YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	Greetings, everyone. Welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group Meeting #90 on December 2, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Joining today's call from the working group, we have Cheryl, Dave, Ejikeme, and Remmy. I think that's about it for the moment.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Vanda.
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	Vanda. Thank you, Vanda. God bless Vanda. So we have Vanda in there too. And I know Tom Barrett will be joining us shortly. We do have apologies from Tracy Hackshaw. Joining also from today from ICANN Org, we have Kristy, Larisa, Jia, Teresa, and myself, Yvette Guigneaux. We'd like to also remind everybody the call is being recorded—and Tom is joining us right now—the call is being recorded so please state your name for the record before speaking. Also, does anyone have any updates to their SOI? No? Okay. Then I will go ahead and get things on screen. And then, Cheryl, I'll hand it over to you or Tom, whichever one—
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I was going to say Tom joined and Tom can take the helm.
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	Tom, over to you.

EN

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, guys. Sorry I'm late. So the agenda is on the screen. You've already done the roll call, I assume, the SOI updates.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: So we'll go over the implementation status and progress report, and then some preparation for proposed Bylaw changes. So why don't we jump right in? I had the opportunity, Kristy, to review the draft report. I made a few edits. Unfortunately, I don't know if you're able to see those. That's just minor stuff. Did you want to bring that up on the screen and show everybody?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. Thanks, Tom. I don't actually see your edits. Oh, wait. It says last edit was made.

TOM BARRETT: It wasn't in comment mode. That's why.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh, I see. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You know we should use suggest mode.

TOM BARRETT: There's no way to turn it on, though. I didn't see a way to add in suggest mode.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: You all see the screen now?

TOM BARRETT: Yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. So over here editing, suggesting, viewing. I'll switch it to suggesting mode in case there are any comments on here. But, Tom, did you want to walk us through your proposed changes?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I don't see that on my version.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: You don't have a editing or suggest screen?

TOM BARRETT: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Suggest is top right. What are you seeing in your screen?

TOM BARRETT: I just switched—I have a new computer. I'm using a new Microsoft browser.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see you use Microsoft. I can't be responsible for you see.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. First paragraph, the dates July 1 through 31st of December. I thought was on—it said September 1st. I don't know if that was deliberate.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: You updated it to say July?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: You were saying September 1?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. Because we submitted an executive summary report in August. So that would have been—
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	You mean dealt within September?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. So this is the reporting period from September to December. We did do the report. It was just a bit late. It was an executive summary instead of a full status report. But we didn't do a report during that period. Yeah.
TOM BARRETT:	All right. So do we want to call this a six-month progress report if it's only for three or four months? Would you want me to say the first sentence?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	The fourth progress report.
TOM BARRETT:	Yeah, just the fourth progress report. That works?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. We'll take a look at it.

EN

TOM BARRETT:	Okay. You have no problem with the next section about Rec 10?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That's pretty much what we seek in our communication, but yeah.
TOM BARRETT:	So it summarizes that very well. Then we have Final Draft Proposed Standing Committee Charter. Yeah. No comments on that. Concluding work on other Recs. So would you say "to be elaborated" there parenthetical, do you mean later in this report?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. We have further below a summary table of where—
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	The chart table, yes.
TOM BARRETT:	Yeah. Okay.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Why don't you just have the link in the document? Where you've got to be elaborated, just make that a hyperlink that goes to that place in the document? For lazy readers, that will work.

TOM BARRETT:	Yeah. Because previous to that, you said that's noted in the detailed portion of this report, so I guess it's redundant. You could even delete it.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:	I think I put a placeholder here for that because I thought it might be helpful to characterize. Once we're sure that people is fully up to date, because there might be some remaining changes according to the spreadsheet, then we could say Recs 3, 7, and 14 are fully complete. And we could characterize and describe on top remaining slides here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Kristy, you're suggesting then that rather than just link to the table and elaborate in the table, that we actually put more sentencing in there with any changes to the table? Have I got that correct?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. It's a kind of an overview of what's in the table because the table spans a few pages. So if you wanted to get a quick—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Sure.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Like a narrative overview.

TOM BARRETT: So down, summary of proposed Bylaw changes, which is for the data, a way for you to catch up.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: All right. Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: So I just changed five to four recommendations since we deleted the rebalancing one. It had five there before.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Oh right. Yes. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Then of course, we do represent date here in July, but that's fine. So scrolling down, we have this summary here. The spreadsheet you sent out as well is the backup for this. So I know there's a few of these later on when we start get to the teams, for example, we don't have a status update yet. I started to add a few but I realized just as internal hyperlink to report sections. Do you want to try to answer the status of those during this meeting?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's really weird because I just updated that yesterday or the day before. But I was having some trouble with the Google Drive version slide. And apologies, Cheryl, I also use PC, so Microsoft. It could be that they didn't save. I was getting error messages when I was updating this

section. But yeah, these should basically just reflect here, I'll just show you on the spreadsheet. So this column H right here, that's what is reflected in the status table. For some reason, those just didn't save here, and I didn't notice that when we only uploaded it to the external drive. So apologies for that. I will make sure that that's included. But yeah, it'll be the same as what's in the spreadsheet here.

TOM BARRETT: All right, excellent. Okay. So we'll wait for you to put up an updated document. Other than that, I'm fine with this format. I think it's a good way to present the status of the group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I agree, Tom. I think it's solid enough a framework for reporting. You know me in formatting, though, I can't help myself. If you go back to your table—thanks, Kristy. Am I correct in assuming that what will be in a status of implementation even merely the hyperlink, no words, correct?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: In the table, yeah, this would be an internal hyperlink to another section of the report that would go into more detail about exactly any sort of remaining steps, who's responsible for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Under those circumstances, I see an opportunity to make the total number of pages committed to the table slightly smaller by giving that

second column a thinner profile because you're going to have much more text in column one than you do in column two. And so hyperlink can be wrapped so I would minimize to the most reasonable allowance for column two, and that will maximize text space for column one. And I reckon you'll get a good half page, if not full page, benefit out of that. That's all.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Great. Thanks, Cheryl. We will do that.

TOM BARRETT: So the internal hyperlinks, so we're going to attach essentially your spreadsheet to this Word document and combine the two?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's right. We're still working on the updating the detail of each recommendation. And that's again based upon the spreadsheet, which you'll see there's still a couple of questions out there and things that we're trying to move around to get clear on is it an ICANN or Board stuff that's remaining is the Standing Committee role? And then in the report itself, we'll just elaborate. So we'll say implementation complete or RIWG role complete, Standing Committee role remaining, and a quick outline of what those Standing Committee steps might be. And then that will include a hyperlink to the report. So we just wanted to share that. I mean most of the kind of substance where we're writing narrative about the work that you've been doing is here in the executive summary, and the rest of the report is really going to be just a brief

status update on each of these recommendations as reflected in the spreadsheet here.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So do we want to jump to the spreadsheet? Did you want to go over some of the open issues there? Any other comments on this summary document?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Do you feel like this is comprehensive enough? Is there any more detail that you wanted to add to the executive summary?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I don't see that.

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that we don't need it.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree, Vanda. I think when executive summaries get too long, they lose impact.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Yeah, I agree as well.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yvette, you're the holder of our agenda. I don't remember. It was the spreadsheet that was next?

TOM BARRETT: I believe so. Yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Since I'm already sharing the screen, I can just scroll right here. So I don't think there are any outstanding questions for the RIWG on the spreadsheet. I think it's mostly just checking between the NomCom RIWG support team and the NomCom staff support team, just making sure that we're all on the same page in terms of who's got responsibility for remaining steps. So you'll see some of these cells are highlighted, but what we tried to do is just further delineate. So before we had completed outstanding, and then Standing Committee role, but we added ICANN Org or Board steps. So some of these have to do with directing initiation of Bylaws change, Bylaws change process takes place. Obviously, that's out of the hands of the RIWG, and so we wanted to just make that clear that you don't have to hold the responsibility for those implementation steps. Those are really on the Board. And then

similarly, anything that we've deemed it's like, "Oh, that's seems like it's a kind of bigger ongoing role, might be better positioned to the Standing Committee," we've allocated those under the Standing Committee column here.

So I guess we could go down this column M here and just see if there are any ones that stand out to this group. Because this is what we've highlighted right now that might still be applicable to the RIWG. So for this one, Rec 11, we have implementation complete, there's no Standing Committee role. And I guess it was a question of does this group feel like steps three and four assessing the options according to implemented Work Stream 2, Recommendations 7, and further steps depending on this, do you feel like those steps are complete or is there something that ICANN Org can do to support those remaining steps?

TOM BARRETT: I don't have any thoughts on that. Anyone else? I say we've completed it.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think so. I think we can move probably step three and four over to completed implementation steps.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, I will do that. And then the remaining ones, again, so this is checking with Jia and Teresa on status of these because these are areas that they were helping with and we've got a call with them tomorrow to do so. So I don't think, again, there's anything that we need for the RIWG to weigh in on here but we just wanted to show you that these are still in discussion. We've noted the implementation on here is complete. So I think we just need to check that all of these steps can indeed be moved over to the completed implementation steps column.

TOM BARRETT: On Rec 13, what does on hold mean?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: The process diagram? It's a good question. So this is why it's highlighted for discussion. I don't know, Teresa or Jia, if you're on and you have any off-the-cuff idea of where this is at, but we've got a call scheduled tomorrow to go through it in greater detail.

TERESA ELIAS: Go ahead, Jia.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: So we're working with a communications team as they are revamping the NomCom website to the newest ITI format. So we're still in communication with Comms on the process on this.

TOM BARRETT:	Okay. Why do we have a question mark on the role of the Standing Committee?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	We're not sure if there is a role there, an ongoing role.
TOM BARRETT:	Well, there's language about assessing changes to the process to see if it requires public comment or input.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yeah, it's a safety net mechanism, certainly.
TOM BARRETT:	I'm sorry, Cheryl. Say that again,
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	It's a safety net mechanism. The Standard Committee held the associate role.
TOM BARRETT:	So the ongoing role is just to get there deviations to the process map to determine if they're material, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Right. Depending on your outcome of the conversation you have between staff tomorrow, Kristy, I would appreciate if you would consider mentioning that the on hold aspect is whilst it is undergoing the standardized or harmonized development and look and feel for ongoing ITI, etc., etc. Just so they know what it means. [Inaudible] wonder.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah. We will make sure that all of these—because this is obviously going to be linked to the status report. We want to make sure that every cell in here is up to date and detail—
TOM BARRETT:	Maybe it's just a word choice. So it's not on hold. It's just still in process.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Yeah.
TOM BARRETT:	Is that fair? Okay.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	And again because that's something that the Jia and Teresa NomCom support staff are working on, I put this under the ICANN Org—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. We don't want it to look like there is a delaying tactic. There's a reason for its stages. And each stage is because blah, blah, blah.

TOM BARRETT: So then we're back to 14, which recurs annually. So I guess the question is in terms of implementation, what are we trying to do here?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: The note here is we just need to have a conversation with NomCom support staff on this work, and I know they've been working on it on an ongoing basis. We want to make sure we have the latest information in the spreadsheet, which may mean that some of these steps get moved over to Org, right, and the ongoing process. Since this is our annual recurring process yearly, I'm wondering, is there a role for the Standing Committee? We had a no here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I feel like we're blurring implementation with recurring activities. So wherever we said there was ongoing activities, we said there is a role for the Standing Committee. They don't suddenly become out of the loop for ongoing activities.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So we would say yes here? Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think it's just part of the process diagram, but I know that it may be a separate sort of process. That was decided to keep out of the process diagram. But whatever recurring activities—so, for example, here—so recurring activities is what? A survey or feedback of some kind saying other ways to improve communication with the receiving bodies?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I think so. Teresa or Jia, did you want to speak to that recurring role?

TERESA ELIAS: Go ahead, Jia.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: Go ahead, Teresa. I'll just share that every year, we reach out to each of the groups for updates to the job description, as well as the criteria and if they want to provide any guidelines or information to the NomCom. So we could add more of a description in that column.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Anything else that you want to discuss? Again, we'll have a call tomorrow to just make sure that all of our I's are dotted and T's are crossed when it comes to this spreadsheet. But any other comments or questions on this right now?

TOM BARRETT: So on 50, obviously, you've got a hot thing there highlighted. NomCom working group we support from ICANN Org, establish a process for the NomCom to make sure that when publishing the job descriptions, the NomCom is transparent if it decides to include other factors and those received. Then we, the NomCom, will update the Operating Procedure manual with this new process, etc., and then a mention of Standing Committee again. Okay. I mean, the status is what it is. I think this is a work document. I'm fine with sharing as part of the status report. There are some things we're still working on.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Just in terms of the proposed timing, you may have noted in Yvette's e-mail to you all yesterday that any remaining comments on the executive summary here, let us know by middle of next week, the 8th or 9th or so, if there are any, and we'll plan to get the RIWG a complete draft of the Implementation Status report by the end of next week, Thursday or Friday, so that you have a week to look at the entire thing and propose any edits, comments, questions. Again, that will be based upon this spreadsheet being fully up to date and reflected in that report.

TOM BARRETT: All right, that sounds good.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Great.

TOM BARRETT: So the next agenda item, if I recall, talked about prep for the Bylaw changes. Right. I know it's not on the agenda, but we probably should towards the end talk about the status of the Standing Committee Charter as well. But let's talk about this prep.

LARISA GURNICK: Hi, everybody. I will take this one and we actually have a simple visual aid. Thank you, Yvette. Because we've had some good conversations about who is responsible for which different parts of the process and it tends to get confusing, so we put together what I hope to be is a helpful tool to bring some clarity specifically to what happens next with the various recommendations and proposals coming out of the RIWG that will require Bylaws amendments or have some other significant governance implications. So just to run through this quickly, and then I'm happy to address questions about any of this, and this will hopefully inform the process of preparing for those various activities that will require Bylaws amendments. So the role of this group, the NomCom RIWG, in addition to having developed a detailed implementation plan and doing the ongoing work to implement and coordinate and everything that you all do on a regular basis, you provide some annual updates to the OEC. We just looked at one of those, the next one being in December. And that, of course, will include the reporting out of areas that based on the proposal will require Bylaws amendments. You also have provided community updates, socialize the various proposals with the community in those cases where the Bylaws are required to be amended or whether there are significant governance implications that

affect all of the ICANN community. And at some, hopefully, very soon to be future point in time, there will be a final implementation report which will go to the OEC to report out that essentially your work has been completed.

Let me see if there's any questions on this so far before we move on to the next grouping of stakeholders, if you will. I don't see any hands. Okay. The next group is OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board, which the reason it's involved in this is because it provides oversight of all the organizational reviews and the implementation of review recommendations, which is spelled out in their charter. They received the semi-annual updates from you all and they provide regular updates to the full ICANN Board. That is their role and their function. They also receive or the OEC, I guess singular, the group receives proposals for Bylaws amendments and provides a recommendation to the full Board as to whether or not to initiate the process of Bylaws amendments starting with a public comment proceeding. So that is the step that we're preparing for. So the OEC receives your proposals, considers what's happening, why it's happening, what kind of community engagement has happened, make sure that everything is clear, and makes a recommendation to the Board to begin the process of Bylaws amendments.

Then, in due course, the OEC would review the public comments on the proposed Bylaws amendments when those become available. And then again, we'll make a recommendation to the full Board on how to proceed. They will receive the final implementation report from the RIWG. And then we'll make a recommendation to the full Board again on how to proceed. The typical action there would be they make the

recommendation to the Board to accept the final implementation report. I don't see any hands. So let's keep going. Yvette, if you could just scroll a bit. Thank you so much.

So that brings us to the ICANN Board. The Board accepts the final report from the Independent Examiner and the feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan. This actually happened quite a bit of time ago and that's referenced in the resolution, but it's included here just for understanding and context. The Board also accepts the detailed implementation plan that was provided by the RIWG and that also happened some time ago. Then the Board will decide whether to initiate the Bylaws amendments process at the recommendation of the OEC and actually direct staff to initiate a public comment proceeding, which is the start of the Bylaws amendment process. And then when that cycle closes out, the public comments are received, summarized. If there's any clarification or additional questions or concerns or anything that deals directly with the proposal that was provided by your group, by the RIWG, we would coordinate with you all to address those questions or comments or concerns or whatever might come out of the public comment proceeding. And then, with all that information, summarized and concluded, the Board would then decide whether to adopt the proposed Bylaws amendments based on the recommendation coming out of the RIWG and based on public comment and the recommendation from the OEC who oversees this whole process. Then, as a final step in this review process, the Board would decide whether to accept the final implementation report and consider the implementation work of this group to be completed.

And then, of course, ICANN community has an important role in all of this as well. They submit public comments at various points in time during the review process, specifically on the draft report and recommendations of the Independent Examiner. So there's an important checkpoint with the community at that stage. Then, the ICANN community also provides input to the NomCom RIWG proposals that require Bylaws amendments or have significant governance implications on the ICANN community. Of course, you've been working on that and addressing these kinds of engagements and communications with the community most recently that all the work that had been done and aggregated for the proposed amendment to rebalance the NomCom, which, of course, concluded already in a different fashion. And finally, the ICANN community will submit public comments on the proposed Bylaws amendments, modifications which will then inform the Board as they make final decision on the Bylaws amendments. That is the process and hopefully brings a bit of clarity around roles and responsibilities.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Larisa. Does anyone have any comments? So I've got two, I guess. One is I wonder if we should mention the transition to the Standing Committee in any of these. Like perhaps for the Review Working Group at some point handing off. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just wondering in what point the process would a Bylaw change then have something to do with the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee will operate under what is the Bylaws are in—

TOM BARRETT: I thought this was more than just Bylaw changes. The title says responsibilities associated with the NomCom review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I took it as purely Bylaw change.

TOM BARRETT: Purely Bylaws. Okay. Is that right, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Let me clarify. It's both. For the Standing Committee, because it is a significant governance change that Standing Committee Charter will be part of the package of information that's going to go out for public comment, even though it explicitly does not require a Bylaws change. But we want the opportunity for community to be aware and to have a chance to comment to provide input, even though they've already been briefed through the process and the various engagement steps that you took to keep them apprised of the work on the Standing Committee and many other things.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. I think Cheryl also recognizes. So this includes both the standing up a Standing Committee and transitioning to that as well as any Bylaw changes. So then question is, aside from what's happening here between the Board and the community and the OEC, is there any role for either the working group or the Standing Committee to participate during the implementation of the Bylaw changes?

LARISA GURNICK: Tom, let me take the second part of your question, the working group. So what we envision as a role, while this is all out for public comment, obviously, you hopefully get to enjoy some well deserved break in your schedule. But depending on the nature of public comments and questions and whatever comes out that staff will summarize as usual, the role for the working group might be to consider that and see if any changes or clarifications or other actions might be needed before the whole package moves through the OEC to the Board for their decision. So that would be the role of the working group.

Once the whole package then is approved by the Board, then the Bylaws amendments would be enacted. Then my legal colleagues, Sam in particular, might have some clarifying comments on that because they're the keepers of the process. But conceptually, once everything is approved, then that all goes into effect. And then as far as the Standing Committee, I think it would be on a slightly separate path because it's not the Bylaws are not—I think there's just a reference in the Bylaws to the Standing Committee, if I'm not mistaken. But then once everything is approved, then it goes into the operationalization phase. So then

ICANN Org would provide support to the process of standing up the Standing Committee and initiating that work. So that would happen after this process of public comment, consideration of input, and Board approval all goes into effect. I hope that helped.

TOM BARRETT: That helps. Thank you. Of course, the Standing Committee has functions that it does that are in addition to these Bylaw changes. But you're saying that it needs to be approved before they do any of their activities, right?

LARISA GURNICK: Right. It needs to go out for public comment at the least, and then approved, I guess, by the Board. Yes. So to kind of close the loop on what was recommended, what was discussed, what is being proposed, and then the charter, in effect, will begin the process of getting the Standing Committee up and running and continuing its operations.

TOM BARRETT: Gotcha. Okay. It makes sense. Any other comments or questions?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I agree, Larisa. Very good point.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Vanda. So are we done? Meeting schedule? So you want to submit to the OEC by 16th. This is more of a deadline, that's not a meeting, right? Or is that a meeting?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That's also a meeting, Tom. So we're hoping to get the Implementation Status report to the OEC by the 16th, 17th. And we do have one last meeting on the books for the month December on the 16th. That's where we'll be able to finalize that report there. If there's any remaining questions, comments, outstanding, anything you want to discuss, we can do that. And then we were able to confirm with Sam that her team is able to join and initiate a conversation around the unaffiliated directors. And then we can discuss a little bit about the anticipated timeline and milestones for 2022, which we've outlined here. But to what Larisa just spoke to you in terms of the public comment period and maybe getting a bit more in detail on what that timeline could look like, we thought it would be helpful before the end of the year. Is there anything else that you would like to cover on 16th?

TOM BARRETT: No. I think that's good. So the implication here is that the Bylaw, the OEC effort to socialize the proposed Bylaw changes will occur when? When do you expect that to go out for publication?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Larisa, do you have a sense of that?

LARISA GURNICK: I don't quite yet because it's kind of tied together with concluding the unaffiliated director discussion, which involves Sam and her team. But OEC has been briefed that this package is coming, so obviously they'll need a little bit of time to plan it into their work and go through the steps that I outlined, which is make a recommendation to the Board and so on. So we hope to target February timeframe to open the public comment. And then of course the typical scheduling and navigating of the 40 days and the upcoming ICANN meeting and such. So that's kind of the general timeframe that we're targeting to get it opened somewhere in February timeframe.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can. One of the advantages of running a public comment on Bylaw changes that span and ICANN meeting, at least in my albeit not terribly limited experience in those things, is that it's often at that ICANN meeting that clarifying questions from community and final socialization meetings they've done. It's also an opportunity for parts of the community who do want to put in a response to the call for public comments will probably be crystallizing and deciding or finalizing what they will or won't put in. So it's a really important time to bridge either side of a meeting the virtual or otherwise the format. So I think this time course is solid. What we've got in front of us should work quite well.

TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Cheryl. Another question I have is in terms of the Standing Committee Charter. What are the next steps for that?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	I'm happy to jump in on that. We've just submitted the final redline of all of the proposed changes to Sam earlier this morning. We hope to hear back I think in five business days or so. Yvette, correct me if I'm wrong on that.
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	That's right.
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	Okay. And at that point, we should have, hopefully, a final draft and that would go into the Implementation Status report as like appendix or an annex or something so that OEC could see that final report. And of course, you'll have a chance to look at that as well when we share the full draft of the Implementation Status report. Does that answer your question, Tom?
TOM BARRETT:	It does. Okay. Sounds good. Any other business?
KRISTY BUCKLEY:	So just a couple of notes that I've jotted down here. We'll put in the action items so that everyone's aware of upcoming dates. So we'll ask the RIWG to provide comments, any remaining comments on the

executive summary by the 9th of December. Org will share a full version of the Implementation Status report by the 10th and kindly request to the working group review and provide any comments on the full Implementation Status report by the 16th. And then we can use a portion of that call in the 16th to discuss any questions or comments that came up that are worth having a conversation about, if any. And if not, we'll just finalize it and submit it to the OEC either later that day or on the 17th. Anything else in terms of action items or that I missed there?

TOM BARRETT: No. I think that's a great summary. Thanks, Kristy. Thanks, Larisa, for your update. I think we're looking good. Any other final comments, questions?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Tom, I just wanted to make one. I just want to remind everybody the call on the 16th, just a logistical issue, we are starting at 20:00 UTC. We will be starting at one hour later so that Legal can go ahead and join us. So I just wanted to remind everybody of that. It's not 19:00, it's 20:00 UTC for that one call only on the 16th. Just so everybody's aware.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. It's already in the calendar that way.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry. Could you repeat this? Just because of the time zone?

EN

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Correct. This is [inaudible] in the call. Correct, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: It's okay. No problem. Back to you, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thank you, everyone. Looking forward to seeing the draft.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thanks, everyone. See you next week. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]