

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Okay, we will now begin the official recording and interpretation of this call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ATLAS III Leadership Development Team subgroup call on Thursday the 28th of February 2019 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today, on the English channel we have Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr on audio only, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Lianna Galstyan, Pastor Peters, Vernatius Ezeama, Daniel Nanghaka, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Priyatosh Jana, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Ejikeme Egbougu, Natalia Filina, Sandra Hoferichter, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Eranga Samararthna, and Justine Chew.

On the Spanish channel, we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Sylvia Herlein Leite, and Alberto Soto.

On the French, we have Michael Linze and Gabdibé Gab-Hingonne. We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, and Yesim Nazlar from staff. We have Gisella Gruber and myself, Claudia Ruiz from staff as well as myself on call management. Our interpreters on Spanish today are Claudia and David, and on the French, our interpreters are Jacques and Aurelie.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channel, and to please mute your lines when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you, and with this, I turn it over to you, Maureen.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes. First of all, I have to apologize, because the agenda that we've got at the moment is actually the agenda that was from the previous meeting, and I guess that's my fault, [inaudible] didn't update the agenda. It's 3:00 in the morning and I have obviously not had the time this morning to do that.

So, what we'll be doing at this meeting in fact is looking at the steps [inaudible] for example in the current agenda that's online, it's that what has actually happened is that at our last meeting, a group that consisted of the team leaders plus one other member from their team so that it was a small, compact group that had probably less than a week to actually put together the final list of the criteria and [inaudible] that was made from the collective list of the four groups' selections that they made in that previous meeting.

Having just kept [inaudible] over that because this whole activity has actually been done by the working groups themselves that they have come up with a final list, and so what I will be doing is passing the mic over to that working group so that they can actually relay to us what their final decisions were on the actual criteria and indicated for the actual selection of the travelers to ATLAS III.

So I think I'll pass it over to Justine. I'm not quite sure which of the [inaudible]. Justine, are you available?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, I'm here.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you. We can hear you. [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, great. Sorry, I sent over a PDF document [to staff] I think in the last 30 minutes for the presentation today. While it's being updated – here you go. I just have to indicate to everybody present today that this is the result of the work of a small team, the one that Maureen referred to, which is basically made up of the leaders of the four subgroups as well as one other person from each subgroup, so there were eight of us who attempted to work on this document.

I would say we've had significant participation from three of the subgroups. Unfortunately, subgroup four – for obvious reason, I think everybody is overloaded at this point in time – we haven't had too much contribution from subgroup four on this particular document, but as I go through it and when I remark on the additional comment at the bottom, at the end, [we're going to suggest] that there'll be opportunities for subgroup four and indeed for members of this working group to provide further input if necessary.

Okay, moving on to the actual document, what we tried to do was to sort of consolidate the inputs or the lists of the criteria that the four subgroups came up with separately and to consolidate those into a single consolidated list so that we could work off one particular copy instead of having four different copies.

Okay, so I've been asked to speak louder. I will try to do that. sorry, it's just very early for me, so my voice tends to be a little bit muffled when I'm still half asleep, I guess.

Okay, so someone's mic is open. Okay. Right, so just – well, I'm not going to repeat what I said. Hopefully, that [inaudible]. But moving on to the actual list – someone's mic is open.

Okay. Alright. So moving on to the list, the consolidated list that we have up on the screen –okay, I'll refer to the group as the small team, because this is the work of the small team.

Right, so the small team – who's scrolling?

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thank you. Someone's background noise is coming through. Okay, so we looked at mandatory criteria, or what we call hard criteria, and we also looked at soft criteria, which is desired, preferred criteria. So the hard criteria, or what we felt should be mandatory, is indicated in red, and the first one being obviously any applicant who is interested in submitting an EOI – an expression of interest – must be part of the At-Large membership, so they must be member of an ALS which is registered with At-Large, obviously, or an accredited individual member.

So the indicators are they must name the ALS that they're with and must prove that they have an existing membership with that ALS, or in

the case of individual members, they have to prove that they are a member of the RALO that they are with.

The actual details of the corroboration, we have to probably work with At-Large staff, or at least the ATLAS staff that support the selection committee in verifying that these people are actually who they say they are, that they're members of an ALS or members of the RALO.

Sorry, I forgot to say this, I'm going to ask that people just let us go through this entire presentation first before they pose questions. Or if they think that they're going to forget their questions, they can put it in chat for us and then we'll address it at the end.

Second criteria under mandatory is knowledge. Basically, all the groups thought that this was an important criteria to have. people who will be invited to attend must have at least a minimum level of knowledge on ICANN and the ICANN ecosystem in order to be effectively participative. So we thought that in order to assess the element of knowledge, the indicator would be that they would have to complete the mandatory component of the ATLAS III program development modules on ICANN Learn, and the evidence of completion would be via certificates issued through the ICANN Learn platform.

We understood from the ALAC monthly meeting of February that the program development working group in particular, their capacity building subgroup was looking at preparing both compulsory and also noncompulsory or additional modules for the ICANN Learn for this particular event, and the compulsory modules would be introductory-

level modules whereas the voluntary ones are more advanced. That's what we understood.

We don't have all the details at this point in time, and we'd like to seek them from the program development working group, but so we said that in terms of completion of this mandatory ICANN Learn modules, we would require confirmation that they are multilingual, which I believe they are, and that more importantly, the modules will be available for applicants to complete within a reasonable time before the closing of the EOI period, because obviously, if you want to assess people on something that they have completed, then obviously, there has to be sufficient time for them to do it before they are assessed on it.

Okay? The third one, the third criteria under mandatory would be participation at ICANN or At-Large, and we are looking at in the last 12 to 24 months to account for a combination if newcomers as well as old-timer for want of a better word. We said that at a minimum, they must be active in the RALOs. Okay?

So indicator would be they must have participated in at least 60% of the RALO calls and meetings, and obviously, the evidence would be provided through attendance record maintained by At-Large staff.

There was a supplemental question on this about how we calculate 60%. The small team didn't actually address that per se, but I would have understood it to mean 60% based on when an applicant first joined the RALO, and we probably would take into consideration apologies as well as online attendance in that calculation of 60%.

Okay, the next [one,] 3B, we would like to invite indications of whether the applicant participated in RALO polls or surveys. The reason why it's not mandatory [inaudible] per se is because we weren't sure whether there were polls or surveys done across every RALO. So in that respect, if it wasn't consistently available for assessment across all five RALOs, then it would be difficult to suggest that it would be a mandatory portion of this particular criteria.

So what we said was RALO participation is a must, RALO polls and survey participation would be an added indication of active participation.

The same with 3C, ALAC meetings. it was pointed out that ALAC meetings are not necessarily compulsory for everybody except for ALAC members. So therefore, it would also be difficult to view this as a mandatory component of this criteria. So again, we thought it could be indicative if people did join the ALAC calls and meetings, and it would be also an additional indication that they were interested in things that At-Large were involved with.

Okay. Moving on to the desired or preferred, what we call soft, criteria, the first one we had was participation – not only participation in working groups but also contribution, and in particular, contribution in policy inputs would be advantageous.

So how we propose to assess this would be to have in the expression of interest form a preset list of working groups for applicants to choose by for example ticking from the list the particular working groups that they are participating in in the last 12 to 24 months. And in addition to

indicating the participation in the working groups, they're also asked to indicate to us or indicate to the selection committee the actual contributions that they made to the working groups that they are participating in.

Okay, someone please mute their mic. So, the dual element was because we had agreed that participation alone is insufficient. We needed to understand the role and contribution of the applicant. So again, I say that applicants would be asked to indicate which working groups they're involved with, and in fact, also the role that they hold in that working group. So for example, as a member, a chair, a vice chair or team lead, or that sort of thing, and to indicate to us what are the actual contributions that they've made to the working groups that they're participating in.

Okay, the second criteria in preferred is active O&E in ICANN-related local or regional activities. So we would be asking for evidence in the last 12 to 24 months of one or more participation in such events as either organizer, speaker, rapporteur, communicator, or a member in the program committee, meaning [responsible for] content rather than logistics. Okay? And added to that, we would ask for a description of the activities that they were involved with, and where available, reports that they could submit, either links or copies of the report that were produced by them.

For this, we would require corroboration from either ALAC or RALO leadership, and if necessary, due diligence by At-Large staff. so depending on what people submit as their evidence, we would have to look at it, the selection committee would have to look at it to assess

whether it's sufficient to make a call for [inaudible] purposes, or they would require At-Large staff to do due diligence.

We thought that if something was very obvious, it obviously would be accepted. If something was less obvious, then maybe we need to look into it further to assess whether it's a viable evidence or not for scoring purposes. Okay.

The reason why this is voluntary or preferred criteria is because we recognize that many RALO members are already engaged in such activities, but we do also recognize that certain RALO members may not necessarily be involved or actively participating in such activities because of the lack of opportunities. Even though they may participate by remote participation, but in that sense, it would be harder for them to be fully active in the sense of physical presence.

The third criteria is applicant should be collaborative and be skilled in team building. This one is obviously quite subjective, but we thought it would be a useful criteria to assess an applicant by, and for this, we'd be asking for evidence to demonstrate such traits, and obviously, the evidence would have to include a description of the activity and references to be provided. So for example, one or two people that the selection committee can refer to to corroborate what they have said in terms of evidence of this trait or skill.

Number four is we thought that applicants should have the ability to lead, motivate, inspire and also build consensus, and for this, we would ask that the applicant provide evidence of one or more of the following, which is, a, having chaired or cochaired a working group, RALO or ALAC,

or a subcommittee or group or track out of those three groupings of working group, RALO, ALAC. Basically, identifying clear assigned leaders of groupings.

B would be [having like] a specific process in a working group on ICANN-related events.

C is having initiated or organized a policy discussion – sorry, there's some typo there – or for a specific purpose.

D is having organized a policy or O&E event or a publication, or being responsible for a publication.

E is having moderated or facilitated a workshop or breakout session.

F would be having had coaching experience, for example being an ICANN fellowship coach or a policy mentor. Again, corroboration would obviously be needed from RALO leadership. We thought RALO leadership people would be the best person to provide corroboration.

Okay, and the fifth one is we thought it would be useful for the applicants to be effective communicators, and to assess this, number one, we would try to glean it from the submitted expression of interest in terms of the clarity and the succinctness of what has been submitted.

B, we would also ask for examples of speaking engagement, presentations made in the last 12 to 24 months, including where this took place.

And C, if they were already active in social media, so they had a high social media presence or following, that would also be indicative of an effective communicator.

The small team did note that in terms of language diversity, it may be difficult to assess people based purely on a lack of command of English, so that's why we said corroboration from RALO leadership would be important, because for example, LAC region, the LACRALO leadership would be able to assess effectiveness of communications put out by their members in Spanish or whatever. So that's an example of how we would assess people from a multilingual background.

Okay? And moving on to additional comments and recommendations, at the last call, there was mention of commitment needed to be made by applicants, and we thought this was absolutely a must, but the way we suggest to approach it is to incorporate a checkbox in the expression of interest form so that applicants must check that box. So by checking that box, in fact they are declaring their commitment to participate in ATLAS III and to contribute in At-Large beyond ATLAS III. And this checkbox is such that they must check in order for the form to be submitted. Okay, so if they don't check it, then they can't submit the form, and then they obviously won't be considered at all.

Okay. [One, Roman numeral one,] we said that the question of enforcing this declaration is something to be considered further, but in the interim, we thought that evidence of the invitee's commitment can also feed into the metric system that's been looked into by the metrics working group for the purposes of the At-Large review implementation plan.

Number two – and this is the portion that I was referring to when I started off the presentation, which is to say that this table is not exhaustive at this point in time. We felt that it represents the must assess hard and soft criteria, but we are open to members to advocate for inclusion of any other criteria that's been raised in the past work.

Number three, obviously only the hard criteria will [inaudible] requirements. Number four, we thought that the selection committee should be able to consider regional and gender balance factors in assessing the soft criteria, but we were particularly cognizant of the fact that care has to be taken to not have an applicant that is marginally clearly more qualified than someone else to be displaced by that someone else purely on the regional or gender balance factors.

And we are recommending then that an open question be included in the EOI form to invite applicants to submit other important comments or considerations in respect to their EOI which they think the selection committee should be aware of.

Number five, someone also suggested that we reach out to former NomCom members to volunteer to be on the selection committee, because we thought that they would have the requisite experience and in this sort of selection.

And the last point, number six, is the selection methodology, or what we say is [discovering] of the EOI submissions has yet to be considered in detail.

Okay, so that is the end of the list. I am going to scroll through the chat to see what are the questions that have been raised, and I may actually

ask some of the editing leads to support me in answering the question if there's any.

Okay, so it's a bit hard to scroll. Okay, if we could start with Alan, [inaudible]. Alan, you had your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Under the first criteria of membership, I think the term "prove" is a bit strong. I'm not sure someone could prove they're a part of many ALSes. I think simply certify or state what ALS they're a member of. And in terms of individual membership, it's just a matter of verifying with staff. So I think "prove" implies you show evidence, and that's probably not possible in many cases, and certainly not necessary.

In terms of the criteria of having attended 60% of RALO calls, I have no problem calling it mandatory, but I really think the selection committee needs the discretion to be able to waive that, should they choose. As an example, Justine, if you had never gone to any RALO calls, I think you'd still be a good candidate. And I know plenty of people who go religiously to the RALO calls who I never want to see at another ATLAS because I've seen them at previous ATLASes, but that's the only place you see them.

So I think we need a little bit of flexibility in interpreting those. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Alan. Noted. Did anyone else have questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Justine. Sorry I'm only on audio. One thing that strikes me on the list – and thank you all very much for the list, I have paid extremely careful attention to it, only being on audio – so congratulations on what would have been a challenging task, putting it together.

One of the things that slightly concerned me was where we might be asking people to – I don't want to say prove –demonstrate a level of activity and making that a hard criteria, when there was no ability for them to know that they would need to demonstrate that activity in advance of putting in an EOI.

So let me extend that slightly by saying, for example, following on from what Alan was just saying on attendance at RALO meetings and surveys, one thing you've mentioned, if over the last 12 to 24 months, no one knew that this was going to be a criteria, then we would be opening ourselves to – I think valid – criticism if we make that an essential criteria.

Now, personally, I think it should be heavily weighted, but I think perhaps giving the option in the EOI form for “please provide any evidence or details of your activities within your region over the last 12 to 24 months,” or, “use the following text box to explain why due to

your newness or lack of demonstrable engagement you have, whatever, equal qualifications or equal justification to be sent.”

You see what I mean? Just giving an either/or option. So I’d encourage you to just consider when people don’t know they were going to have to demonstrate something, how we can allow them to have an and/or option. Thanks.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters, please. Pastor Peters.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, Pastor Peters. I will call on you. There's a queue. You'll be number three, I think. Thank you, Cheryl, for that remark. I don't know if any of the other team leads would like to comment on that, but I'll give you time to think about it. I'm going to [call Tijani to speak] next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Justine. First of all, I’d like to thank very much Justine, Lianna and Abdeljalil who yesterday night spent two hours and a half on the call to produce this table. It was very productive meeting, and I am so happy to have people who can engage and who can make such effort to reach this result.

Now, about the table, the criteria number two, the hard criteria number two about knowledge, we put it here as a must assuming that we will have a list of ICANN Learn course or modules that people should complete. And we should give them time to do so. If we don’t give the

necessary time to do so, they will not complete them. And then they will be dropped, because those hard criteria are dropping people who don't complete them.

So this is very important, so it is for Olivier's group. If they said they will come up with a list of those modules, please do so as soon as possible so that we can communicate it to people so that they do it, and when they apply, they will fulfill this condition.

Another important thing, regarding the commitments of the committee, of the funded travelers to engage, to be active in the summit, during the summit, in all activities of the summit, we consider it as a must, as well as their engagement and their commitment to participate and contribute beyond Montréal.

So those are two hard criteria that my subgroup put them in the hard criteria. But after discussion with the other colleagues, I accepted to put them as a note, but it should be clear that this is very important, and there is something that I would prefer that it is an expressly written commitment, because if you have a checkbox, people will be obliged to check it to make the application, so they would check it anyway and they will not do what is the commitment. But if they write a commitment, in my point of view, it is more, how to say, real commitment in this case and people will think several times before writing it.

The other thing, there is a big problem that I faced since the beginning, a problem of the regional representation. In my subgroup, there was a lot of requests of this issue. The rationale was first the bylaws mandated

that the ALAC is composed by regional balanced composition, the summit should reflect it. This is one rationale.

Other rationales are all regions are not equal. For some regions, there is a problem of language. For other regions, perhaps for most of the south regions, there is a problem of connectivity, there is a problem of [registry,] there are a lot of technical problems. And people are not participating.

For example, I'll give you an example. All our AFRALO calls, Alan attended all our AFRALO calls when he used to be chair. Most of the time, we spend our time to try to understand what people are saying because the line is very bad, the telephone line is bad, the Internet connectivity is bad also, so we cannot communicate.

So those are barriers that should be taken into account. So this point should be really consider, and very [well] considered. We don't have to have a summit with a region very badly represented. It is not good for our image, first, and second, it is not fair, because the summit is for the whole At-Large community.

Of course, there are differences between the members. We know that. There are people who are working with registries and registrars –

JUSTINE CHEW: Tijani –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, I hate to interrupt, but we have a queue building up, so I'd like to give other people opportunity to speak as well. I think we've noted your point. We have quite a long queue, and you've already made a number of points.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know. Let me explain this point, because this point – if you want me to forward you all the e-mails I received, I am ready to do that. This is something that I have to explain.

JUSTINE CHEW: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW: I understand that you have to explain it, and I think you have explained it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm just asking you to cut short your intervention so that other people can speak.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: We have a queue building up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: And we only have 20 minutes left. Thank you for your cooperation, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, I have Glenn next, and then Pastor Peters.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Moment. Okay. So my problem here is –

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. Hi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: My problem here is that the paragraph here makes it [occluded,] because it is gender balance and regional balance, and it's a [may consider,] it is not strong. And then the rest of the paragraph is to make it very weak. There is another – okay, and the recommendation that we choose NomCom people, this was raised by Lianna, but I don't think we discussed it, I don't think we agreed on it. It is something that wasn't really agreed on. Thank you very much, and I am sorry for being long, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you, Tijani. I have Glenn next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi. I see Tijani's point, and I want to use my minute – and it's only a minute, Justine – I think we need to acknowledge that there's challenges and we have to look at our community. We're all in this together. And there is definitely advantages in different regions in terms of connectivity and participation. So this criteria should be empathetic enough that – maybe it's called bending over backwards, but I think we should. I think we have a moral obligation as a family to help our participants be involved.

I just want to go back to what Alan said last week. We need worker bees, not just leaders, so please bear in mind in the selection criteria that these people that are willing to pick up the pen to do comments,

they're willing to get involved, they're willing even to be at the booth, they're willing to really be active members.

So we're not just looking for chairs and co-chairs and ALAC members. we're looking for people who want to do some work. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Glenn. I have Pastor Peters next.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yes. Thank you very much. I'll try and be brief and avoid repeating what [others said,] other than to say that I support the position of Tijani and the last speak. [inaudible] in terms of regional representation is that if you assign equal numbers to each region, then all the criteria that have been agreed upon could be used within the region to select the best from those regions as long as each region has the [equal] position. That's number one.

The [inaudible] to do with the issue of being able to communicate, and if I get it right, you're restricting your evaluation based on participation or cochairing events of ICANN. Majority of us, members of ICANN, are not [inaudible] in the things of Internet, but then we are actively involved [using] the Internet. So advance our own activities as end users of the Internet.

So we are quite [very active] within other areas in terms of communicating, in terms of being able to [lead a group.] So [we'd know where we chair apart from getting] involved in ICANN activities [inaudible] for me, I'm involved.

Then Then the other areas I want us to also consider to look at is the issue of knowledge. If [there would not be a mode] for us to work on [inaudible] I also want to request that such [inaudible] program should be made available as soon as possible, because time is of essence here because we don't have much time.

And then lastly, I would want to thank those who have been able to put all these things together, and I hope that we should not just [constrain ourselves to] looking for leaders. You cannot be a leader without followers. So you cannot develop leaders without also developing the followers.

So as much it is [very easy] to call the group the activity leadership event, [inaudible] those leaders will want followers. And if they're [not available,] there's no one they can lead. [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Pastor Peters. I have Alan next, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of very quick points. Number one, back on RALO meetings, do recall RALO meetings are held at a particular time of the day. there are always people who because of work commitments and other things cannot attend. So again, that has to be factored in.

On the tick box for commitments, I would strongly suggest at the very least there be two boxes: one to say you commit to participating in all of the ATLAS activities, and a second one – because it's a very different concept – that you plan to be available to contribute to things afterwards. So they really need to be separated.

Lastly, on regional balance, number one, there is always going to be last-minute decisions that will upset regional balance. It will not be exact. That's simply a fact of life, we can't control that.

Number two, I've sat on a lot of selection committees when I was chair over four years and prior to that. We get lots and lots of applications by people who feel they have a right to do something and have none of the qualifications at all.

So yes, the selection committee will pick good people. the question I'm asking is if we end up in a situation where from a specific region we just do not have people who qualify in the opinions of the selection committee, do the people who are demanding regional balance want us to accept people who simply don't qualify just to get the numbers right?

And I'd like people to be clear. If that's what you're asking for, say it. But if you're not saying that, then understand that there will be decisions that will have to be made. Thank you very much.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters is in the room. [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I'll put you back in the queue, Pastor Peters. I have Silvia and then Maureen, and then Eduardo, Abdulkarim, and then Pastor Peters. So, Silvia next.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

Thank you. This is Sylvia Herlein, I am the leader of group four. First, I'd like to apologize, because our small group here in South America at the beginning of the year is very important to organize all the year activities and it is the month where we work a lot, and that's why we couldn't participate yesterday. That's why we'd like to congratulate those who could participate because we divided all the work in two. We feel that this is very interesting.

And I would like to thank you, because you've been able to show what we wanted to include in the first part. We observed that you have placed the participation of the current leaders, and we would like to ask the secretary or the prior chair when we need a concept of removing the tie. That's why we are happy that you have included it.

Now, with respect to the methodology for selection, something that we have been thinking about, and now this hasn't really been worked on, we have been considering to add numbers. For example, having or having had a leadership in a RALO, that is the person held a certain position and that's why they can have three points, or having made a presentation and this will give you one point. That is, placing, adding or giving them points, and the summation of all that should give us the best candidates. It could be an initial step to have a selection methodology. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you for that, Silvia. Maureen is next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Justine. I've actually put a message in the chat that I don't mind waiting for others to have had a turn, as long as they're actually raising [inaudible]. In the interest of time, I'll just wait until my final word. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks, Maureen. So we have Eduardo next, and then Pastor – yeah.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Very quick, I just wanted to address what Tijani said about the capacity building, all the courses. I will say they are 99% identified and will be ready once the applications are ready to go, once the application form goes out. All of it will be [inaudible]. Thank you. I'm done.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. So we come back to Pastor Peters because of Abdulkarim has put his question in the chat.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I just want to respond to the last speaker on the issue of regional balance in terms of communication. I feel very strongly about the comment, the fact that we may end up not having [enough] qualified. I don't think there is any region that cannot produce five candidates that can meet all the criterias that have been agreed by the working groups.

So [inaudible] we are not asking that just pick a candidate because it's from Africa or from Latin America. We are saying all the core criterias will be used to assess these candidates from the various regions. But all we're requesting is just let every [inaudible] or assigned the [core] number, [inaudible] the same numbers. Then the criteria will be used to select this group from each region.

So I don't think it is a very nice comment to suppose we end up with people who are not qualified. That, to me, is condescending. So that is my position. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Pastor Peters. Tijani, you have three minutes because I need to give five minutes back to Maureen [for wrap-up.] Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Just to answer Alan's question. We have two kinds of criteria: hard criteria, soft criteria. Those who don't pass the hard criteria, they cannot be selected. All the others – because of the regional representation, we [can't play inside it.]

I mean we [can] use a less tough assessment for some regions than for the other regions so that we can have people participating in the summit. [And don't forget] that the summit is for the whole At-Large. It is not for leaders. There is nothing to do with leaders. It's for At-Large. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Tijani. Okay. That ends the queue. I'll come back to Maureen in a bit. I just want to thank everybody for their feedback. I will be definitely listening to the recording again, and [I'll be able to read chats,] notes, and bring that back to the team leaders to see how we can deal with all the feedback we received. So I'll hand it back to Maureen now. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, Justine, for managing a very good queue of contributions there. And also, I know that you are very good at taking onboard the sorts of suggestions of people, incorporating them in some way into the criteria.

I'd also like people to be aware that with the resulting list we have here, the original list that I was actually sent by this particular group really indicated the amount of work that was involved. It was a series of lists to show the progression of the discussions that took place. And considering this group had only a week to put this together, I think they've done a pretty marvelous job.

But also taking into account that the issues that have been raised about the regional representation for example, there are always going to be considerations down the track, but I think even in today's conversations that we've had, some consideration for equal representation as a basis, and then ensuring, as was raised before, that people who do qualify are not actually there as well, even though a list may be [inaudible] for a particular region or whatever, we cannot miss out on people who show the skills that are required for this particular task.

Moving on, I think what has been shown too is the close collaboration that will be required between this group and of course the program group. I think that we're actually moving to be working together in close, but some [inaudible] are going to be able to come out of what is happening in the other group and incorporating it into this EOI.

And also, making note of the fact that the form will be open, and people can complete it over a period of time until they're absolutely sure that they've got all the information that they require, and you don't [inaudible] get the form, fill it in and it's required immediately. There's going to be a time frame when the form will be required, then [inaudible] for consideration.

Is that me? No? Okay. So, next steps. What is going to happen now is that currently, there is an EOI form that has been designed in preparation for – it's ready for some aspects of the introductory part of the form filling has actually been done, and I'm expecting that this leadership team, the small group that's actually been working very actively on this activity, will be part of the continuing development of this form that's probably going to take place over the next weeks, because this form has to be ready for its launch in Kobe on the 9th of March, and that's going according to Eduardo's timeline which is something that we have to keep to.

So there's going to be another week of pretty strenuous effort required by this group. [Anyone] in this group, they've definitely got a lot of the qualities that have actually been mentioned already within the consolidated criteria list, and more. But there's been an amazing amount of commitment that's gone into [inaudible].

So therefore, what will happen is that this team will work with the organizing committee members who have actually been putting this form together, and it will be really good, because we're going to have some other people who can take into account some of the issues that have been raised about participation, just to make sure that there's some balance, it takes into account what the team leaders – so that [I felt] was important.

Excuse me. Okay, sorry. So, there is going to be quite a lot of work still to be done. As well as getting the form ready, the leadership team [inaudible] start looking at how we choose our selection panel. And one of the things that I said at the outset with the criteria groups was that the selection panel will be people who have not had anything to do with the selection of the criteria, so that the criteria had to be very clearly explained. So that's why there are so many comments made.

The criteria are identified and the indicators, plus some special considerations that might be given. So it's got to be pretty clear in the EOI form as to what is expected of people in their applications. So there's the application form and the selection panel activity, which is still to come.

So again, still a lot of work to be done between probably Kobe and Marrakech, but I really do appreciate the work that's been done already in both groups, and I really think that we have to give lots of credit to the team leaders of the four teams and the leadership development section. Everyone's input has been valued and taken note of, the concerns that have been raised. We'll make sure that in some way, that is addressed.

So, we're at the top of the hour. Thank you very much for everyone coming. It's a really great attendance, I really do appreciate that. And there'll be more news over the next week before we get to Kobe. Thank you very much. I think we can close the meeting now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, everyone, for joining the call. This meeting is now adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]