

HOLLY RAICHE:

...Everybody's got the Agenda? It's up in the upper-right on the Adobe Connect. The issues that need to be addressed... This should take 40 minutes or less. The first Item is to approve the Working Party Charter. The good news is we've talked about it, the bad news is we don't have one, but we know what has to be in it.

We had a discussion yesterday – and this is for the benefit of Larisa and Charla who are probably going, “Oh my God” – we had a very fruitful meeting yesterday amongst Heidi, Alan, Cheryl and myself, to go through what had to be in the Charter. We identified a couple of things as particularly important, but the evaluation criteria and the selection criteria. We've arranged to have a meeting of all of our Working Party Members early next week, so that we actually have some content that we can put back to Charla and Larisa, because that's going to be the most critical.

Heidi is unbelievably busy – as are the rest of us – but Heidi and I have agreed to work on a Charter. Now, I'm very grateful for looking at the GNSO Charter, because normally GNSO Charters are very complex documents, and I was a bit overwhelmed thinking we had to develop one, but for the GNSO Review it's only a couple of pages. We've got all the material – we just haven't put it together. That's an Action Item but it's not a daunting one, and we can do that within the next day or so, I would say.

---

*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.*

The scope of work is going to be something that we haven't talked about in detail, so I'll talk to Larisa and Charla in looking for your feedback. Because the last review couldn't look at the actual RALO structure, I'm assuming by this – and Larisa can correct me – do we want to look at all three levels, which is ALAC, RALOs, ALSes? And are you looking under that Item for where we put the emphasis for this review? And maybe Heidi and Cheryl, we can look at that and get some feedback for that. Alan, you can take over.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I wanted to answer a question you asked. I believe there was a very strong statement saying the last review was largely focusing on the ALAC. This review is largely focusing on the peripheral parts of the organization. That's not to say it cannot make some recommendation that is important regarding ALAC, but the focus really needs to be on the rest of the organization and not on ALAC. I don't want to do what the GNSO did and say, "Thou shalt not look at the Council." I'm not sure we want to prohibition – on the other hand, that's not where the focus is as far as our planning was concerned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Absolutely Alan, you are correct, and in fact we undertook, in the first ALAC Review, when people wanted to take us into the weeds with the tri-level RALO and ALS structure to say we would deal with that next time around.

---

LARISA GURNICK:

I think we have complete alignment on the scope of work. I'd just suggest that maybe – and I'm looking at the slide on the scope of work as we formulated it on the slide that was part of the presentation in Dublin – and there, just in the way it's been ordered – ALAC is listed first.

So what I'd suggest, based on what Alan and Holly just said, is that when we put this information into the RFP that the scope doesn't quote ALAC, but that we lead with the RALOs and the ALSes, and as part of the background introduction of course we'll reference our last review. So for the scope of work it would also be feasible to say, "Because the first review was largely focused on ALAC, the focus of this review will be on RALOs and ALSes."

I think that will accomplish some clarity for the folks that are going to be preparing proposals, that that is the focus, but that doesn't take the consideration of ALAC off the table. So if that's acceptable of you, that's something we can easily accomplish.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, subject to looking at the words. Just for clarity, Larisa, at the last review, the ALSes and the RALOs were off the table, not because they were working well, but because it was such a new concept and at that point, when we started the review, I think the fifth RALO had signed an MOU, but I'm not even sure that had been done yet. We were at a

---

situation where if we tried to change the ground-rules at that point, ICANN would have no credibility whatsoever. So it was off the table, not because it was working so well, but because it was barely alive and it was a very fragile environment, and we really could not afford to even have the suggestion that it needed to be changed at a time when it was just starting to be created. That's not to say we thought it was going to work very well, but for political reasons, we could not discuss it.

LARISA GURNICK: I understand, Alan. Would the word "fledgling" be an appropriate word to describe the condition that you just outlined?

ALAN GREENBERG: Fledgling would be fine.

LARISA GURNICK: Very good.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, what I'm hearing is we can describe this as because this was simply a fledgling creation, without going into the political details, that the emphasis should be as follows, and...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: But once the reviewer is selected, presuming it's not the same individual reviewers as last time, this will have to be explained to them, but that's not something you necessarily want to put in the formal document.

LARISA GURNICK: That makes sense. I'm totally on board with that.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we're going to have to say something about the emphasis is so and so, just because these were very new creations, or something – something very mild, but...

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's get something drafted and then we can revise.

HOLLY RAICHE: We have to draft and review, so where we're up to in terms of the Agenda, the issues that need to be addressed, in terms of the evaluation criteria and the feedback, Larisa, as I said, what we're doing is next week having a Working Party teleconference, and what we'll be using are the slides that Xavier used in Dublin, where he put in some suggestions as to what the usual criteria are for any going out looking for an independent evaluator, and then asking the Working Party to come up with the sorts of criteria that should be specific to this review.

In that way we can actually provide content for both the evaluation criteria and selection criteria. Those are the two items that we have to particularly get some feedback on.

LARISA GURNICK: I was just going to say that it's slide number 16 in the Dublin presentation where we had an outline of the independent examiner selection criteria, and it was slide number 15 that talked about the review evaluation criteria – just trying to make it easier for you for reference purposes.

HOLLY RAICHE: We actually have looked at those slides, and those become very good documents as a basis for further discussion. We've already looked at 15 and 16, but those are particularly useful for us to get some additional feedback. The review methodology – now, I'm not sure, do we have much to say on the review methodology? It's a bit of a puzzle to me.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. Now I'm looking at slide 17. On the methodology, I think we've talked in various preparatory meetings about the usage of online surveys, the need for translation, and things like that. So we're pretty clear on quite a bit of it. As far as online surveys, what the current proposal is it may be qualitative and quantitative, much like the example that we'd use for the GNSO. The areas I think are still a bit unclear,

---

because of the differences of the operations of the RALOs and the ALSes, would it make sense to have online surveys that are different?

Meaning, “Here is a survey to evaluate the effectiveness of the ALSes, and here’s one for the RALOs”? Or does it make sense to keep the questions at a high level and generic enough so it could be applicable to any structure? My opinion, based on the experience of the past, is that having more tailored and clearer, separate surveys that are all similar but tailored, would make it easier for people that are responding. So that’s my two cents, but we’d very much appreciate feedback from all of you as to whether this should be one big survey or multiple surveys.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan, did you raise your hand?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I’ll answer the question just asked and then I’ll tell you why I put my hand up. In terms of the surveys, between the RALOs and the ALSes, I’m not sure if we need a different one. We may want to draft a single one but be prepared to separate it, or draft two single ones and merge them together. To a large extent it may be the same people, and I think we need to be open to either merging them or separating them. In terms of the surveys for the ALS/RALOs and then ALAC and other parts of ICANN, those are very much going to be different. There’s no question there will be multiple surveys.

I raised my hand on Item #3, before we went to Item #4, and I'd like to reiterate some thing I mentioned in Dublin, that Xavier basically said no to. I'd like to raise the issue again. This issue had been raised originally with Ray, and Larisa, I'm sure you were there at the time, that I really believe that a small number of us should have an opportunity to look at the proposals before they're formally evaluated – not to participate in the evaluation, not to be privy to the evaluation, but to be able to essentially give a heads-up, should it be appropriate, on any of the content.

I'm particularly worried about the credentials of the Review Team and the credentials they claim, and how appropriate those are. Also, in terms of history, it's COIs and things like that. My past experience says that kind of information can be misunderstood by impartial reviewers who are not connected deeply to the organization. I would strongly advise that. I understand all of the needs for confidentiality, but I'm also really worried that we end up being reviewed by people who are not able to do the job properly. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Alan, I know. I do remember all these conversations, and I understand your concerns. Of course, it's trying to balance this with what Xavier explained in Dublin. But because we're at the formative point in time where the credentials are wide open for discussion right now, and this would be the opportunity to provide requirements, I strongly urge you to give us specific examples of what you would consider to be an

---

appropriate credential and an appropriate way to assess that credential. Because this would be the time that we could really clearly articulate it in the RFP and also use that very specifically as a means of evaluation, while still preserving the confidentiality and impartiality of the entire process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Honestly, Larisa, I'll let someone else speak, because I've got a very strong position on this. I don't believe that's possible. I say this from the perspective of having participated in numerous proposals, where I had to include a CV, which I very carefully tailored to make it sound like I knew what I was talking about. I very carefully adjusted the words to make it sound like I knew something about the subject. That's how you do things like that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Can I interrupt here? I'll say I think this is perhaps a longer conversation we need to have in terms of how specific we can be and what the processes are. Can we move on with this call, but Alan, I'm not cutting you off and I'm not not listening to you, because I understand exactly what you're saying. I think this is something that we have to get as much information to Larisa as we can, and I think we'll look at the timelines of what we're going to do. This will be part of the next steps, and trust me, Larisa, this issue will be raised again.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: What I'm saying is I want this raised to the Board Committee overseeing this – not to a staff person who says, "Sorry, we wrote the rules, it's too late."

HOLLY RAICHE: Now, we are going through the...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly? I had my hand up. In response to your question about the separation or otherwise of the survey forms, you probably can get away with separate sections, if you want to keep the ALSes and RALOs together, but whilst Alan is correct it may very well be similar people in some situations answering these surveys from a RALO and ALS perspective, there are unique aspects, not the less is the specific outward-focus at the ALSes, which is possibly in some cases needing to be clearly separated from any RALO outreach and engagement.

I'm probably going to come down on the side of segregated if not separated on those. The other reason for saying that is that people will always be happier to give you two lots of ten minutes and one lot of 20, so there's a certain psychology on getting more meaningful answers, particularly when you're looking for some qualitative stuff as well. So from that, I would suggest segregate it, at the best, and if we do segregate it we say, "When you go to the next section, if you are filling

out for an ALS then it will take you another ten minutes,” but to be honest, I still think separated is probably even a better idea.

Just briefly on what Alan’s concern was, one possible way around the confidentiality aspect and Alan’s quite reasonable concerns based on his long experience in the field of being a consultant, you could in fact suggest that at least under commercial and confidence signatories, the Chair of the ALAC could be part of the review process. That would serve the problem both ways. Thank you Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m changing my answer on multiple surveys. I agree with Cheryl. If nothing else, we want to ask the ALSes, “Are you supported well by the RALOs?” and as the RALOs, “Do the ALSes know anything?” or some better phrased words than that. They probably are different. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I’m putting myself in a queue just to point out that some of the answers to the surveys are also going to be contingent upon things listed under #5, such as what individuals have been identified, what ALSes have we sampled, because you’re going to need feedback eventually – sooner

---

rather than later – as to how we select the ALSes. The documents for review, on one Wiki page, which we have for the review, we've got every single document listed, so that's really already done.

Independent meetings – there's this meeting, there will be a meeting of the Working Party coming up next week, and I don't think we have planned, but Larisa from your point of view, on #5.d, which is the list of Items, the list of upcoming meetings, clearly we've got one meeting planned. What do you think would be necessary in terms of meetings between now and Marrakech?

LARISA GURNICK:

I know there was a question as part of the Agenda, so first let me clarify. In Marrakech, we would be expecting for the Organizational Effectiveness Committee to confirm the appointment, and then we'd go into contracting with the independent examiners. So they would not be taking part in any meeting in Marrakech, but they would be taking part physically in the June meeting. That's assuming that the new meeting structure would accommodate that. I hope that could be feasible. But that's going to be part of our requirement – that they participate in the meetings, physically, in June, and of course in October.

In-between, what I was really hoping is to be able to point the people who are interested in sending us proposals in the direction of significant At-Large activities, already scheduled meetings, standing meetings, special meetings, whatever you think would be appropriate, so that they

---

know and they can plan on participating in those important meetings. Because there's no better way to get a handle on what's going on than to actually observe and participate.

As far as meetings with the Review Working Party, certainly remote meetings could be scheduled just as soon as all the contracting is complete and we're ready to go with the kick-off of the review. That's very much a standard part of our process.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, that clarifies that. Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Larisa, sorry, I missed what you were saying. When did you believe that the examiner would be selected?

LARISA GURNICK:

That would be in Marrakech, by a confirmation from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. Generally the way the process works is once they say they're in agreement with individual XYZ to be selected, then based on that our contracting people go into the whole contracting phase, and once that's completed they would be ready to go. We expect that to happen by early April.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Obviously, depending on where they're situated, the situation may vary. It would be really useful to have a face-to-face meeting before they start two months of work prior to the June meeting. I know we can try to do it on a teleconference. Face-to-face is somewhat more effective.

LARISA GURNICK: Alan, how could that happen? Do you have meetings already scheduled face-to-face that they could be invited to?

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no. I would say with one or two selected people. Obviously it depends where they are and where we are, but I'm a little afraid of them doing two months of work prior to really having any substantive and in-depth and confidential discussions. Take that for what it's worth.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think therefore the answer to #5.d, Larisa, is probably there are official meetings, there are scheduled teleconferences and so forth, but I think what Alan is saying – and I would agree with him – is there may be an opportunity, and in fact we should make the opportunity, for having much smaller and confidential meetings. When we say at Marrakech the person will be confirmed, there will be a process beforehand of selection of that individual.

I think Alan's concern was in going through the applications – probably not all of them – having an opportunity to look at perhaps... Well, if we take Cheryl's suggestion, which may be simply making the Chair part of the Committee, and therefore bound by all sorts of confidentiality requirements, if there is going to be any input other than us being very detailed as to what we want from someone, then it would have to be before Marrakech. So in fact the RFP is going to be going out, as I understand it, in December or January?

LARISA GURNICK: Early January.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right, so you need the criteria well before that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Larisa, if I understand correctly, if the decision is going to be formally made in Marrakech, the unofficial decision will have been made before Marrakech?

LARISA GURNICK: No. Here's the process: staff, meaning procurement, legal, various others, take part in evaluating all the proposal, based on all the specific criteria that we discussed and any others that come up, and we prepare an analysis and a score sheet, and based on that score sheet, that's what

---

gets presented to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee with a recommendation, if you will, but it's not a decision. Ultimately, they are the ones that confirm and....

ALAN GREENBERG: These recommendation, do they ever get overwritten?

LARISA GURNICK: Alan, I can only speak for the one time that I participated in the process myself, and nothing was... It was all in line. There were questions presented about qualifications and such, but I can't speak for prior to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: You wouldn't feel comfortable in inviting the person to the meeting based on that recommendation?

LARISA GURNICK: Correct. Certainly I think you'll understand in terms of leverage and contractual discussions, we certainly want to keep all the options open until there is confirmation.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would certainly make a lot of sense if that formal decision could be made two weeks earlier and the person could be gotten to the meeting.

LARISA GURNICK: I completely understand what you're saying, and I'll tell you what my plan is. I have a call scheduled with Rinalia, in her capacity as the Chair of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee in early December. That's something I'd have to discuss with her, because it really would be a matter of what she thinks would be feasible in-between the standard meetings of the Committee. I would also flag that I think our timeline is quite tight. I'm not sure how quickly we could make this happen to accommodate an inter-sessional call with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I interrupt here and just say I think we have to pay a little bit more attention on when we reply on the timelines – we're going to have to think very carefully about timelines leading up to the confirmation of the independent examiner. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Regarding #5, which I think is also asking for us to provide for you so it can be part of, "...And these following meetings may very well be useful for you to look at," not necessarily an expectation that they do, otherwise the cost is going to go up – but just a warning. We should

---

probably use some that our outreach and engagement calendar is noting – things like the various NIC regional meetings, where a number of our ALSes and Regional Leaders also gather.

Of course some of the regional IGFs would also fit into that, “Probably you should go and have a look at how the sub-units operate.” We can put those together fairly well, I think, Holly. Regarding having a couple of people sitting down and having a deep and meaningful with the heir apparent, even if it’s during the contracting phase, or certainly immediately after the contracting phase, you may find that there is a meeting where a number of us are already in attendance at one of these regional events. That may mean just getting one extra person there to have a conversation. I think that’s all I have to say on those things. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Larisa and Charla, in the chat Heidi has asked a couple of important questions. The first is: are you talking about, and would you like the dates for the RALO teleconferences? Do you need a date and time? Obviously those can be provided. But also the second question is: would there be funds for the independent examiner to observe events within regions where the ALSes are active? Maybe you don’t want to answer those straightaway, but they are important questions to think about when we’re coming up with the Charter in the next three or four days – considering it’s almost the weekend here.

---

First question, Larisa and Charla: are you talking about or would you like the dates for, say, the monthly teleconferences for each RALO? Are you thinking about those being listed, and therefore something that the independent examiner could participate in?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just before that, the previous examiner did do that as well, but there's a very different cost in saying, "There are multiple teleconferences. We would think it would be wise for you to attend at least one of these per region," because that's a couple of hours of their time, and saying, "This is a regional face-to-face meeting. You should probably consider attending," because that's significant cost in terms of full day costing, travel, accommodation, et cetera. Any expression of interest worth its salt would want to have that information so that they could cost it in during the process.

LARISA GURNICK:

Cheryl, I agree completely. My approach is to provide as much information about opportunities to engage, particularly remotely, and I would expect that any good independent examiner would take advantage of that. I would just want to be able to point, particularly if schedules are already available, or something high-level – I don't think it needs to be specific – but for example if there are monthly teleconferences, just to be able to say that they are there, and would be part of their work. That would be fine, and that's fairly easy.

---

As far as identifying key in-person meetings for the examiners to participate in, obviously it's a budgetary issue. Our plan is to require or suggest that they be available in-person, one or two of their key people, at each of the ICANN Meetings, starting with the June one. So it would definitely be June and October. This would be the time to figure out if there is another carefully selected and well placed meeting, or set of meetings, that they could take part in.

We could include that as part of the proposal, recognizing, as Cheryl said, that travel costs really expand the budget pretty quickly, so we'd have to be mindful of the additional cost. There would have to be a really strong reason why that meeting would be an essential component of their fieldwork, if you will, to help them with their evaluation.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Larisa, I'm putting myself in the queue before Alan. Heidi, does that answer the questions you raised in the chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, I also have a question, since we're going down the list of what should be in the Charter: lessons learnt from the 2008 Review. Now, do you seriously want, in the Charter, a whole section of what we've learnt?

---

Or do you see that as something that's a separate document? I'm puzzled, Larisa, as to what you wanted?

LARISA GURNICK: Let me clarify. I thought that the Working Party Charter should be a really high-level, simple document, just to clarify what the purpose of this group is, much like the GNSO Review Working Party did. As a matter of fact, a lot of these kinds of things that we're discussing, I wasn't thinking that they should be included in the Charter at all. Basically the Charter is for the Working Party to be the liaison and to provide ongoing guidance, and all those things that are outlined in the GNSO Review Working Party. I hope that that clarifies it.

HOLLY RAICHE: That does. Thank you very much. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Someone used the term "compelling reasons" for having a face-to-face meeting. I'll just mention one. One of our RALOs has multiple factions, which are at war with each other, and by the time the independent examiner is named, one of the groups may have seceded from the RALO.

HOLLY RAICHE: There may even be dead bodies, but we won't go there!

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Give me an example of how well we're working.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Trust me, you'll never find the bodies, that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's true. This is a part of the world where they specialize in never finding the bodies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Yes, we all have our little "put the bodies in the new terminal for the airport and they never find it".

ALAN GREENBERG: The bodies may be a joke. The rest of it is not.

LARISA GURNICK: I've got it.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Larisa, just to sum up, now that I think we've got a better handle on what should be in the Charter, and we've had a reasonably good discussion about the sort of interviews, we certainly put forward the view that we would like at least Alan and/or myself to have a look at, at the very least, two or three of the top candidates who are going to be put forward, but that's for another day. We're not regaling from that. We can come up with a Charter now, I think. You would like that in the next, I'm hearing you say, three of four days, at the max?

LARISA GURNICK: The Charter is really just a good governance asset. It's really for you folks and for the Working Party, so that as you start convening everybody, that all the Members are on the same page as to what their role is and what their purpose is in being a part of this Review Working Party. That's really the only purpose for the Charter. If you would rather call it something else that more clearly defines it for your group, I'm completely fine with that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Most of the stuff we've discussed – the timelines we discussed in Dublin anyway – so we've got a lot of that material. In terms of the Working Party, the independent examiner we have, the independent examiner will be finalized in Marrakech, and you've suggested that in fact the independent examiner will be there in June and October. That clarifies that issue on the Agenda.

---

LARISA GURNICK:

I'm sorry to interrupt, but I just wanted to make sure that you had seen... I think I circulated an updated roadmap that we put together? It actually pushes things out a little bit into 2017, and that was just based on doing a deeper dive and reality check of timing and all of that. Please use that. Really take a hard look at that. Probably the biggest lesson learned from my perspective is that it absolutely doesn't serve us well to try and come up with a very aggressive timeline that already people know will not be achievable. Because then we just keep pushing things out.

I would like to give a reasonable timeline as part of the RFP, so that we can hold whoever gets hired to do this accountable to that, and have an expectation that not only do they deliver on time, but that they can accommodate the needs of the community and give people ample time to provide feedback on all that. So please keep all that in mind and make sure that we are not short-changing the timeframes, and that at least based on what you know today, this is realistic. I'm sure that we'll find things that happen that make us need to reconsider parts of the timeline. But at least based on today, let's make sure it's realistic.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Excellent. Now, next steps – the next steps are you'd need a document that's very close to GNSO Review Charter. That's high-level. It should include the revised timelines that you've sent, and some overview of at

---

least the questions, probably not the answers, and you'd need that in the next little while. The things that you need reasonably quickly would be the evaluation criteria and the examiner selection criteria. In that regard we are working towards a teleconference within the next week to talk to the Working Party and come back to you with feedback on those two issues.

We also need to come back to you so that you can alert the independent examiner about the RALO Meetings and perhaps the General Assemblies being held – the sort of meetings where the independent examiner could attend, would be expected to attend. You would need those probably in two, three, four weeks?

LARISA GURNICK:

Yes, that all makes sense. On my part, as an AI, as I said I'll talk to Xavier, our procurement people, and Rinalia, sharing your concerns and understanding everybody's perspectives in this, to see how we can address this issue regarding the qualification and the selection. If there are specific concerns that you have about certain companies that either have done work before, or have applied before, and you feel that they would not be suitable candidates, I think that there is a place for you to confidentially identify that information for us to have as part of the process.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you for that. I think that was well-stated. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll respond to that, and I'll respond as candidly as I can without naming. There may be some who we don't want, but they may be the lesser of the evils, so I don't think we want to rule anyone out. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Are there any other issues? Larisa, are you happy with where we are up to?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, and please, I'd hope that it would be all right for me and Charla to be included in the Working Party call that you've got scheduled for next week. That way if there are questions, something that could be clarified, we could give you immediate responses just in the interest of time. We would certainly welcome the opportunity to participate.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Heidi and/or Ariel, if you can note that when we organize a Working Party Meeting to discuss the criteria, if we could

include Larisa and Charla, that would be very good. If there's nothing else, everybody has ten free minutes. You can go and have a cup of coffee before you talk for another hour.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Larisa, what is the exact date, what is the latest date that you need this information please?

LARISA GURNICK: The latest date would be the middle of December, December 15<sup>th</sup> or whatever the working day is around there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Any other comments? Excellent.

LARISA GURNICK: Just to respond to Heidi again, our plan is to start developing the RFP based on the high-level information that we've presented and included on those slides. So once you provide us with refinements or additional items we can continue to include those. [unclear 47:25] it would be good to see how that all translates into the RFP language. So my

---

---

question to you is when would you all want to see that? And how much time would you need to provide any additional input so that we could go live with the RFP at the beginning of January?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Less than a week, I'd have thought – seven to ten days, once the Working Party is functional.

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to say that there could well be interactions with the CCWG however. That may or may not be an exceedingly busy time.

HOLLY RAICHE: Has there ever not been an exceedingly busy time in the past year?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: What day was that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like one now. Can we stop? I'd like to go and change a very pooey nappy, unless you want to come and do it with me?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd be glad to. I'll be there in three days.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay honey. I'm not going to wait for that one. I really have to go. Bye.

LARISA GURNICK: Heidi, to accommodate that seven to ten days for the Working Party, or at least some Members to review the draft of the RFP, I think we'd have to probably back up on that December 15<sup>th</sup> date and make it a bit earlier so that that can all be wrapped up before the holidays. Otherwise we run the risk of being late.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Larisa, the Policy Staff will be at the annual Policy Workshop the week of the 30 of November through the 4<sup>th</sup> of December, so we'll have little time, and plus the Thanksgiving next week. So I'd say it's going to be, earliest, the middle of the week after, if staff are going to be involved in that, which will bring us to the 7<sup>th</sup> of 8<sup>th</sup> of December, something like that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Larisa, can you live with the 7<sup>th</sup> of 8<sup>th</sup>?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, Heidi you and I will work out how we're going to manage this, but if we can work towards the 7<sup>th</sup> of the 8<sup>th</sup> and get as much done beforehand as possible, then we can probably meet that timeline.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'm setting aside a lot of time tomorrow, I hope, for this.

LARISA GURNICK: I didn't quite understand. Do you have the Review Working Party call already scheduled for next week? Is that your timeframe?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: It will be Monday or Tuesday, most likely.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay. All right.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let me take a look at if Gisella's still up. I don't think she is. But I'm not sure what the time of the Doodle is.

LARISA GURNICK: NO worry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, well, Heidi and I will kick off on this one. We'll get the Doodle out as soon as possible. Just remember that Larisa, if it can be just you or Charla, are you comfortable with that in terms of the Working Party discussion on criteria?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. We will really do our best to make ourselves available once we know your timeframe.

TRANSCRIPTION NAME

---

HOLLY RAICHE:                   That's excellent. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:                Sure. Thank you all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**