

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello...

UNIDENTIFIED: The recording is on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The recording is on. Thank you very much. So this is the BMSPC, the Board Member Selection Process Committee first call. This call is to discuss more or less the role of the committee and the operation, how we will operate, and then try to see the next steps. So first I will ask Julia to make the roll call. Julie please.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you Tijani. Welcome everyone. On today's call we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Alan Green Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Darlene Thompson, Roberto Gaetano, Cheryl Langdon-Org, Maureen Hilyard, and Oskana Pryhdoko. We have apologies from Baudouin Schombe and Heidi Ullrich. And from staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, and myself Julia Charvolen. May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Tijani.

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.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Julia. So we will go to the item number three on the agenda, which is the roll and operation of the BMSPC. And I have the [?] chance to have Alan Greenberg and [?] with me. So try first to define the roll of this committee, according to the rule of procedure it will oversee peer selection process, including the selection operation, but excluding those responsibilities specifically retained by ALAC or given to the BMSPC.

So it seems our mission, more or less, or roll in this operation. Do we have anything to add Alan or [?] about that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah I can add some examples which may help the people in the group understand what we are talking about if you would like.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes please. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is certainly a number of issues that will have to be decided. The first and foremost is the schedule of the overall schedules, and we'll be talking about that a little bit later in the talk. I've put together an Excel spreadsheet which should help in testing out various possible schedules and see what the issues are, what the problems might be with them, or what extent they will work or not work.

The rules of engagement with the candidates is one of the things that will have to be looked at. That is, once candidates are named, what is the process going to be for presenting them to the electorate and to At

Large in general? Will there be statements made? Will there be debates? Will there be webinars featuring them? Will there be an opportunity at the Singapore meeting to meet the candidates and talk to them?

That kind of thing will all have to be decided. And of course, specifications of what is deemed to be proper and what is improper, if there is anything that you feel like that. The actual voting is one of the things that is completely unknown at this point because it will depend on how many people are on the slate. The voting process that was put together is moderately complex, but allows for multiple rounds and therefore there should be an opportunity for the electorate to consult with their communities in between each round, a luxury that wasn't available last time.

And each round, certainly the last two rounds and possibly the first round, I'm not sure of the technology, could result in a tie. The rules allows the BMSPC to decide at the time, do you address the tie with a random selection? Or do you re-hold the round? And that would depend whether there is enough time to do that, that is largely the main factor.

The overall process, according to the bylaws, must be completed six months before the director is to take their seat, and this year that means the 16th of April. So the schedule is moderately tight. Last time the whole process was carried out in about four months, this time it is five plus months to do it in but in retrospect, if we had all the rules in place, we should have started even earlier which we didn't and we can't change that now.

So you will be under some pressure to get this done quickly. As you'll see, when we look at the scheduling tool, the numbers there were completely arbitrary that I put in just to test the tools. Hopefully some of them make sense, hopefully most of them make sense, but that's going to be your groups responsibility to look at that and decide. As someone pointed out in the BCEC meeting yesterday, the first obvious error it says that the final timeline will be decided by next Tuesday.

Well, that's not likely to happen because we're starting a bit too late at this point to get input from the BCEC and for the BMSPC to make their decisions. So you're going to have an interesting challenge to quickly come up with a schedule. We'll talk more about that when you come back to me and I'll look at the, will demonstrate the scheduling tool.

I think that's all I have to say. Essentially the BMSPC has the responsibility of making sure the election, the selection rather proceeds orderly and is done properly, and not subject to any whatever problems. The BMSPC cannot change the overall rules that are written, but there is a lot of things that are unspecified, and the BMSPC will have to make decisions on those.

And there is a large number of documents from the last process and a debriefing with suggestions from the last committees on what you might want to change. And those should be looked at in great care. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I have a question for you. I have read all of the documentation of the 2010 selection, and I found in the recommendations of the BMSPC of the AP, you understand...

ALAN GREENBERG: What was called the APSDT and then was renamed something else.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: APSDT and that's it. Okay. So I found recommendations that say the ALAC and the RALOs can indicate support [Vancouver] applied director in advance of the BCEC collection of the SOI. And this is, as a matter of [?] a fair notice to potential new candidates. So what to do with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: [Laughs] That's an interesting point. I had forgotten completely about that. That's not actually a rule, that's...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No it's not a rule. It was one of the recommendation done for the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: I remember talking about that, and I had forgotten about it completely so you get points for actually having read and understood everything. I don't know, Cheryl may have some comments on that on how do we do that. There is also supposed to be, and Olivier can comment, perhaps he knows more details, that the board is supposed to do a complete 360

degree that is evaluation of every one of the current incumbent, and provide that as information somehow, I'm not quite sure how they will do that, to the people who are doing this selection, to say basically does the board believe that this person was doing a good job or not.

And perhaps Olivier can comment on that, how that will happen, because that seems to be tightly linked to the part that you just raised Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is part of the review, the process for the upcoming rounds. That means that it is for this, the first time can think about [?]....

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. Well, known of us thought about it until you just mentioned it, so it's a good question. I'm sure Olivier and, has some input on the, getting the feedback from the board, and Cheryl may just have overall input.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier or Cheryl? Who has something to say? I don't see your hands.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's because I haven't put my hand up. I'm waiting to see whether [CROSSTALK]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ...go ahead Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Fine. I'll stick my hand up if that makes you feel better, there you go. Well my first reaction to that particular, and it should be seen as a comment, in the list of recommendations is feel free to ignore it. That is exactly the sort of thing BMSPC should be discussing at a meeting like this. And then deciding whether or not what, which other lead would be the utterances of an individual out of the last BCEC, or out of the last ADSDT.

And see whether or not it has merit. You certainly don't have to do it. If you choose to do it, I would suggest you are going to put yourselves into extreme time pressure, and I would strongly encourage you to leave other future cycle from doing that. That said, if you want to pick up on that, or indeed any other of the recommendations, you should feel free to do so, but they are nothing more than mere recommendations.

Regarding the feedback from the 360 review that was done, and indeed has already been prepared for the occupant of seat 15, so that is material is already available from the board governance committee. It may very well be that Olivier has, as chair, already been given an update. I know that the nominating committee for 2014 will receive this information on those members of their ilk, in other words the two seats that are being reviewed this coming, forthcoming nominating committee.

We would be expecting to get that feedback at the end of the Buenos Aries meeting, and though the BCEC, because it's the BCEC business and

that of the chair, it won't be yours as the BMSPC, can – should be able to rest assured that that feedback already exists and they only need to take it into account. That said, whilst that exists, it will be one of those circumstances that the community would need to be encouraged to read between the lines.

For example, if the BCEC, hypothetically what this means is if the BCEC chose to deliberately not put an incumbent SOI through to be part of their initial slate, then the community may wish to jump to the conclusion that there is something in the feedback or report which has, for whatever reason, ranked the incumbent as a lower level for – does not even meet the cutoff point on total points.

Or has biased the BCEC against it. That would mean that the RALOs would have the opportunity under the rules to be the incumbent back on the slate, if the BCEC in any given cycle choose not to. I've answered in full Tijani, because it is a very important question. You do need to remember that we are talking about the very first cycle, and what you chose to do with the recommendations can take you down either pathway, but if you're going to somehow formalize this opportunity or option to have the incumbent pre [?] than I would suggest it's one of those times where you should remember that it's going to do to your time course. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Let's see what Olivier thinks about it. Oliver please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking for the transcript record. And I thank you for letting me, and having invited several people that are not members of the BMSPC onto the call. My view on this, with regards to the feedback from the board, the 360 review feedback from the board, is effectively that this will be performed, this is actually performed for all new, for all board members who are reaching the end of their time and that might be reviewed.

The information would be sent over to me in a confidential manner. What I would be asking Steve Crocker, the chair of the board, is to be able to share that information with the BCEC, only with the BCEC because I think it's absolutely vital for the BCEC to know if the board member that was selected by the ALAC has performed as they were supposed to perform.

And I guess in a very candid manner, I think those reviews are done. We definitely need to have some feedback on this and it all comes through because of that. Now if it means that the BCEC decides not to have that board member on the slate that they come up with, well then I guess people will be able to draw their conclusions out of this. But I think it's very important, and I do hope that the feedback will be positive enough for the incumbent to be on the slate simple because it would probably reflect quite badly on our community to have chosen someone that wouldn't be selected again on the slate.

But that's really, at the end of the day, I have no information at the moment on whether they would be or not. And so it's impossible for me to be able to let you know when we will be receiving this. What I will do when see and meet with Steve Crocker in Buenos Aries, is to

provide him with details of when we need that information by, and I will therefore...

And I know that Roberto is on the call at the moment, I would have to ask Roberto now when the BCEC would need that feedback. And then I can tell Steve Crocker, and Steve Crocker can then start the process in time for the BCEC to have the correct information. That's all as far as the process is concerned. With regards to the, doing things the other way around as Tijani has asked there, I have no point of view on this matter. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier, thank you. In fact, you are answering another question, but it's not a problem. This is a point that I found in the recommendations and I was really bothered because if we start, if we entered in this process, perhaps we'll need more time, and perhaps I don't know. I don't have any preference, but it is something that is, how to say, concerning me.

Now I see that Alan has raised his hand. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess I'll echo what Cheryl said, this is thought from the outgoing committees several years ago, and that was before there was a decision to do the 360 review of potentially reviewable board members. You've got to decide whether you want to do something about it, and that's clearly your call. I guess I... There was a fair amount

of discussion in the ATRT with Steve Crocker on how these 360 reviews can be used.

Because remember, the BCEC is a creature of the ALAC, of At Large. The other SOs, the SOs that select members don't have that kind of process. And the 360 review is meant to go back to the electors in some level. And it's not clear to me that it should be restricted to the BCEC. The BCEC may in fact choose, even if a director had a horrible rating, just as a courtesy to put them back on the slate.

That's a decision the BCEC will obviously have to make, if that kind of situation arose. But it's not clear to me, I think it's something that needs to be investigated by Olivier and the BMSPC in Buenos Aries, about whether it is proper to give the review to the people who have to make the ultimate decision. Or is it proper to hide that information from the people who have to make that decision?

And I think that is something that merits discussion, and I certainly don't have any input into the process but I do think it requires some discussion. So thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Indeed, Alan. Thank you Alan. Now Cheryl please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Tijani. It's Cheryl again for the record. Look, this is a topic that I strongly suggest we that is the next piece of your work. Tijani, you've accurately identified my primary fear and concern, which is the amount of time it will take for this to be enshrined in some sort of

process. It is a mere recommendation, it is up to you as a committee to do what you will with it, but if you do take it up you are going to be under, what I can only describe as, extreme time pressure.

And you will run the risk of creating a position that does not allow the time for what is probably more important, which is appropriate outreach for the At Large community with the selected slate from the BCEC, and any additions that may buy three or more of the ALSs for any additional people to have on the slate. The time forces Alan will go through is, for whatever reason, much, much tighter than we had originally planned for you to have.

I, as you know, and here I'm speaking in a purely personal capacity, on the first ATRT, which came up with the top identification of need, from the board perspective and the use of the 360s. And Alan and [Olivia] that served on the second ATRT, and as Alan has outlined, we had a meaningful and detailed, I trust, discussion on the access of what we now have institutionally which is feedback from the board with the 360s, as Alan said, available should the community of selectors, in whatever way they are described, wish to access them.

Certain things have happened. The very first review of the board, which was a peer review, not a pure 360, was in fact published during the [?] ATRT I, and that piece of documentation was a piece of public documentation, and so the community with, for all of the ACs and SOs who were going to be making appointments for their seats on the board did have access to that while the last chair of the board was in session.

In the life of Steve Crocker's chairmanship of the board, a different approach has been taken and a more complete 360 review process undergone, been undergone in the guidance of the board governance committee. And I would suggest that as any recommendations of the new ATRT II be finalized, gone through public comments, and put to bed until the process that you all need to go through should be well and truly completed.

That you may choose to not worry too much about deciding on this access point. It is, I would suggest, that the BCEC must have. I can assure you that the 360 already exists because they would, for the last nominating committee to have access for the three people that, whose seats were being filled during our process for 2013. That I would remind you all that when Olivier is speaking to the current chairman of the board, Steve Crocker, on these matters, he is one of the seats – his seat is one that the Nom Com will be reviewing in 2014.

So he also needs to be extremely careful on what advice and what comments he gives to Olivier, otherwise he would be seen as inviting a process that he is about to go through himself. The other thing that I should mention is, I also serve in various capacities in both the GNSO and the ccNSO, and therefore I've gone through the last lot of appointment process from a constituency point of view.

And no access was given to those communities to the most recent 360 reviews. Your community would be the first one that is faced with that challenge. I hope that's helped you. But Tijani, you're absolutely correct, if you go down this particular pathway, you are going to be seriously compromising your time. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Cheryl.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Roberto raising hand Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Roberto, please. Go ahead.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. Just a couple of words. I think that purpose of the [?] 360 review was, if I remember correctly from the time we were discussing that on the board, was exactly to help in giving additional information for the reelection of an outgoing board member. The process of the nom com is confidential enough that the information can be given to the nom com.

The question is, is our process confidential enough so that the board is feeling comfortable in giving this piece of information to Olivier and to the BCEC? If the answer is yes, I think the information should go to the BCEC, but not any further. In the sense that if we give this information to the electorate, I think that we are sort of taking a risk of jeopardizing the confidentiality. Not that I don't trust the voters, it's just that one thing is to decide to slate a candidates and the other thing is to take a decision and at that point, something might happen.

So my personal opinion is, either, and I'm saying this as a chair of the BCEC, either I guess, for example, the 360 review that is terrible, and in that case, I will try to discuss with the members of the BCEC towards not putting the candidate again. Or if we get some sort of feedback that the candidate is not perfect, there are some points [?] I think that we should put the candidate, the incumbent, on the slate of candidates because also...

One thing is the 360 review, and the other thing is the vote of whoever has the right to vote. In other words, the 360 review is an additional tool that might help in making an informed decision about the election. But it's not a definite tool. There is not... I don't believe we can say there is a threshold, and then at that point if the incumbent does not get enough marks from the 360 review, he shouldn't be elected.

There might be very good reasons for somebody to be reelected again by his or her constituency, even if the rest of the board is not happy about his or her performance. Thank you. And I will have to drop off in a minute. I'm sorry, but I had not planned for this call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Before you leave, again, I would like to tell you again you and Olivier, you are not answering my concern. It is another thing, what you are speaking about, it's another thing.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

I have not understood your concern in that case, I'm sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: My concern that there is a recommendation saying that the ALAC and the RALOs may express their support to the incumbent candidate, [?] to the collection of the AI or SOI. So that they, it is for the potential applicants to know that, they see... I will not interpret. It is like this. But this is a different thing, absolutely a different thing. And it is more complicated, very complicated, for our community, very complicated.

And that's why I ask the question at the beginning of the meeting because I think it is a thing that we as a committee we have to decipher it very, very soon. Thank you Roberto. So now...

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, can I come in for a moment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Alan please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Cheryl started off this very long discussion with a suggestion that you have to look at it, make a decision but it's going to affect your timeline. I'll be blunter. Having played with this scheduling tool in developing it for a while, I think you will be challenged to come up with any viable schedule if you add a few week process of getting input from the RALOs.

You may have the skill to do that, but I don't think I would have [laughs].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's what I said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's why I said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's exactly right.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So now this was the difficult question. Now I will go to things that are very, very simple for us. I will add to the tasks that Alan listed some other tasks. For example, should we stick to a slate of seven to 10 candidates and a minimum of three candidates? Or shall we shelve that? I remember for the first round, the BCEC didn't take, they didn't follow this recommendation and lowered the number to three.

So we have here also to decide on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think that's BCEC decision. Is it not?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think it is a BMS decision, but it is to the BCEC to implement it, and if they have a big concern, they may change it. That's what happened for the last election, selection. Cheryl is here to...

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is they were given a range and had the discretion to pick within that range.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's, exactly, okay. Cheryl please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Tijani. Cheryl for the record. Yes, Tijani, thank you very much Tijani. Cheryl for the record, I was just coming off of mute. Yes, this range, the range was actually carefully discussed by the ABSDT and indeed you'll note there is no recommendation from the ABSDT and the last BCEC to make any changes to this at all.

It is up to the BCEC to operate anywhere within that range, or indeed make a ruling any time that suits themselves. You are correct Tijani, the last BCEC chose to only go at the very bottom end of the range. In other words, putting forward an eventual slate of three candidates. That is because the compression of time for any larger than three candidates, would have meant that there was a high possibility that with several rounds of voting that might be required, if you got more than three candidates, and Alan and I can bore you all with the mathematics of this if you like. But I will encourage you not to be doing it in your short call today.

That you simply run out of time and that's what the last process would have done. It would have run out of time and risk not being able to make its appointment when the board needed to be informed and the secretary of the board needed to be informed. Hopefully, this is an issue that won't affect this coming year's BCEC, and the 2014 BCEC will actually be able to decide, and they may decide to only have a slate of three, but they may equally want to decide to have a slate of five or seven or 10, and hopefully not any other number.

But for them to have the luxury of doing that, you have to have very [?] of the proposed time table eaten up by [?] and you need to remember that. I would also suggest that if you start changing the basic rules now, you will again, run out of time. There is plenty of flexibility in the range, as it is written, and there is no recommendation to indicate to your group that a change is in any way desirable. And at that point I will leave it, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. I didn't want to change them at all, but I noticed that last round the number was lowered to the minimum, and that's why I raised the point. There is a second point that I want to raise here. The maximum number of candidates added by the RALOs, by the RALOs through the petition. This was never decided on. This was never kept in mind. Last time we didn't have petitions because we didn't have time.

So I think we have better to fix the maximum number because if we don't do that, we may have a lot of petitions. Yes Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think you can do that. To do that means you would have to have a process. Let's say in the worst case, there are 12 candidates that the RALOs, that many RALOs support and they get on the slate. To limit the total number on the slate, it would imply you would have to pick and choose which of the RALO traditions you honor.

And I think that adds a whole new set of rules that we've never contemplated. And remember, it almost doesn't matter if there are more than three candidates, the first round narrows it to three, period. Yes, there is a problem of splitting votes. Yes, there is a problem that if you have a lot of candidates, you may end with someone who may have won in a small group, losing out because there are so many options and not everyone can pick.

But the rules specify that you use a, sorry Cheryl you'll have to remind me. The kind of voting scheme that you will eliminate people and the second choices automatically propagate. So if you have 12 people, everyone is going to have to be ordered by each of the electors, and we end up with three which are presumably the three that have the most support, whether it was the first choice, second choice, third choice, or 10th choice, doesn't matter.

So personally, I don't think we want that large of slate, but that's a personal preference and it doesn't really alter the outcomes, rather than it makes it very confusing for the electorate perhaps.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you Alan. My point of view is that we can limit the number of additional candidates, that when there are low support.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe you're adding a rule that would change the rules that are in the current rules of procedure. I think if we were to do that, we should have done that a long time ago.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So you think it must be in the rules, but... something. So if you think it's not on the rules, you can put it, how to say, as an operating procedure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if it changes the overall rules the ALAC... If it's not in the rules, the ALAC can override, can add a new rule by a decision of the ALAC. And in fact, we're going to be talking about that in the ALAC, in the Buenos Aries because it's a situation that's come up that is of concern.

But the current rules, rules of procedure and I don't have them in front of me, say that if a candidate is supported by three or more RALOs, that candidate goes on the slate. I don't think you can alter that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no. It is nothing contradiction with that. The [?], it is an addition. So you have this plus you cannot support more than one candidate, so that you will not have an additional...

ALAN GREENBERG: My personal... And it's a personal one, is that it changes the rules and that would have to be something that the ALAC explicitly approves and

perhaps explicitly changes the rules prior to the elections. So we can talk about it more. We're not going to have time on this call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, no problem. And the last point I want to relay, is the quorum for the BCEC. It was a concern last time, and in the evaluation report it was raised and there was a proposition that a quorum of at least one from each region is a good thing, for the deliberation of the BCEC.

ALAN GREENBERG: The BCEC sets rules which have to be ratified by the ALAC, if I remember correctly, and that's one of the rules the BCEC must, should be putting in its rules. And the same for the BMSPC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. So this is one of the main points. Our first task, I think, is to set up an operating procedure. It is in the rules. Yeah, the rule says that we need to establish an operating procedure that should be adopted by ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right, for the BMSPC. The BCEC must also adopt its own operating procedures which must be ratified by the ALAC. Remember, the BMSPC is explicitly restricted from doing things that are the BCEC's role. And setting their procedures are there role, but you do have to set your own procedures and get those ratified quickly. And my assumption is that

the ones used by last year's group is going to be a good starting point and you may not have to change a lot, that's your call of course.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

That's right. But last time, the APLDT, they didn't have an operating procedure. They didn't have any procedure, any rules. So the starting point is not there. This is the point. Anyway. So is there a... Cheryl please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much Tijani. Cheryl for the record. You have an advantage this time, Tijani, with the new ALAC rules of procedure that you do have a bunch of already adoptable rules. You suggest that your BMSPC is going to operate under the general rules of engagement as outline in the ALAC rules of procedure, that is a good starting point for you.

You are correct there is no explicit rules for the BMSPC last time, but that's the case of we were building the airplane while we were flying it last time. That said, I did specifically advice the BCEC, the 2014 in our call yesterday, that I thought, as serving as chair of both committees last time, that in my experience it would be a very good rule for them to have that a minimum on any call that makes a substantive decision.

Now that doesn't mean that you can't have a call and have a discussion, but in any call that makes a substantive decision, that at least one representative from each region is there so that I've encouraged them

to in fact adopt an operating procedure which will give you a quorum rule.

I will say exactly the same to your committee Tijani. I would strongly encourage, and that was the practice of the [?] last time, that you do not have a meeting that makes a substantive or any decision, not substantive, any decision. You may have a discussion, but not make a decision without at least one representative from each of the regions.

So I would strongly encourage you to pick that up as an operational procedure. But you also need to realize that that in of itself, that regional representation rule, is already looked at and involving in the new ALAC rules of procedure. So if you only say that you operate under the ALAC rules of procedure, you've gone a long way of covering yourself. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Okay, is there any other comment about those questions that we raise now? So if there is not, let's go to item number four of the agenda which is the timeline.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Tijani, it's Olivier, my hand was up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I didn't see it. Yes, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was going to ask a question with regards to the operations of the BMSPC, just to make sure that we're clear on this. This group, I guess, does not operate like the BCEC behind closed door, it obviously operates openly and it's, I gather, that it's recording – that the discussions are going to be open, just like the ABSPC discussions were open.

That said, no member of the electorate should be on this group, and so I wonder what one means by this, whether it means that they cannot be part of the conference calls, or whether they cannot be part of the discussions, or whether they cannot be part of the decisions.

Three different levels, and I just want to be sure that we are clear on this. Is it the conference call barring? Is it the discussion barring? Is it the decision barring? And I gather maybe Cheryl would have an answer for this, or maybe you do. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, where did you see that the electorate doesn't have the right to be on BMSPC? It doesn't exist. I am...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so. So it's members of the BMSPC. This is a working group, which is a balanced working group, with two members from each one of the regions. So it's interesting because this could be a working group which ends up with an imbalance if there are members from other parts of the world. That's what I mean by this, sorry for the confusion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just for clarity. No candidate can be a member of the BMSPC. Rather, anyone who is on the BMSPC cannot put their name forward to be a candidate. There is no prescription about being on the electorate in this group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so...

ALAN GREENBERG: There is for the BCEC, but not for the BMSPC.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let me just be quite frank then. If Mister X was a candidate, could Mister X attend the calls of the BMSPC? Could Mister X attend the discussions?

ALAN GREENBERG: If the discussions are going... If we're posting the MP3s, any candidate could listen to them, they could not participate in them as a member. Whether Tijani choose to let visitors speak or not is Tijani's problem, but I would think anyone who plans to be taken part unless they were explicitly asked to participate and speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oliver speaking. That's exactly what I was trying to focus on, to make sure that this is very, very clear indeed. That's all. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. It one of the rules, Olivier. In the rules it is very clear that candidates cannot be on one of those two committees, BMSPC and BCEC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, if I can come back to this. There is a difference between being on the committee and attending the calls. You don't need to be on the committee to attend the calls. So we have the rules that are clear on not being on the committee, I wanted to make sure we're also clear on the fact that you cannot attend the calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's the difference between attending the calls and not speaking, and listening to the MP3 after the fact?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: People who come to the call and participate in the discussion, they are not voting but they are participating in the discussion, they are affecting the decision afterward. So they can listen, that is the recording it is always there, everyone can listen to all the meetings, but they don't have to be on the committee, this is in the rules.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So they can be present on the call but not say anything. As long as they keep quiet and do not text anyone and so on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [?] that they don't participate in the call because you know there is interaction disguised, etcetera, etcetera. So...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: They listen to the meeting on the MP3 afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a rule you can set.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, that's a rule.

ALAN GREENBERG: And you can go in camera and be off the recording should you feel there is a reason.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And Tijani, I believe that you do need to set that rule. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It will be in our operating procedure. Thank you Oliver. Any other discussion about that? Your hand is still up Olivier. Okay, thank you. So if there is not other comments, we will go to the timelines. I am thankful to Alan that provided the scheduling tool, he call it like this. And I will let him to explain the tool that he provided.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. How much time do we have. Officially the meeting ends in two minutes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll be quick. Okay. Let me give you a bit of history. When I was on the board of the Internet Society, for several years I ran the elections and I had to established time lines and things like that. And I quickly realized that with all of the interactions and the constraints on it, this was a difficult process to do.

And I relatively quickly developed a tool very similar to this, that allowed the periods to be set and it was a lot less painful. So that's why I put this together, and I know it helped me and I hope it will help you. If it doesn't, you're free to just scrap it. This is an offer of something which may help.

It's a little bit confusing however. If you downloaded it yourself, or looked at the one on the Adobe connect if you can read it, there is a list of milestones, there is a start date, and then there is a period until the next milestone. The description is the description of that period. That is the period that goes, that follows. And then there is some other notes that may be applicable.

We're already part way into the process. We're sitting somewhere around here, the BMSPC and the BCEC have already been selected, you're now talking. And you'll notice right away, that according to this, you're going to start meeting on the 29th of October. And you have 14 days to finalize the timeline, which would be finalized by the 12th of November.

Clearly, this is not the 29th of October, and you're not likely to finalize the timeline by the 12th. So given the end date is fixed, you're going to have to some playing around to make this realistic. The second point to note is that all of these numbers in the days until column add up to the total number of days available in the process.

Some of the tasks span periods. So for instance, and I've done some examples. If you've done any project scheduling, you'll be familiar with the standard type of chart which has dark lines that will overlap showing the time range for any given task. And this project is no different than that.

So for instance, one of the things the BCEC has to do is draft the expression of interest form, and that has to be done by the time they publish it. They can start doing that today, or yesterday, and it has to

end at the time the publication of the call is published. They cannot do that, however, they cannot do the publication of the call until the BMSPC decides on the overall timeframe because one of the things in the call is the date on which the expression of interest is due.

And therefore that has to be part of the overall process. The evaluation of the expression of interest by the BCEC is something which can start as soon as the first expression of interest comes in, if they choose to distribute it to their members, and goes up until the time they have to do their, publish their slate.

Within that, there are a number of different timeframes. There is a time for people to submit them. There is a time that it will take to ask for references, to get the references back for the committee to look at the references, but the overall timeframe covers the whole process. A couple of things to remember as you're looking at it, if you look at the dates, the start date and therefore implicitly the end date of each task, I've formatted the date including the day of the week.

You may choose to avoid weekends if you can, although I'll point out that for the last selection the second round of voting was on a weekend and we did have good turnout. So it may well be that you can't avoid weekends at all times, and that's a choice you have to make. Similarly the period from the middle of December to the first of January, or second of January, is a period that a lot of people tend to be unavailable, and you probably don't want to have any critical things going at that time.

Again, you probably can't avoid it completely. And lastly, there is the Buenos Aires meeting and the Singapore meeting that occur, and you have to think about that. Now, you may want to avoid doing things during the Singapore meeting, or you may choose to have in person voting at the Singapore meeting, and make use of the face to face time to allow a voting round to take an hour instead of three days, or two days.

So there is a lot of things to consider. If I scroll down a little bit, you'll see the other aspects. The voting round in this example, and the times I have, the dates I have, and the period lengths I have are purely something I put in to test the voting tool. You may find 30 days is not enough for all of the rounds, if they're going to be done electronically, because remember you want a period of opportunity for RALOs to consult with, the electors to consult with their constituencies for each round of voting, if possible.

That wasn't allowed last time. The timing was too tight. But you might find 30 days is much too much if you're going to do some face to face voting in Singapore for instance. And lastly, you'll notice that there is in very bold letters, this must be done by Wednesday the 16th of April, and if you change the time for instance, make that 34 days, you'll notice the target date for announcement of a winner is now past the 16th and it turns red.

I'm not great in Excel but I know a few things. And I think that's about it. It's a little bit messy, but hopefully it's better than working on scraps of paper. And although I'm not part of the BMSPC and as was just discussed, I will not be participating in any of your meetings, should you

choose to explicitly want me to participate in anything as an aide, which doesn't conflict with the overall priorities, I would be pleased to do that to the extent that you feel it is appropriate. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. This is really helpful and I would like to ask you one other question about the periods that you put here. The duration. I think they are not [?] you up them according to the logical thinking. I find them very close to the reality.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I hope so. I tried to make this as useful as possible, and that included giving you dates and durations which I think made some sense. But I'm not on the BCEC, I wasn't on the last one, and how many days you need, they need to do their work for each of the tasks, I really don't know.

In terms of the 30 days voting, I was looking at the fact that you may have as many as five or six rounds of voting. Each round is going to have to take a few days, two or three days at least. And if you have two or three days of consultation in between the 30 days is a reasonable number.

You may not end up, you could conceivably have only one round of voting and that would decide the outcome, depending on how many people on the slate and how the votes come in. That's not something you can predict ahead of time, so you have to allow enough time to handle the worse-case.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's right. Thank you very much Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Cheryl please. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Tijani. Cheryl for the record. Yes, thank you Tijani. Cheryl for the record. It takes a little while to come off mute each time. I apologize for that. I would strongly suggest to you all that in my experience, first of all, this tool is extremely useful and I think all of us give thanks to Alan for putting this together. Secondly, the indicative dates that he has got here was there is some flexibility within the process as he has outlined I would strongly suggest that you just adopt this scheduling tool pretty much as is.

I would remind you that the BCEC looked at this scheduling tool yesterday, and if you make any substantive changes to this tool, or the times in this tool, even if you do squeak under the endpoint, the [?] endpoint, that that maybe, if it's other than minor [?], a little bit confusing because the BCEC is probably going to be expecting to work with this tool as it is written.

And my final point is you don't necessarily have to make change just because you've got the capability. As a BMSPC you this time have good ALAC rules that you can adopt, and pop in any operational procedures

and publish them that you think are worthy, and [?] in my view, worthy [?]. And you can in fact pretty much adopt this and allow for any tweaking, and it should be only minor tweaking in my [?] view of things as they go along. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Cheryl. I see that Alan has his hand up. Yes please Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One minor modification, in the BCEC discussions yesterday, they were charged with coming up very, very quickly with their decision on whether the times that were put in for their tasks were reasonable here. Now, I should say I didn't develop this myself. The person who reviewed these times was Cheryl, who last time chaired these things.

So they have been vetted by Cheryl who says they seem reasonable. But nonetheless, this year's BCEC does have to bless them and bless them quickly or suggest changes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think for you to talk to Roberto and decide how you go forward.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, exactly. I think that I have to talk with Roberto and see what the BCEC thinks about the periods here setup. And according to that, very soon call of the BMSPC is absolutely necessary to decide on this schedule, on this timelines, and to publish them so that we can kick off the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. One of the things I mentioned yesterday on the BCEC call, is in last selection's BCEC and in almost every Nom Com they decided at the last moment to extend the period. If the BCEC thinks they have to do it, and there is psychological reasons that you want to be able to say that you have an extra week because people often wait until the very last moment to submit. But if they believe they are going to want to do that, they need to build that slack in now because we don't have the luxury of this, they want to add three more days that we delay the whole thing three days.

They're going to have to take it out of their own periods. So that's why the periods in this schedule, where it says 30 days for submission and then 14 days for evaluation, the important things is the sum of these numbers, and they may choose to shorten the original submission period, increase the evaluation period, and then at the last moment, move some back into the submission period in an extension. That's a decision they have to make.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes but they have to stay in the range of the submission and evaluation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because you don't want, you cannot slip the start of the election.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless the guarantee ahead of time they will only have three candidates, and the RALOs will not submit anyone, and they cannot guarantee the latter part.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [Laughs] Okay. Thank you very much. Any other thoughts? Any other comments? I have a suggestion for this group, for this committee. I propose that Roberto Gaetano will be a non-voting member of this BMSPC. I think this will help a lot, that direction between the two committees. And I think, yes, I see that Cheryl is okay. I seek the approval of the members of the committee.

So I don't see any reaction. Okay. Who is against? No one is against. So we will adopt it. So Roberto Gaetano will be in the future a member of this group, but a non-voting. I will ask the staff to include him in the mailing list, and to include him in the group so that he is invited every time we have a call. Thank you very much. Is there any other business that someone wants to raise?

So I don't see... Next steps, I think we need first to publish the timeline, and we need also before that establish our operating procedures, publish the timeline. It's very urgent, those two tasks are very urgent,

and then we will follow the timeline. So thank you very much. Is there any other thing? Yes Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to say thank you Tijani. That's all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much for attending this call. And I hope that you will have a good flight to Buenos Aries. And that's all. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]