TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee, BCEC call, taking place on Thursday, the 20th of October 2016 at 21:00 UTC. On the call today we have Julie Hammer, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Eduardo Diaz, Gunela Astbrink, Louis Houle, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jordi Iparraguirre and Mohamed El Bashir. We have no list of apologies for today's meeting. 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 you, Julie. Please begin.
JULIE HAMMER:	Thanks very much, Terri. Just to give you all an update on what happened yesterday and since 00:01, 19th of October 2016 when Ariel actually got out the call for expressions of interest. She got it out one minute into the UTC 24-hour period when we said we would have it out, so congratulations, Ariel. That was a brilliant effort, and it went out to multiple lists and onto websites. And the first request for an expression for an EOI form was received at 00:13. So someone, the first session was pretty quick off the mark, and so to date we've had five requests.

The call – the [part] that was put out, the call for expressions of interest was briefed at the ICANN57 policy update webinars that have happened in the last 24 hours. So I think there's quite a bit of publicity being given to them. So unless there's any questions, that's my update on what's happening with the call for EOI. |

Anyone have any questions? Okay, so moving on to more meaty business, behind the scenes Louis, and Yrjö and I have been having some discussions on the email about the tools that underlie our process, which of course brings us to discussions about the process itself for evaluating our candidates. And so there's a few things that we have been talking about that we wanted to bring to your attention just to get your thoughts and validation that this is an appropriate way forward. The first thing is just to confirm our terminology, and then we'll go ahead and standardize it on the wiki. My suggestion is that we use the terminology that we included in our operational procedures and guidelines, and that is that we call what we sort of deem to be a quick assessment, we call that our initial evaluation. And then when we produce our shortlist and come back and do a deeper dive into the shortlisted candidates, that we call that our detailed evaluation.

For public reasons I think calling something a quick evaluation or, you know, a [deep dive] or something like that might be open to misinterpretation. So I'd like to suggest to you that we use the terms "initial evaluation" and "detailed evaluation," and I'd like to ask if you have any comments or thoughts on that or if you agree or have other suggestions. So Mohamed, thank you. You agree with that. Jordi agrees.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: I agree.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Fatimata agrees, yeah.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. I see Yrjö has just joined. Welcome, Yrjö. Yrjö, we've only just started. And what people are agreeing to is that we standardize on the uses of the terms "initial evaluation" and "detailed evaluation" for our two stages of assessment, as they're the terms we used in our operational guidelines. So I see we've got pretty well, pretty much agreement on that. I'll run that by Vanda and Carlos –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

JULIE HAMMER: – after the call. Are you there, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. And how are you, Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, good. We have a quorum then. Thank you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [You're welcome.]

JULIE HAMMER: Welcome.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I tried to enter into the [Adobe 0:05:24.6].

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, fantastic. Well, we're going to follow up with you afterwards if you weren't able to make the call. So that's great. So we have agreement there. The second point that I'd like to just confirm, and we pretty well have covered this before, is that for our initial evaluation we use a scoring scheme of 1 to 5, and Louis, in our discussions in the background, basically said, you know, what does excellent, outstanding, [marked], qualified, what do those things actually mean? So hopefully you've all had the opportunity to look at the text that Ariel kindly put in the wiki to actually define those terms; what do we actually mean by them?

Can I ask if everyone's had a chance to look at those definitions of the terms so that people have a better idea of what one means, what five means, etc., and ask if – oh, great. You're bringing it up on the screen. That's fantastic. Thank you, Terri. Right. There it is right there. It's hard to read, but what it brought out when I was thinking about the words and putting them down, we originally had as number three, "qualified." But to some extent with our many candidate requirements, that sort of implied that you had to meet every single requirement. And you know, there might be shades of gray there. So I suggested that we change

"qualified" to "good" and made the definition that candidate meets many of the criteria because, as you know, some criteria are very much essential, but others, you know, it can be shades of gray.

So what I'd like to – oh, and the second point, Yrjö also suggested that as well as using scores of 1 to 5 and then computing the average score for each candidate, that we also compute the dispersion so that we can see if there are very divergent views on any particular candidate and perhaps that would lead us to have a discussion about that one before finalizing our short list. So I guess with regards to the scoring scheme for initial evaluation, the three points that I'd like to ask the committee to confirm is first that we're comfortable with the 1 to 5 scoring and calculating the average as the NomCom do. Two – and I believe NomCom do this as well – that we compute the dispersion to help inform us about our assessment, and three, that you are comfortable with the definition of the scores that we've put out there. So I welcome any comments or suggestions. I put the floor – open the floor to comment.

If you have no comments and are just comfortable, please feel welcome to put a green tick or a red cross if you have a concern in the Adobe Connect. Or if you're just on the phone bridge, please call out. So Gunela, please. You have – want to make a comment?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, comfortable.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Hello, Julie. This is [Gunela] for the record. I just wanted to double check and [sort of bury it] under the number one and not recommended, the candidate does not meet many essential [criteria], and I just wanted to be assured that if we have a listing of the essential criteria, we can see preferred criteria.

JULIE HAMMER: Well, we don't – I mean the bylaws are really the essential criteria, I guess. I'd be happy for anyone with NomCom experience to sort of come in with a follow-up criteria. But our ALAC criteria are, in a sense, what I would say is highly desirable. But there's sort of, with some of these, Gunela, I think it's the fact that there's no black and white. Louis – well, first of all, would any of the people with NomCom experience like to comment on that? Louis, I'll [pass it] to you.

LOUIS HOULE: [I'll give a review.]

JULIE HAMMER: Please.

LOUIS HOULE: All right. Just first very [inaudible] you mentioned three items, and I think that we should probably discuss each term and vote on each term because that's not necessarily something that we would agree on the three items at the same time. So it's just –

JULIE HAMMER: Okay.

LOUIS HOULE: – kind of a clarification there. I guess it wouldn't present any problem, but I just want to make sure that everybody's comfortable with that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: That's a good idea, Louis. Thank you very much. Yes, we'll do that. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this is Eduardo. I'm sorry, Julie. I missed some part of what we were talking about here at one point and really lost of what we're doing. So I'm sorry, Julie. Can you go back a little bit and [embellish] what we are doing [inaudible]?

JULIE HAMMER: Definitely. Okay. Thanks, Eduardo. So what we're looking at is our scoring scheme for our initial evaluation of candidates where we go through quite quickly, look at all of the applications and score them. We're suggesting on a score of 1 to 5 where – this is the same sort of process that the NomCom do where five is outstanding, four is excellent, three is good, two is marginal and one is not recommended, and that as part of that process to assist us in our discussions we

calculate the average of everybody's scores but also calculate the dispersion so that we can see if a par—if a particular candidate has a broad dispersion we might need to have a bit more of a discussion about that.

So the three points which Louis suggests we put separately, and that's a very good idea, is, are you comfortable with the 1 to 5 scoring, which we had aligned we'd have the NomCom do it? Are you comfortable with calculating the average and the dispersion to assist us then in our decision-making for producing the short list? And are you comfortable with the definitions of the scores that I have drafted there? Or we can certainly amend them if you have, if you feel that the wording needs some fine-tuning. So that's my question. So we're going to put the questions one at a time, as Louis suggests.

First of all, happy with the scoring 1 to 5 as the NomCom has done for our initial assessment? Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a very interesting question because in this past NomCom we used this – certainly we used this score, and we found out that, you know, if let's say this might work but it can also be – I mean we need to know the spread because if it's – say we have a candidate that most of the people go around three, but I want to push this candidate up, I would put five. And that will skew that candidate towards [inaudible] like [playing] it to move it up. And this is something that we found out in the NomCom, this past NomCom in the process of [rating] these 1 to 5 that we, you know, we need to know this spread because if everybody votes

for three and there's one [point] someone that votes for five, then we should know that. Otherwise that candidate might be a score that's higher than what most people want. It's [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, and Eduardo, I think this is the very point that Yrjö was making when he suggested that we look at the discussion, as well. Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: [Inaudible]

JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry, Louis. I can't hear you.

LOUIS HOULE: Yes [inaudible] –

JULIE HAMMER: I'm still not hearing you. Is anyone hearing Louis?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I cannot hear him. This is Eduardo.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Terri, is there anything that we can do?

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, everyone. It's Terri, and we're checking into his audio.

JULIE HAMMER: Louis, I'm –

LOUIS HOULE: Can you hear me?

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, yes. Yes, I can hear you now. Please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: [Inaudible] I'm just coming back. I don't know what's [inaudible] well, and [inaudible] somewhere outside probably influence the Internet. Sorry. It's only a joke. [Inaudible] I agree with Eduardo. Well, living that situation before, and this can occur. This is why among the comments that we've been providing to Julie and we've been discussing, this is one thing that we have to consider. There is always a chance that a candidate ranking at 3.2 or 3 might be a good candidate, and we have to – this is why Yrjö has been presenting all the details that we've been discussing – Julie, Yrjö, Ariel and I, with that dispersion problem. And now we're just thinking that the first round from 1 to 5 will allow us to have a first shortlist kind of, but we want to make sure that we don't describe any potential candidate that everyone would rank around three because this could be a candidate that we would like to have in

the final list. So this is the discussion that we have had tonight. So thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: So thanks, Louis. So I guess one of the things that I think we would hopefully have as a basis is that the members of this committee don't come with sort of regional biases, that they really are here with the intent to evaluate all candidates on their true merit. So I'm certainly proceeding forward with that assumption about everybody. So one thing that I can undertake to do – because I'm not a voting chair; I'm a candidate, as you all understand. I'm simply there to guide all of you through the process and to speak on administrative matters to how to vote on administrative matters if there is a deadlock. But I'm not participating as such, as one of the evaluators.

So what I can suggest as a way to alleviate some of these concerns is, along with staff, I can keep an eye on the details of the scoring. And if it appears to me that someone might have a bias, I could confidentially have the word for that person and just understand why their scoring might be very different to anyone else's. So if the committee would like me to do that, I can do that. It's really up to you.

Jordi, I think that tick just appeared, so I'm assuming that you're agreeing that I could do that. Gunela, would you like to make a comment? Cheryl's made a – put a tick in the Adobe. Yrjö's put a tick in the Adobe. Sorry to delay swinging to you, Gunela. If anyone is uncomfortable with me doing that, please put a cross in the Adobe so that we can discuss it further. Gunela, please go ahead.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Julie. This is Gunela, for the record. And I agree with the latest suggestion about you taking on that role that you just raised. But I just wanted to return to that definition number one of "recommended." Now this might not be quite as essential as the 3+ in the selection, but just so we have a clear – and maybe people who have been on a NomCom can comment on this – I just think that having the word "essential criteria" and not having, having it clear that there are some essential criteria and some desirable criteria just makes that definition not quite clear. And so I'm thinking should that be reworded? Or if people previously with NonCom experience say that this is quite acceptable, then I'll be happy to hear that and go from there. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Gunela. And I think your point is well-made. These definitions are purely visible to this committee. They're not public. They're not on any public page of the web. They're purely for us as a working page and will never be public. But I do think your point is well-made, and I'm wondering whether we can resolve the issue by simply taking out the word "essential" and just have the description as the candidate does not meet many criteria. Would that meet, sort of resolve the issue that you're talking about? Gunela, if you're answering, you're on mute.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Julie, this is Gunela here. I've put it in the chat and asked –

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, sorry. My apologies.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: – asked you and Cheryl. That's okay. I'm very happy with that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, thank you. And a good point. Yes, so Ariel is already on the job about to delete the word "essential." It's gone, and that's a good point, so thank you so much for that. All right, so with some – if there's any, no further discussion, I'll – I'm trying to – struggling to remember whether we got agreement to the 1 to 5 style, noting that we would be calculating the average and the dispersion and that I would be keeping a watch on scoring in the background. So can I just, confirmation, ask are you happy with using this 1 to 5 scale, calculating the average and the dispersion? Thank you very much. So we'll take that as agreed.

Can I ask, are you comfortable with the definitions that we have now amended just to guide us in the background? It's not for publication at all, these definitions. Great. Thank you very much. Okay, the next point that I'd – we've covered the definitions. We've covered the scoring. The next point – and we've sort of touched on this a tiny bit – is setting ourselves a threshold score that we believe a candidate needs to achieve to progress to the shortlist and to detail the valuations.

Now in the background Louis, and Yrjö and I thought that we would propose 3.5 as the score that we would expect candidates to achieve on

the initial evaluation, 3.5 or above to progress forward. But we also recognized that we need to decide on the shortlist, taking into consideration where any natural gaps in the scoring might occur and any dispersion that might occur in the scores as well. So it wouldn't be a blanket application of 3.5 without discussion. What we're suggesting is that 3.5 be the guidance that we suggest and that we look at gaps.

For example, if we had a lot of scores around the 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, we would probably decide to include those who had scored 3.4, especially if there was then a gap down to say 3.1 or 3.2. So it's, if you like, an intelligent application of that rule that we're proposing. So I'd like to ask if there's any discussion, or feedback or comments on that before I ask if you're happy with that proposal. So any questions? Yes, Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to mention that, you know, if we get 20 candidates and we vote all four, are we going to evaluate all 20, or are we going to reduce that to a more manageable amount of candidates?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Eduardo. And it's a good question. And my feeling – and I'm certainly keen to hear what others feel – my feeling is that we should actually raise the bar if that's the case and look for where there might be a natural gap in the assessment. Like if everybody scores four or more, but there's some in the low fours and a lot in – and some in the high fours, then we should look for a gap. But in all honesty, I would be quite surprised if that was the case. Cheryl, you've had experience on this in NomCom. Please, your thoughts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. Cheryl for the record. I'd be beyond astonished if we had 20 candidates and all 20 scored 3.5 and above. We should be so lucky. Yes, adjusting up would be something that we could discuss. But yeah, the thing is, we'll be applying a different, a separate run through after a discussion of criteria, and by discussion I don't mean the definitions of criteria, but discussion between each other to say why I think the applicant with the blue hair and green spots is a better applicant than the person wearing the purple pants in the photo.

So, you know, we will have a discourse and then rescore if need be with the intention of getting down to the desired final slate number, which in a perfect world, if we're simply recommending one or two people, should be hopefully no more than three or four because there is the risk, and it is a risk in my view, of petition processes adding more names after we put our slate out. So I would think that's one of those problems like a tax problem that, you know, it's nice if you could have it, Eduardo, but we certainly could simply look at the distribution of those hypothetical large numbers of people that meet and exceed our predetermined criteria and look where the middle of the distribution is, and then put an appropriate cut off around that if that's going to help with the first cut. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: Well, as – Louis for the record – as Cheryl just mentioned at the end of her introduction, we'll have to hit in the middle, Eduardo, and discuss a little bit our decision. And that's it, and that [inaudible] that as far as I'm concerned. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Louis. So I think the answer, Eduardo, is that this is a suggestion based on what we would expect to receive as this sort of distribution of a slate of candidates suggests 3.5, but we're going to apply that intelligently, and we're going to have discussions about it. So I'm sure we've got enough experience and sensible people in this group that we'll deal with whatever we end up with in an inappropriate way. So on that basis, can I ask if everybody's agreeable to, at this stage, work towards – oh, Eduardo, yes, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I agree with you. I'm just bringing this up because, based on the experience we have with NomCom, that we've said, you know, we're going to get, we're going to [embrace] a maximum of 12, for example. We said – or eight [inaudible] [group size]. We said that beforehand. I don't think we're going to get a selection of [inaudible] 20, just for [inaudible] an example. But just know I agree with you. We can discuss – what's the – at the time we can discuss it. We don't know how many people [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Exactly. Thank you, Eduardo. So could I ask for agreement that that is our general way forward at this stage, that we look at candidates who score 3.5 and above? Okay, so I'm seeing quite a few green ticks. So thank you for that. But there's just one more item on the agenda, item three, and that is the scoring scheme for detailed evaluation. And what Yrjö, and Louis and I have been discussing in the background is a slightly different approach that might actually help us produce more differentiation in our evaluation than simply going back over a 1 to 5 score yet again. I have done this in other judging situations and found that it actually worked quite well.

What I'd like to suggest that you consider in our detailed evaluation that is of the short list of candidates is that each of the – each of you do a ranking of candidates. So if we ended up with ten candidates on the shortlist, that you actually rank them 1 to 10 and that we add up all of those scores and that the candidates with the lowest scores are the best candidates, and the candidates with the highest scores are the least-preferred candidates. And what doing that sort of assessment does that scoring on a 1 to 5 scale doesn't necessarily do is that it forces dispersion. It forces an individual to actually decide which candidate they prefer over the others. I know that that's probably something that hasn't been utilized in this group before, but I'd like to ask for your reactions to that as a proposal of how we might actually get greater differentiation in our detailed evaluation rather than just going back over the same process.

So when Louis, and Yrjö and I sort of discussed this on email, they felt that this might assist in our process, and I was – with most of them having NonCom background, I felt that if they thought it would work,

then I had confidence. So I don't see anyone – Eduardo. Eduardo, you like the idea. Is there anyone who's not quite sure what I'm suggesting that perhaps needs any clarification? I just want to make sure that everyone understands the suggestion. If anyone is not quite sure what I'm suggesting, please raise your hand.

Okay, well, hopefully that was a clear suggestion, and so I'll just progress to asking if you agree with that as our proposed method of doing our detailed evaluation, that we actually rank all the candidates. Fantastic. I see green ticks coming up. I'll wait for a couple more. Jordi, Gunela… Mohamed, are you comfortable with that? You might be having trouble. Okay, well I'll hope that Mohamed is comfortable with that. Brilliant. Well, I think that's going to be a good way forward, and that will assist us, I think, when we get to that second stage.

Okay, now the next – thank you very much, everyone. So the next thing that I want to talk about briefly is a timetable for our trial of the initial evaluation tool. Yrjö, and Louis and Cheryl have agreed to put – as well as myself – we're going to be doing sample EOI forms. I have on the agenda proposed a really ambitious schedule for that. I must confess I'm struggling to meet it myself with everything else that's going on. But my concern with when we might get to do a trial initial evaluation is that once we all start traveling – or those of us who are going to Hyderabad – once we start traveling, and once we're in Hyderabad and then get home, we have precious little time left before the close of the expression of interest.

So, for example, I leave for Hyderabad on the first, and I don't get home until Friday the 11th, and really then we've got only the 14th of – Monday

the 14th to Friday the 18th of November to do any work before the expression of interest closes and we have to start looking at candidates for real. And I've thought about whether – even though we have a meeting in Hyderabad, it's not going to be a closed meeting. It's going to be an open meeting with the [BMSDC], so it's not a meeting where we can do any of this type of work. So that's why I've put in the agenda a really, really ambitious suggestion of timescales where both of us doing sample EOIs, even if they're just rubbish and just put, you know, what like Alan did put, you know, some responses in each of the fields. If we can do that by very early next week, and then if the committee, including those who have done the sample EOIs, could evaluate them by, say, 24 hours before our meeting, then with the tools being automatic, I believe, Ariel, maybe by our meeting this time next week we could look at the results and talk about the process and provide feedback on the web tools.

I'm genuinely not sure whether that's achievable or not. But my great concern is that if we don't try and do that, then we won't be able to – we've been – I guess the only thing we can do is try and have discussions on the tools over email. And I think that could be quite problematic. So I'd like to throw that whole issue open to you for discussion and see what you think. Yes, Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: If you're talking about the tools that I've been trying to today – well, today early this morning, I still had some concerns about a couple of areas [inaudible] and for an ordinary user, there's definitely things that I will raise on the emails that we are sharing, Yrjö, Ariel, you and I. There

is some of the – one of the facts, to tell you the truth, I've been playing the bad guy, and I'm using a French interface with the application. And I definitely have some concerns on other languages than English to be able to use the application as it is right now. So I know it's probably a minor problem. Ariel's been emailing me a little bit earlier today. But I do have some concern.

And the other one might not be a language concern; it's a using of the [inaudible] having, trying to use a file in the application is not as easy as it looks like. Should it be your picture or some of the documents that you would like to join, there's a couple of concerns that I still have at this time, though, Julie. I'm not that worried about that. But it's there right now. So I have some concerns about that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Louis. I guess just to respond to that, the form is already in use because that's the form that we did and finalize – or that was finalized for the [corporate] expression of interest. So while I think there's – perhaps if some real issues are found with it I'm sure [Ken] and Ariel will be able to correct them in the background.

I think the comment you made regarding language, keep in mind, though, that one of our very key criteria is that the board candidate must be able to operate in English, and this form is only to be completed in English. So I think perhaps the fact that you're suggesting there could be issues with other language, I'm not sure that is something that we need to pursue further. We have highlighted that the form has to be completed in English and that we do expect our

candidates to be able to function well in English. Any smaller issues with that form, certainly we should all communicate with Ariel in the background in case there is some problem that hasn't been picked up to date and that we can fix.

I guess what I'm – the tools I was really talking about is our tools for the evaluation, not so much this form, but our tools for actually doing the initial evaluation at this stage and then the more detailed evaluation. So I guess my question is, is the schedule that I've proposed achievable, or do we have to come up with some other sort of ways, given how much time we lose with the Hyderabad meeting, some other way of testing the tool? Or do we simply not get a chance to test the tools; we just have to swing right into it? So that's really my question. Is it worthwhile trying to achieve this schedule that I've put in the agenda?

We don't have the agenda up at the moment, so the schedule I'm talking about is for the four of us doing forms to try and complete them by 23:59 UTC on Sunday – and I know that could be an issue for you, Louis – and then for the committee over the next couple of days, by 21:00 UTC on Wednesday, to have looked at all five and done an evaluation. I see Cheryl's saying in the chat let's try to make the schedule if we can. And Gunela is saying that, as well.

Okay, I see you've made some more comments. So Louis, in relation to the – yeah, you're saying that if you use tools that translate or your browser is in another language it shows, it brings up problems. I wonder if what we should be suggesting to candidates is they fill out the forms with their browser using English settings. Would that be a better way to

go because we really do need candidates who can function in English? And if they can't – Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: I [inaudible] you know, I told you I was playing the bad guy, and –

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah, no, that's fine.

LOUIS HOULE: – for, you know, for a person that would not be [inaudible] would have an application, well the system that the application allows you to answer in another language, I mean, of course you will answer your data in English. You will answer everything in English. But all the application and the tools that we are providing the explanations are in English. But it doesn't correlate to what you see on your screen. So people are – they can be totally confused and not be able to provide a picture or a document. It won't work because it's not that – it's not that easy. I've been able to do that, but I mean, it's not that easy to do it, and it could maybe bother some candidates who wouldn't be able to just deliver the application or the content that they would like to [give to us]. So it would penalize probably some non-native English-speaking people. It could be. I don't say that it would, but it's a possibility. It's only what I wanted to mention. So I will be the bad guy again tomorrow, and I will try to find the solution to that. Thank you. With Ariel, of course.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Louis. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Cheryl for the record. Louis, I hear what you're saying, and I certainly understand and respect the testing you're doing. But if it does cause a problem, if the applicant's preferred end-user technology causes problems, which biased them in our review of their application because of how they can interpret the questions in the exchange of languages or whatever, I'm not actually too sad or disappointed about that because if it biases it and we therefore rank them lower, all that means is it's not going to be a problem that we will have to solve, or more to the point, more worryingly not solve if we put them through to the board because they're going to have exactly the same issues when they interact with anything in the rest of ICANN world and with their board work. So sad, tough, but there you go. I think it's in the "it happens" pile. If it causes a problem and it leads to the detriment of an applicant, so be it.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl. So I do appreciate that you brought that up, Louis, and I think perhaps what I'll work with Ariel in doing is seeing whether we can update the form to recommend, perhaps, that candidates make sure that their browsers are using English settings when they fill out the form. I think it's reasonable to expect candidates to be able to look at the instructions in English and interpret them and point out that if they use settings of another language that it could cause issues with the form. And for those five applicants who we've already sent instructions

to, maybe we will point that out to them, but I think if we put – Ariel, you and I can have a look at where we might put that in some guidance at the top of the form. But I do thank you, Louis, for pointing that out.

Okay, recognizing we've only got five minutes to go, I'm going to move on very quickly to agenda item – oh, and just note that based on your feedback we will try and meet the schedule as best we can, very ambitious schedule of trying to do a trial evaluation and look at our results this time next week. We'll just see how we go.

Agenda item four, the other subcommittee with Jordi and Vanda, which is coming up with a plan for candidate evaluation, we haven't really kicked off our work yet. Thank you to Jordi and Vanda for volunteering. We might – I suggest that once we're through this next week that maybe we can do some work together by email, and I'll certainly be seeing Vanda in Hyderabad. Jordi, are you in Hyderabad? I can't remember. I know you told me one way or the other, and I can't remember what it was. And anyway, I won't delay now. So that work hasn't yet started, but we'll work on that in another week or so.

The agenda for our joint [BASIS] and BMSPC meeting in Hyderabad, which is an open meeting, we really can't do any of this type of work in that meeting. But I really see it as a meeting that's more for the audience than for the committees, so for those who are in Hyderabad, I'm hoping that you will all be able to attend if you haven't got conflicting commitments. For those who are not in Hyderabad, there will be a phone bridge that if you're not able to attend, I will understand. I see that our agenda is really giving an overview on our

process, what we're doing and really an update on where we're at and being able to answer questions from people outside the committee.

If anyone has suggestion of things that we might cover in the committee meet—in the joint committee meeting other than that, please do let me know, if not now, then please send me an email. But I don't see in an open meeting that we can do much more. But I think that will be valuable for the audience. So before moving on to any other business, I'll just pause there. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR   Yes, thanks. That was a [new] hand for me. Sorry. I went up and down fairly quickly. Wasn't sure you caught it with the new one. Cheryl for the record. I just want to formally apologize for not being able to attend the meeting with you in Hyderabad on the Monday for the joint meeting between us and the BMSPC. I have a commitment to present at the ccNSO members meeting on a particular matter, so that being new work and not just sort of a warm fuzzy update, I thought that was probably my –

JULIE HAMMER: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR   – most important activity to do. So apologies [noted].

JULIE HAMMER:	Thanks for that, Cheryl. That's noted. Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yes, thank you very much, Julie. Just as I put into the chat, just to let you know, currently there is a tentative session for the at-large leadership, that is the ALAC meetings and RALO leaders scheduled for the 3rd. That's a Thursday at both the BCEC as well as the BMSPCs between 11:00 and 11:45. Thank you.

| JULIE HAMMER: | Right, yes. Okay, thank you. I think I saw that on the agenda, so that's on Thursday the 3rd. Yes, so [Fushani] and I – that doesn't require any of the committee members to join, but you would certainly be welcome to join on the bridge or in the room if you're there. But I think that's just, yeah, [Fushani] and I giving an update.

Okay, so I'm just now – I would like to ask if there's any other business. Please raise your hand if there's something that you'd like to raise to the committee. Okay, there being no hands, and it's the top of the hour, I would like to confirm that the next meeting will be at this same time – Louis, please go ahead. |
|---|---|

LOUIS HOULE:	[Just again], I want to thank you for all the good job that you are doing for the committee. I see [inaudible] and it's tremendous work that you're doing, and we're grateful to you for doing all of that for us. Thank you very much, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Louis. I really appreciate that. Thank you so much, and also I'd like to acknowledge all the work that Ariel is doing in the background. She's just an amazing young lady. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Julie, I also want to apologize for Hyderabad. I noticed that at the same time that it is going to happen there will be a public meeting of the NonCom happening at the same time [inaudible]. I have to be there. Sorry.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Eduardo. Noted. But that shouldn't be a problem at all. I do realize that a lot of you will have other commitments there. Okay, so just confirming that our next meeting will be at 21:00 UTC on Thursday the 27th of October, this same time again next week. And hopefully we'll be in a position to discuss how we've done some evaluations of some pretty seedy characters, actually, I think that we're going to have applying to be trial candidates. So we might be lucky if we get anybody over 3.5. So look forward to doing that during the week, and talk to you all again next week. Thanks, everyone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, Julie.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, and bye for now.

TERRI AGNEW: [Thank you, and your meeting] now has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to [inaudible]. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]