knowing that a newer version is coming out. So there you go, our blog.

TOM BARRETT: Excellent.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. People that are looking can stick with the old version. That's not good.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Sounds good. Anything else? We want to try to get this out in a week or so before the fourth? So that will be next week. Is that the plan?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think. I'm less familiar with this so maybe Larisa can speak to it. I know that there's an internal comms process for blogs from community members. I don't know if, Larisa, that you want to speak to that.

LARISA GURNICK: Yeah. I'm certainly not an expert on it. So I just wanted to highlight that we are working with our Comms colleagues on whatever the right

---

process is. So yes, with your approval that this should go out, we'll now move it forward and check whatever, dot the I's, cross the T's—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not complicated.

LARISA GURNICK: Exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not a complicated or a very long process. It's just to ensure that the standard way of stating certain things is followed and that the various sorts of look and feel, a way of approaching Comms is given a once over, your occasionally get a tiny bit of feedback as it goes through the Comms experts. But, in my experience, it's yet to be substantial. It's more of making what we've written look better.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. All right. Should we move on to the next agenda item, the mid-year report? Do you want to talk about this, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. I'm happy to talk about it, Tom. The proposal, something for you to consider, the mid-year report obviously is generally due around the 30<sup>th</sup> of June. However, noting how much substantive work is underway, the Standing Committee Charter, the Rebalancing document and the various other things and activities that are going on, and, by the way, we're also

---

working behind the scenes to schedule responses to your questions from Göran or an occasion for him to come and meet with you at one of the upcoming meetings. So in checking in with the OEC, or in particular Avri and Patricio, they are very happy to give you and us a bit of time, a couple of weeks or whatever might be necessary to be able to conclude some of those really important pieces of work so that when the update goes out to the OEC, it's inclusive of the things that are already pretty significant [inaudible]. So I just wanted to extend that suggestion and option, and they understand the complexity and the intensity of work and would be happy to get something that is more complete in terms of days, open items, even if it comes several weeks later. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:

So we're thinking a month delay or two months delay? When do you think we'd have some other stuff to look out from Legal?

LARISA GURNICK:

I would say not months. I think a reasonable amount of time would be within a month's time. So whatever can get accomplished within a month's time, and then produce the report. But definitely not longer delay because I think it's important for them to know what's going on, and obviously it's important for you to report it out. So this is just a short common sense kind of delay, recognizing where things are at the moment.

---

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Sounds good. So we're on our meeting schedule. Any other business?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Not for my side.

TOM BARRETT: Our next meeting in July 8, and then we just continue throughout the summer.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Just to inform that in July 22, I will be involved into the NomCom final selection of the members for the leadership positions. So will we will be working the full day. So I will not be able to participate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we change that date then? Vanda's contribution has been solid and continuous, and I think it would be a little farcical for us to clash with major NomCom commitments.

TOM BARRETT: That's fine with me.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We have time. It's 19 to 25. That is the block time for the NomCom to work. I do believe that before that and after that, I'll be ready to participate. But during this time, unhappily not possible.

TOM BARRETT: Can we move it to the 29<sup>th</sup>? Will that work for people?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: For me, okay.

TOM BARRETT: We can again discuss this on the 8<sup>th</sup> but I'm fine with moving the 22<sup>nd</sup> to the 29<sup>th</sup>. Is that our last item here, Kristy?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I just wanted to recap the action items to make sure I didn't miss anything, if that's okay.

TOM BARRETT: Yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. So we talked about, Tom, you sending out an e-mail to the list or maybe to members of the working group to just say like lower participation, and if they don't plan to participate to please resign, including the factsheet before it goes public. ICANN Org will have a meeting with the Policy folks next week, just to see if there any ideas for how to improve participation among the members that we do have. And then on the two documents we'll create cleaned-up versions of those and send out for the final ones over. And then this last point about just

---

moving the meeting from the 22<sup>nd</sup> to the 29<sup>th</sup> of July. Did I miss anything?

TOM BARRETT: Sounds good to me. Anyone else?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, everybody.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you all.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Bye.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**