
JULIE HAMMER: ...make a start. If you would be kind enough to do a roll call Yeşim.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yes, certainly, with pleasure.

Let's please start with recording and I will go ahead with roll call.

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Fourth Candidate Evaluation Committee 2017 Selection call, held on Thursday, 29th of September 2016, at 1200 UTC.

On the call today, we have Julie Hammer, Mohamed El Bashir, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gunela Astbrink, Yrjö Länsipuro, Vanda Scartezini, Eduardo Diaz, Louis Houle, Dave Kissoondoyal, Wolf Ludwig, and Murray McKercher. We haven't received any apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself Yeşim Nazlar.

Finally I would like to remind everyone to say their names before speaking for the transcript purposes. And over to you Julie, thank you very much.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you very much Yeşim.

And we've got a very full agenda today, so I'm going to try and push through it as quickly as possible. Thank you to the alternates for joining. I do appreciate that.

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 first five agenda items or four really, are ones that I particularly wanted you to join this for. And after that, you are welcome to drop off the call and we will continue.

The first thing that I wanted to discuss was BCEC code of conduct, that we have had that posted online. Vanda made a suggestion that we simply accept what was online, which is actually the same as the 2014 BCEC code of conduct. There was a comment from ... And I apologize. I can't remember who to suggest that we might want to think about including something about work practices in that code of conduct.

My suggestion would be that we put comments about the work practices in our operational procedures, and keep the code of conduct as it was last time and as it is in the 2017 draft. So I would like to ask for views on that at the moment and then talk about how we record our commitment to the code of conduct.

So I'd just like to ask if anyone has a comment. If there are no comments, then I will ask you to pick whether you agree that we should finalize this code of conduct as written.

I see Eduardo, Cheryl, and Yrjö, lots of green ticks. So thank you for that. I think we've got the majority of people in the Adobe room have indicated their agreement to proceed with the code of conduct as written. And what we will do is definitely include work practices in our operational procedures. So thank you all for that.

What I would so now like to suggest is that we record our personal agreements with, and commitment to the code of conduct, in an email to staff. My suggestion would be that I send out a request asking for

your agreement and that in response to that email you respond to the group and to staff, and that staff then record formally and then archive those emails. And that would include members and alternates, because we don't know at what stage alternates will need to be invoked at short notice. So, first of all, if there are any comments please raise your hand. If you are comfortable with that suggestion, could you please indicate with a tick?

Great. Again thank you very much for agreement. If anybody on the phone are not in the Adobe wishes to say something, please just interject at any time.

Ok, thank you. So with that, we've finalized the code of conduct. I will get that email out to all of you in very short notice.

And I would like to move on now to agenda item three, which is work practices and invoking alternates, and I particularly am keen to have the inputs of everyone including alternates on this. What I have done and circulated to you is some very, very rough drafts of what I thought might be useful operational procedures and guidelines. I have to confess, I couldn't find any from previous years. So I've out together what I thought might be a useful set of topics. And in that of what I would like to do, I'm just affirming what we agreed to in BCEC roles and responsibilities, that was what we covered off at our joint meeting last week. So if we could move down to BCEC meetings in the first instants. Just so you got control in the Adobe room yourself.

What I have written there is that we will agree on a regular time to conduct meetings via web conference, unless otherwise advised.

Weekly meetings will be attended by members only. The text highlighted in red is the text I'm particularly seeking input on. The BCEC will consider that a quorum is achieved if at least one member from each of the five RALOs is present. So I would like your input on that. And then the other thing I've mention about meetings is, BCEC may also progress by email between meetings where that is appropriate. And I think there are quite a few things where we can proceed by email rather than wait for meetings to make progress.

So I would like to seek your opinions on the issue of a quorum. Do we need to define what a quorum is? If so, is one member from each of the five RALOs present, is that adequate? So seeking your comments on that.

Yes, Murray, please go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER:

Yes. Hello. It's Murray McKercher speaking as an alternate. And I have gone though this process once before, so I think it's wise that the quorum is in there and the representatives from the RALOs [Inaudible] in ICANN. Just one comment about email between meetings, I think that's wise, but I would be a little bit cautious on the confidentiality of the information going over email.

That's my only comment on item one. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Murray. Julie speaking.

And I think that's really wise advice. I guess when I wrote that I was really thinking more about administrative aspects, but I'm glad that you brought that to my attention, because that is something to be very careful about. And perhaps what I will do is add in something about sharing confidential information over email. Although to some extent I think we do have that covered to a degree in the code of conduct, but it's a good point in any case.

Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Just a general suggestion. If we follow most of the NomCom procedures, we are going to be in the safe side. And not using names for instance, not putting any specific questions and points inside the email. So if we follow those rules, we are going to be okay. So that's my point, we should take a look at the NomCom and try to follow most of those procedures, we will be... Because we are selecting a board member anyway, and we should follow the same procedure that NomCom does, and the same request they do with the additional issue that people needs to know better ALAC and At-Large.

Just a first impression. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Vanda.

Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes, this is Eduardo.

I want to add to what Vanda was saying. It's true when we are using the NomCom, we use like numbers. I mean we know what the numbers are, so we know which candidate we are referring to, so we don't use names. But also, I think, I don't know if it has been done already, but we should have an email listing just for this group, so we can send mail to the mail list. Which I think we do, right?

JULIE HAMMER:

We already do. It's Julie speaking. It's called BCEC 2017, and that does not include alternates.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. And the other thing is that we using the NomCom is a Wiki space which is private only to this group. I don't know if that's there yet or what. So that is all my points.

JULIE HAMMER:

Julie speaking.

Yes, Eduardo. That's absolutely a great idea, and certainly what I was envisaging would happen. Because we don't yet have any confidential information yet exist. But Heidi, I'm sure staff will use to setting that up for different reasons, and there shouldn't be any problem in setting that up for us.

Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, this is Heidi. No, there is not a problem to do that.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Great. Thank you Heidi.

So thank you Eduardo, we'll definitely be doing that. And I will just make a note that we need to make reference to that in our operational procedures.

Thank you for those really helpful comments. I would now like to move on to the next section, which is work practice. Again this is relevant to our alternates. What I have drafted at the moment is that "BCEC members are expected to attend meetings, to undertake adequate preparation for meetings and to complete work required outside of meetings professional, thoroughly and within requested timeframes. Both BCEC members and alternates will participate in training sessions for the tools, which will be utilized to support the candidate selection process."

So I have a couple of questions. One is, do you think that the first part of that paragraph adequately describes our expectations for work practice without getting so specific that we become a bit draconian. And secondly, are you comfortable for members and alternates to actually undergo the training in tools. The thinking behind that is if we need to invoke an alternate member at short notice, we may not have time to get them up to speed on the tools. So that if they've already done some

training with the rest of us, in the early stages of this process, then we've solved that problem. So I would like to ask for your comments on this paragraph and those two particular points please.

I see Vanda has agreed.

Okay, so no comments. So if you are comfortable with what I've suggested there, would you please indicate a green tick?

Great, thank you very much. So on the basis of that, when we schedule some training sessions for alternates I will do my best to make sure that it's at a time convenient to alternates as well as members. And if we can't find one single time, we might have to seek our [inaudible] and maybe even do two training sessions, and I would attend both to accommodate everybody's schedule. So at this stage we haven't made any plans or, Heidi, I don't know whether you've had any opportunity to speak to Ken [Bauer] about this yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thanks for the reminder Julie. I will do that today.

JULIE HAMMER:

Great. Thank you so much Heidi.

Okay, so, work practice, tick.

Now this is the crux of the issue, if we could have the previous documents up again. Sorry Yeşim. If we could have those operational procedures up, and looking at paragraph seven. Now I am really seeking

your input on paragraph seven. Because this is just my initial idea, and you may disagree with them, and I'm more than happy if you do.

"The BCEC will invoke alternates under the following circumstances. A BCEC member from the RALO advises that they are unable to continue participating in the process." So I think that's a pretty reasonable one. And if someone says 'Something has come up, I just can't do it anymore', we need to be able to accommodate that.

The next couple though I would like your discussion on. "A BCEC member has not attended three or more meetings, and is deemed by other BCEC members to be unable to fulfill their responsibilities, or a BCEC member, although attending meetings, is deemed by other BCEC members to be not appropriately contributing to the process." So I would your thoughts on those, whether they are reasonable suggestions, whether you would change them in any way, or whether you would actually add in other circumstances that might warrant recording.

Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes.

I think it's a reasonable thing to use for this part, but the question here is when we say "by other BCEC members", how many members have to be in accordance for this to happen? One, or full body, two thirds? You know, we get into that thing.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: We might be getting into that.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, good point.

And what would you suggest?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Nothing comes to my mind right now. I'm just pointing that out. It's the first time I'm seeing this, so I don't have any suggestion yet, maybe other people might have something to say. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Thank you Eduardo.

Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. This is Yrjö Länsipuro.

I mean these situations that are described here are okay expect in my mind that, it's difficult to [inaudible] this question about whether there is appropriate contribution, so on and so forth. So I would prefer that we have more objective criteria for changing a member [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Yrjö, would you just suggest we keep the two and delete the third? Is that your suggestion? Or?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes, this is my suggestion.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you.

Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Hello, this is Gunela Astbrink.

Julie, I was also concurring with Yrjö there about how you actually quantify who is not appropriately contributing surpluses. It's a very difficult call, I do understand the reasoning behind it, but if we are to have it in there, it needs to be more quantified in regards to some particular parts of the process. And I understand that, that would be quite difficult.

So I can't offer anything at this stage, but it's something that we could consider if we are going to piece that one there. And that's the question.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Gunela.

Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I agree with Yrjö. That's very difficult. You know, you should call the person once. But due to the timeframe that is very short, that we have to make this decision... I do believe it is a second point that a BCEC member has not attended three. Three is too much. It's too maximal. And because we cannot lack with any person over time, so it should be two meetings. So two meetings, maybe it's all. So I believe that we need to have more close number, like two at minimal. If in the second, you should call the alternates.

JULIE HAMMER: Right. Okay, thank you Vanda.

I've just been advised that I'm missing some comments in the chat. I'm not as good as some of you at keeping up. So I'm just pausing for a moment to try and catch up with the chat. I note that Murray has suggested...

Oh, Jordi, you've joined us. Great. Thank you very much for joining.

I note that Murray is suggesting that a simple majority of members deciding to excuse another member. So that's a good point. Thank you for that.

There is a lot of agreement with Yrjö. Dave has said if the BCEC member is unavailable and know that they unable to attend meetings, for the sake of good running of the process, if the BCEC member has not attended one meeting and contacted the chair of the RALO, the BCEC should take into consideration that the message has come from the BCEC member through the chair of the RALO.

Dave, I'm not quite sure if I am understanding your point there. So if you would like to...

Right, thank you for putting your hand up. Vanda, I will give the floor to you, and then to Dave. Thank you Vanda.

Vanda [inaudible], Dave please.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL:

Okay, thank you.

The point I was trying to make is that, from paragraph seven the message comes from the BCEC member, and then we see that if three meetings hasn't been attended by the member, then the committee has the knowledge that member is not interested. But nowhere it is mentioned that the chair of the RALO informs the committee that, okay, we have a member, but specifically then that member will not be able to attend, so we are going to replace or have the alternate.

It's a matter of just putting in a condition that the message can come from the member or the chair of the RALO, or the leadership team of the RALO.

That's my call.

JULIE HAMMER:

Right, so just to check that I understand you correctly.

In the first stop point you are suggesting that a BCEC member or the RALO chair advises that they are unable to continue. Is that correct?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL:

Yes, the first point. Or we can leave the point number one as it is, and we put another point "The chair or the leadership team of the RALO informed that the BCEC member from the RALO is unable to continue for participating in the process." You just put one more. Because the message comes from the leadership team from the RALO.

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay, so I can add that in as a third point.

Is everyone in agreement with that?

Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Hi, what I see about this third point is in my view, it's someone has not good performance. For the short period, if you short period and then it would be clear after the end of our work, when do we should have 360 review of each one performance. And then that performance can be open, then the RALO will see if their indication was good or not. And

this can be used in another occasion. We don't have time, and we don't have really, a good criteria to... Just need someone during this short process, just because we don't have this time and we don't have appropriate process.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Vanda. Eduardo, take your comment, and then I will try and summarize what I've heard.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay, this is going to get very convoluted if we keep doing this. I think what Yrjö said about the number of meetings, that can be a point. If the member advises that they cannot keep participating, then that's it. I can think about following circumstances, I can add not following the code of conduct and not following the working practices, and all these circumstances that will have to have all the ifs of what happens to this, or if the chairs are... It becomes very convoluted. I think it should be something simple and this committee has a short period of time to do the work, so you know, we can do things easier than that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay, Julie speaking.

Thank you Eduardo. And to some extent you've summarized what I think I was going to say. So, I'm going to delete the third dot point as Yrjö and a number of you have suggested, because it's too complicated.

We will keep the first dot point as it is. We might include some words to say it's the RALO chair advises that they are unable to continue, then we will replace them. And the current second dot point, we will amend that to say "If a BCEC member has not attended two meetings, and is deemed by a majority of BCEC members to be unable to fulfill their responsibilities."

Can I ask if that's the correct interpretation of the advice you've given me? I see a couple of ticks.

Great. Okay. I will make those changes, and I appreciate all the feedback that you've given me.

So the only minor point in the next paragraph that I wanted to check with you was that, if we have to invoke an alternate, that I would be seeking the assistance of the other member from that RALO to help me get them up to speed. Would all of you who are full members be willing to assist me in that regard?

Again, I will just ask for green ticks, rather than too much discussion.

Great, thank you very much for that.

So at this point in time, we've covered... Because we've already had the discussion on the training tools which is agenda item four, and Heidi is going to be progressing on that, and all of you have agreed that everyone will be involved in that training. I will consider that, that agenda item has been covered. And so for those alternates who've joined us up till now, thank you so much for joining. It's not necessary for you to remain on the call, however should you wish to do so, I'm not

going to require you to leave. But you are very welcome to drop off the call at this point in time. Thank you very much for your attendance.

So I would now like to move on to agenda item five, which is the regular meeting time. Because we've tried to accommodate so many people, including the alternates for this meeting, it has been quite difficult to find a time that is suitable to everybody. Now that we are down to our core group of eleven, I would like to try and find a time that is a bit more suitable for everyone. I thought I would open up another Doodle that had perhaps more hours of the day to explore your availability and to ask whether there is a particular day of the week that we should focus on. Noting that Fridays are quite difficult for some of our members for religious reasons.

So I would like to ask whether Thursday might be a reasonable day to focus on. If again, maybe ask for green ticks. If we can explore Thursdays, or have to explore every day of the week.

Okay, lots of green ticks, brilliant. Thank you. So what I'll do is I'll work with staff to send out another Doodle poll. Some of you have suggested that rotating meetings might be a good idea. I must say myself, I think that can sometimes add complications, so what I would like to try and do in the first instance is try and find a single time in the day when we can lock it into our diaries each week, and meet there.

And I know Carlos has joined us as well. So welcome Carlos, thank you for joining.

Right, so I will move on now to agenda item six, which is the draft candidate's requirements. Now, I know a couple of you have said we

should just be focusing on the same candidate requirements as for the NomCom. To be best of my understanding, that's exactly what we have here.

Thank you Yeşim for putting that up.

The page that I have put together is slightly different from the candidate requirements that were used in 2014. The changes are that, under ICANN Directors shall be, I have updated that wording to agree exactly with the new bylaws. And really, the only thing that has changed between the old bylaws and the new bylaws here is that what was originally number five has been deleted, which was "Persons who are willing to serve as volunteers without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses." That has been removed in the new bylaws, because directors now do receive not just reimbursements but actually director's compensation. So that now agrees exactly with the new bylaws. And the words under Additional Bylaw Qualification, again, they are exactly out of the new bylaws. So, that would align completely to my understanding with what the NomCom would be focusing on.

Then under ICANN Operating Principles, I've simply used the same qualifications as the NomCom to the best of my knowledge. So I think we are pretty well in line there.

And then under the ALAC specific guidelines, there was one new criterion introduced in 2014, and that was an understanding of our [inaudible] At-Large. So my question is are you comfortable that we've covered off appropriately the candidate requirements in what I have put up here? Is there anything additional that we might need, or would

you prefer to go away and think about it, and respond by email in a couple of days?

So I would like to open the floor to comments.

Vanda, thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Well, I just, I believe that, for many of us that have been in NomCom, this is quite clear. If someone that is new could read better and [inaudible], and really the five items. And the ICANN Directors shall be, that is all the conversation, all the discussion, will be in English. Because when we are talking about At-Large group, if from different regions, there is a lot of people that is not really able to be understood or be clear in English, and this makes the work inside the Board very difficult. So, I would believe to enforce that this point is important. And we have in the past some problems related to that, and this is something I believe is quite important for At-Large, especially people inside the Board.

It's just that. All the others, I believe is quite good recommendations and guidelines.

I do believe also, sorry, that the information about the new structure of ICANN should be a requirement. So during questions or interview or what else we can do... Big knowledge about the after IANA transition that is ready now, should be a point that people need to understand to join the Board.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Julie speaking.

So Vanda, first of all you talked about working in English, so that is number five of the first paragraph. Was there something additional that you thought needed to be added? My understanding is that that's already there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. I just would like to put this in the [inaudible], just because we are talking about people in many regions where English is not the main language. And people, many of them are not able to be quite understood in English. Just to reinforce that. It's nothing... I know that it is there, that's my first point. I said is five point, that to reinforce that, because not to allow candidates to join without... And we waste time if people that we analyze are not really able to participate in English. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Vanda. So let me make sure I understand you correctly. What you are suggesting is that when we come to evaluate candidates, that we take that into full considerations, rather than we actually need to change anything regarding English in what we have here, which is our candidate requirements. Is that correct?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. But, first of all I would like to put those in highlight or in bold, to avoid people that are not able to express themselves in English to even be a candidate.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll go to Cheryl, and then perhaps after [inaudible] other comments from that point.

Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Julie.

It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

I put my hand up first of all to indicate that I feel these criteria as [inaudible] were fine and indeed, were the ones that we should go ahead with. I think it's probably reasonable as Vanda indicated that we do bold up if needed, or underline, or make slightly larger in font, the operational ethics that are required, the one "[inaudible] have a good command of written and spoken English". I do understand Vanda's point. And unfortunately it is one that has become an issue [inaudible], not in recent times for any NomCom appointee, but we have had situations from ASO, sorry, Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee appointments have been [inaudible], and it has become quite an issue in the past. That said, it's a point well taken, I certainly agree with you.

I noticed Carlos has asked for a couple of days on this, I'm happy enough to do that, although I would be equally happy to agree on it now. But I think what's important is that we recognize these criteria, these candidate requirements will be published, they have to be published under existing expectations and At-Large Advisory committee will [inaudible] requirements. But we will be putting these into the call for expressions of interests, and that's something we do need to start working on. And I know you will get to that Julie, relatively quickly. All of these, with the changes you have made to fit in line with the compensation now, with some minor modification, is pretty much what has been used since 2010. And I'm thinking we really should be able to just sort of get on with the job on these. If we are going to give any time for us to consider these, I would suggest we don't give ourselves any more than 48 hours to do so.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Cheryl.

Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I disagree in highlighting in the point number five, because to me, when I look at it if you highlighted, you are telling me that is the most important thing that a Director should have. And I think it's a combination of all this, all the other items too. So I will keep it the way it is, and people can read it. And our group is the one that's going to

evaluate those people based on those requirements, so if we all understand that the person cannot communicate in English [inaudible], that's a fact that we will take in the evaluation. And the other thing is, I think this is a very pretty concise requirement. I think you did a great job here picking up pieces from the NomCom, from the ICANN bylaws and the ICANN and At-Large. And I think those requirements are there, we can wait forty-eight hours to do this. But our work is very... We have a short period of time doing this, so I'm ready to agree on this now, but if other people feel different, that would be fine for me.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Eduardo.

Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, thank you. Cheryl, I don't want to go in deep drafted documents. Just this ICANN legalese is hard to swallow. If we are going to attract people from a wide background, I just want a day or two to read it and put some questions where I think I need a clarification. You when I read notwithstanding anything here to the contrary, it's already difficult, it takes me longer than a minute. Not only because of the language, but because I'm not a lawyer. So I'm not planning to redraft this, it's just this legalese stuff is sometimes hard to swallow, and maybe some clarification might be useful.

Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may?

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Carlos.

Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [CROSSTALK]. Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Julie. That was a fresh hand I had put up, [inaudible].

Carlos, I appreciate that, and one of the reasons I supported a no more than 48 hours was to allow people to take the time to do that. By the way, technically as Gunela has noted, you can increase the font size. This is an unsynced document, if you select the full page view for the pod, you should be able to make it far more readable. I'm working on an 8-inch tablet, and I can manage to get it up large enough for my old eyes to do. So even talking to staff, I thought you improve the usability of the document size.

I want to disagree with you on the notwithstanding and legalese aspect of this. I recognize we all need to be comfortable and happy, but most importantly, a potential applicant, someone who we would be getting an acceptable expression of interest, if they can't manage the level of language that this is currently written in, they will have a snowball's chance in hell in managing a single Board meeting or advice, or understanding the detailed advice that ICANN Legal would be giving them in terms. I know Vanda has served on the Board, that she is well aware of the unbelievably large amount of briefing material that comes

out before Board meetings, and if you think this is a complicated level of language and legalese, this would pile to insignificant by comparison. I'm not fearful of putting out something at the level of language, which at least reflects the type of language level the people would have to work in. But that's probably me being a little harsh.

Perhaps... offline conversation with Vanda, with anybody who wants to know exactly from her perspective, which was a few years ago, I admit, the enormous amount of prep material, which is in some cases, two and three arch file folders full that is given.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Cheryl.

So I guess just to put my own perspective on a couple of those points. I think Vanda made a good suggestion with regards to including a requirement under ALAC specific guidelines, including that the candidate has an understanding of the new ICANN structure, post IANA transition. So, I would... Vanda I notice your hand, but I might just finish summarizing.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

No problem. Go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:

So, I would ask if you agree with that, because we haven't really had any discussion on that, would you put a green tick in the chat now or in the Adobe now? I thought that was quite a good suggestion.

Thank you. So I see lots of green ticks. So I will add something under ALAC specific guidelines there.

To express my personal view regarding highlighting written and spoken English, I think my personal view is in line with what Eduardo expressed. I understand how important that is, but I wouldn't really like to highlight a single requirement over any other in what we put out. We can certainly make sure that when we are engaging with candidates, that we make judgments in that regard. My personal view is that I feel a little reluctant to highlight that one thing in the candidate requirements over and above all others.

So I just again ask for... Can I ask for a green tick if we don't highlight that? In line with what Eduardo suggested.

Okay, so thank you for that. So I will make that one addition and the...

Thank you. Vanda, you wanted to add something?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes. I haven't seen in this list one point that is quite important for the Board work, is time, time commitment. Because what was there in general in my roll or something like that, does not represent the time spent in all the work.

[CROSSTALK]

JULIE HAMMER: Excuse me Vanda. If you look at the bottom of first page, there is a whole section titled “Time Commitment and Working Practice” outlined in the notes.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Because, I will suggest in the ALAC specific guidelines, is also to report back to ALAC and participate in the most [inaudible] way in the ALAC issue. Because it is important for someone that is [inaudible] as a member of our choice, that could be very important. So we are seeing Rinalia now participating a lot of [inaudible] issues. And that keep tracking everything that we have done.

So, it’s vey important in my point of view for a candidate. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Can I ask for green ticks if the members feel that it would be useful to add [inaudible] criterion about working with ALAC. I will need to work on some words for that. Can I ask for green ticks if you think that should be included, or red crosses if you think it should not. I am also noting that we got one minute to the top of the hour, and a couple of agenda items still have to go. So I’ve got a few ticks. Vanda I’m assuming that’s an old hand.

Eduardo, please go ahead. Eduardo, I can’t hear you. I see Eduardo is typing in the chat. Okay, you’ve got disconnected.

So I will work on some phraseology to add in those two ALAC specific guidelines that we've discussed. And when Eduardo gets connected back in again, we can go to him and see what his comment is.

Eduardo just interrupt when you are back online. You're there now?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

JULIE HAMMER: Go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello, can you hear me?

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, I can hear you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted say that this requirement that we are talking about, so that the person should participate in the meeting, it's something that will happen in the future. [AUDIO BREAK]. I can tell you what drive record is, and I can find out if there is an understanding of [inaudible] ICANN, things like that, because these I can really talk about, but are you going to participate in the meetings. Yes.

JULIE HAMMER:

It's a good point you are making. I will see if I can come up with some words that capture the sense of what Vanda was saying. And if we can't find the right words, we might just leave it as is.

I would like to move on now. I had expressions of interest proforma on the agenda. I don't think we've got sufficient time to really talk about that in any depth. But my intent is that as soon as we finalized the candidate requirements and I'll update them first thing in the morning my time, and send you out an email for you to consider them. And will just take 48 hours for those of you who aren't as familiar as some of the others to just get their minds around them. And then we will agree that they're finalized. What I would ask others to do, particularly those of you with some experience in this process, is to have a look at the old expression of interest proforma, get a bit of feel for how it might need to be updated or improved this time around. There will need to be some changes with the changed wording in the bylaws. So if you could start having a look at that, and we might try and do a little bit of work on that outside the meeting on the list.

The final thing that I have circulated, and again I think we might be a little bit early in the process to be able to agree to this today. I've circulated Tijani the proposed timeline. He is going want our agreement as to whether we believe we can meet that or not. At this stage, I'm not sufficiently familiar with the work that we need to do to be confident that we can meet that timeline. But many of you are more experienced than I, so what I would ask you to do is, over the next week, everyone look at that timeline, and provide feedback as to whether you believe we can meet that timeline or not. So I guess homework for the group is to review the draft candidate requirements and when I recirculate

them, provide your concurrence. Have a look at the expression of interest proforma and compare it to the draft candidate requirements, and look at the proposed process timeline and provide feedback on that.

Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Went to speak and almost nothing happened. Thanks, Julie. Cheryl, for the record.

Just going back a step. And yes, we do have to look at this timeline in detail. But it does however give us a lot of indication as to why we need to get on with this job, and get on with it promptly, effectively and efficiently.

I would like to offer my assistance on a little redrafting on the [inaudible] expressions of interest documentation that was used last time. But also I wanted to ask that we decide as a group that we will be using the online facilities for these expressions of interest. The creator that is currently, but currently I mean up until including the current serving NomCom, not the one that is coming into existence at the end of the year, but this one that just finished its extensive work other than recording, because as far as I know, a couple of things such as the ability to save the document and not have to do anyone sitting, that's different now. Because the online tools, which are already built and [inaudible] leverage of, would improve year after year. So we want to not only just redraft it on a few of those things, just to bring it up to speed, but we want to make sure that we agree that we will be using those online

tools for the collections, cause it's going to make all our lives a lot easier.

Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think that's a fantastic idea. I certainly am hoping that everyone is willing to use the online tool, especially after they have been gathering through...

Can I just ask everyone to indicate by a green tick that they are supportive of using the online tools that are available for us to go through this process?

Thank you very much, that's great.

So I've already gone seven minutes over time. The one other item of homework that I would ask you to do and respond initially by email that Cheryl has offered to put it up in a Google doc as well, is provide me feedback on the other items that I've drafted in our operational procedures and guidelines.

Oh, something just changed.

I've put them together as a very initial draft. I know many of you are a lot more experienced and I would like to tap into that experience. So please provide me feedback. We do have to have these procedures approved by the ALAC as a whole, which means we have to get them finished fairly promptly, and up on the Wiki, I envisage that [inaudible] should be public procedures for everyone to be able to see, so I would

like us to be working on them between now and the next meeting. So please, once Cheryl has got the document up on Google doc, she will send a link to that, and we can all work on that.

So before wrapping up, can I just ask if there is any other business that anyone would like to raise at this time?

In that case, thank you for making a lot of progress. We got through an awful lot on this agenda, and I really thank you for all your comments, and great input. And look forward to working with you between now and our meeting next week, and then talking to you again next week.

Thank you to everyone. Thank you to our staff for all of your support too. Goodnight and talk soon.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks everyone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Bye.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned. [inaudible] Thanks very much for your participation and have a [inaudible] rest of the day. Bye-bye.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Yeşim. Thanks Heidi, thank you Ariel.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Have a lovely day. Bye-bye.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]