ROBERTO GAETANO:

Hi, this is Roberto. I see that almost everybody is online. I see that the first point on the Agenda is a little bit of blah-blah from my side before we do the roll call. So I would like to start. This is the first teleconference for this Group, at least with me participating in my role as Chair. I think that in terms of aims of the call, I think that we need to agree on a schedule and on a way to operate.

I will rely, for the first part of the life of this Working Group, on the expertise of people who have done that in the past, specifically Alan and Cheryl. Then once we have done this housekeeping we will continue the work of this Working Group with communication, mailing lists and teleconferences strictly limited to the Members of this Group.

Maybe if there are some different opinions on this point we can discuss this on the mailing list and not use precious time in the teleconferences. Question to Staff: Julia, are you ready to do the roll call? Do you think that we have a sufficient number of people on board? Are you waiting to make contact with other participants?

JULIA CHARVOLEN:

I can do the roll call for you if you wish.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. I would like to start as soon as possible.

---

*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.*

JULIA CHARVOLEN:   Yes.  Sure.  Welcome everybody to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee on Thursday, 7th November 2013 at 20:00 UTC.  On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Roberto Gaetano, Veronica Cretu, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Murray McKercher, Ellen Strickland, Siranush Vardanyan, Carlos Dionisio Aguirre, Jordi Iparaguirre, Andrew Mack and Mohamed El Bashir.

We have no apologies so far.  From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Julia Charvolen.  May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes.  Thank you and over to you Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:   Thank you.  The first thing that I have to learn is to timely mute and unmute my microphone.  Okay, I would go to #3 on the Agenda, which is the role and operation of the BCEC.  I will give the floor, as I anticipated in my introduction, to Alan Greenberg, who will explain a little bit about how we are going to operate.  Alan, are you ready to do your presentation?

ALAN GREENBERG:   I think Cheryl should probably go first on the actual operations of BCEC because she's the one that ran it last time.  I'll be talking a little bit about the things the BCEC will have to decide on very quickly to allow the

scheduling of the overall selection process. But probably Cheryl is best to go over the operation of the group itself, which I have no real knowledge of other than what's written in the rules.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    I'm happy to go.


ROBERTO GAETANO:    Please go.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Okay. It's Cheryl for the record. I think it's very important to recognize that this meeting where Alan and I are engaged with you as the BCEC that it's very much just an introductory exercise, whereby you can get the benefits and tools that have been put together in recent times, which Alan will be focusing on.

I had the honor to serve as the Chair of both what was then the [ABSDT? 00:05:47], which was the design team for the process the first time around, and for the BCEC, in other words the Committee that you are the new version of. It's essential of course to recognize that the activities of the BCEC, it's your role to call for expressions of interest to come into you.

You use online and telephonic meetings to establish benchmarks and criteria that you're going to set as requirements and no-go measures for

evaluating the expressions of interest that you gather. You then go through a number of iterations of rankings and then you come up – I'm doing this in very short order of course; there's a lot more in it – with what's called a slate.

That slate is then published and the opportunity then exists for the regional At-Large organizations, providing that at least three of them agree, to add people that you may have chosen to not put through to your slate but who did in fact apply via your expressions of interest process. So you do need to recognize that your processes are ones that have to be short enough to allow for that iteration of additional people that may be able to go on at the end.

Then of course the voting and selection is done in a manner keeping with the current Rules of Procedure. I'm very keen to make sure that the BCEC is seen as absolutely sacrosanct in terms of its confidentiality. It's essential that you conduct yourselves with the utmost confidentiality, and we do need to be extraordinarily careful that you're seen to have all of the high standards that not only meet but hopefully exceed those that the ICANN NomCom would put itself through.

The other thing I think you need to realize is that there is this other Committee, which is the BMSPC. That's the modern version of what was the design team last time, and you will find that its job is to work in an oversight and complimentary role. At the end of your process you get a chance to debrief and hopefully make positive and negative comments to help us build a better model next time.

And it will be the BMSPC's role to not only act as an oversight for your Committee's activities, but also to help you with the debrief build a better model for next time around. I'll stop there and I'll jump in again as needs be, if you don't mind Robert. I see that Olivier has his hand up, but also Alan has some specifics to share. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I would like to have Olivier… He had his hand up before but I didn't notice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Roberto. I was just going to add a couple of more things. First I entirely agree with what Cheryl has said. With regards to the meeting today, this is a special meeting in that there are some people on the call that are not Members of the BCEC, and that of course includes myself, Alan and Cheryl. We are guests on this call, so I would like this to be reflected – that we're guests and not participants.

That was the first thing. The second thing was to let you know that I will not be part of any further BCEC calls after this one, unless of course invited by the Chair of the BCEC in an advisory role; in the same way as today. And of course you're free to invite whom you wish to the BCEC calls, as long as the measure of trust and confidentiality is not broken, as Cheryl very well explained just now.

So that's one of the things I needed to say. The other thing is that I believe that some of the Members of the Working Group might not have their statement of interest published, and as you know we try to make things as transparent as possible in this community. I know that all of the ALAC have their statement of interest published, and I think all of the RALO Leadership have their statement of interest published.

I have not discussed this with anyone, but I believe that it would be good for the Members of this Committee to have their statement of interest published as well. I think there should maybe be a follow-up after this call on how this is done. I think some of you already have one. I believe that this is the link for the statement of interest.

These are the two things I wanted to mention on this call. I wish this Committee the very best for being able to select the best slate for At-Large. It's extremely… It's a critically important task and I wish you the best for it. That's all. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:      Thank you Olivier. I would like to add one more thing. For sure I would need advice and expertize from Olivier, Alan and Cheryl. I hope we will have the time in Buenos Aires to have a little chat, just to allow me to grab this expertize and advice from you. I think that we will try to keep it as a minimum; your participation to teleconferences in the future, also because you have a lot of other things to do.

I would like to ask Alan now if he has something to add to this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you.  Yes, I do.  I guess the first thing is that all Members of the BCEC really need to do their homework and read the various documents that control what the BCEC does and how it sets rules and things, and the feedback from the last BCEC.  The relevant documents are the ALAC Rules of Procedure.  Let me put into the chat the URL that points to them.  The ALAC Rules of Procedure Section (19) is the Section governing the selection of the Board Seat 15 position.

There is another document that's pointed to on that page also, which is referred to as an adjunct document.  And it's the Adjunct Document #3 that is talking about the Board selection procedure.  That points to a lot of the historic documents.  It also contains a pointer to the debriefing from the last one.  There were a lot of comments that were made after the last process of things that perhaps should be fixed and some of the rationale for the decisions that were made.

I think in order for you to set what your rules are – and one of your first steps is going to be deciding what the BCEC rules are to govern your operation.  They must be published and they must be ratified by the ALAC, but they're up to you to set.  Very similar to how the ICANN NomCom governs its own rules.  And clearly you have to do that pretty quickly.  The rules that were used for the last one are clearly a good basis. You may wish to do some tweaking and adjusting to it.

The next thing or the other thing that you have to do in parallel is to look at the schedule. Setting the overall schedule for the selection process is up to the BMSPC. But clearly a whole bunch of the intervals within the process are things that you must do, and therefore you have to provide some guidance on what you'll feel comfortable with. There's no point in having the BMSPC saying that a certain phase will be done in 14 days, if based on the belief of the BCEC its' going to take four weeks.

So it has to be rational. And we can't really kick off the whole process until that schedule it set. There is an absolute deadline – and I don't know what the penalty is for violating it, providing they have some insight –, but the bylaws call for the ALAC to tell the Secretary of the Board who the person is that it's selected six months prior to the seating of the Director. And in this year that maps to April 16$^{th}$.

The operational deadline is for the NomCom this year to know whom the Director is before they start their selection process. Cheryl could comment in her new position as to whether there is some flexibility, but according to the bylaws it must be done six months before, and that sets the timeline starting at the end of November, when this Committee and the BMSPC were selected, as to how long things can take.

Now, to put it into perspective, the selection that was done in 2010 was done in four months, and things were pretty tight. This time, although we planned to start really early we didn't and we have a little over five months to work. So there's more flexibility than last time but it's still a

tight schedule. I think that's all about I want to say on the specific process

I do want to spend a bit of time looking at the details of the scheduling, because there are a number of intervals that you must tell the BMSPC you're comfortable with, and you're going to have to do that within a very short period of time. I don't know, Roberto, if you want me to do that right now or if you want to go onto more general things and then come back to that?

ROBERTO GAETANO:     Thank you Alan. I would like to add a couple of things and then give the floor to Murray, who has his hand up. What I would like to add is that we have an Action Item on Staff to have a list of all the relevant documents that we need to be familiar with. And by doing so I will rely on the input that you just gave us, Alan and Cheryl and of course Olivier, if there is something.

So it was nice to have the pointer to the URL on the chat, but if we can make sure that everything is consolidated so that we don't miss anything. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG:     I was going to point out that Adjunct Document #3 is, if we've done our job right, the consolidation of all the past documents. It should have

**EN**

everything in it except the Wiki pages that are being used by this year's Committee.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Thank you very much. That's one step forward. The second thing I'd like to do is make sure that we have a deadline for the Members of this Committee to make sure that everybody has read all the relevant documents and that we have understood all of what's relevant, plus that we all complete our statements of interest. And I would like this to be done before we get to Buenos Aires so that in Buenos Aires we have all these things done. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just a quick question for Alan and Cheryl. Are the rules and process for NomCom very similar to what you're expecting from the BCEC, and could we really learn a great deal from that process? As a new person I'm asking in ignorance. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is, in a number of ways. And those ways are quite particular. You don't go into the disguise that would be familiar to those of you who've gone through a Nominating Committee experience, because what you're doing is in fact, as the BCEC, you're acting in a traditional Nominating Committee role.

In other words what you're doing is, you're not appointing so you don't through a deep-dive interview, but you do create a slate for a normative selection process. In our case it has an electorate from the leadership in the At-Large community and the ALAC, at least at this stage. It's similar in terms of the outreach of the vetting and the setting of the criteria and the matching of expressions of interest to that criteria.

And you need to set a benchmark. The system that was built allows for nominally 100% points for the absolute perfect person who ticks every box to the absolute maximum. Now, you will probably be wise to set something at least north of 75%, and I would like to think somewhere in the 80%s, as a percentage cut-off point above which you will be considering and below which you wouldn't.

So in that way it is similar to what NomCom traditionally does. But what you're doing is putting a slate out for the community to select from. You're not appointing and you're not doing a deep-dive. Does that help?

MURRAY MCKERCHER:     Yes, that's very good, thank you. I'll review the documents that Alan has suggested and if I have any other questions I'll get back to you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I can add one or two things. Cheryl mentioned that you don't do interviews. There's no rule that says you can't do interviews. The last

**EN**

group did not choose to. It didn't feel the need for it. That's a decision that you'd have to make if you chose to do that. Roberto says you have to read all the relevant documents and that's actually a key word – one of the documents pointed to in the Adjunct Document is referred to as the Whitepaper.

This was a very massive documenting of a massive amount of work that the ALAC went through, and At-Large went through, in developing this whole process. Those of you that are interested in the history may well want to go into it. That's not a document you probably need to carry out your work, so I'm just taking that 100 pages of the list, if you don't choose to read it.

A lot of the answer to your question, Murray, is in fact in the current set of rules that the last BCEC put together for itself, and you will have to adapt with whatever changes you see as appropriate. That already captures a lot of the things that are in fact similar to the NomCom process.

And I'm not quite sure it will be from reading them but since we went through this process once already, the combination of the rules the BCEC set for itself and the debriefing, may well give you a perspective on what the similarities and perhaps what the differences are between the BCEC and the NomCom. Thank you.


MURRAY MCKERCHER:        Thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO:        Thank you Alan.  Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you.  I just wanted to pick up on one thing, and that was with the mention that Alan just made to the debrief from the last BCEC.  One of the things that you need to decide is you have your ten Members and Roberto as an independent Chair, and that's pretty much the line-up that we had last time.  We had our ten Members and I served as an independent Chair.

Because I was also serving on the ALAC at the time, I very deliberately did not have a vote, and you will find in the debrief material a proposal that says there may be something useful in having a casting vote if you end up with a vote that's occurred amongst your ten members that's resulted in a 50/50 split.  And I would suggest at least on more than one occasion.

I just want to give you a little background, and this will be in the utmost confidence.  We had a situation in the last BCEC, which is why that is in the debrief, where we went through on a particular matter three runs of voting.  Now, normally everything is done on consensus on using the online tools where people allocate marks and rankings.  But something occurred that meant we actually had to make a vote decision.

After three times it still was 50/50 and that was with all ten Members voting. That's something, Roberto, that I would strongly encourage you to avoid, and there's two ways you can do that. You Committee could decide that in that circumstance you could have a casting vote, and that is certainly one way and quite a reasonable way out of that.

You could decide that you are a voting Member. That's a little more untidy and I wouldn't encourage you down that way, because I think having the ability to be an independent Chair for this particular activity is very important. But let me tell you why we got into this situation last time. We had an unconscionable breach of confidentiality and we had to fix up a terrible mess and how we managed to do that split our group in two in terms of decision.

So if you ensure – perhaps by getting the Members of your Committee to sign an appropriately-worded confidentiality agreement. There's one that the Nominating Committee uses that might be appropriate or you could write your own – as a peer group that you do not allows what was really a right royal muck-up, that will solve you that problem. So be warned. Stuff can happen. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:    Thank you Cheryl. Thank you in particular for pointing out what a terrible mistake I have done in accepting to Chair this Committee. So before I get more bad news I would like to move onto the next point in the Agenda. I think that we have discussed sufficiently in general about

the role and operation, and I think that on the mailing list, if I need some advice I can privately email Cheryl, Alan and Olivier. But I think that we should move to the timeline because I'm sure that there are some questions on the timeline and I think that I have some myself.

I think that, Alan, you have drafted the timeline? At least I've received a message from you stating this. Is there anything that we should note in particular on the timeline, or shall I go quickly through the timeline from beginning to end and ask for comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd be glad to go through it. I've in fact figured out that I can share my screen and give a live demo, if you like?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes please. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, you all should have… This spreadsheet is accessible on the 2014 Selection Wiki, so you could download your own version. This is just a simple Excel spreadsheet. It's a tool I've used when I've run other elections before of trying to figure out how to set the schedule, because there are a lot of different interactions. This is the schedule that's going to run over several months.

It's easy enough to arbitrarily set times, but you have to consider what's going on when you're setting some of the intervals. For example in the middle of this process you find the Christmas and New Year's interval, which a lot of people disappear for. So having a critical deadline in the middle of those or immediately before those might be problematic.

There's going to be two ICANN meetings, and in particular the meeting in Singapore is probably going to overlap on top of the voting or somewhere around there. So when the BMSPC sets the schedule they're going to have to pay a lot of attention to this, and since you're controlling the input that's given to them you're also going to have to pay attention to it.

If you look at the screen right now, or at your own version, we're currently sitting around the interval of 14 days that was allocated to line number five in the spreadsheet. That is the two Committees have been chartered and they now have to do their initial work. By the way, you referred this as a draft. I would prefer to look at it as a prototype because I'm not pretending to try and set the schedule just to give you some overall structure that the decisions can now be made by.

You'll notice on notes on the period I have a whole bunch of them, six of them, where I said, "BCEC must agree to the deadline." These are times that you're going to have to meet in order for the schedule to work. The first one we look at in line six is the time from which the BMSPC publishes the final timeline. Currently that's set as November 12th, which is before the Buenos Aires meeting.

If we can't meet that then other things are going to have to be compressed so that the final deadline is met. You'll notice on the 26th of November there's a 14-day period from the 12th of November to the 26th – that's the period… The 26th is the time when the BCEC issues a call for expressions of interest. So clearly by that date you have to have finalized what is in the expression of interest form.

Now, the last BCEC has given you one that you may be happy with, or you may choose to make changes to it. And there may be comments in the debriefing that would suggest changes. I can't recall exactly. You then have to set a period of time for which you're going to allow the applicants to submit expressions of interest. You'll notice it says 30 days are allowed for that period. That's just an arbitrary number.

It maps roughly to what happened last time, and I suspect Cheryl may want to give you a bit of debriefing as to what might be the reasonable times. The next deadline is the deadline for after all expressions of interest are submitted, the BCEC has to, through Staff, send out requests for references to submit their input. I've suggested that two days should be enough to turn that process around. Maybe less, I don't know.

You're going to have to decide how much time you give the references to submit their input. My recollection from the debriefing is that last time the time appeared to not be long enough and some references didn't complete their input. That might be something you want to think about. Next, there's a period of time, line ten, which is the deadline for

the references to come in.  Line 11 is the 21 days that we're saying the BCEC has to announce the results.

So that's the 21 days plus the 14 days in which you can read al the expressions of interest and start making your decisions.  Now, typically both the last BCEC and most NomComs end up extending the deadline.  I guess that's an issue of psychology.  People don't submit until the very last moment, so it's only at the very last moment that the group realizes they don't have enough applications.

You don't really have the ability of changing whatever the January $21^{st}$ date when you announce the slate of candidates.  If you believe you're going to have to take the 30 days and give people an extra seven days, for instance, that seven days is going to have to come out of somewhere.  It could come out of the amount of time you give yourself to decide on which candidates you present, or somewhere else.

One of the tricks you could play is tell people you're going to give them 23 days to submit expressions of interest and give yourself 21 days, and that extends the 23 to 30 and reduce your 21 to 14.  In other words, the sum of these numbers is within your control.

So if you're expecting that the logistics are going to have to extend the timeframe, you may want to build that cushion in right now, because we don't have much of a cushion in extending the absolute deadline, unless we get dispensation from the NomCom and the Secretary of the Board to do that.  And I'm not expecting that.

The periods after that are the BCEC announces the slate. For that the target date here is the 21$^{st}$ of January. RALOs have an opportunity to find other candidates. Now, the only candidates they can find are those that have applied to the BCEC but have not been accepted. If you haven't applied to the BCEC with an expression of interest you cannot be added by a RALO.

Then there's an opportunity for RALOs to get support from other RALOs, because a candidate can only be added at that stage if three or more RALOs support them. There's a publication of the final slate and then a voting period. The voting can consist of up to five or six different rounds of voting, depending on how many people you select.

The last BCEC in its debriefing made it clear that one of the reasons that only three candidates were selected were to minimize the amount of voting rounds needed. You may choose to make that decision the same or you may choose to make another one. But that will affect how much time it will take to do the voting.

Lastly, there is the announcement. You will notice that I changed something… I'm not sure what it was, but because I changed it we have a deadline of the 23$^{rd}$ of April. Does anyone remember what I changed? [laughs] Let's see if going back fixes that… It doesn't really matter. If you make these numbers small enough then the red goes away and it says the election is good.

In any case, this spreadsheet identifies the various period that must be set by the BMSPC and the ones that govern what you're going to do. You have to provide guidance to them for what the minimum times are that you feel are acceptable. I won't belabor the point any more than that. I think the overall issue is that you're going to have to look at this relatively quickly, so that the schedule can be set by the BMSPC, which meets tomorrow, by the way.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you Alan. I see Jordi has his hand up. Jordi, you have the floor.

JORDI IPARAGUIRRE: Thank you Alan for that very clear explanation. I have just a couple of questions that are maybe explained in the documents we have to read, but just in case… I understand that we can use ICANN Staff in order to communicate to the world that the period to receive candidates is open and in case we need to reinforce that message in case we don't get enough candidates. If so, we can restate that through the same channel. Is that the way to proceed or is there another one?

And the same question for the messages. Do we have to write the messages ourselves and say: "okay, this is the message we want to communicate,"? or are Staff going to help us? This is my first point. My second one is about background checks. Sorry, go on.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I think with regards to that you're in a good position in that everything was done four years ago, so you have models on which to decide are you going to use that statement, changing the dates of course, or are you going to do something different. You're going to have to do that in conjunction with Staff. The actual announcement – I believe last time we used formal ICANN announcement processes – will be done through Staff.

The content of the messages you have to decide, either as a group or by delegating it to someone in the group.

JORDI IPARAGUIRRE:    Thank you. My second question is about the background checks. [00:44:18] company that provides background checks. Is that the same case for the Board selection candidates?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Can I respond to that, Roberto? I will anyway. Thanks for that question Jordi, I appreciate that. Something that you do need to be aware of: the normal and exactly the same process that the due diligence is done for the Nominating Committee selections, which of course if you've been through NomCom you'll know that due diligence is done between the deliberations of the NomCom in any year, and their selections including

some back-up for each of their selections, goes to ICANN Legal and yet a third party does the due diligence.

It's very important that amongst the things that you have on your expression of interest form, on your website and on your outreach work, is that due diligence will be done on all candidates who make the final slate. Now, this you could consider as a cost and an impost on the ICANN community, because anyone who's on the slate could then be elected by the At-Large community during our selection process and then be appointed to the Board.

You do have to have the situation where the due diligence is done on everybody who is put forward on your slate. And that is one highly motivating factor that you might want to consider, because if you put a slate of ten, that is going to be – might I suggest – a horrendously expensive exercise and may indeed mean that we would have a lesser degree of due diligence.

So, you, Roberto, will have to have that thrill-packed and exciting discussion with ICANN Legal and indeed the Chief Financial Officer, as I did. But it's far wiser to remind them of course that once they're on the slate, any one of them can be appointed by the community. So you've got to get ahead of the game.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you Cheryl and Alan. I see Olivier's hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much Roberto.  Just a quick question to Cheryl: did she have a choice between five or three?  There was a consideration on how many candidates would be chosen.  How many candidates did you have put on the slate last time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you.  That's a question that we had a problem dealing with for a number of reasons.  We actually put four out on the slate and then of course it was able to be expanded for the normal process.  We really couldn't have much larger a number.   That was because of the compressed time, the need to meet some deadlines and us having such a short amount of time.  We needed to allow as much time as possible for the regional review, to see if three regions wanted to add people onto the slate.

I'd like to think that this time around everyone is familiar and confident enough with the process that your slate; be it three, five or even seven – obviously I think the middle number is the better one – pretty much is accepted and taken as a carte blanche.  But that the rules still allow for additional people to be added.  I would suggest however that if you keep to the dates that are in the tool, you do have to have enough time to do a reasonable reiteration of getting any extra name in.

I would think you shouldn't probably go to the electorate with any more than seven names, but that's just my utopia.

ROBERTO GAETANO:          Thank you Cheryl.  Fatimata, you have the floor.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA:      Thank you Cheryl, thank you Alan.  Just a question of clarification: in the spreadsheet we have you mentioned that the BMSPC would publish the final timeline on Tuesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>.  Is this a simulation or is this the real date?  Is it that after this the Members of the BCEC will work just to meet the deadline according to the explanation you just gave?  Or is it a simulation?  If this is a simulation you may help us understand better the scale.

ALAN GREENBERG:          That was the date that ended up in that spreadsheet.  Clearly, given that that is next Tuesday, that's not likely to happen, so one of the things that's likely to…  That date is likely to slip and therefore everything else will have to be compressed a little bit because of that.  There's nothing in the spreadsheet that is locked in, apart from the things that have already passed.

The things that have happened in history we can't change.  There is nothing there that says the rest of it cannot change, with the constraint of the end date being controlled by the bylaws.  So I agree completely with you that the date of the 12<sup>th</sup> is not very practical.  I have no other explanation other than you have your work cut out for you and the

BMSPC to get the schedule published as soon as possible so that we can go forward. But the 12th is probably not to be a date that's met.


ROBERTO GAETANO:     Thank you Alan. That was also my interpretation; that the 12th of November means as soon as possible. I have myself a couple of questions and comments. I think that the publication of the final timeline… The slippage of the publication of the final timeline doesn't mean that we shut everything down, because the following period of 14 days is the BCEC to decide on BCEC [awards? 00:52:13] and candidate [URI? 00:52:14].

So that means that we can start working anyway, even if the final timeline is only drafted and needs to be trimmed in the details. The second thing is that in this timeline of all the activities that we have to do, ICANN recognizes that there are some actions related to periods where we have a high BCEC activity. And there are some other periods where the BCEC is idle or the main action is on somebody else.

Unless I'm mistaken, starting the 3rd of February 2014, line 14, the BCEC doesn't have much to do. Those are activities that are going to be carried on by someone else. Am I correct or not?


ALAN GREENBERG:     Roberto, you're correct on both points and I should have pointed that out. The days until the next milestone are additive in this case. In some

cases however the periods can overlap. For instance the BCEC can start reviewing the expressions of interest before you get the references in. So the actual time that the BCEC has to look at the expressions of interest is longer. So yes, these are additive and the periods can overlap.

You're going to have to do a more detailed, more traditional scheduling with overlapping lines to show that. Certainly that is the case, but yes, you're also right in that the period from which you announce the slate, during the next few weeks the RALOs have to do some work and you don't have much to do. And as soon as the RALOs announce whether they are adding anyone you have to then compile those inputs into the final slate and that's only minutes of work by someone.

Then you're basically out of business for the rest of the period until the debriefing. And I guess Cheryl may comment on this. There may be some exceptional circumstances that would call you back together to address some horrible happening, but there's nothing scheduled at that point.

ROBERTO GAETANO:     Okay, thank you. We are just a few minutes away from the hour and unless somebody has very strong objections, I would go to the last point on the Agenda, which is next steps. What I would like to concentrate on in the future, if I may recap what has been said on this call, is that the first step is the statement of interest. Our Members need to fill in the

statement of interest and make sure that's done. Then we need to make sure that we are all familiar with the relevant documents as soon as possible.

We need to file a confidentiality document and I think that I need to work on that text is going to be. I will probably be in contact with Cheryl, if she's available, in order to make sure that we have covered all the pitfalls.

Then I would like you in the next very few days to have a look at the schedule and possibly by the end of this weekend give any comments that you have on it; things that you think are unfeasible or difficult, so that we can ensure that we pass all this information for the final compilation of BMSPC's schedule.

In particular I'd like you to note the periods in which we are going to have peak activities and that will run inclusive of traditional Christmas and New Year vacations, so that you can make sure that you can make a commitment to the operation in that period and postpone your vacation, so to speak, until after the 23$^{rd}$ of February 2014. So that's basically what my recommendations are for next steps. I see Cheryl has her hand up. She has the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you very much Roberto. Just following on from what you're saying about the commitment, I wanted to share with you something that we did manage in our last BCEC, and I'd like to think could be

aspirational to your BCEC. That was that we never ran a teleconference that discussed and agreed any consensus outcome, unless each of the five regions were represented. We also had 100% commitment to either consensus, calls for consensus or the use of online voting tools or ranking tools.

So whilst we did not necessarily have 100% attendance at all of our calls, we did have 100% commitment for lists and online activities and of course the assessment. And I think that's something your group should aspire to as well. There is a reason why two of you from each region are appointed and that is to have a bit of redundancy. But I would certainly encourage you to not do any of the substantive work unless you have each of the five regions engaged.

Other than that I'm more than happy to stand at your beck and call. I believe it will complement by role as Chair of the 2014 NomCom, but do ensure, Roberto, if you don't mind, including Veronica and Fatimata, and others that are currently active in this upcoming NomCom will assist you in this, that your online application is one that takes the benefit of what has currently been upgraded for the NomCom, and that is so that the online form can be saved.

The one we used last time and the one that's been used by NomCom up until now has not been able to be saved and it's been quite annoying. So that would make life easier as well. I do apologise for the background noise.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you Cheryl. Just to add to what you've said, I promise not to call teleconferences between the 25th of December and the 1st of January to ensure maximum availability of the Members. I think that I'm ready to close the call, unless there's… I see Olivier. I'm going to give him the floor. This is your last chance to raise your hands. Okay. Olivier, and then we'll close the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Roberto. Just a couple more things to add: one is your relationship with the Chair of the BMSPC. As you know, tomorrow we will have a call with the BMSPC because they are the warrantors of the rules and they're the ones that look at the process of how things run.

I gather that you will have extensive discussions with the Chair of the BMSPC, and it might well be that the BMSPC invites you, Roberto, or anyone you've delegated to this task, on some of the BMSPC calls, if there is some work that the BMSPC has to do and deal with. That's one thing.

Second thing: as you'll have seen, Cheryl, Alan and myself are happy to oblige and help with anything to do with process issues, etc., and of course you've got At-Large Staff that are here to help you out. Then there's one additional thing and that's the issue of confidentiality. Cheryl has alluded to this earlier. Of course, all of the BCEC's work is

confidential so the calls that we are having, including this one, are recorded, but the recordings are not made public.

The recordings will be made available to Members of this Group, and the recordings are there for anyone who is unhappy with the selections or the fact that they've been taken out, or if there's any conflict or anything like that, the recording of the call is something that is there as a confidential record of your dealings.

However – and I realize that some of you are not ALAC Members so you might not be aware of this – there is also a possibility to go in-camera. Going in-camera is effectively asking for the recording to be stopped altogether. This is something that we have sometimes done on the ALAC calls, where anyone who was not an At-Large Advisory Committee Member would have to leave the Adobe Connect room and the call itself and effectively the recording would be stopped.

All you have to do is ask to "go in-camera" and Staff would then confirm that to you. Of course, you don't have anyone that's not a Member of the BCEC on the call anyway, so you wouldn't have to go through this motion, but certainly Staff would come back and say, "okay, the recording is now stopped." You'd then deal with whatever needed to be completely off the record.

I hope that you will not have to be entrenched in that position to need to go in-camera, but who knows. Then you can say that you want to turn the recording back on. Staff will turn the recording back on and you

can give a quick explanation of what happened just afterwards; a quick summary of the discussions that took place in-camera. So that's an option that is open to you as well.

That's all. I realize that time is ticking. Thanks and good luck.


ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you Olivier. I would like to just answer a question that Carlos has asked in the chat about our next call. At this point I'm not setting the time for our next call. I think we should communicate by email. Next week a lot of people will be traveling to Buenos Aires in any case, and it would be very inconvenient to have a call next week.

It's a bit unfortunate because we are tight with the schedule, but I think that our best bet is to have an informal chat as soon as we get to Buenos Aires and to then make the best possible use of the time we're there. For those not coming to Buenos Aires we should connect via videoconference whilst we're there.

This said, I see Olivier's hand up but I think it's still from… yes. I see Alan. Alan, you have the floor and then we'll close the call.


ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Roberto. Given that a fair number of the people will not be in Buenos Aires either at all or at the beginning of the week, you may want to have Staff do a Doodle to set up when that discussion will take place

**EN**

in Buenos Aires, to make sure that there can be reasonable attendance of those who are not there.

ROBERTO GAETANO:     Absolutely.  Okay.  This said, I think that I will thank everybody for participating in the call.  Thanks to the participants.  Thanks to Staff for their good work.  Let's be in touch on the mailing list.  Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**