
PANAMA – NomCom Review: Review Working Party (RWP) Working Session
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 09:00 to 10:15 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

THOMAS BARRETT: Why don't we quickly go around the room and introduce ourselves. We can start down here.

SATISH BABU: Hi, my name is Satish Babu, part of At-Large and a member of the Nominating Committee, twice, two years.

RON ANDRUFF: Ron Andruff, also a former member of the Nominating Committee and [inaudible] observer.

NADIRA AL ARAJ: Nadira Al Araj, I'm a current NomCom member and also a member with the Review Party.

ANGIE GRAVES: Angie Graves, I'm working with the NSSI for Organizational Reviews. Thanks.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

LARS HOFFMANN: Lars Hoffmann, also with the ICANN organization supporting the Review Working Party.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Damon Ashcraft and I am a member of the NomCom and I'm chair-elect.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Christine Willett and I'm ICANN Org. staff supporting this year's NomCom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, vice-chair, working with Tom on the Review Working Party for the NomCom.

BRAJESH JAIN: Brajesh Jain, first time member of current NomCom and member ASO-AC.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Leah Symekher, current NomCom delegate representing ALAC North America. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN Board, OEC member.

ROBERT PLUMER: Rob Plumer, vice-chair of NPOC.

THOMAS BARRETT: Thank you all, I think that's suitable for roll-call. I know I'm sensitive to time-constraints and so we'll move right along. The IE-independent evaluator published their final report a few weeks ago at a high level. I'll assume for now that you've read it but if you haven't that's okay.

So, this was the main deliverable of the assessment phase and we now move into what's called the feasibility and initial implementation phase where we review this final report, assess the recommendations for feasibility, make some suggestions or refinements if we deem appropriate, and perhaps even suggest an initial implementation of it, which will then be submitted to the Organizational Effectiveness- or Efficiency Committee, and then board approval.

So, I think our role -- those of you that have been participating through the assessment phase, we pretty much have been helping the IE but hands-off in terms of telling them what the report should look like. You know they came to their own

judgement on what the recommendations should be based on interviewing hundreds of ICANN folks, their own personal experience with other non-profits, interviewing board members, etc. -- as well as the NomCom.

So, this is the main deliverable, I do, just from a housekeeping perspective, I do think there's two outstanding issues from phase one that we probably want to wrap up in the early part of the feasibility phase. One is the -- included in the scope of the assessment phase was a review of the first NomCom review and looking at whether or not looking at the recommendations made in the first NomCom review, in fact were carried out and have been effective.

So, this report doesn't address that directly and so talking with staff we suggested that we'll come up with a simple matrix saying here is what was recommended previously -- we have to apply some rules in terms of you know it's been six years -- some of the improvements could have been implemented right away but then dropped by subsequent NomCom's. So, we have to at least take an effort at fulfilling that part of phase one. Any comments or questions about doing that?

LARS HOFFMANN: This is Lars. Just, on that note we would suggest that, unless there's objections, that we would provide a first draft to LWP to say here's what the recommendations were the first time around. Here's what the implementation status is, and then for you to discuss, ask questions, as you see fit.

THOMAS BARRETT: Alright. The other outstanding item that I want to make sure we do is, we received 10 public comments and we basically relied on the IE to review those and provide some of those comments in the final report. I just want to explicitly go back, look at those public comments, and again have a simple matrix saying, you know, this constancy suggested these 10 comments, and they're represented by these recommendations, or not recommended -- or not represented at all.

So that's just a sort of housekeeping -- I want to make sure we can show the community, in fact we heard their public comments, some of them in fact are reiterations of previous comments they made, and we want to make sure they're heard, and they've been acknowledged. We think they've been covered and here's what we can do about it. Any comments on that?

Alright. So that's my summary of the final report. We're gonna move on to membership. This is just a logistics meeting. I know

that the current NomCom is in their final week of selecting various candidates there are several people rolling off of NomCom who are interested in participating so, we basically will have another few weeks to solicit members, interested parties who want to participate in this so that when we get to our full Working meeting hopefully we can get the final membership.

So, staff has projected who the current membership and has indicated that they want to continue to participate so we have a fairly high participation there. And as I said I hope that we add some more members over the next few weeks. Any thoughts on what other outreach we should be doing for membership?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, Cheryl here. I am particularly keen to see if current, most recent nominating committee, in other words, people that are rolling off the 2018 NC. If they can join us on this feasibility implementation phase, it's going to be extremely valuable input because it's closest to real time experience. I'm sure we've all had the experience of, 'ah, yes I was in the NomCom in 1924 and this is how we did a conversation'.

NomCom's have been changing and developing at a great deal of currency, so you know, I know you're nodding but I also realize you've been really, really busy and probably feeling a

little exhausted and daunted. But if you can rally, if you can rally, I really think your contribution would be extremely valuable and highly effective. Now, to that end I suspect that if we can get enough of that input that would do quite nicely on wider outreach because the Nominating Committee is such a diverse design. I don't want every man and their dog. This needs to be an agile, small, affective, and efficient process, and that probably means a small team of willing leaders. Thank you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, Damon Ashcraft for the record. Cheryl, I think what you said makes a lot of sense, and what I should just is that we work together after this meeting and actually once the final selection for the next NomCom is made as far as the those members, we know definitely who is rolling off Now we get you a list of their contact information and then you can personally and then maybe even reach out with the current leadership and say, 'thank you for your service and we would appreciate you in this group' and make it personal, and tackle it that way.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Damon's absolutely right, that would be the process by which we do this. and I think that I heard you say you wanted a small, a group that would really understand the process, what we

would try to do is those people who are going off of NomCom, given that they had two years now, particularly those kinds of folks -- it would be helpful to have those folks there so that they can bring some good weight to it. Thank you.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Any other comments about membership? Alright, so let's talk about implementation. So, the first issue is really the scope of this phase. In fact, it's probably misnamed a little bit, right? So, we're calling this the feasibility and suggested implementation phase, so, would probably make sense to bring up the first page of the template -- if we could do that?

So, this is the main deliverable of this phase, which we hope will take about six months and we can present to the OEC by the Barcelona meeting --will be a template for each recommendation that looks like this, alright? So, and this was a template that was borrowed from other reviews -- we can tweak it a bit but basically, we want to be able deliver to the OEC this template that talks about -- first of all is there consensus within the working party for this particular issue? Do we support the corresponding recommendation, or do we suggest a revision to it and if there is a revision to it, of course, is there consensus to the revision? And if we want to descent from the IE, explain why we don't think the IE, either assessment or recommendation is

getting consensus and perhaps again suggest a revised recommendation.

So, if you scroll down a little bit on this template we have again we could comment for the party, we can talk about dependencies for this recommendation -- can you scroll down a little bit more, is that possible? Perfect. Here's where we want in terms of our feasibility, we want to examine the cost to implement the recommendation, what resources are needed, what kind of timing we think might be required, what kind of bylaw changes might be required within NomCom or within other groups.

There's a box here called prioritization level, which says 'IE difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation based on expected resource requirements and budget implications and other dependencies'. So, you can see here that staff has made an initial assessment, that's just for internal use, that's not going to go into the final report. So, the final report will have the Review Working Party's assessments, we might even want to break that out into priority and ease of use. Yes?

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

Nadira. I'm also -- I remember we had some sort of discussion about the revision and in a certain recommendation kind of

agreed by the community. We have the recommendation maybe some editing not revision we don't want to invent and start creating a new -- and then that's kind of diverged from the already -- community has commented on it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I just jump in there, Cheryl for the record. You raise an important point but it's a blessing on us all that the independent examiner we have had the privilege and pleasure of working with has come up with really quite acceptable and highly implementable suggestions.

So, we won't have to fight the challenge of having things that we believe are not feasible, impractical, too expensive, or not going to meet the need because in fact that doesn't seem to be what the report is giving us to work with. So, I think that we are blessed by not having to be challenged by that. So, I agree with you, we can we can ensure that the community sees a patency in their voice.

THOMAS BARRETT: Which is a great point. I think there is a calm here about the level of consensus that, we should probably talk about the expectation there, in terms of what level of consensus are we going to be working with for this template.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom can I jump in again?

THOMAS BARRETT: Yup, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. Spent an awful lot of time talking to parts of ICANN members about the ‘C’ word and it says, as defined by the GNSO working group guidelines for a very good reason because it does not lock you into a single definition of consensus to work with. Again, I think we're going to be working in a blessed environment because I believe we will probably get full consensus, unity out of the working body, for all of these things. But should it be the case there is a minority or divergent view, those guidelines are something we can state and quote.

I fear, if you tried now to agree that we are going to work with full consensus, for example and I've become an even crankier old lady, and I decided to become just bloody-minded and difficult, I could hold up process because we agreed that we have to have full consensus. So, working with the guidelines and using them as reportable in a transparent way I think you gives us some flexibility and ability to move pass road blocks. I

don't foresee any road blocks, I'll hasten to add but should something like that occur, I discourage you from becoming too tightly committed to a single choice out of the consensus definitions.

THOMAS BARRETT:

So, are we comfortable with that or do we want to clarify level of consensus? And there is another second page for this which I want to make sure is not missed -- which talks about suggested implementation status. so, this phase is not just is this feasible, what we think this its gonna cost, or needed resources, it's also a suggestion to the OEC and the board; here's how we envisioned how you can implement this once it's approved, right?

And so there is a piece of the template that addresses that as well. Can I go back to the template though because there's a question that I have for the group; that is, you know this template is going to be our deliverable to the OEC, should there be any other deliverables or is this the sum total of what we're going to be providing?

LARS HOFFMANN:

This is Lars for the record, and Tom you -- so essentially this will be up to you. If you think you want to come up with the work for the implementation guidelines, I'm sure the OEC would

welcome that. You can always keep and also as you said before adopt and amend this template to include more information if that is may be easier. But I think that's something we can discuss along the lines. But in principle if you did just this template with 'just' in big quotation marks, that from the OEC perspective is, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, what they would be expecting.

THOMAS BARRETT:

You know I just want to ask the question up front, we'll keep asking and maybe something else will come up. So, this is our main deliverable, then the question is how do we want to do the work? There's 27 recommendations, there's maybe the equivalent number of people -- what I'm going to suggest is to borrow something from the NomCom.

Let's start off by doing a straw-poll. So, we can take for example, this type of template maybe put it into a spreadsheet form and each individual one of us can complete it as we assess it today. So, for example do we support the issue? That's the issue in the final report, these are questions we can probably decide in the next month or so if there's a level of consensus on a particular issue -- and there'll be a fairly -- issue -- we'll be done with that particular recommendation. So, I'm suggesting

with we start with the straw poll for all of these recommendations. Any thoughts on that?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: This is Damon, I think it's a great way doing it.

THOMAS BARRETT: Thanks Damon so what we'll do is -- my homework with staff we'll come up with the straw-poll -- it could be as simple as an excel spreadsheet that has all 27 recommendations and these columns across and you just fill it out for yourself, maybe we'll get something fancier someone to do a doodle poll or polling type software, so we can collect stuff electronically. So, in the process of doing that we will probably tweak these questions a little bit because I see this not only as final deliverable but as a tool we will use throughout the phrase to understand where we are in terms of completing the work.

So, for each recommendation for example there might be a bunch of recommendations that are all related to training -- it makes sense to categorize those into one groups were going to assess on training ones together because there's some overlap. There might be a bunch -- go ahead, you have a question? Okay, alright.

So, one of the things I think I might want to add as part of the straw poll is to give you the opportunity to, you know, let's figure out or we could even take a shot at categorizing the recommendations. And maybe we'll group them together as part of the straw-poll, so you'll see all the training questions together, right, you see all the process questions together, all the like categories everything related to bylaws to board and so you're assessing those as a group and that make sense?

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thanks, Tom. We had a first stab at that yesterday very quickly and so we've done a pre-categorization, obviously open to discussion since we have now, there's no one to -- we came up with kind of these six, obviously my favorite is the 'other', categories and so they kind of fall relatively well into, it's in the stack I sent around earlier. But I could suggest for example if we have the straw-poll and I'm not the best polling person in the world but we can probably ask you know do you agree with issue, do you agree with this recommendation, you know, do you agree that this is the category it falls into and if not which other ones do you think if you go into?

And that way we have a starting point and then we see if the group agrees with it. This is done on the run so while we think it might roughly work I'm sure there's corrections that need to be

made. yeah but if I can just -- so you have the skills and training that holds six or seven, recruitment issues and with the recruitment agency involved here, the operations, so the internal working of the NomCom more administrative mainly, the communication between the NomCom and those bodies that they make nominations too, the role of the external consultant and then the other.

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

Lars, I remember. I can't remember who supported us with a spreadsheet was provided with the -- who are the source of decision making of this kind of recommendation -- the referral point focal point -- it was like any spreadsheet, a detailed spreadsheet for each of the recommendation or maybe an example of the that was the most effective tool.

LARS HOFFMANN:

I think, for the NomCom? So, we have an internal document spreadsheet but I'm not sure we shared this. where we basically just pulled all the recommendations out and essentially used the same that we have in the implementation tool, sorry in the feasibility assessment -- let me just pull this up -- so in the feasibility assessment we have this in essentially a different format.

It's in a spreadsheet that has recommendations, the issue, and then the prioritization and here it's also anticipated, what does it say here? what part of the community, you know, ICANN community, ICANN board, ICANN organization but we've never filled that out and I'm -- we could have shared that -- I'm not -- I don't know -- it's essentially this in a different format and I'm happy too, I like working with spreadsheets, others don't, and so I'm happy to share that -- it doesn't matter and we can pull that back and forth. Alright, great.

ROB PLUMMER:

So, I don't see who will do it and, that's what I don't see over here. I think that Nadira's right, that's very relevant is to know who the person is going to be to implement that. And, I don't know if you've been sharing this, I'm sorry I'm new to the group. My question was slightly different about the slide we just saw earlier; are all these recommendations ones that the independent examination led to? Okay just wondering thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Hey sorry, if you see the red are -- green are high priority, which is obviously just a suggestion, three up.

CHRISTINE MILLETT: In an effort to parse the review team report for digestion by the NomCom, which we haven't even presented, the teams been busy. My team actually parsed the report by chapter, findings within each chapter and then recommendations correlated with those findings. That's similar to what we've done previously in the org for the review team recommendations for our internal analysis. I'm happy to share it with Lars and Andrea and the working party support staff in case this you know the work we've done is at all helpful.

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl here, if I could just jump in. Just to remind you all what you are doing at this stage. This is a feasibility assessment. Beyond this feasibility assessment, when this template and whatever adjunct material goes with it goes to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and then goes through a board process, a resolution will occur, one trusts, that enacts us to do some recommendations.

We then go on at that point in time and do an expanded detailed implementation plan; so, don't try and drink everything's gonna be coming out of the firehose at this point people. This is the feasibility assessment, allowing us to rationalize, prioritize, and make a pitch for certain details or certain differences.

Differences should be minimal in this place with the independent examiner's recommendations, okay?

So, it's our job to look at the how, for example, for the who, and the when because the what's kind of there, so we're not relitigating the what. It's at the top, if we have a problem with the what than we need to deal with it, but I don't think that's going to be an issue, but we do need to do things like, in a six to 12-month span or in a three to six-month span, or within the next two months after resolution, this action should be implemented has a high priority and it will have minimum complexity but maximum cost of 100,000 dollars. That's the kind of stuff we need to be doing here but that's not the end of your game, because you get to expand into a detailed implementation plan post ICANN org activity with this paperwork.

SATISH BABU:

Satish here. Thanks Cheryl for pointing this out so who gets this the consumer? Or for who is this document targeted for? The board alone or for someone else?

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR:

It is for the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and the ICANN board will take whatever the Organizational Effectiveness

Committee’s advice into consideration. The board, of course, could actually disagree with this Organization Activeness Committee so until you see the whereas’ and the resolves, you do not know.

And I have certainly experienced, had a little bit of practice at some of these reviews -- I have certainly experienced where even community support has gone through, implementation is certainly supported, the community being reviewed thinks it's a good idea, it got through to the ICANN board and they’ve changed it. And that's okay. Then we get to work with whatever the resolves are.

NADIRA ALAJAR:

Another question. Thank you for elaborating and giving good reasoning for that. My concern, also with the feasibility part, because some of the recommendations, as we say, the duration, the time. For example, the assumption that they need the board decision, so we have to have anticipation who would do -- well take the decision and that's that kind of -- must be sought in the process is that what am I understanding?

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR:

For example, if I can take what you said am I hope I have heard it correctly, an example of where we would perhaps want to reach

out to legal for example. While we are putting your opinions on your priorities and its feasibility is when something is going to be recommended as a bylaw change because as soon as you have a bylaw change you have a fixed and defined minimum time that can't start until something happens and then runs for a certain length of time.

So, if we say it has to be done within the first six months doesn't happen. So, we have to be aware of those limiting factors but that will be different in each of those recommendations. So, that's an example point where -- for example if we got a point in time where there is less budget pressure on a recommendation it maybe high priority, but it might be impractical to do in the 2019 financial year, but you could suggest it should be looked at in the 2021 or 2122 financial year.

So, you're getting down to that sort of detail but not trying to build the whole boat this is a good drafting design that can then be embellished and detailed depending on what of the design gets approved.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Anything else? And don't forget there is another field at the bottom of this template where you can -- whoever is working on this recommendation there's a high-level summary of the

proposed implementation steps. So, without doing a detailed plan you can certainly -- the audience is, as they always say, the audience is a board and you want to help them understand how this conceivably could be implemented. That's certainly within the scope of our effort.

SATISH BABU:

Satish again. One other process question. So, when does the review party's task end? Is it while handing this over to the board or after it has been approved and implementation starts? These are also coming under the property of the working party.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Happy to take that. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. The board will in its resolves usually state that a review implementation working party needs to be formed. Alright so that's going to be a defined point that can be and often is, many of the people who have been involved in the working party in the first place and the feasibility assessment, what we're working into now. But it doesn't have to necessarily be. But there will be a defined start of the detailed implementation planning. I've never seen it's where they haven't done a resolve.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Lars, but they've always done a result on a defined point start because once that's started you have six

monthly reporting, right? That new entity reports every six months.

LARS HOFFMANN:

If I can just add to what Cheryl said, this is Lars. Everything she said is absolutely correct. Because the NomCom's are certainly different than say an SO/AC the group that is the reworking party may well continue if the leadership decides to. From an organization perspective there's no preference also you can all retire from this effort and hopefully will recruit a new group of people, obviously that will not be our preference but if that's the way you go than we will support that work as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well of course by the time you get to that which is going to be 12 to 18 months down the line, we've got another turnover. We've got the next NomCom. You know there's a bit of fresh blood we can drag into the Gris of the mill at that point.

THOMAS BARRETT:

So, Lars, I wonder if you could -- is there another question? Go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, I have another question. This is Damon for the record and if you answered this while I was out of the room I apologize. If they were willing and they had time, would you have an objection NomCom members serving on your team? I'm thinking -- I mean not newbies I don't think that would make sense, but if there are people that are in their second term. There are a few that I could think of that do have the time resources available, are those folks that you'd be willing to have?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know about Tom's opinion, but mine is a hell yes.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Well that's some consensus.

THOMAS BARRETT: Oh absolutely. No one's excluded. We'll take current NomCom, current board members, anyone that wants to participate. Which actually, so, in terms of our working process, you know, Lars put up some initial categories because we've already grouped these recommendations by category. So, as part of the straw-poll, we want to say 'yeah, those categories make sense'.

I think the next way to proceed is to then say each category can be a sub-committee.

And so, if you really care about process or bylaw or training than you can volunteer for that committee and you'll already know which recommendations you're getting. And so, some of those sub-committees -- you know, again, it's like a deep dive into the NomCom. You can decide how deep you want to go in terms of your sub-committee.

Some of those may, if it's training for example, you might want to propose something and get feedback from ICANN HR, then maybe there's some overlap with what HR's doing with ICANN for training. Some of them you might want to get feedback from GNSO and other SO's.

And so, based on the sub-committee it certainly makes sense to reach out within the community, even to talk with the current NomCom, even if they're not part of the review working party and get some feedback if that's appropriate; or the board. So certainly that's -- I think we have to divide and conquer for those kinds of deep dives because some of these may be done in a month, some of them may take much, much longer. Are there any thoughts about that approach?

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR: Tom, just a question from Cheryl. It's pretty important on a small group that you make sure your committee as a whole engaged, so I assume there will be, should you go down a subgrouping pathway, first of all it's very likely that some people will end up in multiple subgroups, but you are going to have to bring back things at regular intervals to the committee as a whole.

And I'd also suggest that this is a light, in adverted commas, exercise because you got a bit more than 164 characters, but you don't have three pages in each of these things and that can be you know documentation.

But, let's make it easy for the OEC to work with the output and so to have a certain style, you know, a certain approach, homogenous -- you know what I mean, feel to what is being passed on to the OEC and the board be good.

So, regardless of what a subcommittee does, and that's a fine way of doing things I am a great proponent of distributing work anyone who's worked with me will know that -- but we need to make sure that it comes back, and it becomes a committee of the whole product and particularly the look and feel. It's slightly different again with us because we do not have a staff support structure that's contiguous.

We're not an entity like a CR or SO. The Nominating Committee as staff support but we are not actually associated with that, so we are going to have to beg, borrow, or steal resources from ICANN content. So NSSI may have a different role with us than they do with other parts of the process because normally, let me use the At-Large advisory review recently right, it's now the At-Large support staff that work on things with everybody. It's not possible here so you know that may be an opportunity for us to make sure there's a fine and contiguous look and feel to output. I don't know how you feel yet, but we need to keep not in front of mind that's all.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Thank you for that and I do think staff has done a good job with this template sure which ensures there's a consistent output per recommendation. But there certainly, I think there will be some tools that we could use within the working party to review the work, right? So, I would envision a template just like this straw-poll you're taking when you are answering your initial assessment on some of these we'll extend that -- add columns for example, add the subcommittee that's assigned to that recommendation, who's on that subcommittee.

So, we should talk a little bit about our meeting schedule and our communications plan. And so, I'm going to hand this off to

staff in terms of your expectations of how many times a month. Are we talking twice a month we are going to have calls, is that the plan?

LARS HOFFMANN:

Hey Tom, this is Lars. That would be our recommendation. That's usually a cadence that works well and two weeks would also give subcommittees the opportunity to meet individually and exactly report back depending on how many groups there are. I suspect that there won't be -- if there are six categories, I suspect there will be fewer than six subgroups considering the amount of people we have, so maybe there's three and three -- I mean TBD.

But two weekly calls and then I would suggest that staff is in touch with the chairs to determine whether, you know, next Thursday -- whatever day it is -- next Thursday's call is feasible or not or whether we should skip it or because there's a holiday or maybe the work isn't progressed because of other work is at the forefront.

And so, be flexible but have in principle every other week a meeting and I would suggest also to have rotating times which might make it's easier because I believe the group is quite spread out globally speaking.

THOMAS BARRETT: So, for July, do we have an idea of when you want to have the calls in July?

LARS HOFFMANN: Well our suggestion is usually to start the week after the week of the meeting so that's I believe Monday the second of July is the first week, so it would be the week of the ninth of July. To start we could -- I would suggest to make it easiest to do it and that we keep the Thursday slot, make the first meeting a 20:00 UTC meeting which used to be our standard time during the final phase. And then during that time we can get a doodle poll out for the second time but that way we can get that into the calendar to start off with. So that would be the ninth, that's three, so I believe the twelfth is the Thursday, is that right?

THOMAS BARRETT: I'm just looking at my calendar as well. The twelfth and the 26th.

LARS HOFFMANN: Let me just see. Yeah so Thursday the 12th and then Thursday the 26th of July. So, 12th on 20:00 UTC and the 26th TBD.

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR: If I may -- the 20:00 UTC obviously suits a lot of people, we've discovered that. We might want to allow some flexibility you know for some people to say, 'can we move an hour forward or an hour later' like house out but if we get IICALs out that take us quite some time in, it's much easier to modify an existing ICAL than it is to have things receive or not receiver.

If from a logistics point of view, and I like the plan if you do whatever time in time rotation get it into our calendars and then if at a meeting can we move it forward an hour or back an hour then it is just adjusting that existing thing. I think that makes it easier for people to work with. We may need to take a couple of longer than one-hour calls, that's -- you know, when you're doing some integration work, we just need to be aware of perhaps blocks of time that more people are able to make available, I guess we can see that.

But, I'm concerned that if we're going to ask people to devote, let us say, one day a three-hour block, that we get that into their calendars well in advance. Unfortunately, in some of the work I've seen happen recently you get less than half your team turning up, because of things being organized a little too late.

So, let's get our regulars in, but if we believe we might need a larger block, I think we then doodle that and see what works. Now it may be that it works out that if you got three times two,

so your subgroups, you know? Two subjects into threes -- that everyone can donate about an hour and a half or we can split that over two days. But we need to work that out in advance I think or as far as possible in advance, thanks.

THOMAS BARRETT:

So, I have a question for the group. We talked about doing this straw-poll. It would be great if on July 12th we could have the straw-poll done, so that assumes that we could get something out to you and you have the opportunity to go through all 26 recommendations and complete the straw-poll.

So, my question to you is, if we gave you -- you know, how soon do you need that document to complete the straw-poll or is it not even feasible even if we give it to you today to complete it by the 9th. Is that too soon for people to try to complete a straw-poll by the 9th or would you rather have two extra --

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR:

Tom, did you just say give it to us today to be completed by tonight?

THOMAS BARRETT:

By July 9th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: By July 9th, okay thank you, because my response to what I thought I heard was going to be difficult to put on the public record.

THOMAS BARRETT: I'm just -- I want to know if -- is it feasible to have the straw-poll completed by all the members by July 9th?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: July 9th, okay.

THOMAS BARRETT: What are your thoughts about that?

LARS HOFFMANN: So, from a -- this is Lars for the record -- from a staff perspective, I think we can aim to get you the straw-poll out by the second or third of July, I mean I don't want to commit this as people are traveling. So, we'll see where we are.

THOMAS BARRETT: Thanks, so give it a week. Is a week enough time for all of you to complete the straw-poll? I guess that's the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I jump in, Tom?

THOMAS BARRETT: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If a week isn't enough time for these people to do the straw-poll, they need to back out of this now because they ain't got the time to do the work. I'm not here to be loved.

THOMAS BARRETT: Yeah. So, is that something we can commit to then? If we have something to you by the third, the fourth which is a US holiday, we'd get it done by the 12th?

LARS HOFFMANN: Just to double check that we're on the same page; the straw-poll will contain essentially the issues, 'do you agree yes or no', the recommendation, 'do you agree yes or no', and then the categorization, 'do you agree yes or no'. Is there anything else that needs to be included in that?

THOMAS BARRETT: That's a good -- something to think about. That's a good question, is there anything else we want to ask in the straw-poll? I mean some people might have suggestions for revisions now, if they don't agree with it, they might be willing to suggest something. So, we might want to include that.

LARS HOFFMANN: So, you want to include 'what else do you suggest'?

THOMAS BARRETT: Yeah. And --

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay.

THOMAS BARRETT: Any other ideas? And I think this could be as simple as a Google doc that people fill out. I don't know if you have an electronic tool that can be used, yeah. I mean all this was a challenge when I was in NomCom -- to make these kind of requests. So, two other topics I want to cover. One is our communication and outreach; are we comfortable for example publishing the straw-poll on the Wiki, or is that something we want to use for internal use only?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm gonna jump in again, Cheryl. Particularly because we are not part of a constituency, support organization, or an advisory committee, I think the utmost transparency is an essential. So, I think everything should be recorded, everything wherever possible should be transcribed, and everything on the Wiki.

And if there's a reason to make an exception to that, we state that there's an in-camera piece of work and as any decent entity would do with an in-camera piece of work, we still report on it with the limitations of the confidentiality that may be associated with it. But, you know, we still have to be accountable, but we have to be accountable to the whole of ICANN, so I think that the Wiki is going to be an essential tool.

LARS HOFFMANN: I was just going to say Brandon in the chat agrees as well.

THOMAS BARRETT: Great, so we're all in agreement, everything is open. What else I would want to suggest is that perhaps every eight weeks, we publish a score card for the community, in case they're not visiting the Wiki everyday like we are. And so, we put out a score card saying, 'here's what the working review party's been up to,

here's what we've done so far, again, if you want to join, you may be able to add expertise and help with some of these subcommittees'. So, it's almost like a recruitment tool, as well as a way to communicate what is going on. So, the plan is to do that basically every eight weeks or so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, Cheryl again. Do you have a particular person who you think should be in charge of that score card, because for example we've had staff supporting some of our cross-community working groups with score carding?

But we don't have that sort of staff support, but we could ask for that specific staff s -- you know what I mean? If that's something we need to do then there are people who are skilled, you know I'm not gonna name them now, but it's not difficult to find them. That have got processes and programs already running, plugging into their expertise may be useful for that, that's all.

LARS HOFFMANN: This is Lars for the record. My gut reaction to this is that on the NSSI team we obviously support the specific reviews, we also use the scorecards to report on that, so I think this may be a template we could tweak a little bit and then distribute to the group and use the data points you want to see captured and I

think we'd be happy to provide you then with scorecards for you to, again, then sign off on and make sure they're correct and then publish them accordingly every eight to 10 weeks maybe. No problem, we'd take that on.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Great. So, I was gonna wrap up. Any other thoughts or comments before I kind of summarize the next steps? So, we all agree that we're going to complete the straw-poll by July 12th, we'll work with staff to have that out to you by July third. Which gives you about a full week to take a look and fill it out.

I also want to work with staff -- I want to take care of those two other outstanding items we talked about; we take a look at the past, prior NomCom and that may not be done necessarily right away but start the process of what that piece document or deliverable would look like. As well as looking at the public comments and coming up with a template on what that document will look like.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Tom, June is so -- which do an awful lot of public comments because they do an awful lot of PDP processes -- have some of the shelf templating for the reporting in a public form on how public comments submitted encourage us to pick up some of

the stuff because Mario has modified over the years and we use that.

THOMAS BARRETT: Great. Anything else guys? Alright thank you guys for coming today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And welcome aboard. This is the fun part. Can I just recognize in case it isn't recorded, though I'm sure it is with Angie at the helm over there, that we have had a number of people who weren't a part of the roll-call and introduction join us in remote participation during the call?

So, for those of you that weren't looking at the Adobe room you had a number of your compatriots not limited to but including Brenden, Mark, Wolf, and Yrjo. So, you've actually got quite a nice team to work with and let's go have some fun now -- with this, I mean, not here in Panama.

THOMAS BARRETT: Yeah, there's one more update. Zahid and David were here today which is the leadership team on the NomCom. So, I'm actually joining Zahid who's giving a debrief on the NomCom to some groups today and I'm also giving a debrief on the Review

Working Party. So that's happening today. RSAC is happening in a few minutes and then NCSU we are doing this afternoon.

NADIRA ALAJAR:

At current Nominating Committee, there is a recommendation subcommittee. How can we integrate both together, like whatever recommendation we have for the next Nominating Committee with the group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Want me to get that? The recommendations coming out of one NomCom which of course are to encourage the following NomCom to look at learnings and benefit from experience, should be focused on exactly that -- from your NomCom to the next. That doesn't mean we won't take a look at and be influence by, but I discourage an absolute nexus. My reasoning is it's probably going to be the 2020 NomCom's recommendations that will be affected by our work not this one or even the next.

So, let's keep a very close eye on all of the recommendations, in fact not only the current NomCom and the next one or two but let's have a look at a couple years of the past; there's some really good material in, there right? So, let's not ignore all of that but they really need to be the handing of the baton of information

from one NomCom to the next, but we're gonna run over several NomCom's with our work.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you we can stop the recording.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Wait, you were waiting for us to come back so you could close?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]