KOBE – NomCom Review Update
Monday, March 11, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

TOM BARRETT:

Hi, everybody. Why don't we get started? You can take your seat. This is the public meeting of the NomCom 2 Review and so we want to give you an update of what we've done and where we are today. So the agenda will talk about how we got here, the preview of the implementation process, the estimated timeline for this next phase and then what the outline of a detailed implementation plan looks like, and then next steps following the Kobe Board action that is expected this week.

So just to remind you how we got here, so we had an independent evaluator who conducted a variety of surveys and interviews, and developed a report on 27 recommendations. Those did go out for a public comment period last year before the report was finalized and the Implementation Planning Team essentially approved those 27 recommendations with four revisions or amendments to the existing recommendations.

After working throughout the last six months or so, or nine months of 2018, we finally submitted to the Board OEC, the feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan of those 27 recommendations. So those were submitted in December

and so the OEC has reviewed that. They have reviewed the final report of the independent evaluator, as well as the staff report of all the public comments. And so we are expecting Board action this week on that feasibility study and our expectation is they will approve it as-is without any revisions or comments.

So in terms of the next phase of this NomCom Review, as I say, we expect a Board action this week to direct the community to form an implementation team for implementation of these 27 recommendations. So we expect after this meeting to start the planning for that and decide how to communicate to the community that we want to form this team and invite participants.

And the plan is within six months to provide a detailed implementation plan for these 27 recommendations, so essentially, I believe it was at the Montreal meeting roughly. I'm sorry? Just in time for the Montreal meeting.

Then the Board would consider our detailed implementation plan. Again, this is going to be focused on process, not actual decisions, simply how we propose we implement each one of these recommendations. And then once the Board accepts the detailed implementation plan, presumably they will then direct us to go ahead and implement it as defined or with whatever

revisions they want to suggest and report back to them every six months until we complete the implementation.

And then finally, if deemed complete, Board passes a resolution to adopt the final report and closes the review.

So that's basically what's happening in the next phase, really a two-step phase, so we come up with our framework on how we suggest the implementation of that recommendation should proceed and then we go ahead and implement it. Any questions on that?

So in terms of timeline, here are some of our milestones. Again, Board action this week on proceeding with this review. We then spent the next month or so forming the implementation team. So again, we expect many of the current members of the review to continue but we're also inviting new members to join as well and then we spend the next six months going through the 27 recommendations and coming up with that detail and implementation plan. Again, present that to the Board and then proceed with implementation. Question on that?

So before I jump ahead, I do want to throw out a question for you folks. So the typical review, let's say it's ALAC or GNSO, the implementation is thrown back to the supporting organization saying, "Here are all the recommendations we came up with, you guys go ahead and implement these.

So the NomCom, in fact, doesn't have an SO. You change over every year. Many of the recommendations when you look at the 27, there are five general categories. I'll just review them for you. It's what I all the accountability and transparency group of recommendations. There's a set of recommendations around changing the ICANN bylaws or the NomCom bylaws. Those are over-arching categories and then there are more operational categories such as trading of NomCom members and the leadership team, how you do the assessment process and the recruitment process. So those are five general categories.

So on the operational level, those last three, trading, recruitment, assessment, you guys are very close tot hat, very fresh in your mind so it makes a lot of sense to involve the current NomCom and most recent NomCom in helping to implement those.

But the ones such as there's some proposed bylaw changes, for example, we need to figure out how to involve the community in deciding how to implement those because some of them will require buy-in from the different SOs. So I'll give you an example. One of the recommendations is to conduct a rebalancing exercise of the NomCom and determine whether or not it's representative of the ICANN community.

So this is really prompted. It is in the bylaws to do this every five years, but one of the constituencies out there says, "Hey, we deserve a seat in the NomCom. How come we don't have one?" And so we generated this recommendation saying let's examine rebalancing. It's also somewhat connected to the fact that you have an empty seat here, which is the GAC rep who hasn't shown up in ten years. And so all those are wrapped up into this recommendation.

And here's another one that says, "Whatever you do, don't change the size of the NomCom." There's no recommendation saying we're going to add three more seats, so keep the number of seats you have but perhaps look at, determine whether or not it's representative of the community.

So how would you suggest we proceed on a plan for rebalancing the NomCom? Any suggestions? How would you do that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Well, as a representative of the said constituency who is missing their seat, I think it'd be fair enough to give that unused seat of the GAC to NPOC.

TOM BARRETT: So that would be your decision. You would say yes, let's rebalance. Let's take away the GAC seat and give it to NPOC. So I

guess I was curious about what process would you use to decide that? because the community has to agree on that. It's a consensus-based kind of process, right?

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: To respond to that, definitely I think there is a concern that the noncommercial constituency is under-represented. But that goes back to the GNSO and I think maybe that's the challenge.

Your question is a really interesting question because is it possible to do that rebalancing just at the NomCom level or does it require other bodies to change as well? But certainly, I would say that having a better balance between the commercial constituencies and the non-commercial constituencies in NomCom is very important.

And I would not let go of the GAC chair. I think part of the whole ICANN model is that governments need to be part of this bottom-up inclusive process and yes, they have bailed. They have not been committed with us. They have been reluctant and they have political reasons for not wanting to serve on the NomCom, but I think there's can actually be negotiated.

I had a conversation with the GAC Chair about this recently and I think there is more openness. I don't know if you've experienced that, but I wouldn't want to give up on that as a principle. But

certainly, better balance between commercial, non-commercial, I think would be important.

I'm not sure. Maybe it's also good to look at the At-Large representatives which, of course, is a very large grouping within ICANN. Maybe they'd be willing to agree to fewer. I'm just speaking off the cuff here, but maybe At-Large would be willing to have fewer representatives so that other constituencies can be better represented.

I'm sure when you look really …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think it's something that would need to be discussed with all the constituencies.

TOM BARRETT: And the other thing to think about is as we go out for comment, there may be another constituency that says, "Hey, I didn't know you were doing rebalancing. We deserve a seat as well." So I guess I'm looking for some ideas about it's not simply … The Review Team doesn't want to make this decision. They want the

community to make this decision. This is Cheryl, my Co-Chair, by the way who just volunteered to give up one of their seats.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which "they're" am I being lumped in with? I've worn a number of hats in my life in ICANN.

I say it as a heed, not in jest. Where does this end if every time a new subunit of a new subunit of some sub-section of some part of ICANN creates itself into what it declares is an interested community? Do we just end up with an utterly and absolutely unworkably large number of people? That is one end of the spectrum.

We've got to look at the precedence we're setting here too. So what Tom and I, and I think the team would like to see is some out of the box and willingness thinking. Don't just sit entrenched in your current views and say, "ALAC, of course, is divided exactly in five geographic regions. Nominating Committee couldn't possible be interested in geographic diversity, so why wouldn't we take one of the only organizations who, by bylaw requirement, is absolutely equitably divided geographically and reduce its numbers. That's one way of looking at it. Another way of looking at it is why don't we have one GNSO, one ccNSO, one per ccNSO, and let them fight out who gets to sit at the seat.

I'd be delighted to have run a NomCom when I did with somewhere between seven and 11 people around the table to be brutally honest. The actual number doesn't touch it. It's the balancing that does. That said, our recommendations are not suggesting lowering the total number, but please help with a bit of clever thinking, not just entrenched beliefs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The other thing with opening it up is you open it up, you don't just necessarily want … The community might come back with saying, "Well, maybe reduce something," because already, the suggestion was made to reduce the GAC seat. So we think here in this conversation that we'll have maybe one extra seat as a replacement and a reduction of one seat maybe. I don't know how it's going to go, but it might be other things that the community might come up with.

So you open this up, then you have to have the openness and thinking of saying, "Well, anything might happen." Like for instance, the recommendation could be one per GNSO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I have another option which would maybe be somewhat popular in the community and I think that would be, at the moment, the GNSO has seven seats in the NomCom and the

commercial stakeholder group has four of them, which is a little insane. And my suggestion would be like, again, we could maybe take the unused GAC seat and give two seats per each stakeholder group which would actually make them look sort of balanced.

And well, then there would be basically just one stakeholder group suffering from that and the other three would be gaining, so that would be my other suggestion.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: That is kind of what I was getting at as well when I said, "Look at how the GNSO NomCom representation is calculated," because there is a constituency in balance. Now, of course, there's diversity within the business constituency and I think the idea behind that is to respect and reflect that diversity within the business constituency.

But the thing is there's also diversity within the non-commercial constituency which also deserves to be reflected. But that, I think, certainly would be a model.

And then Cheryl, out of the box thinking, I do think that geographic diversity, and that's why when I made that outrageous suggestion about AT-Large, I was hurting because I think the geographic diversity is vital and I think At-Large brings

that to NomCom in a way that no one else does. But I think we should also not have to just rely on At-Large.

So another way of looking at it would be to have NomCom more deliberate geographic diversity formulas for constituting NomCom across constituencies.

JONATHAN COHEN: Well, when the NomCom was created, I was on the Board at the time. There was a lot of healthy debate about what its makeup should be. I was one of those who felt two concerns.

My first was that by populating it with members of the GNSO and otherwise, that you would import the politics thereof into the NomCom and you would, instead of having a group that was really set out to find the best applicants, you might end up having people coming with agendas, either an agenda never to let somebody from another constituency get in or being focused on one aspect of people as opposed to looking at the person as a whole, etc.

One of the suggestions I had at the time, and I just don't think is it worth a chat, is to have not necessarily a bigger NomCom because it will become unmanageable and dysfunctional, but to actually cut it down so that any and every constituency has only one representative. But you have two or three ex-Board

members who are non-voting members to come in and participate fully and act as guides, some kind of assistance to the people making these decisions with knowledge and experience that they don't have.

I've tried to underplay. My experience was small because it was 100 years ago, but I think it has been of some small value to people on the committee to know that there's somebody there who has actually been through the process and has some feel.

So I would ask you to consider that. I feel slightly smaller, one that has less chance to poll. It might be in the best interest of ICANN as opposed to worry about "Gee, they've got more than I have" and "There are too many commercials" and "There are too many non-commercial on there." I hate that kind of approach to it. That's not the purpose of this exercise.

LARS HOFFMANN: I appreciate that Tom brought a very non-controversial issue as an example for the discussion. It's always interesting. I just want to remind everyone that at this point … I thought actually there were some really interesting ideas that were being floated. But at this point, what Tom said, I just want to remind everybody. I don't want anybody to go away and think that any decisions have been made or that any agendas have been had.

The next six months are about, and that's what Tom asked in the beginning, thinking about the process, how the community can come to a solution. Should this be done through a survey? Should it be done in a way that the bylaws say at the moment the GNSO has seven seats, so we kick it to the GNSO and they need to sort it out themselves? The same with the ALAC. The ALAC would have five seats. Is that the way forward or should there be a cross-community group of sorts who discusses this? And then who gives them the mandate?

So it's really, at this point, thinking about what process can we put in place to come up with a good solution rather than focusing on the solution that we ideally want. That's really for later in the year once the Board has adopted the [inaudible] implementation plan.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So not to be non-controversial but in my experience of whatever years I've spent on the NomCom, I hear this thing that do we want to increase the size of the NomCom [inaudible] become too big? And actually, from that experience, I think actually we might be too small.

Let me explain why I say that. When we start looking at quorum that we need to have to actually hold a NomCom meeting, there have been times where we haven't been able to meet the

quorum. There have been situations where a lot of work that has been done by the NomCom members, they're feeling burnt out. I can tell you that this NomCom this year worked really hard over the last few months and a lot of people have had to do a lot of work. So actually having more hands on deck might not be a bad thing. But this can be discussed.

On the point of what you just raised about what we need to do is not talk about issues but talk about the process, I think that one of the things you could do is basically, and I know this is part of today's processes, to reach out to the different SOs and ACs and stakeholder groups or constituencies and actually bring this onto the agenda. I'm not really sure that they're looking at this right now as something that's a priority and it's only six months from now that this thing has to close. So I would say reach out to them, not just at this meeting. Reach out to them individually and ask them for their comments.

TOM BARRETT: Any other comments? So I bring up this question because I'm looking for an actual answer, right? I'm trying to illustrate that as part of this next phase, for example, this question, what criteria do we use to decide rebalancing? Our implementation plan is to lay out, "Do we know what the criteria is? If not, how do we

figure out what they're going to be and then do we go do public surveys or comment periods to fine tune that?"

And so, again, at the end of the six months, we won't have a rebalanced NomCom. We won't have made a decision about adding seats or replacing seats, but hopefully we have a plan we're going to implement.

I'll give you another example. I want to follow-up to Jonathan's comment about maybe we should have more ex-Board members [inaudible] in this process. So there is another recommendation that proposes a standing committee for the NomCom. Very similar idea.

So they focus on the NomCom process as opposed to the decision it's making year to year and that would be an ideal role, I think, for ex-Board members to say, "Look, you can be much more efficient here or you're not paying attention to the Board advice or understanding it." And so, again, we need to figure out through this process how to differentiate the role of that standing committee to the NomCom itself and make sure they don't get in each other's business, but are complimenting each other.

And then, of course, the community has to buy into that and say, because it was a budgetary, perhaps, component to that, that

requires yet another committee within ICANN that some people would resist.

Any other thoughts or comments? I'm sorry. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't' know if this is listed in the document, but we have this thing we call the firewall problem, which is that a NomCom is supposed to erase all institutional memory from one year to the next and that's sort of fine as a general principle except, of course, there are some of us who serve more than one term and we're not allowed to say that such-and-such was an idiot and we shouldn't even consider him or her next time. Or on the positive side, the opposite kind of thing.

Would it be a good idea, perhaps in terms of the confidentiality requirements, to basically tell applicants that their information is handed off to this institution called a NomCom which may carry that information forward from one year to the other and that is in their interest. It's not a bad thing. Have you had any discussions about that at all?

TOM BARRETT: So a big part of the 27 recommendations are about building the institutional memory of the NomCom, but a lot of that is "does not identify candidates by name". We don't think that is

something that should be shared from year to year. Or any identifiable information.

So for example, one of the recommendations is as you go through your assessment process, that it be a blind process. You evaluate candidates without knowing who they are. That's one of the recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's an excellent proposal. I'm sure it works.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we did it back in my NomCom's day, so hell.

TOM BARRETT: No, I'm not sure. Maybe I did, but you mentioned institutional memory so I jumped on that. There are definitely several recommendations that focus on improving institutional memory so you're not reinventing the wheel every year and so that you're getting better every year.

You had a question about whether or not you can get the consent, perhaps, of candidates that carry their information forward one year. Do you want to clarify that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, so NomCom's typically have a lot of overlap from one year to the next. Most of us are term limited by two terms but that means that we may see the same applicant a second time around and we don't have a blank sheet in our mind as the other people sitting around the room that are new. As a principle of equality and fairness, it's not a practical thing. If the information about a candidate can't be moved from one NomCom to the next NomCom, within that two-year cycle, I think that does more damage to the system than the potential harm if we can define what the harm is for that information to be shared from one NomCom to the next. Obviously, it stays within the NomCom. It's not like an open book forever.

TOM BARRETT: You know what? Ole said it. As usual, he's a very clever guy and I agree with him.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think that's actually a tricky issue. I do think that when it comes to NomCom procedures and a clear understanding of what the specific role is of NomCom and the criteria that we use for our process, I think the firewall isn't helpful and I think we're working towards that, and that should be … It's in the recommendations. I think when it comes to candidates, I think we have to be fair to the candidates and I think that rule, that

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

every year is a fresh process is there in order to be fair to candidates. I don't think the process precludes us if there are NomCom members who have knowledge of candidates. They might have that because they were candidates for a previous NomCom.

They might have that NomCom knowledge because they've worked with them or they served on some committee or process with them and I think we've got professional and privacy respecting ways within the NomCom to share that information when it is necessary to share that information.

But I do think that the firewall about candidate, about applicant information and applicants being given a fresh opportunity every year, I do think that's important.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I'm just going to go back to Lars. I think actually a document is being sent to SOs and ACs would be helpful, even constituencies. I would take very recommendation that you've been working on, ever stream, and I would make it sort of a question. Then I would ask them for their thoughts on it, give them space for that sort of like a survey, and then I would actually force them to give a solution to the problem saying, "what's your specific response?" because just saying this is a

bad idea doesn't help. This is a problem that's been identified. What do you think your solution is?

And then I'd also leave it open to them to any others because there might be things within the 27 recommendations, they might want to ad something else. That might be a good document to start off with so that they can focus on the issues.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Tom. Just on this issue because I think maybe a hybrid approach might be applicable, if for example, someone went through the NomCom process and then failed a background check. There was some financial crime or something like that. But they reapply three years later or whatever it is and that new NomCom has no idea. They go through the whole process. They go through the interview process. Maybe there's some eligibility that we could lay on top of that review that preserves that confidentiality that you're talking about but it makes it a little more efficient in that we don't reinvent the wheel each year in that kind of case. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. I definitely think it's a slippery slope if we start keeping databases of previous candidates or listings just because then we are all human beings, we're going to end up

giving them more priority. We definitely tried something like that last year, not to review what we did but yeah, this maybe could be considered for another time or this and that. It just didn't seem to be fair at all. That's all I can say and it will not really welcome newcomers, insiders or outsiders.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. On John's point, I think it's an interesting idea because there would be certain things, as an example of this, that you could say, "Well, this logically will be more efficient, will not waste time and may not have a privacy implication.

But to the point of whether due diligence issues would be something we could identify, the problem with that is a lot of times, things are identified through due diligence and they're not clearing out things like, "He's got a criminal record so they're absolutely out." It could be just issues that are brought forward and actually has to make a call saying, "Well, I think yes or no." Sometimes it gets taken to the whole NomCom. So it's a little fuzzy and it may change over time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Very true.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Just to [inaudible]'s point. I think it is a very good idea. Again, on the process though, I would be reluctant. It's not for me to make that decision obviously. It needs to be the [inaudible] was formed and if they want to reach out, they reach out whatever way they want.
	My advice would be at this point to write to the SO/ACs and to stakeholder constituencies and say, "This team is being formed. Here is a reminder of the report. If there are important decisions that will be made over the course of the next two years, send somebody who can represent your points."
	And then once the Board adopts the implementation plan, and actual concrete steps are being taken and decisions are being made, I think that's probably the right moment to send out information to the SOs and ACs to say, "Look guys, this is happening. This is our proposal. Do you agree? Should we do something else? Do you have other suggestions?" if that makes sense. I don't want to push back. I just think the timing might be a little better if it's staggered slightly differently.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I was going to say I'm happy to push back. Perfectly happy to push back, [Z].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I will help you with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's fine. Let's keep in mind carrying on from Lars who is being very polite, where we are in the process as well because we've had an independent examiner whose come and done survey work, interviews, a lot of all of that groundwork. From that community interaction, they have given us these recommendations. As a result of that, the Board took some action and adoption and the result of that, a feasibility assessment has been done by a cross-community team.

So what Lars has just said, the next natural thing is to, if you believe, you've got skin in the game, get engaged now. It's not a new opportunity to re-litigate or review.

LARS HOFFMANN: And just as a quick reminder, the draft final report with recommendations was out for public comment and we did the road show in Barcelona, so at least there was. It was definitely elevation and information pushed out.

TOM BARRETT: So I think it's great you guys got all these ideas. We're not going to do anything with them. And let me explain to you why.

So we talked about this standing committee. That's one of our recommendations to form. So as many of you know, at the end of your cycle, one of the things you generate is a series of recommendations for the next NomCom. Right? You look back, saying, "What's the last one recommended to us? Did we do them?" and then you look forward and say, "What do we think the next NomCom should be?"

Many of those recommendations will go right to the standing committee and they say, "Gee, this is an overarching issue." Right? So what we want to do is put into place that process. That's why I'm saying we're not going to do anything about your ideas, but we want to sure your ideas are captured in your report for the next year's NomCom. And so that way, then the standing committee can implement them if the next year's NomCom can't.

So the process here is you guys are running into all these challenges. Make sure you capture that in your final report so that it then goes back to this standing committee to say, "Wow, this is something we haven't thought of. Let's follow this type of way to remedy it." Does that make sense?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Tom, if I may, slightly to Ole's point as well, remember, too, one of the recommendations is also saying that we don't start

with a [inaudible]. It isn't going to be a blank slate on policies and procedures and all of that as well that there will be institutional knowledge on the way things are done and lessons learned, and so that will also help some of the issues that you've all identified. And to be honest, every NomCom I've ever been involved with has identified.

[JON NEVETT]: Quick question. Would it make sense, then, to establish that standing committee first in the process and then that standing committee could help implement all the others as opposed to rely on a NomCom that's slated to select candidates?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm welcoming you to join the feasibility, the next phase, because that's exactly what this detailed implementation working plan does. Not only does it look at the costumes. It looks at the prioritization and the order in which it goes.

Now occasionally, the ICANN Board will say things as it has to previous review processes where they want the simplest and least costly things prioritized and we take that on board. But the opportunity to prioritize and put things in an order, and what you've just said makes incredible sense to me, not that that's worth much, is now in this next phase where we decide what is

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

getting a first priority, what is getting the greatest attention, what we are going to budget for to then have implemented in the next 18 months to two years' time.

TOM BARRETT: Right, and just to add to that. Remember how the PTI got off the ground, that interim director, right? The initial folks got in because they were part of the PTI formation but then after that, they had a more normal process to elect Board members. So it may well be that we just internally be the first standing committee but then going forward, we need a more community-led way of deciding or criteria deciding how to staff that standing committee because it's not just because we're here, we get to do it. But maybe there's a way we can as an initial basis, start that process. Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: Jon, I might have misunderstood but just to be clear, the implementation is not necessarily to be done by the NomCom, right? So there will be an implementation team by the community. Obviously, some issues the NomCom has to take on and the operational has to be [inaudible], but it's not an additional task to what you are doing in your day jobs. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	They maybe have been working on this, so I apologize. So any thoughts on how do you staff that standing committee? What's the term of the members on that, etc., things of that nature?

TOM BARRETT:	Well, the recommendation says four to six people, perhaps of ex-NomCom or ex-Board members, no more specific than that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That's the next phase is the detail.

TOM BARRETT:	But again, I want to make sure you folks capture these ideas so that when we have this body in place, you just have this report in terms of here's what we recommend the NomCom do next, right? It's very important that we capture these ideas while they're fresh.
	All right, so any other comments on this? Sorry. Go ahead, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:	So from what I read in the report, basically what we do today as NomCom is voluntary and those who are supposed to be on the standing committee and who should be carrying this institutional memory forward up are also going to be from the

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

community, which means that they are also volunteers. Was there anything that informed this? Why didn't we look in the directional stuff to carry forward institutional memory if that was the reason why we needed a steering committee?

Because I see from what I read in the report, it appears to me that the implementation committee will be doing much more than carrying forward institutional memory. They are going to have responsibilities to determine the budget, to a large extent run the budget, and for me, this might have, depending on the individuals involved, this might have some impact on how the seat in NomCom gets to operate. If what we were looking at was just to carry on institutional memory, why didn't we look at getting or using [photos], the [radio] on ground?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think the short answer, perhaps, is that there's always this tension between the NomCom trying to be independent from the ICANN Board. So they don't want to look like the board's maintaining the institutional memory and it needs to be the community. But it wasn't specifically looked at.

Any other thoughts or comments?

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is probably somewhere in the documentation that I haven't read but how many people will the implementation team have?

TOM BARRETT: Well, historically, the past phases, I think we had 15 people officially on the list and about half of those ended up participating from meeting to meeting. But it is an open group so we welcome other participants. In fact, as part of our implementation plan going forward, for example, there's a bunch of recommendations on training, training of you folks.

We may want to say, "We really should get ICANN Academy involved in those recommendations or HR department at ICANN because some of this has to do with providing training to the NomCom about what a Board Director does, etc. And so we'd love to, perhaps, reach out and tap folks who are training experts to help us take on those types of recommendations.

So there are several group types of recommendations where I think we can say, "You know who would be great for this is this person within ICANN," just in case they don't voluntarily raise their hand, we can go tap them on the shoulder and say, "You've got great experience that we want to tap into."

Okay, so let's just walk through what we think this implementation plan will contain. So again, for each of the 27

recommendations, so there's a, essentially, plan for 27 little mini plans within our document, the timeframe that we think it would take to implement this. So I'll give you another recommendation. We're recommending two-year terms for the NomCom. But we don't want everyone to age off at the same time, so we need to figure out two-year terms and how to stagger it so you don't lose the entire NomCom every two years. That's a multi-year process.

So the definition of desired outcomes including metrics where applicable, an explanation of how our implementation plan addresses the issues identified in the final report, a way to measure the current status progress towards those objectives, any budgetary implications of how we implement this, and obviously, details of who will be responsible for the implementation of each of the 27 recommendations including how the community will be involved.

So again, there's a template we'll develop and for each of the 27 recommendations, we'll fill in these different bullets.

So next steps. Form the implementation team. All right, so that will happen over the next few weeks. I know you folks are busy in your assessment phase through June so we understand, but if you think you're interested in coming on board after the June time period, let us know. We'd like to know, would welcome

your involvement, understanding you're busy the next few months but we would like to know if you think you'd want to come on board and help us.

So we're going to confirm our leadership team, set up our regular meeting schedule, and then develop that template of what each of the detailed implementation plan will look like for each recommendation. Like we've done in the feasibility phase, we'll plan public outreach. Personally, I think these meetings are great but I'd like to, for the next meeting, for example, get on serving on the leadership team is to try to get on the agenda of each of the SOs because they're obviously not showing up here, so I'll go to the registrant constituency, the ALAC, the ccNSO and say, "I need a 20-minute time slot on your constituency day just to talk about these recommendations. So that's part of planning we'll probably want to do for the next meeting.

And then after six months, we deliver those 27 mini plans, basically, to the OEC and once we get their feedback and approval, then we go ahead and implement each of those 27 recommendations.

Any questions, comments about that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Tommy, if I may? I think it's important for those of you who haven't been immersed in these sorts of processes before to recognize that when Tom's referring to this forming an implementation team, Tom and I on here, we were also talking about this team that we've been working with for several cycles of stuff now doing different things with some of the same people.
	It is actually a very formal thing. Part of the Board resolution will be and will form the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group. It is a new construct which Tom and I are willing to play with, if they're game enough to have us. But it is a new construct. We would like to think that a number of people who have been on the journey up until now will continue on that journey. But it's not that it's the same thing that you've got to try and get into as a new person into the group. It's a new construct. It's an opportunity for refreshment as well. So we'd like some consistency from some of people who've worked with us since the very, very beginning and it's an ideal opportunity for others to come on board because this is when it gets down to [tin] tax. This isn't just it's a lovely idea. This is details.
TOM BARRETT:	And one of my concerns is that we go through this process, six months plan, another six months implementation, and it blows

up because some part of the community feels like they weren't aware of what's happening, they weren't consulted and basically, it goes off the rail. So we want to make sure because of the community-wide aspect of the NomCom that that doesn't happen.

Any other comments, suggestions, advice?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If there's not, I just wanted to pick up on the point you were just making, Tom. This is unique in a NomCom Review. Of all the organizational reviews, this is the one time in the cycle of organizational reviews where there is not a stable lump that we can identify beyond the name, Nominating committee. There is no standing staff that is not engaged in the actual work of the NomCom that can suddenly become immersed in implementation.

Imagine, if you will, if we tried to use the staff that is busy trying to support a NomCom. It's very different because it's not an AC or an SO and it's not even the same people, so it is slightly different which makes it a little bit trickier but probably open to some more opportunities.

So that's why we're working with MSSI. Normally, they at this point are going, "Right, and we step back now. You've got into

your next plight." By the time you get into the detailed implementation, MSSI is going, "We've had enough. Thank you. We're moving on to the next point." That is not how we're approaching even our feasibility work. So it is a slightly unique situation because it's not an AC or SO.

TOM BARRETT: Anything else, guys? Yes.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just a very general question, and thanks again for meeting with us previously and now again. A lot of the recommendations, I remember looking at the whole grid of it. They're quite subtle. They're little things. Some of them, I think, also looked at, were not directly around NomCom. If I recall correctly. Board terms, for example, came up as an issue to look at for NomCom to be able to play its role in enduring continuity. But forgetting all of those nuanced recommendations, based on the review and your consultation around the review, what are the big things? What are the things that you feel really do need to be changed?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There are 27 recommendations and by definition, they all need to be. They've all gone through feasibility. We are committed

now. The Board will approve 27 recommendations. We now get to detail and prioritize them.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yeah. I suppose I'm looking for, so transparency, I think that stood out definitely as a sort of over-arching cluster of recommendations. That's more or less what I'm … I'm not asking you to rank the recommendations, just sort of big picture issues that you feel stood out, that the community felt needed to be addressed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anriette, anything that didn't make the cut through feasibility is what would have fallen through that sieve and everything made it through feasibility. Four of the recommendations, we made minor modifications to, so this is one of those times when the independent examiner's report and recommendation was very palatable to the group that was doing a feasibility assessment and it was very minor course correction that occurred in those four recommendations.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I think we're done. Real quickly, I think the NomCom's job is to improve Board governance, right? So these recommendations, hopefully, get you down the road for

improving your productivity and your efficiency and improving overall Board governance.

Any other comments? Otherwise, we'll give you your day back. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]