YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	Hello, everyone. Welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group Meeting #89 on November 17, 2021 at 19:00 UTC.
	Joining our call today from the Review Working Group is Tom, Arinola, Cheryl, Remmy, and Vanda. We do have apologies from Michael Graham, just so we get that on the record. And joining from the ICANN staff today, we have Kristy, Larisa, Jia, Teresa, and myself, Yvette. Is there any changes or updates to anyone's SOI? No? Okay. I think we're good with that. I'll go ahead and get the agenda on screen. And, Tom, I will turn it over to you.
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Yvette. Welcome, everyone. So today we'll go over the latest draft of the Standing Committee Charter we've just sent in the last 24 hours. And then we'll talk about, basically, our plans to get into year-end report and work on the remaining open items for next year. Shall we jump right into the charter? Kristy, are you going to lead this discussion?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Sure. Thanks, Tom. Hi, everyone. I'll just share my screen. Can you see the Standing Committee Charter?
TOM BARRETT:	Yes, we can.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Great. So you may recall on the last call, we went over verbally some of the changes that were made and your last thought. This latest version here is a clean version that ICANN Legal, Sam has just reviewed. We went through a number of iterations back and forth just to try to address her comments. She seems satisfied with this version, which is great. Of course, we recognize that you haven't seen it in a while. So we want to make sure that everyone on the working group understands the latest version. And any questions, comments, suggested revisions that you might have, we'll make those in suggestion mode and redline today, in case there are any. So, Tom, would it be helpful to just walk everyone through?

TOM BARRETT: I did have a chance to quickly review it. Maybe we go through section by section to get people's feedback. I've got a few comments. So let's just talk about the background. You have two paragraphs there, one describing the rationale for the charter, the second providing some historical reference. By the way, did anyone else have a chance to review this? I know it just came out.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Oh, I haven't. Sorry but I haven't.

TOM BARRETT: No worries. So it just came out. I have read some comments. I guess I'll make mine. So, Kristy, I'm going to suggest—I realize this charter basically has gone through several iterations and is in front of different

EN

audiences. But in terms of once it's done, I wonder if we even need this second paragraph. I would propose we just strike the whole paragraph. Basically, it refers to the some of the current rules of the NomCom, which won't be applicable if our bylaw changes go through. So I wonder if anyone would object if we just strike the whole thing.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. It looks repetitive because this is done under the context of NomCom. So people that are reading this understand what NomCom is. Because it's in many other issues and included bylaws what is NomCom is and how they operate and there is more than 20 years. So I do believe that is not necessary to repeat those things again in this background.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Any other thoughts?

TERESA ELIAS: Yes. Tom, this is Teresa. I'd like to respectfully sort of disagree. I think it should be left in because if this is going to be a public document, which, assuming that the whole idea behind this is for full transparency about NomCom, yes, there are plenty of people who know who NomCom is and what they are. But there are also plenty, there's just such a larger community that doesn't have a full idea of what NomCom is. And I think just that short paragraph of historical reference of who and what NomCom is, I think is necessary. It gives a quick drop of who they are, what they do, and who they serve. And, yes, if the bylaw takes hold and we change the one-term to two-year term, then that's the only thing

that has to change. So I think it is an informative paragraph and it is a good paragraph to have for people who don't have anything and who don't know about NomCom. I have to tell you, if you go to meetings and you walk around, people are like, "I don't know what NomCom does. I know that they see people but I don't know who they are. I don't know what they do." So I don't think there's anything wrong with having that informative paragraph there. I don't think it hurts anything.

TOM BARRETT: All right, fair point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, Cheryl here.

TOM BARRETT: Hey, Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maybe we can get some middle ground. I see Teresa's point of view very clearly. You know how you can move things across by saying it's an "quote" and so it just gets a little line down. It's clearly a little piece of— as if you've boxed it up, Teresa. But it's just a word processing tool normally. So just to make it very much the historical aspect. I think that'll do the job nicely. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, I'm fine with keeping it in. I wonder, how do you feel about striking the last sentence and keeping the rest?

TERESA ELIAS: I think we just change it when and if the bylaw takes effect. I think for now—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's going to be a living document.

TERESA ELIAS: And it's real. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's going to be a living document anyway, Tom. So if nothing else leaving the sentence there will mean that it's updated to the new terms when the bylaws come in.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. All right. Any other thoughts or comments on the Background section? Shall we move to the Purpose section?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. Will do, Tom. I just added that comment here to note any changes. I would say that overall, everything that was in the previous version is really trying to capture here in this latest version that the spirit of that—and we tried to reflect as much as possible—the changes

were more to, as we talked about previously, kind of bring up the level of detail a little bit and be less prescriptive about each activity and each step of work that the Standing Committee would do and more a kind of guiding document, to give examples of the work that they might do, and to provide a framework for them to operate in. But yeah, most of what was in the previous version is still here in some way, shape, or form. It's more that we clarified some points, made it clear that the Standing Committee is in an advisory role. And we remove some of the detail of the day-to-day work that it might be doing.

So this purpose here, again, largely reflects the previous one. I think we added a little bit more color to it in terms of describing continuous improvement, increasing the effectiveness and efficiency, while also enhancing NomCom's transparency and accountability to the overall ICANN community. Of course, the Standing Committee's role is to provide that continuity across the cycles and build institutional memory.

In the previous version, there was a third bullet here which talked about the need to communicate and coordinate with other entities to inform processes and standardize. It's more of the how of the purpose. So that you'll see actually woven throughout the charter more about that communication and coordination role, which is more how the Standing Committee will fulfill its purpose and less of a purpose in and of itself, if that makes sense.

TOM BARRETT: Yes. Okay. So this is slightly different. So the version I had, the word the "support" was capitalized, the first bullet, but here it's not.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think I just made that change this morning because the formatting was not working.

TOM BARRETT: Gotcha. Okay. Because I was going to suggest we capitalize the word provide.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Either way. But yes, consistent would be good. Yes.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So that was one comment. That's fine. It's just a grammatical issue. Then we have support continuous improvement to the NomCom Operating Procedures. That's fine. So I get these two main bullets and that makes sense to me.

The question I have is on the next paragraph. Some cases were a bit repetitive. So the second sentence talks about "The Standing Committee is an external complement to support continuous improvement." I've got a bunch of questions about this. Obviously, it's the first bullet of the purpose. Can we have a little discussion about who's responsible for driving continuous improvement of the NomCom? Is it the Standing Committee or is it the NomCom members or is it NomCom ICANN staff? What are people's thoughts on that? Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I believe that the NomCom itself, since the people is moving a lot, for instance, they see a lot of newcomers. They have no condition to be responsive for continuity. So it's something that needs to address points that, in my opinion, should be the Standing Committee that we have discussed before. Because some points may not add value to the previous knowledge about process, about communication, about training, and so on, should be done and should be overseen by someone that is not directly involved in the process itself, and maybe for the first time is looking at the process and they cannot understand if it is better or worse than the previous one. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I see Cheryl supporting you in the text. Anyone else have thoughts on that? ICANN staff, what do you think?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Hi, Tom. I'm happy to jump in. Sorry, it's hard for me to raise my hand when I'm sharing screen. I think the word "complement" here really reflects the Standing Committee's role in supporting that continuous improvement. I don't think the word driving would be the one that we would use but it's more that support role, considering that they are the group that's going to be around year over year in comparison to the NomCom itself. But the work of continuous improvement is also part of the role of the NomCom and the NomCom support staff and all the things around that. So I think the term here external compliment is that it's outside of the NomCom but it's still supporting that role of continuous improvement.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Kristy. Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Actually, Kristy just said exactly what I was going to say. If we look at the document and its overall content, the Standing Committee serves as a supporting and advisory role to provide assistance and guidance in the continuous improvement of the NomCom and its process. And like Kristy pointed out, words like drives or oversight, whatever, something like that, changes that role. And this document as it is, I think everyone's worked so hard on it to get it to the point where it is now where there's a comfort and an agreement about the role of the Standing Committee as it's spelled out in this document.

TOM BARRETT: So I guess I didn't hear any answer. Who's responsible for continuous improvement for the NomCom? Does anyone have any suggestions?

TERESA ELIAS: So the continuous improvement, Tom—please, I'm happy to have someone … Kristie, you can tell me if I'm wrong—if you're talking about who implements, is that what you're asking, Tom? Who implements the suggestions or recommendations?

EN

TOM BARRETT: No, I'm thinking, for example—Cheryl, I may be butchering what the ATRT3 did—but they talk about each group was going to come up with an annual continuous improvement plan and they would monitor progress against that plan. So who comes up with the plan for continuous improvement of the NomCom? Who really will publish it?

TERESA ELIAS: NomCom would, because NomCom is the body that actually drafts up its processes and procedures, and then clearly it's reviewed and commented on.

TOM BARRETT: So you're talking about NomCom volunteers or NomCom staff?

TERESA ELIAS: No.

TOM BARRETT: Vanda just said she didn't think it should be people involved in the process. Yeah, go ahead,

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, I supported Vanda's approach because I think the role of the Standing Committee as a resource for any given NomCom's annual improvement planning or tri-annual improvement planning is an important aspect. And what Continuous Improvement Programs do is ensure that there is an incremental improvement and that may or may

not involve significant override, it may involve minor tweaking, it may involve just follow a plan that was put together 10 years ago and it still works fine. It's the stop, look, and listen type approach to working forward. So I think with the right wording, without risking shifting the meaning that we have in this existing document, we should be able to see the Standing Committee as the important bridging resource for any given NomCom to meet that criteria that ATRT3 put together. Does that help?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. It helps. So are we envisioning that as part of the NomCom leadership responsibilities—what are they doing each year vis-à-vis continues improvement?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Tom, one of the advantages of the model that NomCom currently runs with is that that three-year cycling in the leadership team, one of the benefits of having a member of that team in the Standing Committee should take care of all of that. It's not up to our Standing Committee Charter design to look at that minutiae, in my view anyway.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. My concern is if no one's assigned this responsibility, how do we make sure it gets done? So you're saying—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'm saying is it is the entity, the actual bylaw recognized entity, which in this case is the Nominating Committee—in brackets—of any given year. They are responsible. That is where the responsibility lies unequivocally. We, in terms of the chartering of a Standing Committee, should be able to make very clear that the Standing Committee is a valuable asset and resource to any given NomCom in that process. And here, I don't mind how much of it is owned by staff and how much is owned by [inaudible] Mary who's been put on to the Nominating Committee by the Registry group, right? That doesn't matter as long as the work gets done and the Standing Committee is clearly a useful resource.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Is that a new hand, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. Hi, everybody. Just a point of clarification on the reference to ATRT3 recommendations. Tom, you're quite rightly. ATRT3 has a recommendation that's been approved by the Board to implement the Continuous Improvement Program as kind of an evolution of the organizational reviews. But how it will be implemented and what exactly that will mean, not just for the NomCom but for all the SOs and ACs, it is still something that needs to be planned out, progressed, discussed with the community, spelled out, and all kinds of processes and procedures. So I think trying to solve for that at this point might be a little premature. There will be a Continuous Improvement Program as

designated by ATRT3. But how it will evolve, I don't think any of us know that just yet.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Larisa. Yeah, that makes sense. But certainly, there's no reason why we can't model what the NomCom does after that. I'll assume that's an old hand, Vanda. That helps a lot.

My specific comment is in this third paragraph is serving its purpose. NomCom Standing Committee may need to communicate, coordinate with other entities to inform a set of processes to standardize. Then we have a sentence in here, "The NomCom is ultimately responsible." So I'm wondering if this sentence belongs here. I know obviously what it's trying to say. Just starting off at blogs here in this sense of the charter for us to talk about the NomCom and maybe confusing people we're talking about the Standing Committee.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I'm happy to talk about this. I think the call that we had when we reviewed the charter and Sam joined, there was sort of a growing recognition on this group that we needed a really clear kind of disclaimer of what the Standing Committee is, is not going to do and really clarifying and underscoring that it's really the NomCom that's ultimately responsible. We added for the avoidance of doubt, the Standing Committee doesn't participate and oversee. It's all just disclaimer language just to make it very clear up front what the role the Standing Committee is and also is not. That's where that came from.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Maybe it's the first sentence that blog somewhere else. So we have the disclaimer information as a stand-alone paragraph. Because the transition is what I'm stumbling on and maybe it's the first sentence that belongs somewhere else so that we start the whole paragraph with a disclaimer stuff. You could even go in the previous paragraph. I'm not quite sure the right place for it. This is an odd transition to me.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes. Got it. Okay. So I'll make a note that maybe we could combine that with the previous paragraph, as noted, and then the disclaimer kind of stand on its own.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. How does everyone else feel about that? The previous paragraph where we talk about ICANN Org support staff who focused on standardization of NomCom processes and bring continuity, we're saying both. So why are we saying also bring continuity as we also previously just said that about the Standing Committee? Right. The second bullet above. Insert the word "also" in front of the word "bring continuity" in the previous paragraph. Yes, right there. Does that make sense? Again, it's a disjointed thought for me as well. Any thoughts on that, Kristy? I don't know if that's an up arrow meaning something, but I look at it in chat.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sorry. What's the up arrow referring to?

EN

TOM BARRETT: I can't see if you're trying to raise your hand or not.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh no, I'm not.

TOM BARRETT: How about "and also provide continuity" instead of "bring continuity"?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: Does that sound okay?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: Any other thoughts on purpose from anybody?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. I'm okay with that. What I do like to be more, a separate paragraph, in my opinion, should reaffirm that the negative points. That is, the Standing Committee is also prohibited to participation, oversight, or something like that, because those are the questions that the

community will make. So I would like to have this as a separate paragraph, just to make sure everyone will read, will pay attention on that. Because this is the main questions that we had among people in the community and we need to explain each time. So it's something that is important to make it clear that is stated on the purpose.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Vanda. Yeah, I think that that supports removing that opening sentence that Kristy has highlighted in yellow. So, Kristy, what do you think about moving that sentence to the beginning of the previous paragraph?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. That's what the red line shows. You'll see I've deleted paragraph, paragraph. It's not moving it there until I accept the changes.

TOM BARRETT: I see. Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I need to keep it in red line just so Sam is clear on what changes we made.

TOM BARRETT: So what I'm saying is don't append it to the previous paragraph but make it the opening sentence of the previous.

EN

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Opening sentence. You want it up here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. What do you think of that?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: The Standing Committee is in an external complement to support continuous improvement. Still kind of an awkward thought. I guess we're talking about external support. How about "is an external complement to support the NomCom's continuous improvement"? It's not a big deal. It just seems kind of awkward for me. All right. Any other thoughts on purpose before we go to the next section?

All right. So Scope of Responsibilities. Here's where obviously you have two bullets on purpose, one that talks about support, continuous improvement. The second one talks about providing continuity and building institutional memory. So in the scope, we kind of downplay continuous improvement. We focus on the second bullet from the purpose. So it talks about continuity, building institutional memory. And then it adds in mentioning engagement with ICANN Org, and role with respect to bodies that appoint delegates.

Again, we've already had the discussion about continuous improvement. So we have a sentence in here, part A. I wonder if we even need that sentence anymore where it says, "The Standing Committee is not intended to be involved in the work of each NomCom, it is intended to help support the continuous improvement of the NomCom." So that's, again, a disclaimer, which I thought we've already kind of said above. Do we need to repeat that?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe it's clear in the first bullet in section two. It's over there.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. What do you think? Anyone else? Anyone disagree?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The only thing that I'm a little concerned is that we have the go ahead from the Legal. So maybe we should not change too much on anything that we are reviewing because we need to pass again to the Legal. It's takes time.

TOM BARRETT: I don't know if this is a controversial change.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, yeah. Just an alert to not change things that maybe look like we'll need another Legal pass to allow them to be read. That is just an alert that I'm thinking about. Because we are in the end of the time and our

report will address that. I do believe that we should take a little care. Just that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I see Larisa's comment. Yeah, we rely on ICANN staff to tell us if any of this they think merits additional review by Legal, if it's problematic in some way. We can have that discussion at the end of this call to see if we've come up with anything that you think changes the legalistic wording of this document in a way that Legal would be concerned.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Tom, I'm happy to jump in. I am putting everything in redline just so that it's transparent to Sam what was changed. I think, in general, the rule of thumb is as long as there's no material changes. So for just rearranging wording or adding a word and clarifying, that's usually a quick review. If there's material change then that needs a closer review by her.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. Any other thoughts on part A of Scope? I'm just proposing we take that one sentence out on Part B, just a grammatical. On bullets, we either have to decide to have punctuation at the end of each bullet or not have punctuation at the end of each bullet, and just be consistent there. Where we want to do it. Any comments on part D? Okay. Thanks, Vanda.

EN

So on part C, I have a comment on the first sentence where it talks about "will help assess the previous NomCom cycle using the end of cycle feedback from applicants and survey results." I'm suggesting we say "using the end of cycle feedback and survey results," so just get rid of "from applicants," and then say "from applicants, NomCom members, and receiving bodies." Why don't you try that out? See what people think of that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think we had end of cycle feedback.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, that's fine.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: But then—

TOM BARRETT: Let me let me try again, Kristy. I'm just saying to rephrase it. If we get rid of the word "from applicants," add it back in to the end of the sentence. Basically, I'd say the end of cycle feedback is not always from applicants, but also from NomCom members and receiving bodies. So there's feedback and surveys from those three groups of people that the Standing Committee would probably be assessing. So when you say from applicants, I would say comma, NomCom members and receiving bodies.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Or just all end of cycle feedbacks.

TOM BARRETT: That works, too. What are your thoughts about that? Anyone else?

TERESA ELIAS: I tend to sort of go with Vanda's suggestion because we're starting to add more detail and we don't want to get too far into the weeds and start spelling stuff out. Because then again, we have the potential of changing the context of what the document was. And there again, it's going to be looking like we're going to need to renegotiate what it says on the document versus what the definition is.

TOM BARRETT: So you're comfortable what Teresa was saying—or Larisa? I think it was Teresa, right?

TERESA ELIAS: Yes.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It is.

TOM BARRETT: So we say using all end of cycle feedback.

TERESA ELIAS: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: And get rid of "from applicants" and the other stuff I said.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TERESA ELIAS: Exactly.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Tom, I don't recall every edit that I made on this. But I do recall—I think previously we had it say end of cycle feedback. And Sam said, "From who? Where is this coming from?" She wanted that clarification so that's when we added in "from applicants". So I think maybe the term wasn't clear on its own. Now, I also recognize that we probably don't want to have to name every single source of end of cycle feedback. Is there an alternative that makes it clear where the end of cycle feedback is coming in from and what that pertains to without having to list it out?

TOM BARRETT: I guess I would go back to what we originally said. Because I don't think we want to limit ourselves to just applicants. I think that's too narrow for what the Standing Committee does. So I would go back and explain that to Sam, if we either don't spell it out or we have to spell it out.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Could we say, "End of cycle feedback from applicants and other stakeholders"? Would that be inclusive of—

TOM BARRETT: Sure. Are people comfortable with that? Do you think that would be acceptable?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think so. I think as long as we keep the subject in. It was a question of like, where is this end of cycle feedback coming from? As long as we have some reference to the subject of where it's coming from, then it should be okay.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Cheryl says it's okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. In my opinion, all feedback received by NomCom. Because sometimes they decide not to ask for feedback for some groups. I don't know if we should state that as an obligation for NomCom to make feedback for the applicant, for the stakeholder, for their own groups, for

EN

the chairs. So it's a list. I don't know if these proposed ideas of the Standing Committee should be—I don't know. For me, it looks like we are enforced, the NomCom, to do that. That's my concern here.

TOM BARRETT: Anyone have thoughts on that? Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Just as a note—and, Jia, please correct me if I'm wrong—the current practice is or what we've implemented or we're trying to implement or going to implement for 2022—and, Jia, please correct me if I'm wrong—is we're going to be getting feedback from successful and unsuccessful candidates as to how the process proceeded for them. We've never reached out to the selecting bodies to be part of that process. That would be another survey that we'd have to implement, another process we'd have to implement. The largest importance to me is—and I could be wrong—is that this process works well in attracting as many qualified and skilled applicants to apply for the open positions, and that the process is clear, concise, and efficient so that they don't have difficulty in applying for open positions. We also get feedback from the NomCom delegates as to recommendations on how they saw the current year's process proceed and they make recommendations also.

Now, those are things that are currently in place. I think if we're going to define something about now we need to reach out to all selecting bodies, all selecting bodies don't have any. They really don't do anything other than provide applicants. They don't have any full participation in the process. They don't have full participation in the process. The only

people that have full participation in the process is the NomCom delegates and the applicants.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Teresa. I think it's broader than that. As we say selecting bodies, are you talking about appointing bodies or receiving bodies?

TERESA ELIAS: Both.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So certainly, receiving bodies definitely participate. They provide advice about the skillsets they're looking for. They provide feedback. It may not be via formal survey, maybe via some other mechanism on whether or not the NomCom provided what they asked for. So that feedback loop is pretty crucial for continuous improvement of the NomCom. It's not just getting feedback from applicants and NomCom delegates. It's definitely also from receiving bodies. So you're right. We may not have a formal survey mechanism. There's several recommendations that specifically talk to getting feedback, though, from receiving bodies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, Cheryl here.

TOM BARRETT: Hey, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: NomComs frequently, if not always, do that. So the codification of it doesn't need to be part of their charter. Our charter does say we will codify regular activities, help them codify. So I'm not sure that we need to go into this degree of detail again.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I'm not sure what we're arguing about. Are we okay with this current wording? I guess we're disputing about whether or not we can say other stakeholders, where we asked for end of cycle feedback and survey results. Is that what we're disagreeing about, adding other stakeholders? I'm wondering why this is controversial.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm also discussing whose job it is. Again, this is the business of any given NomCom. It's the business of a Standing Committee to be the bridge, the facilitator, the assistant, the resource, all of those sorts of things, but not to do the work.

TOM BARRETT: I agree, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In this case, NomCom activities.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I don't think it says the Standing Committee would do the work. It's just says end of cycle feedback and survey results. It's not saying we'll do the survey or solicit the feedback.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm saying what business is it to even go to that degree? Any given NomCom should do an analysis. Use the Standing Committee as a resource and, of course, publish any outcomes that are appropriate for publication, etc., and annual reports. But if it's in the Standing Committee Charter, I just think we need to be really clear about not overstepping the mark of what should be a light touch but consistent facilitation and assistance resource.

TOM BARRETT: I'm just saying this is a pretty essential part of the review recommendations to have this sort of feedback loop. I think we're not relying on the NomCom to do it because it hasn't done it in the past consistently. But I have—

TERESA ELIAS: I have to respectfully disagree, Tom. I have to respectfully disagree.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Teresa.

TERESA ELIAS:	We do. We do get feedback consistently from applicants. And every year, the NomCom delegates provide feedback. So I have to respectfully disagree because there is end-of-year report. So the only change that I can see here—and please correct me if I'm wrong, Tom. Careful with that word, it hurts—the only difference that I can see between what you're saying and what I'm saying is adding something that defines all stakeholders involved. But then again, we have to be careful because what that adds, when you add other stakeholders involved, it makes it sound like, and especially if it's in the charter, that those people that are providing feedback have active roles in the selection process, which they do not. The only active role that a selecting or receiving body has is in providing their expectations of skills and requirements from the candidates or for the open positions that they wish to be filled. They do not have an influence on who and how a candidate is selected.
TOM BARRETT:	I think you're right. In fact, the Standing Committee doesn't either. We have those disclaimers early on in this document. I think what we're talking about in terms of the type, whether or not they could provide feedback on the process that was used to select those candidates. So even though they're not part of the process, they absolutely can provide feedback on how the process took place.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Tom, this is Kristy. Apologies. I can't raise my hand. Here's a suggestion. I think because the Standing Committee has a role in supporting the continuous improvement of the NomCom, one of the things that it

could later suggest once it is standing is there is additional surveys and additional feedback collected on the process and that that is incorporated here. But without prescribing that up front in the charter itself, which would kind of automatically, it would put into ink, into writing exactly what feedback has to be collected from whom, which might change over time. So just a suggestion to make it more general here.

TOM BARRETT: So is this already general? It says from applicants and other stakeholders. Isn't that fairly general?

TERESA ELIAS: I think it should be the original. What was in there originally before we added this from applicants and other stakeholders, in my opinion, I think we should go back to what it was originally before Kristy made that change. That becomes a general statement, which over time, as Cheryl stated before, this is a living document that will change over time.

TOM BARRETT: It becomes general only if we're not specific to applicants. Otherwise, it becomes a limiting statement. So our original was did not limit us in terms of who we'd get feedback from. You're saying in response to a question from ICANN Legal, we modify this to specify one particular stakeholder group.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. If we add all end of cycles feedback in the results received then—

TOM BARRETT: Sure.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: We can check with Sam.

TOM BARRETT: So yeah. So the compromise is using end of cycle feedback in several results. Again, just say we don't want to be specific because whoever wants to give us feedback will. It could be someone who's just a third party observer. Why would we look at their feedback and see if it's relevant?

I'm sorry? I can't hear you, Vanda. Okay. Maybe not talking to us.

All right. On these bullets, I noticed this has already been modified. I have a different version again of the document, but I know bullets A through E, I see you've already corrected the tense reviewing, supporting, supporting. So that was going to be my comment as well. Again, missing a punctuation in the third bullet. Should we move on? We're running out of time.

Composition. Any thoughts on composition? It's a little awkward to talk about … "The Standing Committee shall be composed of four members." So that's a composition. Then as a sub bullet to that, we talk about the NomCom associate chair, which is obviously not intended to

be one of the four members. So it's a little awkward. I understand, obviously, I don't know if it's going to be clear to everyone that it's actually a five-member Standing Committee. Perhaps bullet A can be changed to five somehow since the two sub bullets add up to five.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. In my opinion, then explain that four members then this additional one.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. I'll make a note that that's confusing. I think if we add five here, it refers to selected from a pool of eligible candidates, which, of course, the NomCom associate chair is not there kind of an add on. But I'll make a note of that it's confusing and we'll figure out how to clarify that.

TOM BARRETT: Right. That's a selected pool, that whole section moved out to the next bullet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kristy, I often use the ex-officio term to get away with that. So a total of five, one ex-officio, and then go into the breakdown.

EN

TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Cheryl. Minor question on the opening sentence of this individual candidates. Do we need the word individual there up above?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	They're not going to be recommended, promoted, or endorsed candidates are they? They are going to be off their own bat, throw themselves in the upper options, and that's it.
TOM BARRETT:	Yeah. But we're not talking about legal entities. We're not talking about corporations.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	No. But we're also not talking about SO or AC endorsed or recommended or selected.
TOM BARRETT:	Right.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	It's like the associate chair or something like that from the NomCom, the chair to be or something. They are individuals that apply. When the governance committee selected them and the Board approval, those kinds of process.

TOM BARRETT: That's a point that we don't make clear here. Do we talk about how people are nominated? That can be later? We haven't really talked about the nomination process.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: It talks about individual public expression.

TOM BARRETT: Public feel like. Okay. All right. Everyone's comfortable that's enough? All right. I know we're coming up the top of the hour.

Standing Committee chair. Will facilitate dedicated meetings and support the will of the group. So you have "will facilitate dedicated meetings, supporting the will of the group". I wonder if you just say "and support the will of the group".

Then you have a membership requirements, membership eligibility requirements. It's not a big deal. That's what we're talking about, really, eligibility to be a member, right? I'm just scrolling ahead. So we'll go through. I don't have any other comments for the rest of the document. You had a question, Kristy, on terms, item five. It is considered a full term. So that's kind of a new one, right? This initial term thing.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, just defining what a term is. So we suggested since we refer two terms here that the definition of what a term is should probably go first in the ordering.

EN

TOM BARRETT: I see. Okay. So is the implication here that some members will only serve two years unless they're full term, if it's the initial term?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's right. They would still be eligible to run for a second term of three years, but the initial term would be considered a full term. Yes.

TOM BARRETT: I guess my question is do we have initial members who don't serve three years?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes. We do. Seats one and three, I believe. We conclude after a year or two to create a rotation. Otherwise, you lose the whole committee every three years.

TOM BARRETT: Right. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That has to stay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Any other? So you have terms, you have meetings. I don't have any other comments in this document. Any other thoughts about this document? So I guess the question for ICANN staff is—I guess we did deviate from one point of feedback that Legal had. Any other problematic changes here?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I don't expect the changes proposed would be challenging to get approved. Did anyone else have any questions or comments on these last few sections? I know others didn't have a full chance to review the document before the meeting.

TOM BARRETT: Yes. I know there are some edits. Yours is the one I received. Maybe you could send it back out, like give people—I don't know if there are other changes in here as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We need to do that because we don't have a full complement anyway. So yeah, I'd say 72 hours with the fresh version for the list to respond to would be my suggestion. And no response means agreement, just by the way.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So do we need to get feedback from Legal before you send out a clean version on this, Kristy?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: A clean version? Yes. But I can send out this version of the markup. So for those who missed the call, they can see what transpired and what was proposed as changes.

TOM BARRETT: That works. Yes. All right. Next agenda. Thank you, Kristy and everyone, for that. That's been useful.

Next agenda item, meetings. So, two more in December. So this is it for the month of November. December 2, I assume we're back on the Thursday schedule.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. 2, 16, we have our schedule. Get feedback on unaffiliated directors. Legal to initiate the conversation. And then review the outline of anticipated timeline and milestones for 2022. This December 2, meeting about final preparation for proposed bylaws. What else do we need to do for the proposed bylaws?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think that's just making sure that we have them all together and packaged and ready to go because we want to be able to include them in the implementation and status and progress report.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. But they've already been submitted to the OEC. We're not changing what we submitted in that regard, Rec 10, right?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think that's right, although there is the question about unaffiliated directors, which we won't get to discuss until the 16th of December.

TOM BARRETT: Do we know what the question is?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: You're waiting legal feedback on the proposal, right?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, but I didn't know there was any question about that. I know they were just assuming they haven't read it yet or they've read it and they want to make changes. You're saying they're going to propose changes?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I can't speak for them. But I know that, yeah, there was going to be a conversation on unaffiliated directors based upon their review of what you submitted and that they will be ready to do that by the 16th.

EN

TOM BARRETT: All right. Any other business, guys?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Not for me.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, everybody.

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Bye-bye. Larisa, I guess we don't see you in the next meeting so happy Thanksgiving.

TOM BARRETT: That's right. All those people in the states get a holiday next week. Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]