YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group Meeting #84 on August 12 at 19:00 UTC.

Joining our call today from the Review Implementation Working Group is Tom, Cheryl, Dave, Vanda—I know Remmy was in here, he might have gotten disconnected—and Jay.

Joining from the ICANN staff is Larisa, Jia, Teresa, Kristy, and Yvette Guigneaux, myself.

We'd also like to remind you today's call is being recorded, so please state your name for the record and for the transcript.

Does anybody have any updates to their SOI? No? Okay, it looks like we're good there. So I'll get the agenda on screen and, Tom, I will turn it over to you.

TOM BARRETT:

Thank you, Yvette. Hi, everybody. Welcome. We're going to go through the final executive summary or the midyear report, see if that can be put to rest and sent off to the OEC. And then staff has been going over the implementation steps in our implementation plan and revising those to be for accuracy. And then we can discuss one to two areas of work to focus on for this and the next call as well.

So should we jump right in? Kristy, are you going to handle this? All right.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, Tom. We thought we would just give one last quick overview of the executive summary just as a reminder to everyone in the working group. It's been sent out a couple of times via the mailing list. I think the latest version which includes proposed edits and comments from Tom is shown here.

And the proposal to the working group that we discussed with Cheryl and Tom in advance of this call was just given the timing that this report was technically due the end of June we asked for an extension given the ongoing work that the working group has been doing, especially around the important issues like the standing committee charter, for instance. That report would come a bit later.

We're about to offer this agenda item going into the spreadsheet where we're going to walk through the status of various implementation steps for recommendations. And that's where there's a lot more detail in terms of what actually is remaining to be done in the next four and a half months through the end of the year.

So the suggestion is to just by way of expediency give an update to the OEC by sharing this executive summary with them as the midyear report and just send a more detailed end of year report with all of the status of implementation steps, hopefully most of which will be completed by then.

So this is sort of our last chance to look at the current version of the executive summary if there's anything glaringly missing or needs to be modified in it. Tom, is there anything you wanted to add to that by way of characterizing and teeing this up?

TOM BARRETT:

No, no, no. I think executive summary I think is suitable length for a midyear report. Did ICANN staff have any thoughts on whether or not this would be appropriate or any other suggestions?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Lisa, did you want to speak to if this is going to be appropriate from the OEC's perspective?

LARISA GURNICK:

Hello, everybody. Sure, I'm happy to speak to that point on the timeliness and transparency topic that that Kristy had teed up. We thought that the executive summary would provide a useful update, not just to the OEC but also to the community. Because then you know part of this when you all approve it to send to the OEC also gets posted on the wiki for even greater transparency. So we thought that would be helpful.

And depending on the nature of the conversation in the next agenda item as to ways that we could update the more detailed steps, we also thought that it might be good to maybe follow up with part two of this progress update if you will that provides the more details as to the specific implementation steps. So perhaps a good way forward considering timing and deadlines and just what's possible and what's not possible would be to start out with the executive summary and then follow with a more detailed update as it becomes available. Thank you.

EN

TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Larisa. So I guess I wanted to understand a little bit more about the thinking behind that. I was thinking that we would not have a part two at all. This would be our midyear report in its entirety, and then for the end of year report we would include updates to the implementation plan. Do you think it's necessary to do something before yearend in terms of updating those steps?
LARISA GURNICK:	Tom, thank you for the question. I guess the thinking is that while the executive summary really tackles the areas of primary focus over the last six or seven months already and the more complicated issues perhaps, there's still quite a bit of other stuff—sorry—work, steps, procedures, and progress that it is likely useful to reflect really to speak to the work and the effort of this group. So while I don't know that it's explicitly necessary, I think that it would reflect well to demonstrate all the progress that has been made.

So it's just a matter of…and perhaps, Tom, it might be helpful for you to see, for you all to see the way the implementation steps have been organized for slightly easier digestion updates and whatnot. And particularly as Kristy walks through some of the specifics that she'd like to flag for you all today. We might be able to come to a pretty easy conclusion that some of these things could be included in a follow-up update without too, too much trouble and extra effort but it would reflect well to show that progress is being made.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. All right, great. Thank you for that. So, Kristy, do you want to walk through this executive summary and see if there are any final thoughts or comments or objections to the edits?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure, Tom, I'm happy to. And as I think you're sharing, if you could just scroll through. Folks have received this email a couple of times but just to orient everyone on the call so we're on the same page, this provides a brief overview of the main areas of work that the working group has been focused on basically since January of this year. You can keep scrolling. Yes, this is good. There we go.

It emphasizes the revisions proposed to the standing committee charter. That is something that I think everyone is aware is ongoing. I think we would have been able to wrap it up this week with this with a final draft on the standing committee charter. But just given that Sam is out we wanted to make sure that we're using everyone's time as efficiently as possible. So having that conversation around decision-making and voting procedures and how you define consensus, it would be good to get her experience on how to make that most efficient based upon her views of how things work in other groups.

So we did want to tee that up as a major outcome of work for the OEC to be aware of, that that's been a pretty significant piece of work that this working group has been working on. And that in that subsequent follow-up report that's where we could put a placeholder to include that final proposed draft of the standing committee charter that has

complete buy-in from the working group and that has been discussed with legal. So it should be in pretty good shape for their consideration.

And then following that we talk about progress on other recommendations as well as outreach efforts to enhance participation in this group which has already yielded greater participation even in the few weeks that we've been doing that with a new member and this greater involvement from existing members. So that's been fantastic.

Tom, feel free if you want to jump in to speak to any of your comments, but they all…I've reviewed them all. They all seem very straightforward to me. Thanks for looking at it carefully and providing those clarifications. That's really helpful.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I guess the key point here is that making sure ICANN Legal is not doing any research or analysis regarding the term "independent directors" since we no longer use that for this review. So if they need to do some research, it's around "unaffiliated directors" and not "independent directors." So I want to make sure they're going down the right path for that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, I believe they are, and thank you for catching that.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Cool. Yeah, the rest is straightforward.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I mean, there's a summary of the proposed bylaws changes which, again, doesn't get into the details of exactly what those are at this point but at least highlights the areas where there will be proposed bylaws changes related to five recommendations.

And then I think either at the very end of this or in the accompanying cover note, that's where we could provide a detailed update to the OEC of where things are at now, why they're receiving an executive summary report, what they can expect to see in the follow-up report with some more detail. Including the final draft charter and detailed data on the status of all the remaining implementation steps.

Including whose responsibility the steps are because as we went through them as you'll see in the next agenda item it's very comprehensive in terms of outlining all the steps that need to happen to get from recommendation to implementation. But I just want to make sure that this group isn't taking on too much given the work that you've already put in and the goal to wrap up the work by the end of this year. So we want to just make sure that the responsibility for who is doing what is really clearly parsed out so that we can get a good handle on what's the remaining work that the group needs to focus on.

So we can put that in a draft cover note and send it to this group for review and comment as well.

TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Kristy. I was on an IPC call yesterday and it was mentioned that the OEC has already had a call with the SOs and ACs of the GNSO, I believe, and they mentioned some of the things they're trying to do for the NomCom review. So I know they're starting to have those conversations as well and do some outreach to the GNSO in particular about some of our recommendations. Do we have someone here on the ICANN staff that attends those calls as well?
LARISA GURNICK:	Tom, I would generally be in attendance on any organized OEC calls on a topic specific to NomCom issues. But the one that you reference, I'm not immediately aware of, so possibly this was one of the Board members attending their normal…having regular interaction with a particular stakeholder group and could have mentioned this. So, unfortunately, I can't bring more clarity. But for future interactions that are structured in terms of the OEC reaching out to, let's say, SOs and ACs leadership and such, myself and others on my team would definitely be a part of those conversations.
TOM BARRETT:	Okay, great. Thank you, Larisa. All right, so do we need any sort of consensus or vote to approve this executive summary? How do we proceed with this, procedurally?
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	I believe we could put the mark for we agree, we not agree, or something like that.

TOM BARRETT: Sure.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just for being registered that we are in accordance what is written there.

TOM BARRETT: That works for me.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: For those who need to know how to do the mark, at the bottom of your screen or the bottom of your Zoom toolbar there's something called "Reactions." If you pop that up, you'll see where that green checkmark is just in case you're wondering how to do that.

TOM BARRETT: You want a green check or a thumbs-up?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I put a green. Whatever.

TOM BARRETT: All right, green check or if you disagree you can put a sad face or an X. All right, it looks like we have four people who agree. Still waiting on you, Remmy and Jay, Arinola. There we go.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We also have agreement in the chat from Dave, so Dave is good, plus one.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, awesome. Thanks, Dave. All right, so not seeing any disagreement, we can send this out to the OEC.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Thanks, everybody. I guess you remove your green check. All right, so next agenda item is to look at the spreadsheet that staff has put together.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, and that will be me. I just need sharing privileges for the so I can share my screen.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, let me go ahead and hand you that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We'll gladly make you co-host, Kristy. You're the next [inaudible].

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, so as usual I have too many windows open. Let me see if I can find the right one here.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I personally think that's a sign of intelligence.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Let's hope so.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: That's my story, and I'm sticking to it.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So can you all see the spreadsheet here?

TOM BARRETT: Yes.

EN

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, great. And is it zoomed in enough for you to actually see it, or do you need me to zoom in a bit more?

TOM BARRETT: Oh, well, I can certainly read it.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah? Okay. And, Yvette, if you don't mind just popping in a link to this in the chat. It was sent via the email listserv for the meeting materials, but just so everyone can access it, that would be great.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: All right.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you so much. I'll just quickly walk through this. So basically, as we went through the December 2020 report and the implementation steps based upon what was marked as completed versus outstanding, it brought up a few questions in terms of we wanted to make sure that the steps that are marked as outstanding are truly outstanding and then we wanted to get clarity on who is really responsible for doing these remaining outstanding steps. Because, for instance, some of it says ICANN Board to take action on bylaws change, which is great, but that's for the ICANN Board to do and not a responsibility that the working group has to take on.

TOM BARRETT: Yep.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So as you try to define what is it that actually you need to focus on for the next few months of your work to wrap this up, we wanted to make sure that we were really parsing out this is what the RIWG has to focus on. These are some implementation steps that involve other actors, but we really want to be able to zero in on the remaining work for this group.

So that's what you see here. And just to walk you through the spreadsheet I should point out this is part of our broader database. And so as I understand, the data that you see here will be publicly available on the wiki. So as implementation steps get updated or completed, that will be reflected in the database and then reflected on the wiki in real time. So it's a fair amount of work right now upfront to walk through this in excruciating detail, but the benefit is that it's going to be publicly available, it will updated real time, and the final reports that this group produces are going to be really accurate in terms of what you've done and accomplished and what remains.

So you'll see here there's just the subject includes the title of the recommendation, the description of the recommend here in Column F, the set of completed implementation steps, and then what we currently understand as outstanding implementation steps.

And then you'll see here in Column K that ICANN Org staff has had some conversations to just try and give an update on in some cases what's happened since 2018 when this review was completed, which may have

implications for whatever remaining work needs to be done in terms of implementing that recommendation. So that's what we have here in Column K, and that's mostly what we're going to speak to on the call. And I will lean pretty heavily on my colleagues Teresa and Jia on the NomCom support staff to provide those insights since that's their day-to-day work.

So before we go into the details, any upfront questions or comments on this approach to the spreadsheet or anything that's not clear?

TOM BARRETT: No, that makes a lot of sense. This is a good approach.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. So, Teresa and Jia, I'm going to ask you to jump in here pretty frequently as we walk through this, but we've got here on this Recommendation 1, we had a call that you probably know off the top of your head but I can't remember which call it was. It was a couple of months ago where we basically said once the SOs and ACs are asked to post their final job descriptions, then we would consider Recommendation 1 complete. And so, Teresa and Jia as the NomCom support staff agreed to take that on to make that request. And, Teresa and Jia, is there anything that you wanted to add to that?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: Sure. Yes, we will request that each of the SOs and ACs post the job description once the application for then NomCom delegates is confirmed. This year, we sent them a PDF of the request in an email, but

going forward we will definitely request that they post it on their website.

TOM BARRETT: Sounds good.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Jia. So that's Recommendation 1 that will be completely done once that request is sent. And, thank you, Jia and Teresa, for being willing to do that.

Recommendation 2, this has to do with training, and there are actually several recommendations that are training related. So if you scroll down here, you've got member training, leadership training, and evaluation training. And you can see in the comments here in Column K that you've got some notes just in terms of basically what's evolved in the training within the NomCom work over the last couple of years.

Teresa or Jia, did you want to speak to the current offerings on this and maybe what you think might be remaining work to fulfill these recommendations, if any?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: A few of these have been implemented. We have had the unconscious bias training which includes interview skills and evaluation training. In addition, this year we have launched the board governance training for not only the leadership but as well as the whole NomCom delegates. So

it's the same training that the Board members get, so they have those trainings as well.

There's one point that we wanted to clarify which was the metrics to make improvements to the training. This could be a different conversation or we could take it offline, but we wanted clarity on metrics on how to define improvements for these trainings.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Which, Jia, if I remember correctly, is actually related to another recommendation. Is that right?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: Exactly, yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I can't remember which recommendation off the top of my head, but it's further down. So maybe we just make a note of that here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I mean, I think there are two ways to determine metrics here. One is a survey of the people who participate in the training to see if they thought it achieved its objectives. So I assume some sort of questionnaire happens after the training perhaps to gauge what people thought of that. The other metric really will be in the receiving bodies about whether or not good candidates are being selected that fit the job description for the various openings. All right, any other [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Hey, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I popped it in chat. I think there's value in both those things. It may be that there's a greater frequency. You might end up two or three data points depending on how much training is done for the exit surveys for the trainees. But you at least, I would think, would want annual feedback from the receiving bodies. I think they're both quite valuable measuring points.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Anyone else have thoughts about metrics for training?

TERESA ELIAS: Hi.

TOM BARRETT: Hi.

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, can you clarify for me how your second metric that you mentioned which would be to gain information or feedback back from the other

selecting bodies whether or not they are receiving qualified candidates? To me, that falls into the assessment and evaluation process versus training. Because this is…I'm going to stop there because I don't want to confuse the issue.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Let me go to Tracy next before I respond. Tracy?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Hi, Tom. One suggestion I have is perhaps to do the evaluation of the training both immediately after the exercise has been completed as an evaluation by the NomCom members themselves but perhaps another evaluation similar to an exit type—I don't know if that's what Cheryl is getting at—but an exit type approach at the end of the cycle. And perhaps at that point they could assess the impact of that training, the impact on the approach to the evaluation itself. Just coming out of two similar NomCom exercises I think that might be valuable because it also would help with the improvement if required of the training for the next cycle.

So if there was any, for that particular group of NomCom members, if they linked anything that happened in the training activity, whatever it was, so the evaluation or whatever they would have been doing in that process. And if they saw a need to add or improve anything, that would be a good opportunity to do it at that point. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Tracy. I appreciate that. So I'll put myself in the queue, Teresa, to try to address your last question. I would think that, obviously, we have job descriptions that are written by the receiving bodies for their appointees. There needs to be a feedback mechanism at some point about whether or not the NomCom is doing a good job meeting those job descriptions with their appointees. I don't know when that takes place.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible]

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry, Vanda? Go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: A 360 evaluation among the appointees.

TOM BARRETT: I guess I was thinking more of if, for example, let's say the Board is saying they want to see appointees who understand board governance more or nonprofit finance. They want someone for their finance committee. That's specific in what they put in the job description. I'd like to someone with a finance background. You would think we would get feedback back to the NomCom if the appointees met the job description written by them.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I'm just getting a bit of apples and oranges mixed here in barrels, at least in my mental barrels. So help me understand. I would have thought that the metrics we're interested in for these recommendations which are to do with NomCom members would be limited to the NomCom members, not who the NomCom appoints.

And so as Tracy said, there's a number of opportunities at the beginning and annually and at the end of the term to extract their data from them: "How did you find the training? What other training or support might have been useful?" type stuff, right? But there's also the sending bodies, and we need to make really sure that there is flexibility in whatever is set up here.

And I think that's what you're saying, or at least in relation to these recommendations, that if we send five people to the NomCom from the ALAC At-Large, then the sending body—ALAC At-Large—could and should have any opportunity to say how they see those people are doing. In other words, are they communicating updates from the NomCom in any given year? Are they giving regular presentation material to their communities? That sort of stuff, right? That's different, however, to the similar but distinctly different assessment by the receiving bodies on the type of candidates that are appointed.

I just want to make sure we're all clear on which type of measure we're using for which of these recommendations. That's all.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or do I have it wrong?

TOM BARRETT: Well, yeah, I guess I did have it differently. I think that in terms of the sending bodies and whether or not the people they're sending to the NomCom are doing a good job, that really has nothing to do with the training per se. It has more to do with whether or not they've written a good job description for those NomCom members. I don't see that necessarily, whereas the training is designed to say let's level set. We have people coming in from various bodies with different skillsets and understanding of what a Board member does. Are they being trained sufficiently so they can do their job? I guess that's why I thought the only way to determine if they're doing their job is to ask the receiving bodies if they're getting good appointees. So it's a combination of two things, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: It's a combination of did the appointing body send someone who is worthy but also were they trained appropriately to do the job?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, can I jump in here really quick?

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead.

TERESA ELIAS: I want to sort of go back to where we're supposed to be on this particular recommendation which this is for training specifically for the NomCom delegates. And this is to ensure that they have the appropriate…they're aware of the policies and guidelines and that they need to abide by when making the assessments and selections.

TOM BARRETT: Yep.

TERESA ELIAS: And they also have the training skills and tools to be able to review the applicants' skillsets so that we are following the recommendations and guidelines which have been given to us by the appointing bodies. That's the training we're talking about here. That's what this recommendation is about.

TOM BARRETT: Right. Thanks, Teresa.

TERESA ELIAS: And then our question was….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I'll [inaudible] what she said.

TERESA ELIAS: And the question was, because here the working group is requesting a metric, the question was what sort of metric do we use that says that we are providing those trainings? And my comment was to this is that in particular—and I think for a lot of working group committees—is that all trainings should be reviewed every year to make sure in case there's new information that should be shared, in case there are new trainings that need to be put into place, so that it's always improving and always evolving. And so those metrics may also be changing and improving as the skills of the NomCom committees continue to advance and improve. Off my soapbox.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. Stay there. I love you on that soapbox. It's a beautiful position, and it's a statue that we need to take a snapshot of because I agree 100%.

TOM BARRETT: All right, so just to clarify, we're seeing a screenshare here. These edits are going under Recommendation 1. I assume they should go under Recommendation 2.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. That's me, Tom. And, yeah, you're right. This spreadsheet is a little bit wonky in terms of it moving around. And so there we go.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, okay. All right, so I will…I mean, I still believe—maybe this will come later—I still believe that we need to get some sort of feedback from the receiving bodies on whether or not the NomCom is picking good candidates. And I guess if it turns out they're not, then we need to address that somehow, partially through training.

TERESA ELIAS: Yeah, and I agree, Tom. But I think, so that we're not wasting your time, I think if we just sort of make the decisions per recommendation, then we can blow through this really quickly and it doesn't muddy the waters about what we're talking about in any decisions and guidance on from the working group members. And that would be really, really helpful.

TOM BARRETT: All right. All right.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, so are there any…this number three has been crossed out in terms of implementation steps just because it's done. So it's noted here. and Step #4 is, again, the metrics that need to be applied to determine the success of the training program.

And we don't have to dive into the substance of those conversations right now to determine what those metrics ought to be. It's more just to determine, okay, this is our outstanding implementation step that this group does need to come back to and have a conversation about at some point. For right now, we're just trying to figure out what are those outstanding implementation steps that we need to put on the agenda for the next couple of months. Does that make sense?

TOM BARRETT: Yep.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Anything else on this? I think some of the budget implementation steps here, make budget request as part of ICANN's budget cycle, so if you recall the current draft standing committee charter includes a role for the standing committee to represent the NomCom in ICANN planning and budgetary conversations because it provides that continuous [inaudible] of resources that are needed year over year. So I'm not sure if these implementation steps remain salient for this working group to do versus maybe part of ongoing work of the standing communicate, for instance. Does that make sense?

TOM BARRETT: Right. I guess there's already training that takes place. We don't want to reinvent the wheel for what NomCom staff is already doing for their training process, right?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: So the question as a review group what do we need to do for training that's already happening?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Teresa or Jia, do you want to speak to that?

TERESA ELIAS: I think my question here from the review group is I think Larisa added something in the chat. So Larisa added that we could draft the metrics that you all could review and if you agree upon it, then that would be something that we would need your buy-in from on how to develop the metrics that would be satisfactory.

The surveys are a great idea, but I've got one thing to add to that. Surveys are only as accurate as the participants agree to respond to. So we can send out the surveys. And, of course, I'm sure all of you have been through this. Surveys go out but if not everyone participates, then it's a very narrow…we have a very narrow feedback item. And so maybe we need to figure out how else to get this better responded to.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Just to respond to Teresa to start with, I would take—perhaps unsurprisingly for those of you who know me—a very simple approach to that dilemma, Teresa. It's not considered that training is completed nor the NomCom member has in fact performed adequately as a NomCom member until they do do a survey. They're not negotiable. I mean, we've got a captive group of NomCom members. They'll bloody well do as they're asked. And if not, then they're replaced. So that would be my approach to making sure you've got the right degree of survey feedback, but that wasn't why I put my hand up.

Why I put my hand up was in response to the question on the standing committee and budget aspect. And I do think that what we have here is a situation where implementation steps for this—and in fact these, there could be other recommendations—were put together without our knowledge now of what the standing committee would specifically do.

So this is an example of when we first put the steps together, we thought these very important steps would live associated just with this recommendation. But now we've got the standing committee stuff fleshed out, it can be there's a nexus with that activity and it can be almost halved off and noted that that's where that activity belongs. The implementation still has to happen. It's who, how. It's the how part and the who part of it being done that needs to also be tied in. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. I'll note Remmy agrees with Larisa in the chat and Tracy [inaudible] post evaluation. But now I guess to Cheryl's last point, these outstanding steps, I think the suggestion is these are not outstanding for us. They're going to be outstanding for the standing committee. So we can, in a sense, declare victory in some places here. Is that a new hand, Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: No, sorry.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So I think I agree with Cheryl. Some of these steps are no longer outstanding for us. Maybe we need to just…we've talked about metrics already. So 5a, for example, word with ICANN Org to identify suitable vendors. I don't think we're going to do that, right? We're going to let the standing committee do that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, we are not doing that.

TOM BARRETT: Vanda agrees, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yeah. Definitely standing committee.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So, yes. So 5a, 5b, 5c…so a, b, and c all go to the standing committee as does 6 and 7. So all we have left as an open item here really is to finalize [inaudible].

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's it.

TOM BARRETT: Does that make sense? And I would say we would repeat that for the next two recommendations as well.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: It seems so. Let's have a look here. Yes, they're pretty much the same.

TOM BARRETT: So, yeah, for Number 3 we'll do the metrics for leadership training. Then all the other ones get delegated to the standing committee.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: Cool. Are you comfortable with that approach, Kristy and Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS:	Yes, sir. Thank you.
TOM BARRETT:	Okay, thanks.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Okay, so everyone doesn't have to watch me do this, I'll just highlight this.
TOM BARRETT:	Oh, it's fun to watch.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Okay, so we've done all three of those. Moving on to recruiting consultant. Teresa and Jia, we have some status notes in here in terms of the current process. Did you want to speak to these a bit?
TERESA ELIAS:	Sure. What's changed is we tried to make sure…our goal was to try to make sure especially this year that our regions were equally and effectively represented when they were going out and recruiting candidates. So Jia and I sent out emails to vendors that we knew provided the resource for recruitment and had them submit statements of work. We looked over that and presented three of the final selection to the leadership, went through. They reviewed. We made a selection on two, again with a goal to make sure that all regions were represented.

And then once the vendors were selected, then they go through the process of clearly being established and establishing contracts and making sure that they're within the budget guidelines, etc. And then there is a…once that has all been finalized and approved, then there is a meeting that takes place with the vendors with the recruitment agencies with the NomCom so that expectations of what the NomCom wants them to specifically recruit for is discussed and then a project plan is laid out. So once that's all rolled out then the recruitment firms, the gates are opened and they're allowed to go do their work.

That is the process now. Not saying it's perfect. Not saying it doesn't need improvement. But that's currently what we've developed starting from 2018 to now, to this year.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you for that. And is Step 7 here the last step, or are there more steps?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Well, we're on [inaudible].

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, perfect. Okay. So again we have the involvement of the standing committee. So perhaps…so I guess the question is do you need anything more from the working group for this recommendation, or does the rest of this belong in the standing committee?

TERESA ELIAS: From the NomCom staff point of view, I believe that the remaining steps belong to the standing committee. But we do feel…I mean, we are fine. The NomCom staff is fine with getting feedback from the working group if they feel that there is somewhere in there that they would like us to improve on any of the process steps at this point.

TOM BARRETT: Is there a written description of that process, or is it just what you described?

TERESA ELIAS: It's just what I described. But certainly, we can definitely draft something up if you wish us to.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I mean, I think certainly as something the standing committee would probably need going forward that we have a written process for this. And I assume it also includes deadlines and dependencies.

TERESA ELIAS: Absolutely. We can definitely draft something up for the working group as a guide as Remmy is saying so that…and, yes, one of the things that I did not mention is that during the conversation with the recruiters with the NomCom a timeline is given to them of when they should be starting their work and the deadlines that they have to meet during those timelines. So the vendor is exposed to the timeline, but we are

definitely…the staff can definitely put together a description of what the recruiters…the expectation and the project plan.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you. Yeah, and the other element to this is making sure a written job description has been finalized for the receiving bodies before the recruiting consultant starts their work. So that's kind of a key dependency. I remember in the past it was well into recruiting season when, for example, the Board finally gave their advice on what they're looking for. We want to make sure that scenario doesn't happen. The Board advice has to occur and be assimilated by the NomCom prior to the recruiting activity commencing. So those sort of dependencies probably should be in the process.

TERESA ELIAS: Understood. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. Thanks for that. Okay, yeah, so if you could write something up, then we could review it. And that would be really the only final step we need to do for this recommendation.

TERESA ELIAS: Okay, understood.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I've just written that these steps will really be aimed at the standing committee, but I put a note here and this will be an action item that Org will draft up a process description as well as the dependencies and share with this working group.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Mm-hmm. Okay, so Rec 6 I think is pretty straightforward. Teresa or Jia, did you want to speak to this? There's just they no longer use outside evaluation resources.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: In the past there used to be an evaluation consultant, an outside firm who would assess the candidates. And as of, I believe it was 2018, the NomCom has decided not to use that external resource and the NomCom reviews the candidates.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jia. So the obvious question is whether that decision is binding on future NomComs.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: So there is an assessment and interview subcommittee, and they create the evaluation tools and matrices and information that's needed for the NomCom delegates. This is what's currently happening right now. There

could be changes in the future, but as of right now there is not an evaluation consultant.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I wouldn't want to tie it down. I think our language needs to be careful here because the discretion, those changes that we just described would vary from NomCom to NomCom and you need that flexibility for the NomComs to be built in. So as we capture it, just make sure that our language is not [inaudible] here. That it always preserves that autonomous ability of the NomCom to make those sorts of changes and decisions and, indeed, for another NomCom to reverse that sort of thing. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: So I guess the question is do we still have a recommendation here that we need to implement, or are we saying it's no longer applicable?

TERESA ELIAS: Can I jump in here, Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Sure, go ahead.

TERESA ELIAS: I think following up on what Remmy posted and what Cheryl said, maybe we look at this recommendation just in a slightly different angle whereas maybe this recommendation would be to review the evaluation process for accuracy and efficiency and if it is producing the results that are required of the NomCom to select the most effective candidates or selectees that are being requested from the appointing bodies.

Again, I think this is all part of a process. These are all processes that should never stop being under review. If we get feedback from selecting bodies that they're not completely satisfied with the selectees that they're getting or maybe we're not getting as many applicants as we want, maybe we look at the assessment process and the evaluation process to see what might be missing. So maybe it's about evaluation versus whether we have an outside resource or not.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks for that. I see comments from Dave and Remmy. So I guess I'm not comfortable for deciding this no longer is a recommendation. Obviously, it has already been approved by the Board. We can't simply say, okay, because the last two years hasn't done it, it no longer applies. But maybe again, as you point out, we can make this part of the standing committee's assessment that it goes through to help determine if it makes sense to hire an external evaluation consultant or not based on feedback from the NomCom for that year. Larisa, is that another hand?

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Tom. Essentially, to agree with you. I think that now that the role and the purpose for the standing committee is becoming clearer and more focused that could be where this is referred to for them to consider as they look at how well the process and the operations are delivering on the promise.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you. So I guess the question is on Column D, the subject and the description, should we have those strikeouts removed?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I mean, I think so.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Probably start acknowledging that there is this recommendation that is a differentiation between the RIWG working on it versus SC consideration given the fact that we no longer use an evaluation consultant externally right now. But that could change going forward depending on future decision-making and maybe assessment and guidance from standing committee as well.

TOM BARRETT:

All right, thanks. And Vanda is in a text as well agreeing. So I guess the question is do we have anything more to do from the review working group for this, or do we just be done? Do you think…Tracy, go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

I'm not sure if this is an opportune time to have the assessment of the actual non-evaluation consultant [inaudible] issue. Because that is available or can be made available at this point. I know that there's the [inaudible] but this particular NomCom used one approach. And is it something that, going forward, can it be part of this process? It seems as if it's sort of an all or nothing approach. So it's review the [inaudible] consultant recommendation but there's reference to what is currently going on. This is my point. So I'm wondering if there needs to be reference to also review what is currently happening with the NomCom of the day. I guess that's the way to say it.

So, for example, if they're using an approach that is relatively robust or whatever, the standing committee could look at that as well as any other consideration that would be [inaudible] consultant. Because it seems as if it's just, well, review [inaudible] consultant but it doesn't treat the review what has been happening as well [inaudible] there's a new answer.

TOM BARRETT:

Yep. Yep, thanks, Tracy. Yeah, that's a good point. So to tie a ribbon on this, again, I think that we're going to halve this off, as Cheryl says, to the standing committee as part of their job to assess the evaluation process and the need for a consultant.

EN

	We're at the top of the hour. Does anyone have any final thoughts on this before we go to any other business and next meetings?
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Not from my side.
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Vanda. So I think we have to stop there. Should we talk about the next meeting? Now we have our meeting with Göran coming up later this month.
LARISA GURNICK:	That's on the 30th of August, I believe. Yeah.
TOM BARRETT:	Okay. So when is our next meeting? Let's see….
LARISA GURNICK:	The 26th.
TOM BARRETT:	The 26th. So we have a call on Thursday the 26th and the Göran on Monday the 30th. Any other thoughts before we end the meeting?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	I'll just quickly, if I can, Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sorry. I couldn't raise my hand fast enough. I'll just review the decisions and action items for today for the record.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So we have a decision to approve the executive summary and send it to the OEC with a quick turnaround on the full status report of all the implementations steps once we've completed going through the spreadsheet.

And ICANN Org will draft up a process description for Recommendation 5, the recruiting consultant, for the working group to review.

And then there are a couple of other more specific notes that we captured in the spreadsheet in terms of what's going to be referred to the standing committee versus what are remaining steps for the working group. And so we'll make sure that those are action items that we take forward between now and the 26th.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Great. Thank you for that. And I assume the next meeting we'll continue this process. And again, hopefully most of the remaining open steps are moved to the standing committee. So I guess that the task will be to figure out which ones we can't really move. We want to [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. So have a nice weekend and we'll see you in a couple weeks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Thanks, everybody, for coming today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]