
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello everyone. Welcome to the NomCom review implementation working group call meeting number 82 on July 8 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Joining from the review implementation working group today, we have Tom, Arinola, Cheryl, Dave, and Remmy.

Joining from ICANN Org, we have Kristy, Larisa, Teresa Elias, and myself, Yvette Guigneaux. We'd also like to remind everybody today's call is being recorded, so please state your name clearly for the record. Before I go on, are there any changes to anyone's SOI?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: I have changed jobs and then updated my SOI.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. So you've already taken care of that on the Wiki end, you're already good with that?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Yeah, I've pasted the link on the chat.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, perfect. All right. Thank you, Dave. Okay, I think we've got that settled and we don't have any apologies as of yet, so let me go ahead and get the agenda on screen. And Tom, I will turn it over to you.

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.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Yvette. And Dave, congrats for your new role. Looks exciting. All right, so the agenda today, we'll talk about updates on the participation outreach and our blog posting, and then the summery for Rec 10, the feedback from Legal for the standing committee charter and then Any Other Business.

This is mostly going to be led by staff today. Number two, advice from the policy and blog. Who wants to take that?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Hi Tom, I can jump in and just relay what we've heard from our policy colleauges last week if that would be helpful.

TOM BARRETT: Sure, that'd be great.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: And on the first piece, the participation outreach on the last call, I believe Tom and Cheryl had suggested that they might reach out to some participants of the group just to let them know that they're still very much wanted in terms of participation. So I don't know if you wanted to provide any updates on that outreach before I dive into the advice from policy.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I have not done that yet during the holidays, but I will definitely take care of that before the next meeting.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Okay, great. So just briefly, we had a good conversation with Mary Wong and Steve Chan from policy last week just to get their perspective on—obviously, they run a lot of working groups with the community and they've seen all sorts of different challenges around participation and engagement around that, and so we had some good conversation with them, just framing of what the working group here with the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group is doing and we have some strategies from them. I have a couple of notes here that I'll cover to make sure I don't miss anything.

So from their experience, having a framework of operating rules, norms of participation and kind of clear outline of what's expected of a working group member, including how decisions are made, is quite helpful. So they said that review teams and also cross-community working groups have encountered a challenge of low participation which can usually be traced to the passage of time or the initial charter or participation norms were not there or were not very clear.

So she said if there's not a standard terms of reference or participation norms, that it could probably be one of the first things that this working group agrees on, with a timeline and deliverables so that all participants understand what they're in for for the remainder of the work.

So obviously, we recognize that this work has been undergoing for some time, so there's a question of what to do now, look at where we're at in the process, recognizing that they're still really important to be done. This could be one of the ways to help address this challenge and to

create documentation to bring that clarity, hopefully without being overly onerous. It could be a couple of pages that just speak to the expectations of participation.

The other thing that Mary and Steve noted that has been effective in other policy working groups is active outreach from the co-chairs. So you, Tom, and Cheryl, and any others if possible, and they said it needs to be very proactive and specific and targeted. It can't just be an e-mail update and sort of let us know if you're going to participate, because the folks that you're approaching are already inundated with requests, and part of the framing is the importance of the work, especially the topics that the working group is tackling now, which we have noted some of that in the blog and that can be a helpful reference point for the outreach that you might want to consider, Tom and Cheryl.

And then finally, just getting a sense of what if low participation continues and are there any risks that they've seen with that on the policy side. And they said the kind of risk of ongoing low participation as the working group concludes its work is it could ultimately jeopardize the outcomes and intended effects of the work if there's not diverse and strong participation throughout that process that creates that buy-in and the interest in making sure that the outcomes of this work are seen through and are successful and fully implemented and finally adopted.

So that was the cautionary tale that they have seen, and I think that covers the main points. There are a couple of folks in the waiting room, it looks like, Yvette. I'll just see if there's anything that anyone would like to add or if you all have any questions about that conversation and any advice that you received on that.

TOM BARRETT:

Hi Kristy. Thank you for that update. All very useful information. So I have a few questions, I guess, for the members here. Obviously, it would have been great to have a participation framework from two or three years ago. I guess the question is, do people think it would be helpful to spend time on that now, or has the boat left the dock so to speak? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I've worked with systems both with and without participation frameworks. The most useful aspects of participation frameworks is when clear and unambiguous participation frameworks are not only well and truly and very much publicized up front before people join but that the framework also includes the exact powers and expectations. And it's all very cute for PDP processes to have mechanisms of making decisions, but in our particular case, we're pretty much decisionless. We get to implement what has been decided.

So there's a disempowerment. You're not here from an industry perspective to influence the outcome of generic top-level domains and the next round. So the whole motivation is different. So all for participation guidelines, all for clear and unambiguous what you may or may not get out of this if you join, and absolutely keen on ensuring that you sign up and when you sign up, there are expectations. And that has only recently come into the PDP world with PDP 3.0 at least in the G space.

So happy with all of that, but I think it's that motivation that is slightly different in review teams as opposed to cross-community working groups and policy processes where the outcomes can be different.

Possibly, there's a difference too between the work done in a working group leading up to recommendations being agreed upon, gone through the ICANN public comment process, approved and then get to be implemented and the implementation. And I happen to know for sure that at least one or two dropouts from our group were because they thought they could change the outcomes. Oh, damn, that's not our job, so packed up their bat and ball and gone home, going boohoo in the corner.

But if they had known that and gotten involved at a different point in time or earlier, or they would have had a different approach to trying to get their endgame during the whole process. So I think it's all about the prior planning. Thanks for all of that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl, for that. Arinola or Remmy or Dave, do you have any ideas with that? Or Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, I believe that Cheryl [summed up] very well what happened.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Arinola or Remmy, Dave, what are your thoughts?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: I concur with Cheryl. I have already typed on the chat.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Dave.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to note in chat, I see your question about the worthiness of effort to be put in now. No, I think we still make effort, but not to get in the way of our other, real work, which is actually finishing our job, not getting more people to help us not finish our job.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: That's actually my second question I haven't asked yet, but how much specific recruitment should we be doing now? So it sounds like—I take on point Kristy's feedback that if we did want people, it needs to be very specific targeting of certain SO/ACs for example and individuals. But it sounds like you folks feel like we're pretty much set in terms of our framework, how we're working, and don't necessarily have much of a need to get new members. Is that what I'm hearing?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I do believe that we will finish our work. It would be great to have others, but we can do that and complete our task. For my point, the only issue is someone in the future, "Yeah, it's just four of you." Well, sorry, the others had other commitments or other issues that didn't allow them to participate. But this does not mean that we are not finishing and adequately and with quality our work. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I will go ahead and send out an e-mail anyway, as I said, for the next meeting, particular to the IPC and BC, both of which have been vocal about Rec 10. So I'll give them the opportunity to have someone join the group. Kristy.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thanks, Tom. I'm trying to take notes just for the action items, and I wanted to clarify Cheryl's comment saying that she was keen on ensuring it's clear what everyone's signing up for when they sign up and that there are clear expectations. Did that mean that you think a couple of pages outlining the norms of participation in the terms of reference would be helpful at this juncture, or no?

TOM BARRETT: I think that we certainly don't need a full framework as if we were starting from scratch. If you have some suggestions that you think might be helpful at this juncture, let's identify them, but we don't need a full-blown code of participation sort of thing given that we're trying to wrap this up.

If you for example think we have developed some bad habits that we should change, I'd love to hear those kind of suggestions on how we can do things different. We do have people attending now who I would love to see, hear more often from who are kind of quiet. But I think any suggestions are welcome that you think might be effective at this point. But as I said, I will follow up. I'll send out a fairly targeted e-mail myself before the next meeting just so I give a few folks an opportunity who are going to be vocal anyhow.

I also want to follow up with something we talked about at the last meeting, which was e-mail to the members who have been inactive. Do you know if that was sent out, Kristy?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

I don't, Tom. I'm not sure if anyone else can speak to that.

TOM BARRETT:

Okay, so let's follow through with that. That way, we can prune the list a bit. As you recall, the draft of that e-mail pretty much asked people to commit, if they want to stay on the list, they should participate. Maybe that will shake some people and wake them up for us.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Okay. And Tom, if I can just raise my hand again, if it would be helpful, it maybe is a way of kind of following up from that e-mail, letting people know that you're looking for greater participation and you really hope that they do reengage, and you can point to the fact that you're working on even just one or two pages outlining the expectations around that

participation so that it's clear—again, to Cheryl's point, what is it that they're signing up for, the expected time engagement and timeline so that when we're asking them to reengage, it's also a little bit clear what it is that we're asking them to reengage on and for how long and how much. So I think we'd be happy to help draft something like that if you think that would be a helpful next step to follow up with people on after we send that e-mail to inactive participants.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Kristy. I don't think we need a separate document. Maybe we edit that e-mail to make it clear how often we're meeting, so an hour every other week, and how much longer we expect this implementation to take. Anyone want to hazard a guess when they think we'll be done?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You know, my first thoughts were "Not soon enough."

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Good answer.

TOM BARRETT:

Do you think we can be done by the end of the year?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

We could.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's what we should be aiming for, yes.

TOM BARRETT: So why don't we say that in the e-mail, saying what we're asking for is an hour every other week through the end of 2021?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, we'll add that to the e-mail and we'll get that sent out.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. Shall we talk about—we also have the blog post [inaudible].

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes. So—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: You can link that. Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Exactly. That's a great suggestion. So we will send out the—Yvette will send to you a clean and also a markup version so you can see the changes that were made, version of the blog to you, Tom and Cheryl. We can copy the rest of the list if that will be helpful. Just because it's coming from you both, we want to make sure everything looks okay from your side—

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead and copy the whole group. I'm fine with that. Sorry for interrupting.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: it's okay. And I think in terms of the publishing timeline, it needs to go through a couple of final steps before it gets posted on the web, so we're thinking of aiming for next Wednesday to be conservative. Does that timing sound okay?

TOM BARRETT: Perfect.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. We will do that, and I think that's everything for agenda item two then.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Kristy. Who wants to talk about recommendation 10?

LARISA GURNICK: Hi. Happy to talk about this, and it's actually a very short story that I'm proposing to tell you on recommendation 10. At the last meeting, I believe Kristy walked through the document and I think by now, everyone hopefully has had a chance to see what the clean version of the document looks like. So if it's okay with all of you, we would suggest to forward this document to the OEC on your behalf in response to their question on everything that went into the work on recommendation 10.

So we just wanted to confirm that you would be okay with this suggestion, and if so, we can take it from here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I thought it was a good summary of all the stuff that's been going on. So I'm fine with it being sent. I think Cheryl is agreeing with that as well, if that's a recent text.

LARISA GURNICK: Very good. In that case, back to you, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Awesome. Thanks, Larisa. We move on to the next agenda item. You have some feedback from ICANN Legal. Is that something we can discuss today?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, Tom. I'm happy to share my screen just so you can see the latest redline, if that would be okay.

TOM BARRETT: That would be great. Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, so just in terms of the framing of this, this is sort of an interim redline. As you recall, the conversation with Sam a few weeks back, she was really encouraging of an iterative, collaborative approach on don't

feel like you have to go into a cave and rewrite this and hope that it comes out perfect. So that's kind of the spirit in which this version is being shared with the working group.

So based upon that feedback from Sam which we took notes on and then we had a brief conversation with her last week to just check in, this is the current version of the charter which I will walk through the sort of main changes of it. And hopefully in the next couple of weeks, we can get to a more final version, but we wanted to at least give a sense of the progress that's happening behind the scenes, so to speak.

So just to kind of walk through some of the changes here, one of the main adjustments made in the purpose is really an emphasis around providing the continuity across NomCom cycles and building institutional memory of the NomCom. And this was previously number three, helping to coordinate processes and communications, and this is kind of assumed in the role that the standing committee is going to play, so the detail on that can probably be moved to a work program and it's embedded in the purpose and roles here without being its own separate responsibility if that makes sense.

So we've elevated that a bit, and it says right here in serving its purpose, it may need to communicate and coordinate with other entities as both initially and on an ongoing basis for coordination across ICANN communication. And then it adds that disclaimer I think Cheryl mentioned, making it very clear that the standing committee doesn't participate, oversee, influence decision making processes of the NomComs to make sure that there's no doubt around that. So that's the initial framing here.

TOM BARRETT: If I can just interject real quick. I see a thumbs up from Cheryl. So the other I guess change in terms of perspective here is that the standing committee also in a way is serving the OEC. The OEC is going to help select the members and we're really helping the OEC making sure we have an efficient and productive NomCom. I wonder if we want to have a statement to that effect as part of the purpose. What do people think about that? Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Hi Tom. Just wanted to clarify what your vision is with that, because OEC has a role as a committee in overseeing the reviews and the implementation, not so much a role in the governance of the NomCom. So I think Kristy will touch on some of the potential roles for the Board in the standing committee further down, but not really clear what you mean about helping the OEC because I don't see clearly yet what OEC's role is in relation to the NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: You're right. I should have referenced the BGC, right? So who on the Board will be appointing members of the standing committee? Would that be the OEC or the BGC, or have we got to that level of detail?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, I don't think we've specified that level of detail yet. So once I get to that section, it does talk about the Board playing a role in that based

on the conversation that you all had with Sam a couple weeks ago, but we haven't specified any particular committee or working group yet.

TOM BARRETT: So it would probably be the BGC, I'm guessing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, but it's also up to the Board. That's something that they need to have input on. They've asked for the input, they need to be part of that planning process. My guess is, yes, BGC. But they could say their great aunt Mary, and that's their role to do that if that's what they want to say. My guess is it will be the BGC, but it's not a push piece of information from us, it's a pull piece of information from them.

TOM BARRETT: So we don't need to be specific, you're saying, about what committee.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly.

TOM BARRETT: But I guess the overall question [inaudible] should we mention something in purpose about how this would interact with the Board, or just be silent?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm always less is more, but I think we should recognize that there is a clear and unambiguous role for and importance of the role for the Board in these decision making processes. I think all it does is elevate the whole concept. I don't think we need to go into ad nauseum details.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So Larisa or Kristy, do you want to take a shot at just putting in a sentence mentioning the role the Board has with the standing committee?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. I'll just put a comment in here, Tom, to raise that, and I can also talk with Sam about how best to do that in a way that's, to Cheryl's point, not pushing in terms of prescribing any particular engagement but recognizing that relationship between the standing committee and the Board here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, and we don't need to specify which subcommittee is engaged. That can always be decided later by the Board. Thanks.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Did you want me to continue further down?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Okay, so again, we just added a little bit more here around what's entailed in providing continuity here, and this is along the lines of conversations that we've had in the working group and with Sam. This responsibility includes documenting, publishing, maintaining NomCom process maps.

We also added participating on behalf of the NomCom in the annual ICANN budget and planning process to ensure that NomCom interests are represented in that process.

Then we also added—I think this was implied in certain section of the charter but we tried to make it a little bit more explicit here, kind of reviewing the annual cycle to determine any changes that could yield improvements. And so those are kind of the three main roles articulated here in terms of providing continuity. Of course, more detailed activities can be articulated in the work program, but a kind of higher charter level, this is the current framing.

TOM BARRETT:

[inaudible].

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

And then in building the institutional memory of the NomCom, one of the things that seemed important to acknowledge—maybe not explicitly but somewhat implicitly—is that this review concluded a couple of years ago and ICANN Org staff in light of the findings of that review and the recommendations, they take it quite seriously and I know that Theresa

and Jia have worked hard in the last couple of years to make sure that things aren't getting reinvented every year as much as possible. So we've included, in collaboration with ICANN Org staff who are working on evergreen materials and templates and ensuring that the NomCom is building that institutional memory, that the standing committee really provides that additional support for them and role in terms of establishing and maintaining an archive and any changes or additions there.

and then we've just eliminated the detail in number three but really articulated that obviously in fulfilling its purpose, the standing committee is going to need to communicate and coordinate with other entities, and we just removed all of this detail about exactly who and how, because it's going to be up to whatever is happening in the process of the standing committee work at that time, and we assume that that may evolve over time.

So again, a lot of this detail, you'll see a note here that these activities might be useful to include in an initial workplan of the standing committee but that embedding them in the charter may become a bit challenging as the work evolves and you might feel the need to update the charter as it evolves.

So to Cheryl's point, less is more in terms of what goes in the charter and the level of detail here.

TOM BARRETT:

Sure. I think that's fine. I would just go back up, that paragraph under three, I would remove the words "initial" that appear at least twice. I

don't think we need the word "initial" since it is an ongoing focus. I think it appears twice.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I think that's fine.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Any other questions, comments before I move on?

TOM BARRETT: I guess a general question—I don't want to spend too much time on it, but do you envision that we'll have to develop an operating procedure for the standing committee similar to what the NomCom has? Or is that just an annual workplan?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's a good question, Tom. I don't know. Are there other folks from ICANN Org that can speak to whether there's precedent for that and if that's customary for a group like this?

TOM BARRETT: What do other standing committees do? Sorry, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Sorry, Tom, yeah, we can certainly take a look at other similar standing committees. I don't have direct experience, but it seems to me based on the charter and the intent and purpose that a workplan that's anchored to the charter seems to be sufficient. That just is my take.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. That sounds good. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just following on from Larisa, I actually think there's a greater dynamism—but that is in no way indicating lesser importance—to a regularized and annual workplan, and I think that should be a very public workplan. I think it is important to have it as particularly with a startup entity, dynamic and open to feedback as well. So I would definitely be going in that well-known, well-publicized, well-developed regularized workplan. It may not even be an annual one. It may be an 18-month one, because there's an overlap period between one NomCom and the next. But that, to me, with a strongly built charter and clearly understood mission and purpose, is the most useful way forward.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Dave is saying that they should have operating procedures and that could be incorporated, I guess, into a workplan. I assume they would come up with a standard template that might contain this sort of list that we're deleting today. That might come up to be the standard template for an annual workplan. Just to make sure you're not missing anything.

all right, Kristy, I'll let you keep going.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Sure. We've eliminated a lot of this detail in case it's useful to put in a work program. And then again, the relationship with ICANN Org, we thought, was helpful to keep in here and articulate here. So again, we talked about working in consultation or cooperation with ICANN Org to help assess the previous cycle, determine if processes are working properly, any changes needed, and then again to not be too long-term perspective, we say "Activities may include ..." And that's what's listed here. So it's indicative but not prescriptive in terms of what needs to happen, if that makes sense.

TOM BARRETT:

Yeah. Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

And then this section also, Sam felt, was important to maintain in terms of providing guidance to appointing bodies, especially around the diversity needs for the NomCom in line with Work Stream 2 recommendations, and again, "Activities for this may include ..." to provide indicative guidance for future standing committees without overly prescribing what they're doing. And the other detail here is removed, but of course, this detail could be moved to—as I suggest in the comment here—activities, programs so that it's not lost because I think the standing committee is going to need some guidance on what

it's initially working on and how that work evolves over time, but [that is best placed] in a living document rather than a character.

And then section six here, we change—the descriptions here seem more indicative of the outputs or the work products that the standing committee would be doing. I'm sorry some of this is bolded text. For some reason, Google Docs changes the formatting sometimes.

So we've just reframed this as the outputs that the standing committee would be responsible for. And again, it's framed as "Such as ..." So it's not limited to this, it's not the only thing that the standing committee could do, but it's indicative of what kinds of things that the standing committee would provide in terms of outputs. Any questions or comments on that?

TOM BARRETT:

No, I think that's a good change.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Okay. And then this, I would say, is probably the section that's most under construction in terms of some need for probably another conversation with Sam. So the process that she suggested was to just mirror the Board onboarding process, so numbering the seats one through four and kind of having this clear rotational basis on when they join and when they conclude. But because there are so few seats, it's a little bit more challenging in terms of staggering the terms and making sure that you have a solid first standing committee and that there's not too many bodies moving in and out of that in the first couple of years.

So that's an area that I still need to work with her on further articulating, but just wanted to let you all know where that's at and that this is probably going to change pretty significantly the next time you see it.

TOM BARRETT:

So this basically is coming up with an eight-person standing committee, or how many members are we looking at now? Ten?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

I think it's still four. It's just saying that the seats will be numbered one through four and rotate accordingly. And then there's just articulation of everyone's responsible for recommending members and then the role of the Board I think still needs to be determined whether or not they play a more active role or if they're just involved in the selection of candidates. So that's something that we need to discuss a little bit more with Sam.

And membership requirements, there was a question from Sam here just saying that endorsements might raise governance issues, applicants endorsed by the SO/AC. I think these redline edits were provided by the working group on the last iteration, yeah?

TOM BARRETT:

It was a few iterations. But let me back up for a second. Any thoughts or comments on the changes to the composition? That really doesn't change much, right? From what we had before.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Not so far, no, and this is probably the area that's going to need the most revisions next.

TOM BARRETT: So the first four members—are we still saying these are appointed by the Board, or are we saying that—the font is a little small, that's why I'm squinting here.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh, sorry. I can zoom in a bit more. Here you go.

TOM BARRETT: Are we saying that the Board will select the four members, or are we saying they're selected some other way?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That is sort of to be determined. So we're trying to address the concern around self-perpetuation of the committee.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Yeah, item C, if that's still valid, is saying each organization is responsible for the method by which it recommends a member to the standing committee. So that implies that the ACs and SOs are recommending someone, right?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: They are. But obviously, there are only four seats and there are many more SO/ACs. So how they are selected, and making sure that each group is represented on a rotational basis, needs to be further articulated.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. And then on your membership requirements, you were saying that there was an issue about applicants being endorsed. That's kind of a moot point if they're actually recommending a member now.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Right. And there's somewhere inhere a question of, should they recommend just one person or should they recommend two to three and then the existing standing committee along with the Board representative then makes a call about who will be invited? So those details need to still be figured out.

TOM BARRETT: And where it says incoming members who are not from the same SO/ACs, why is that highlighted?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I'm not sure. Sam highlighted that. Maybe she didn't mean to highlight that one. Maybe she just meant to highlight the endorsement one. So I'll talk with her about that.

TOM BARRETT: Obviously, the idea is to make sure we don't see the same—we have to rotate somehow.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Exactly.

TOM BARRETT: So [inaudible] force a rotation. Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: And then the terms, I think this is added text and then we're just trying to clarify what the rotation process is going to be. Sam had a comment on suggesting that we remove the vacancy process until we determine what the preferred selection process is. So we don't want to put the cart before the horse in terms of articulating what the vacancy process is before we really solidify this composition section.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So we'll come back to that. And so all the red text, in case this isn't clear, that was prior redline from the working groups. So those are your edits, and everything in green are the edits that I made based upon the conversations with Sam.

And the meetings, [inaudible] there's a little bit of seemingly conflicts in terms of information here on the meetings. So it says for instance email discussions do not constitute meetings, but then down here it says consensus can be determined and documented by Internet-based discussion without the need for a meeting. So it might be a little bit confusing. If an e-mail discussion isn't a meeting, how do you take a decision by consensus in an e-mail discussion?

TOM BARRETT: Well, can you take a survey or a vote?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I guess so, but we probably need to clarify the language just so that it's not seemingly inconsistent between these two sections. And then we added—this is really similar language to the conflict of interest policy in the bylaws, so we just kind of pulled from there to articulate the conflict of interest policy, and then we added in that the Board has a role in charter and approval of charter amendments.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, those look like good edits to me. Any other thought or comments from others? So what's the next step on this, Kristy?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think from my side, I wanted to be able to share the latest stage of this with you all, see if you had any questions, comments, concerns and then based upon this meeting, I'll plan to keep working closely with Sam on

getting closer to a final redline that we can present to the working group to see if you have any other suggested revisions or changes or questions. So hopefully by our next meeting—I think it's on the 29th. Is that right?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So I don't know what various holiday schedules look like, but personally I would hope to aim to get you a more complete redline version by the 29th.

TOM BARRETT: Today's the 8th. [We're not] meeting on the 22nd perhaps. Are we meeting on two weeks?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: We moved it because Vanda is involved in the—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [I remember that I asked it, yeah,] because of NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: I have no problem with these edits. Obviously, it's a much more lightweight charter, but [inaudible] so it doesn't preclude anything that's

been taken out. So unless anyone else has issues, I say we keep moving forward with it.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Will do. And thank you very much. And in the meantime, if anything strikes you, if you have any questions, comments, feel free to e-mail me and I'll do my best to incorporate that in the next iteration.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Thanks, Kristy.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, thanks, Kristy. It's an enormously important piece of work you're doing. Greatly appreciated.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Really good.

TOM BARRETT: So I think we're at the end of our agenda. Any Other Business? We have the next meeting on the 29th, not the 22nd, correct?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Correct. That's my fault, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: And what should we talk about next meeting? Any thoughts about—are we going to talk about the same thing, still working on the charter, or do we want to start working on something else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, if we've got a fresh version by then, there should be some time devoted to reviewing the status of it, because we should be hopefully getting it towards finalization.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So what's the logical next thing to work on after we're comfortable with this charter? Any thoughts?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We agree with you and Cheryl. We need to put something behind us and go further. So if Kristy come out with this final version, I believe that is good to pass through and put behind.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tom. Another thought, or in addition to what Vanda and others said, we will be preparing an update, your semi-annual update,

and as part of that, I think that'll give us a good opportunity to see where things are based on the detailed workplan—or I'm not quite sure what the specific name is, but that might also bring more into focus what else is remaining after some of these bigger ticket items are addressed and moved forward. So we anticipate having at least a draft of some sort to share with you all by the next meeting on that point.

TOM BARRETT: Awesome. Thank you. Any Other Business or comments?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Not from my side.

TOM BARRETT: All right. We'll talk to you guys in three weeks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, everybody.

LARISA GURNICK: Kristy had her hand up. I think she probably wants to just recap decisions, action items and such.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, go ahead, Kristy.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, just to make sure—and I've got kind of messy notes over here because I was sharing my screen also, but just to recap. Org will make some edits to the e-mail to participants and also include some practical suggestions. The aim there on the timeline is to conclude the work by the end of the year. We will send out a clean version of the blog by end of day our time today in the Pacific Coast, and the aim is to have that published by next Wednesday.

Org will continue to work on charter revisions and present these on the 29th and then as Theresa mentioned, we also have the semi-annual update being prepared so we can review that and discuss it on the 29th as well. Did I miss anything critical?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I guess no.

LARISA GURNICK: I was just going to add that I think Tom also suggested outreach to some folks in IPC or I forget the groups that you mentioned, Tom, but you know what talking about, some outreach—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The business and the IPC.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. And I'll contact my own [registrar or registry] constituencies too, just to say they had the opportunity. I'll send off a few e-mails. And we also said that on that e-mail, we're going to send out to members who haven't shown up in a year or so. Actually, if they want to reengage, here's what the commitment is that we're looking for for the rest of the year.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If they don't want to reengage, feel free to let staff know that they are being removed.

TOM BARRETT: That's right.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: I think that's a go do summary. Anything else, guys?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I don't think so.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Thanks, Kristy. I think we're good.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, [inaudible].

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]