
PART ONE:

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) call, taking place on Thursday, the 13th of October, 2016 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today we have Louis Houle, Julie Hammer, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Jordi Iparraguirre, Alan Greenberg, Murray McKercher, and Mohamed El Bashir. We have listed apologies from Vanda Scartezini and Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez.

From staff, we have Ken Bour, Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Julie. Please begin.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Julie Hammer speaking. So I'd just like, very briefly, to acknowledge the huge amount of work that Ken Bour and Ariel Liang have been doing behind the scenes, adapting the NomCom tools that have been used in that Board's member selection process for us. We still have a little way to go, we think. We've enlisted Alan Greenberg behind the scenes to have a look at the tool, and he's highlighted a couple of issues, both with the tool, but also with our process that we will need to discuss as a committee and perhaps revisit one or two of our positions. But that will come out perhaps as we go through, but also I'll need to cover that in the meeting after our training session. So I'd like to hand over to Ken now to lead us through, and I think he and

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.

Ariel are going to walk us through what they've done. Thanks very much, Ken.

I'll go on mute now and ask everybody else who's not speaking to please go on mute. And if you have a question as we go through, perhaps Ken would indicate whether he wants questions to be held till the end, or whether he's happy to take questions as we go through. Over to you, Ken. Thank you.

KEN BOUR:

Thank you very much, Julie. This is Ken Bour. I'm going to just give a brief introduction to what we're presenting today. Ariel is going to take the lion's share of the oaring and the getting us through the tutorial, if you will.

Just as sort of a little bit of background – you probably know all this already, so I'll keep it brief – I was asked by a combination of Julie and Heidi and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, because they knew of my work with the NomCom. About three years ago, we built an entire Wiki Confluence platform solution to help automate, track, record, document the whole process all the way from the beginning of the application form, where the candidates would fill it out, and all the way through the polling and voting and where the committee members did all their evaluations. So we went soup to nuts building this platform, and it's been largely extremely successful, according to feedback that I get from NomCom, from Joette Youkhana and others – and I think Cheryl Langdon-Orr remembers her having participated in that as a committee member. So they asked if we could figure out some way to maybe repurpose, reuse,

and take the essence of what we did for NomCom and then apply it to your particular Board Member selection process. And, indeed, we have done exactly that.

So I started out by grabbing the various pages that are on the NomCom. They have their solution on a completely different Wiki platform – it's protected, and it's secure. They have certain security requirements that I don't think apply as much to your process, so what we did is, instead of building a separate platform, which would have been very expensive and very time-consuming, we're using the ICANN Community Wiki, and we've created a separate space in there for this purpose. Actually, the space was already there; we just reorganized it. And the page that you see right now on the Adobe Connect Room is the home page, which is colorful and nice, and short and sweet, and basically, it guides both candidates and committee members to various important aspects and elements within the solution.

So after I did all this initial design work and put the structures up, one of my goals was to train Ariel Liang, so that she could actually not only administer, but she could learn the underlying technology – the macros, and the plug-ins, and all of the programming that's required, the parameters – to be like a second. And in fact, she has developed so much skill, and she has learned so fast, that I feel perfectly comfortable turning this over to her. She consults with me back and forth, but she's really the driver here, and I am as pleased as I can be to have participated in her rapid learning. By prior agreement, we said, "Well, Ariel, why don't you walk the committee through this? You know it by heart, and you've had a lot to do with putting it together." So with that,

I'm going to be quiet and turn it over to Ariel, and then I'll go on mute. Unless there are any questions for me?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you so much, Ken. This is Ariel Liang, for the record. First, I really want to say thank you to him, because without him, we cannot get to this revamped space for the Board Member Selection Committee, so I really want to appreciate all the skills he taught me. And then also, I want to say thank you to Julie, Cheryl, and Alan, that provided all the input and advice in a very timely manner, so now we can incorporate all these changes into the space and tools that we're going to use for selecting a candidate.

So, Julie, if this is okay with you, I will do a quick overview of the structure of this space, and then I will focus on the Expression of Interest you asked for after this general walkthrough. Are you okay with this arrangement?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes, please. Go ahead, Ariel. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay. Thank you, Julie. So what you can see right now is the home page. The way we've constructed the page is to make sure if an interested candidate stumbled upon the page, they can find information relevant to the application immediately; and then also, another target audience for the page are all the committee members, so they can find their relevant workspace and documents quickly, as well. That's why

we want to make sure to list only the essential information on this page, with very clear logic. Then people can quickly find what they need.

So I'll just quickly go through these different sections. Of course, the first part is providing a very brief background, what the Board selection process is about. And then, in this last green box, we listed these five most important pages, links for interested candidates to check out, to start the process. Of course, the requirements for candidates is the first one; and then we also have the comprehensive page with instructions, and then teach interested candidates how to request an Expression of Interest form, and then submit it. That's in the instruction page. And then the third is the reference page for all the pertinent documents and links.

Just as a reminder, please mute your phone or audio when not speaking. Thank you.

And so, the third one is the reference page for all the pertinent documents and links for any interested candidates. And then, the fourth important page is, of course, the Expression of Interest form, where an applicant can locate his or her form under that page. We also apply some kind of security measures to protect their confidentiality, and I will talk about that later.

And then the fifth one, we also want to develop a sample Expression of Interest form, just for anyone to have a sneak peek and understand the detail and the level of details you need to provide to apply for this position.

So, these are the five most important resources. And now, we also spell out the privacy policy, and make sure that candidates understand that we will protect their identity profiles, and make sure they don't worry about these things. And then we [inaudible] a Code of Conduct of BCEC, here.

And then, below this line, it's basically a content stream or structure of the space, and you can see all these important pages listed here. It's actually a comprehensive list of all the pages in the space. So I will walk through them quickly, one by one.

The first one is the Expression of Interest form. This is where a candidate can find his or her own EOI form. And then we will use some kind of macro or restriction to make sure that if an applicant accesses this space, he or she can only see his own form, and not the other people's forms. And then during the application process, while this application is still under development, we will not open this space – we won't reveal the content to the BCEC members yet, until everything is completed. So this is some kind of security measure we put in here, and we will talk about that in detail when we walk through the forms.

The second page is the Board Member Candidate Requirements page, which BCEC members have agreed upon, so we had them put a list of all the information here. Also, we made sure that nobody can add this content except for Julie and also program staff, just to make sure that people don't stumble upon it and mess with the content here.

The third page is the At-Large Board Member Application Instruction page. Here we tried to make the instructions very clear, in full form,

step one, step two, so they understand exactly how to initiate the process. So we provide the background of this selection process first, as a kind of beginner information, and the second box you see is how to request an Expression of Interest form. It's actually quite simple; it's just to send an email to the program staff admin. We created a dedicated email address just to deal with EOI-related matters, as we understand concerns about confidentiality, and we want to make sure only authorized staff can interact with the candidates and provide their logins and other EOI forms. So basically, essentially, it's just to send an email, but we also want to emphasize that candidates need to read the Candidate Requirements Document and other reference documents to make sure that they're eligible to apply for the position. So with that, [inaudible] putting information here.

And then, the third box is how to complete an EOI form. There are quite a few instructions here, but in general, the first thing they need to understand is that they need to use their ICANN Wiki login to log into this platform first, in order to access their form. If they don't have a login, they need to contact the Program Admin, and I can create their ICANN Wiki credentials. And on the second one is how to add content on their EOI form. We provide all these useful bullets for them to read through. I would really appreciate your feedback, maybe after the call you can read this in detail and let us know if we missed anything.

We also highlighted some important tips – for example, “this form must be completed in English,” we've highlighted here. And on the third [CROSSTALK]

JULIE HAMMER: Excuse me, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes?

JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I just noticed that Alan has asked a question in the chat, and I thought this might be a good place to put the question to you. He's asked, "What mechanism is used to return to an applicant's form? Is it a cookie, or is it linked to the Confluence logon ID?" So I just wonder if you or Ken could –

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, thank you, Julie. Thank you, Alan, for that question. The way to return to the form is using the link. For example, when the applicant expresses their interest to start the process, that will send them an email, and that email contains the link that goes to the form. So they need to safeguard that link and use it to locate their form. But if for any reason they lost that link, if they still remember how to get to this At-Large Board Member Selection homepage, and if they click on the Expression of Interest, this page, they will see their form here. Because they can only see their own form, they will not see anybody else's form, so the only form located here is their individual one. Whether it's a link to their Confluence login ID – they need their Confluence login ID to access this Wiki first. And yes, it's linked, because we use this new restriction that only lets them see their own form here. And this is linked to their login ID. Alan, I hope I answered your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, Ariel. To be clear, we've done a number of other surveys in At-Large in the last couple of weeks, where we were told that you always return to your link, to your survey; but it turned out it was related to a cookie, so it only worked if you were from the same machine. So I wanted to be clear what the issue was here. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. It's not really a cookie. This is a [inaudible] on the Google Form that we dealt with earlier.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is linked to the Confluence ID. That is your answer, correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Correct.

Okay. So thank you, and we'll keep going. Let me just go back to the instructions page and quickly finish this explanation here. So basically, this third [inaudible] is how to complete an Expression of Interest form, and it's got all the important information and details and tips to

facilitate the process, and we hope it's comprehensive enough for any applicant to find answers to their questions throughout the process. We also made sure they can find the Program Admin's email anywhere – well, a lot of places – on this page, and throughout the whole Wiki space. So if they run out of solutions, they can always email us and I can answer their questions. So that's this page.

The next one is the Reference Links and Resources page. You probably recall that before, it was a simple Wiki page that listed all the Candidate Requirements reference documents – for example, ICANN Bylaw Article 7, Articles of Incorporation, and all this information. So we still retained all the original information, and we listed it in a very clear table format; and then we also included some other information – for example, the ALAC Rules and Procedures, and also the Instructions page that I just showed you earlier, and other important information such as the BCEC members and alternates. One of the questions of the form is to ask people to provide referees, and these people are not supposed to be BCEC members. So we make sure to provide all this information and think of all the possible scenarios, and list all the relevant resources here, in this table. And then we also specify whether they are internal links – whether they are within this Wiki – or whether these pages are outside the Wiki, just to provide some kind of additional information. So that's the Reference Links and Resources page.

The next one is the Board Member Selection Timeline that the BMSTC has recently approved. We believe this is very important not only for the interested candidates to understand the timeline, but also for those committee members. We made sure to put this at a high level, so everybody can find it quickly by looking at this last navigation.

Next, I will quickly touch upon the rest of the sections in this space. This is the public-facing work space for both committees. We didn't do many changes within the pages, but you can find the [inaudible] Teams and other documents, Code of Conduct, quickly from this [inaudible] page. And then, this becomes the interesting part of the space. We also tried to create these restricted spaces for BCEC members to conduct their work. So for example, when it's time to do candidate polling, of course it will be quite confidential, so we want to make sure in this space, only BCEC members and Program Admin staff like me and Heidi can access and view the content here.

We also have another section, Program Admins Restricted Work Section. That's mainly for me and Heidi and Ken. So for example, when we judge the applicants, we want to make sure that we can see what the statuses are. For example, we had Alan fill out a pamphlet to test how it works, and then this table automatically pulls information from this Expression of Interest space, and that will populate the content and let us know who's submitted what information, and a link to their form. In this way, we can keep track of people's progress. But this will only be viewable by the admin, and nobody else can see it. So this is an admin-restricted area.

And lastly, we also have an Archive Area for the previous two rounds, and once this round completes, we will drag all the content down to the Archive section and we'll create a new equivalent for future rounds that will keep everything in one place. So that's the overall structure of this space.

Because today we are mainly focused on the Expression of Interest form, I will go here, and we can have plenty of time for questions and answers, too. So this, what you see, is an Expression of Interest form, and thanks again, Alan, for providing that content. I will put the link in the chat and you can also take a look at it yourselves. Basically, this form is structured by interesting

[AUDIO BREAK – END OF PART ONE TRANSCRIPT].

PART TWO:

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) call, part B, taking place on Thursday the 13th of October, 2016. On the call today, we have Louis Houle, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Jordi Iparraguirre, Mohamed El Bashir , Yrjö Länsipuro, and Gunela Astbrink. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this, I'll turn it back over to Julie. Please begin for part B.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you very much, Terri. And just to confirm, we no longer have – this is a question – we no longer have Fatimata, Carlos, and Vanda on the phone bridge?

TERRI AGNEW: Confirmed.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: They are no longer on the call.

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay, thank you. So, formally, we don't have a quorum because we don't have any representatives from LACRALO, but what I'll try and do is, if we make any decisions as part of this meeting, we'll try and confirm them very quickly by email.

So, in order to meet our timescale of having our call for Expressions of Interest out by next Wednesday, there are a number of documents that we need to finalize. One, of course, is the Expression of Interest form, itself, which Ariel and Ken have just gone through for us. As you can see, there is still a little bit of fine-tuning that we need to do on that. But I think that most of the issues identified today can be resolved in the next few days behind the scenes, and we'll be working hard to do that.

The other two documents that need to be finalized from a wording point of view are the call for Expressions of Interest email that will be sent out by Staff – and I sent you a link to our current version of that on the Wiki – and the staff response to that Expression of Interest request.

So, there are a couple of things that Alan highlighted when he was going through doing his application that I now need to discuss with you, because it affects the wording in that. The first is the references, which we had thought we would get the candidates themselves to submit. That seemed to me like a pretty good idea at the time, but Alan has pointed out the pitfall in that, and that is that we won't – that referees may feel reluctant to state some issues if they know that the candidate is going to have visibility of those references. So I would like to ask the committee whether you feel we should revisit that decision, and actually seek the references separately from the referees directly,

rather than ask the candidates to submit them. I'd like to ask for views on that, please.

Okay, so what I might do, rather than ask you to comment is, if you think we should revert to the original proposal of seeking references directly from the referees, would you please put a tick in the Adobe Connect, or a cross if you don't?

Can anyone hear me?

UNKNOWN 1: Yes, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Ah. Thank you, Louis. I really need you to give me a view, or at least ask a question or raise an issue, because this is a decision that we must make, if we're going to move forward. Louis has put a tick in the Adobe Connect.

Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Julie, I'm confused, here. Can you repeat what we are doing here? Because I missed something. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry. Okay. What we had decided as part of our process was that we would ask the applicants, themselves, to go and get their references,

and submit them as part of their Expression of Interest form, that the applicants would upload their references. That is how our procedure is currently structured. What the NomCom do is, they get their applications with just the names of the referees, and they then approach the referees directly for the written references, so that the candidate, themselves, doesn't necessarily see those references. The candidate doesn't submit them. So, Alan has pointed out that the disadvantage of asking the candidate to get their references from a referee is that the referees may feel reluctant to say anything negative about the candidate. Alan has suggested that we might rethink that; and so, what I'm asking the committee to do now is revisit our decision about whether we should go directly to the referees for their references. Yrjö, please – would you like to make a comment?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yes, thank you. This is Yrjö Länsipuro, for the record. I would recommend that we follow the NomCom practice, because it has worked quite well over all these years. That is to say that the candidates, when they start to make the applications, they indicate whom they want to have their references, also with email addresses and so on, and so forth. So it is then possible for the staff to approach them and ask for references. Now, in this system, if the candidate has given a name of a referee, but actually the referee is not eager to say anything, this gives the option for the referee to remain silent. There have been a lot of cases in the NomCom practice, where candidates have indicated referees but those have actually just remained silent. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Yrjö. And I guess my first question is, is there anyone who needs further clarification about the question I'm asking? That is, should we go to that same process as the NomCom and get the references directly, ourselves? So, any further clarification needed before I ask you to indicate with ticks and crosses? Okay, so seeing no hands – oh, I'm sorry, Eduardo. Please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to be clear that I understand this, because I'm also in NomCom. Let me put it in my own words, and let's see if we're talking about the same thing. The NomCom, the applicant puts their own references in the application. And then, we contact them – the references – in different groups. We go through the process and call them directly, or contact them directly about the candidate. Is that what we're talking about?

JULIE HAMMER: That's correct.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That we do it that way? Okay, thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: That's correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Julie. It's [inaudible]. I think we need to be a little bit [inaudible], here. Unless they've changed radically – it's Cheryl, for the record – an Expression of Interest to NomCom provides the name and contact details of their references, and then NomCom reach out to those referees, not the applicant provides already-written-by-the-referee references. So I think we need to be really clear on the language here.

JULIE HAMMER: That's correct, and I've actually changed the terminology to use the word "referee," because I noted in the NomCom template, that they were using the term "reference" for both the written piece of paper and the person. So I've actually changed the terminology in our form to use the term "referee" when we're talking about the person, and "reference" when we're talking about the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Julie. Listening to Eduardo and knowing that what he was saying was interpreted both ways, I wanted to make sure that everyone is really clear on what they were supporting or not, because it makes a big difference to our work.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes. So, I guess my question is, are you all comfortable if we change what we had intended to do, and now we simply ask for the names of the people who are going to provide the references to be submitted by the candidate – and their contact details – and we directly approach

those people to provide those written references? Could I ask you to indicate a tick in the Adobe if you're agreeing to that proposal?

Great. And Louis, I think you had indicated a tick earlier, and – okay, thank you. So we'll go ahead and do that. What I will need to do is quickly change paragraph 11f in our Operational Procedures, which I had submitted to Alan, but I'll do that very quickly to correct that. It will also affect what we say in our Expression of – in some of our instructions on that form. So Ariel and I will need to go through our form, and align that with what we've now decided, and restructure the form slightly.

So, the second issue that affects our document for approval is what information we actually publish. So we've already discussed this to some extent, when Alan was on the call. This is publishing a list of candidates who've applied. We've said in our Operational Procedures that we intend to publish the names of the candidates who applied, and that we will do that after the applications close. And what Alan has pointed out, and we haven't currently got it covered in our consent form, is that we really need to publish the Expression of Interest, at least of the final candidates on our slate that we put forward to the At-Large community for voting by the ALAC. So I'd like to ask for comments, questions, about what we should do regarding that. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Julie. I will hark back the experiences we had in the 2010 round. I'm not personally familiar with the 2013-14 round. But in 2010,

and the reason I am so keen to make sure that we have a clear and unambiguous requirement that for a complete Expression of Interest application to be satisfying for us, to meet that basic is-it-complete-or-not criteria, that our applicants do need to give permission for at least a minimal amount, which [inaudible] discussed and agreed to, to be published at the time of the final slate.

I'm less convinced that we need to put the amount of material that we will then allow to be published on the slate, out for everyone. I understand the rationale, but if I may – let me assume – let me take you to an example. I'm a RALO leader, and I note in the name list of those who put in an Expression of Interest, some sort of incredible luminary in my area, that I think would be the most wonderful Board member known to mankind. I petition the rest of my RALO with that person's name, and whatever I can Google on them, or just my own experiences. I get that RALO – my RALO – to agree. I then, with the rest of the RALO leadership, get two other RALOs to agree. In the process of those regional due diligence and petition efforts, I would argue that contact would be made with that person, to see whether or not they're even still interested, and that much of the material that would be needed for that petitioning deliberation – which, to be honest, I hope never happens, ever, ever, happens – sorry, it's [inaudible] time here, as well – that what we do is then, if we have a successful petition, then we publish whatever it is we publish for a final-slate candidate, anyway. I stay really unconvinced that we need to risk people not wanting an exposure of an unsuccessful application EOI to go out publicly. You see what I mean?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I mean, in 2010, we had a nail salon owner from Florida, who didn't know anything about ICANN, apply. We published her name and the fact that she was Florida-based. That's all the community needed to know. They did not need to know about her nail salon work. You know what I mean?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes. Thanks, Cheryl. Did you want to continue at all, or can I –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No, no, no.

JULIE HAMMER:

Or do others have any – thanks, Cheryl. Any other comments?

Alright. So what I'd like to ask you to do with your green ticks or red crosses is, I'll explain as clearly as I can what I'm proposing, and then see if you're happy to agree. I'm proposing that we publish the names and domiciles of all applicants at some point in time soon after the Expressions of Interest submission date has been reached – the deadline. And that is the only information that we publish. Then, when we have produced our final slate of candidates, we publish the suitably – the Expressions of Interest of those candidates only, with any personal information that needs to be withheld removed from them, and that we

would only publish the information of any other person if they were petitioned by the RALO and subsequently ended up on that slate of candidates. So I'm hoping that my proposal is clear. Could I ask if, by using ticks and crosses, whether you agree to that as a way forward?

Thank you. I see Jordi, Louis, and Mohamed have not indicated. I'm just hoping that that's because they're having – not because they disagree. Please say if you disagree.

Okay. Louis, just to finish off, we are only – thank you, Jordi – we are only proposing to publish the information in the Expression of Interest for the candidates on the final slate. We will withhold – I know that Jordi's mentioned privacy issues – we will withhold personal information that might have privacy implications. But we also need to highlight right up front, in our instructions to candidates, and in our consent and authorization undertaking, that we will be intending to do this, and that the candidates must agree. So – Jordi, did you have your hand up?

Jordi, I can't hear you, but please go ahead.

Okay. Alright, so I'll take all those ticks as agreement, thank you. What Ariel and I will now do is make the changes to the call for Expressions of Interest, to the staff response to that, and to the Expression of Interest form itself, to make sure that they all align and provide very clear warnings; that is, what our intention is regarding their information.

Okay, so that's taken quite a bit of time. But noting that the two draft documents that were sent earlier do need some amendment, what I'd ask you to do is, if you have any comments on them other than in

relation to these two issues which we will correct, please provide those comments back to us by email once you've had a chance to look at them. Jordi, you've got a – you've raised your hand. Please go ahead.

Oh, right. Hand down. Okay, so I'm not going to ask for agreement to both now, obviously, but we will work on them and send – the timeline for us to complete these is next Wednesday, the 19th. So we'll be working hard in the background, and when I do send them around, I'd be really grateful if you could look at them as quickly as you possibly can.

The other thing I just wanted to touch on, agendas item 4 and 5, is the need for us to plan out a more detailed process of evaluation, and I've just put a few thoughts down there. Firstly, a plan for tools familiarization. Ariel has really just given us a run-through of the EOI today, but there are more tools in the background that can be adapted for our use, that the NomCom use. And basically, what we need to work out is what sort of a scoring scheme we might wish to put in place. We might want to, in the period when the candidates are filling out their EOIs, we might want to perform a bit of a trial evaluation using some sample EOIs. Alan has done one; Cheryl and I were planning on doing two others, and perhaps using those three Expressions of Interest, we might be able to do a familiarization with the assessment tools, using those applications. We need to finalize any changes that are going to be required for the tools and just exercise them all. I'm not sure whether there's anything else, but this is the activity that I'm proposing we need to do between now and when candidate applications close.

What I've wondered was whether there might be a small sub-committee – maybe two or three people – interested in working with me to develop that schedule and to help facilitate that process. Jordi, I'm seeing that you have your hand raised. Is your hand up?

Okay. Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: Yes. I'd be pleased to assist you in doing that.

JULIE HAMMER: Fantastic. Thank you. Any other volunteers? Particularly those of you with NomCom experience would be very handy.

Yes, Louis.

LOUIS HOULE: If I may add a comment, I'd say that as soon as you have the EOI ready – Cheryl's and yours – it would be nice to already be able to test it, too, for all things. The sooner, the better. This is what I wanted to say. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Definitely. I completely agree, and that's what I'd like to try and do. Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö. Yeah, I can certainly help you, also.

JULIE HAMMER:

Fantastic. Fantastic. Okay, well, if anyone else feels that they are able to assist, please let me know by email. But at least, I'm very happy to move forward with Louis and Yrjö, and we'll work up a program. But we do have a lot of work to do between now and the candidate submission deadline to really get all of that finalized and be ready to jump straight into the candidate evaluation.

The second thing that I thought we needed to put our minds to is how we actually go forward with that candidate evaluation and think about our schedule of, what are the deadlines we're going to set for ourselves between the 18th of November and the 22nd of December, when we have to have the final slate published? So, again, I thought we could have a small sub-committee – I'm not sure whether it ought to be the same sub-committee, or whether some different people might be willing to work on that with me, so I'd like to open that up to comment, whether people think it should be the same group. I don't want to put too much on just a couple of people, or whether a couple of other people might be willing to volunteer to work with me on that. Looking for your feedback on that other planning task.

Louis?

LOUIS HOULE:

It would be nice to have some new players on that. Of course, I'd be glad to help you there, also; but as a team, it would be nice if we could have some contributions from our members. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes, I agree, Louie. So what I'll do, because we've got a number of people who haven't been able to remain on the call, I'll put out an email to the whole group, advising that you and Yrjö have volunteered to assist me on the first little Work Team, and asking for volunteers for the second one. So then we can move forward on all of those.

The last thing that I would like to discuss on our agenda is item six. We are continuing to struggle with finding a regular meeting time in two different parts of the day, that we can alternate. We've done a number of Doodles. I've put around a Doodle for the 04:00 and 07:00 UTC time zone, and it just seems to be impossible to get people able to join at that time. The only time – and Mohamed has been very flexible here, and I do thank you, Mohamed, when we spoke in the background – the only times when it appears we can get just about everybody along is 21:00 UTC. That is the exact time that we are meeting now, for our meeting, not the training session time. 20:00 was quite good, too, but Mohamed has agreed he can be quite flexible and make the 21:00 UTC time. So even though I would like to honor our commitment to rotate meetings as Vanda has suggested, we just can't find the time. So I would like to ask you if you agree that we need to standardize our meeting times at 21:00 UTC on Thursdays. Opening that issue up for discussion yet again, what do you think? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Julie, and hopefully the [inaudible] will be slightly quieter, although I hear them circling. I think what we can probably do is say

that that's the result of the Doodle outcome for now, and perhaps revisit when we may indeed have a heavier workload for a smaller amount of time, later on in our process. We have that one very, very busy month, and it may be that we need more than one call a week, we may need longer calls. If that's the additional pressure, then the timing for our calls may need to be reviewed at that point. So I think go with the flow now, but make it clear that as the workload increases, and as the time on a call or the number of calls in a week may need to change, we may also need to change back to a rotation, or something. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Cheryl. That's a really good point, so I take that on board. If there are no further comments, I see Eduardo and Yrjö have agreed. Can I ask if others agree that we stick with 21:00 UTC for the time being, until such time as we may need to meet more frequently? Great. Thank you very much.

So we're up to agenda item seven, "Any Other Business." Can I ask if there's anything else at all that anyone would like to raise, please? Yes, Cheryl. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Julie. Cheryl, for the record, again. I just wanted to see if we can start thinking – and to this end, because of the number of people still on the call, we'll have to make sure this goes out to our list – one of the earliest decisions I would like to encourage us all to make well in advance of us getting any of the Expressions of Interest in early applications started, if possible, is – and it is contingent, obviously, on

one of your sub-team activities, as well – but let's at least start thinking in rough numbers. When we have a set of criteria and ratings that we've agreed on, that's almost too late to decide at what level should we try and have our first cut-off people, to exceed a particular amount. So I'd like to think that very early in our process, before we start looking at reviews, we have established in our minds and then have a consensus agreement that a percentage or a number – it might be a number called 3.5 out of 5 or 4.7 out of 5 possible weighted points, or it might be 87%. I don't care what the number is. I care that we start thinking about a number, that if you get that much support on the assessment and weighting of your criteria and your application – if you get that number or above, we automatically consider you for that next set of discussions as we go towards final slate. If you don't get that number – in other words, you are below – we have two choices then. We either do not consider your application further, or one of us can discuss, bring forward, and petition to the rest of us why we think that applicant – even though we all scored them rather lower than we did the others – does need consideration, and there may be reasons for that. Not going to go into those reasons now, but there is a hypothetical set of reasons that might occur. If we're in the middle of our reviewing or starting our reviewing, that is not the time to start discussing whether it should be 85% or 80%, or whether it should be 4.2 or 4 out of 5. You know what I mean? Let's start thinking about that now. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think that's a really good point. I would like to suggest to Louis and Yrjö that we encompass that in the work that we're doing as part of the tools familiarization, because under there I've got

“develop a scoring scheme that is consistent with the tools.” And perhaps with the experience that both Louis and Yrjö have, perhaps we can start putting our minds to some of that and include some of that guidance as a proposal in what we bring back to the group. Does that sound like a reasonable way to go?

LOUIS HOULE:

Mm-hmm.

JULIE HAMMER:

Great. Alright, well I’ve made a note that we will look at that issue. Thank you very much for raising that. Can I ask if there is anything else that anyone would like to raise before we finish the call?

Okay, so I really appreciate the huge amount of time that you’ve all given us this morning, this afternoon, this evening. I think we’ve achieved a huge amount. Thank you once again to Ariel for all the work she’s done behind the scenes. I’d also like the rest of the group to acknowledge the work that Cheryl has done in the background, as well, helping with her advice on developing some of the tools and the draft documents that we have. So thanks so much for assisting in that, Cheryl.

At this stage, our next meeting is going to be 21:00 hours on Thursday the 20th, 21:00 UTC. And I look forward to talking to you all then, but also progressing a lot of this in the meantime by email, and getting a lot of our actions done that way. Thank you everyone, and the meeting is adjourned.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much. Bye-bye.

MULTIPLE VOICES: Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you so much for joining. And again, we apologize for the technical difficulties earlier on in the meeting. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Terri. Thanks, Heidi. I see everyone else already dropped off our [inaudible]. I can see Ariel once again, but I know she and I will be talking. Heidi, thank you so much for letting us have so much of Ariel. And Terri, thank you for all your support in the background, as well.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, not a problem. We'll get next week's meeting sent out a little bit later on today.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: So, Heidi, obviously you've been really, really busy with other commitments, but are you comfortable – oh, Ariel, you're back. I was just singing your praises. Heidi, are you comfortable with where we're at? I mean, I still think we've got a few challenges to get things.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]