TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee, BCEC, call held on Thursday the 27th of October 2016 at 21:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Vanda Scartezini, Eduardo Diaz who will be on telephone only but then be joining us a little bit later on the Adobe Connect side, Julie Hammer, Yrjö Länsipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Gunela Astbrink, and Louise Houle.
	We have no listed 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 the call back over to you Julie. Please begin.
JULIE HAMMER:	Thanks very much Terri. And welcome Heidi, I didn't realize you were just on the phone. I'm not on the Adobe Connect, so I'm so glad you could join us.
	Okay, so agenda item number two, update on the publication of the call for expressions of interest. There has actually been no change at all since last week. We still only have five applicants, or five people who have asked for an ELI form. No one in the last week. So, Ariel and I have been talking about whether we resend, at some point in time, the call for expressions of interest, and we'll just do that in the background

without worrying the committee too much about that at an appropriate point.

So, unless there are any questions on that? I'll move on. Just giving you a moment in case there are any questions.

Okay. So, onto agenda item three. Many thanks to those who filled out expression of interest form, and thank you to everybody for doing the job candidate evaluation. Hopefully, you got a few giggles out of some of them.

And since they were… I really do acknowledge Ariel and Louis for doing their forms by the target date, which was very ambitious, as was the target date for doing the assessment. So, I thank everybody for doing it by that ambitious time.

Ariel is now going to take us through the tools to show you the aggregated scores and the individual scores. And I would note, in having looked at this, that it's probably a little bit atypical, because obviously, this was a little bit of a fun exercise, and so, I think the distributions are perhaps not what we would quite expect. They're a little bit more divergent then what we would expect in a real initial evaluation.

So, I'll hand over to you, Ariel, to just show us, in case some of you haven't had a chance to look at them. And before I hand over to Ariel, I'll ask Cheryl, who has a comment or a question. Thanks Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I was just going to pick up on what you just noted, and that was the distribution as one of the extremely dodgy candidates, I'm delighted that some people thought I was an outstanding one. But I thought I was an absolutely appalling one, and the fact that there were ones and fives, I wondered, in fact, whether some of us did reverse the numerical order.

So, I think we just need to be really sure by the end of today's call, that we understand what number does relate to not recommended, and what number relates to outstanding. But that said, I personally thank you for all of the outstanding votes.

JULIE HAMMER: And Miss Piggy thanks you as well. Okay, yes, no, that's a really good point. So we'll have a discussion on that a bit later. Over to you Ariel, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks so much Julie. This is Ariel Liang for the record. So before we talk about the scores, I just wanted to quickly mention the EOI forms, and when we distribute it these forms for the committee to review, you may remember that section A is hidden, and then you only saw section B, and C, and D, and that's to protect the identity of the applicants for the blind testing.

And then after the scores are all completed, I have revealed section A for you to see. And now you can see the whole picture. And you can actually see who are the top candidates and their pictures and names.

So, that's how this form is structured. And it's also very quick, in a way that I can manipulate something in the macro, and just change one measure with configuration, and then everything will appear to all of you, so that we can make sure this is efficient relief process.

Now I will go to the polls that, sorry, the voting, the polls tool that we use for scoring candidates. And then the views that you're seeing now is actually what Julie and I see in the admin interface, so we see everything, basically, who voted for what. And then we also have seen this summary box on the top that shows the average scores of each candidate.

But when you were voting, during the process, you probably didn't see all of this information, and that's intentional. And we only want you to see your own scoring, and not being influenced by others. And so that you are not having this kind of view.

But right now you can see who has voted, and then also, just to show the summary box on the top is the automatically calculated by the system, so that's another thing to enhance efficiency. And then, now I would take you to the score results page, and I will actually put this link in the chat too, and also you can see it yourself.

So, basically, this is a Google spreadsheet that I viewed on Google Drive, and then this is the spreadsheet I created. And the way I did it was to manually copy the score of each candidate from each committee member.   And you can see from column F to column O, that everybody's score for each candidate.

And then for column B, that's the mean or average score. And that's also kind of calculated using the Excel formula. And then, so that's a number. And then this number should match what is summarized on the Wiki, by the Wiki tool, and that's why we have this column D here, it's the average score on the Wiki.

So we just have kind of a benchmark to make sure there is no mistake when I copy over the score to the spreadsheet. And on column C, it's variance, which means how sporadic the scores are for each candidate. And then you can see the bigger the number, the more variance the candidate's score.

And so you can see, like for example, the first candidate, which is Cheryl, I guess, and then she has [inaudible] score from the committee scores. And then the one with the least variant score, actually, I think, Yrjö, yeah, and that's 1.41. That's the lowest score. So that's how we interpret these numbers.

I will stop here, and I think, I guess we can take some questions or comments. Did I miss anything Julie? Do you want to add anything?

JULIE HAMMER: No. I think that's great. And I think that the fact that you've got that double check for bringing, to make sure the scores have come across correctly into this spreadsheet, I think that's excellent. So, I think Gunela has a question. Go ahead, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks Julie. This is Gunela for the record. I found this a great process, and it was really interesting seeing the results and how they're tabulated, and thank you Ariel for all of that detailed work. When I was doing each of the candidates, I had just the one window open, and went back, and the scoring sometimes disappeared, you know, between the one and five.

So, I had to go back and do it again. So, I decided I would have one window for the, going through the information in the EOI, and then another window for the scoring, and that worked really well. So, I just thought I would share that type of process with you, that works for me. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks good [inaudible], Gunela. Yeah, I think that would work really well. It's very hard just working in one window. Any other questions or comments?

So, something that I'd like to ask you. I think that the blind process whereby we restrict this ability of what everybody else is doing from the rest of the committee up until we all finished, I would propose that's the way we go forward, but I also think it's useful to reveal to the whole committee, before extent of the scoring of everybody else.

So, are you comfortable that what we've done here is exactly what we should do when we do the true blind initial evaluation? Maybe just put green ticks if you're happy that we reveal all of this information to everybody. Cheryl is happy.

Louis is happy.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Eduardo is happy.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, Eduardo. Eduardo, great. Have you had a chance to see these, Eduardo? You're not able to see the Adobe Connect at the moment, but have you had a chance to look at them online?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah. I look at them online. We used this tool in the NomCom, so I'm very familiar, but it's very interesting. What I want to talk about, you know, once we look at this, is how we're going to rank all of the people, knowing [the spread?]?

JULIE HAMMER: Right. Okay.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That's what I'm interested in seeing, because that, we don't do in the NomCom. We use the actual numbers [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Right. Okay. So, thank you for all of those green ticks. And what.. If there are no further comments or questions about this, I think we can say we're ready to do the real one without initial evaluation, and then

move on to what you were just starting to touch on there, Eduardo, and that is moving on to the detailed evaluation with the suggested ranking. We don't yet have the tool put together.

I don't think it's a very complicated thing, but we don't yet have the tools to actually do a practice ranking. I'm proposing that we use these same five sample EOIs, just something that occurred to me. Do you think we need more than five, or are we comfortable to just continue with these five? Any thoughts on that?

So, seeing nothing, I think what we'll do is we'll just progress and use the same five, yes, Louis says five is enough. We'll use the same five. What I see, and doing, and I'm working in the background with Jordi and Vanda on this more detailed process and schedule during the second, or the detailed evaluation for real, but we do need to do a trial, is I see everyone again, in isolation, ranking candidates.

Now, it's going to be interesting because we've got a different one to five scale, and that's the scale that we used in a different way in our initial evaluation. So, it's going to be important not to get confused on this. Maybe what I'll do is, I'll create one or two more.

I might do that in the background over the next week or so. I might create a couple of more so that we've actually got seven. And therefore, we won't get confused with one to five, we'll actually be ranking one to seven, with one being the most, the highest ranked candidate.

Eduardo, what I think that means is that for those of you who might have ranked more than one candidate, at the same score, in the initial

evaluation, it's going to force you to differentiate between them, and to some extent, that's what I see as the advantage of this approach. That it actually forces every individual to not score any two candidates, or not rank any two candidates the same.

You can't [inaudible] on ranking. So, what I suggest is that we… Ariel and I produce the tool, and we do the trial, and I think we've got time to fine-tune it and see how it works. Ariel, sorry, I didn't notice that you wanted to raise your hand. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Julie, this is Ariel. I couldn't raise my hand because I'm sharing screen. So, I just want to add about the trial. If we used same tool on the Wiki for the detailed evaluations, it's possible, actually, I just spoke to [inaudible] today, and we do something look like this, for the committee members to rank the candidates, and would give them these choices, and that's the top five candidates sample.

But the drawback is, we cannot enforce each committee member to choose a unique ranking for each candidate. And you can certainly, based on this tool, you can rank two people the same, second place, for example, and then Wiki cannot enforce that. And then, if we really want to enforce this, we probably need to explore a third-party tool. We should have quite a few options to look at.

But if we want to resort to Wiki, we just need to make sure all of the committee members stick to giving a unique ranking number to each candidate.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. My thinking, and I'd welcome other people's views, is that we don't need to go to an external tool. I think Ariel and I can keep an eye on it in the background, and if someone, through misunderstanding, ranks people at the same level, then we can see that in the background, and we can talk to those people and get them to adjust, but it's, you know, I think if we max so that everyone understands that, you know, they must rank all of the EOIs, one to seven, only one in each ranking, and we can perhaps even put a note to that effect at the top of the page, or you may already have that note there, Ariel, I just can't see it at the moment.

Anyway, I think we can talk about that, yeah. I'd be happy to use this same tool, that Ariel has already got done. I didn't notice she's working so hard in the background. Can I see what other people think? If you think we can make this work without any extra costs or effort to ICANN? Eduardo, you can't see it. Oh, you're on the Adobe Connect. There you are! Yes, please, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I am confused about this, that I have in front of me, because we are assuming here that we have only five people. Is that the case? I mean, what happens if we have 10?

JULIE HAMMER: 10, we list one to 10. Not a… And what we're doing is we're ranking the top, the person we think is best as number one, and the person we

think is worst at number 10, and when we add all of the scores, the candidates with the lowest scores are the ones that we believe are the best candidates.

But, what I'd like to emphasize is, I want us to see this only as a tool to lead into any more detailed discussions about candidates. It should allow us to discard some of the… If everybody ranks, you know, out of 10 candidates, if everybody ranks the bottom four pretty much the same, we can probably not even have a discussion about them, and we can focus on those of us, or those candidates who we believe are really the three contenders.

And then have more detailed discussions about them. So, I don't see this tool as making any decisions for us, but simply helping us focus on which of the candidates we should be putting a lot more effort into discussing. Does that sound reasonable?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. Yeah.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. And to some extent, that's why I thought, so we don't get confused, I might create two more applications, and they'll be silly ones, because I haven't got time to do anything much more sensible. And then we've got one to seven, so we shouldn't get confused. Remember too, that when we do this for real, this will be on our short listed candidates, because as a result of the initial evaluation, we're going to

drop some candidates off, and say these candidates aren't worth looking at further.

And so, say we started off with 15 applications, we might end up with say, eight or 10 short listed, and we would only have those coming through those detailed evaluation process. So, yes?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Julie, this is Eduardo. If we are going to rank order each of us, rank order the people, why are we [inaudible]? Why are we making one side to one before that? Because I can go ahead and look at the whole slate, and then rank them in an order. [CROSSTALK]

JULIE HAMMER: The idea was that this, we would only need to look in greater detail at the short list, because initially, the idea of doing the initial evaluation and producing a short list is that that would be done quite quickly, without going into great depth, and in fact, without references. And then we would just put the effort into those candidates who we believed were going to be real contenders.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I got it now. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Yup, okay, thank you. Any other questions? Okay. So, Louis, and Yrjö, and I haven't even yet had a chance to look at a schedule for doing our

next stage of our pile of the detailed evaluation tool. I didn't even know Ariel and Ken had created it. So, that's brilliant. And I'll do two more applications, and then I think we can progress this by ticking things along on the email list, and just asking people to do their trial once it's all up and ready to go.

And I think we'll have to do that, because we can't progress this at our public meeting in Hyderabad. This is something, I think, we need to do in the background, and have it done, I think, shortly after Hyderabad. So, if people are comfortable, I think we can achieve that. I think now that we understand the process and what we're trying to achieve, I think that should be achievable.

Okay, so given that, I'd like to now move on to agenda item four. I'm just quickly checking the comments in the chat, make sure I haven't missed anything. Yes, Cheryl, has noted that any large variance needs analysis. Absolutely. And that would need to be discussed in a real situation.

Okay, moving onto agenda item four, now Jordi and Vanda, and I have been doing some work in the background, developing a plan and a schedule for actually doing our detailed evaluation for real, and how we weave getting candidates references into the schedule, and how we deal with them.

We're still not quite ready to share our plan with you. We're still talking about a few issues between ourselves, but there were a couple of things that were raised as part of our email discussions, that I thought it would be very helpful to have the whole group's feedback on. One thing that I

did note was that it's important to make sure that we've got our terminology straight, otherwise we can be very much talking across prefaces, and that's why last time, we got the terminology of initial evaluation and detailed evaluation sorted out.

The terminology that I'd like to, if you use the tool bar to scroll down to agenda item four, I'd just like to propose the terminology about our various listings of candidates. So, first of all, we have a list of all candidates. And we are obliged to publish that. We've said in our operational procedures, we will publish that. And those are the candidates who've submitted a valid expression of interest by the deadline of 23:59 UTC Friday the 18th of November.

People who've asked for an EOI, but never submitted it, or never completed it, or it's invalid for some reason as judged by staff, and that will be, anything like that, we will report to the committee anyway. Those are not candidates, and therefore won't appear on the list of candidates. But this is a complete list of everyone who has applied with a valid EOI.

Then as a result of our initial evaluation, that is the one side scoring, where we must cut some clearly inappropriate candidates out, we will produce the short listed candidates. And that is, those candidates that will proceed on to detailed evaluation. And then, the outcome of all of our deliberations is the final slate of candidates, and they are the names of the candidates who are going to go on to the ALAC for voting.

So, I just wanted to, if you like, define those terms and make sure that when we use them, we clearly understand that short-listed candidates is

not the same thing as final slate of candidates and so on. Is everyone comfortable with those terms and their meanings? Could I just ask you if you're happy with that? Or, if you have any questions?

Great. Thanks everyone. And the first point that I'd like to ask of the committee, and it was something that was suggested in our little subcommittee, was that for transparency reasons, we should publish the list of short-listed candidates. I'd just like to ask your views on that, I must confess to you, I would have some concerns about during that, but if the committee feels that for transparency reasons, we should actually do that, then I'm happy to have my opinion overruled, but can I ask for any comments on that? Or discussion please.

Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Julie. Can someone help me understand what advantage in transparency is there in that? Where we publish all applicable, all acceptable and finalized expressions of interests and applications, the names are there, and we do a final slate. What is the additional benefit of that additional step of the short listed [inaudible]?

Because without having that rationale, I'm struggling.

JULIE HAMMER: The only, and I mean, I had said that I'm not comfortable with the idea. So, the rationale that was mentioned was for transparency reasons.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So what transparency reasons? Please help me understand someone.

JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry, I can't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. [Inaudible]

JULIE HAMMER: Unfortunately, the person who suggested it isn't on the call. Which clearly is Jordi. I don't think Jordi is sensitive about knowing that this is his suggestion, and I have said privately to Jordi that I do have some concerns about that. Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: Yeah, Louis for the record. I do share Cheryl's concerns. I would like to ask Jordi what the value added for doing that. I just don't understand it. I don't see any value added in doing that. Sorry, but I don't see it. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is a new hand, yes. In the absence… Cheryl for the record. In the absence of a compelling rationale from Jordi, or anyone else, I can think of reasons why we shouldn't, and I'm happy to present those. There is a

clear and most unusual requirement in the rules of procedure, because of the ability to petition for anybody who has put in an expression of interest, a complying expression of interest and application, to be put forward by regional leadership and the RALOs, providing they can get two other RALOs to agree with them.

So, we have to publish that list, which is the largest list, and that's important for process, to our commitment, and that works as a very transparent thing. The reason we often don't publish these things in other situations, is because there is a certain negativity, disappointment, etc. publicly noted, where people have applied for such a role, and have failed to put forward in a final slate, or indeed, appointed at all.

If we were to publish the short list of candidates, I think we're carving those names into another class of levels of acceptability, and I think it would open the debate up as to why, you know, my best friend, Auntie Mary, didn't make the short list, but your best friend, Uncle Jim, did. And I just think that will muddy the waters and impact on people's comfort with it.

I think, you know, you even make the final slate, or you don't. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Cheryl. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, I would also advise against [inaudible] candidates. Our process now is already much more than [inaudible] than the NomCom process,

where we publish all candidates, and then we publish a final slate. I think that this is [inaudible] enough. We don't need to publish every set of our [inaudible]. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Yrjö. So, I guess there are two ways that we can go. We have a quorum. So this committee is in a position to make a decision on this matter. Or, we can seek further justification from Jordi as to why this might be an advantage. I suggest in the interest of our limited time in this process, my preference would be for the committee now to make a decision.

First of all, please give me a green tick if you're happy to make the decision on this matter now. Thank you. So, we will go ahead and make the decision. Please give me a green tick if you would not like to publish the short-listed candidates, that is, we keep them private.

Thank you. Okay. So, everyone is in agreement on that. But thank you for a good discussion on that, and I think that was worthwhile having. Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: This is Louis for the record. This being said, I would like to have Jordi's rationale on that, because he's not there, so it would be nice to have him at least, and share information with everybody.

JULIE HAMMER: I will do that, and put it this way, I mean, if he comes up with a reason that we, none of us thought of, and we're convinced, we can always change our minds. So, I'll definitely do that by email, and ask him to share with everybody. It's just a real shame he's not on the call.

I think he had definitely intended to be on the call. The next issue that I would like to discuss, it came up in our discussions with Jordi, and Vanda, and myself was on the issue of references. We have set a deadline for the submission of references as 23:59 UTC on Friday the 2nd of December, which gives referees two weeks to submit their references.

We've highlighted two candidates, but they must impress on their referees, that this will be the deadline, and that they will need to seek their referees to get their references in. A few questions, and Vanda raised some of these questions because it's effectively the way things happen in NomCom.

Firstly, Vanda queried whether we intend to forward a list of questions to… No, I think it was Ariel actually that might have raised this, because Ariel has been researching the NomCom process. So anyway, the question came up, should we be sending a list of questions to the referees to answer?

Should we be tidying up EOIs before sending them to referees, as happens in the NomCom. And how flexible should we be with the deadline for the submission of references? So, my first question is, do we believe we should be sending a list of questions to referees to answer?

And I would then follow on, do we actually have the time to do that? Or should we simply be looking at the information that a referee seeks to provide us about the candidate?

I'm reluctant to give you my opinion first, because I really want to hear the view of Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perhaps you don't actually want to hear the view of Cheryl, but she got her hand up first. As someone who is active as a referee, frequently, in ICANN world and in the real world, if I can make that comparison, I actually appreciate questions when they are not too numerous. So if we could put a small selection of concise and relevant questions, and I think we should be able to do that, in short order, perhaps a little subcommittee of us could do that, that to me, does make the job of being a referee much easier, especially if we also have the, would you care to tell us anything else please put it here or not, as a catch all in addition to that.

I would be tempted to ask, if we do go down the questions pathway, and we may not, but if we do, if it could be some sort of interactive form. The number of times I've had [inaudible] to me that, of course, you know, or objects that aren't able to be, you know, filled in, so I don't care whether we use Survey Monkey, Google Forms, some other something or other, you know, direct them somewhere in the Wiki.

Don't care how, but it would be easier for referees to be able to just put the answer onto whatever we send them, rather than have to go through, does my operating system match yours? Sort of story. The

easier you can make the job of the referee, the faster you'll get the turnaround, and the shorter and more concise list of questions, is if we do go that way, the faster you'll get the turnaround.

And to answer your final question, even before we get to it Julie, I think we should be absolutely deadly on the cut-off. I don't think we should be flexible at all.

JULIE HAMMER: And Cheryl, your view on whether we tidy up EOIs or not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You know, if we got 45 expressions of interest, and we ended up with, you know, 15 to be considered seriously, I might be concerned with the amount of time we have, if we had the time to tidy up, but if we're going to be seriously considering, you know, four or five of these things, would suggest, well, why not?

JULIE HAMMER: Cheryl, we'll be, because of the timing, we'll be seeking referees reports from every single valid applicant.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In which case, it's [CROSSTALK]…

JULIE HAMMER: …short-list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, yes, if it was short-listed. Well, look, you know, don't tidy up, and if they've made a mess, then that goes through to the referee.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Thanks Cheryl. That's really helpful. Louis.

LOUIS HOULE: Louis for the record. Cheryl, it's a good point, but I am asking some standard questions to every [inaudible]. I'm not quite sure that it's going to provide the answer that we're looking for sometimes, you know, from our experience on the [inaudible]. You need some questions and details, and you need to expand a little bit on what he means, and just to clarify, the point that you want to take from a referee.

So, I'm kind of puzzled with that. Maybe we don't have enough time to do that, but I like, you know, interactive, as you mentioned. I prefer interactive possibility. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Louis. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes, this is Yrjö. Yeah, I think that if we have a list of questions to the referees, that will structure our work, and it's easier to compare the references. Just a suggestion, could we actually use the same questions

at the NomCom? I think that we could easily get those questions from the NomCom. They are not secret, in any way. And we could get them [inaudible] or from the chair of the NomCom.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Yrjö. I'm sure that Ariel would be able to get them? Ariel? Ariel's hand is up. Would you mind if, Vanda, if I go to Ariel in case she's wanting to answer that question? Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Julie. In fact, I already asked NomCom about sharing a list of questions they send to referees. And they expressed some concerns about confidentiality, or some other things. They're not entirely comfortable to share the list of questions directly with me. And then I asked them whether they can just give me kind of an idea of what types of questions they ask, and they're still in some kind of internal discussion, and I'm chasing after them, try to get that kind of idea.

So, I will follow-up if the committee decides to go that route, asking a set of questions. I think at least they can provide some kind of concepts, what kind of questions they ask, but I don't think they can provide exact wording of the questions.

JULIE HAMMER: Sure.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Ariel. Yrjö, did you want to add anything?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I just want to say that, I mean, as, for my experience, from NomCom, the confidentiality of NomCom applies to the information about the candidates. Their details. Everything else, according to the principles that have been used in the NomCom throughout it opened, and I don't see any reason for claiming confidentiality for something that is clearly for us as process, not the data or names. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. I think that's a good point. I'm puzzled by that as well. But having said that, I think if we do decide to post questions, that we've got a wealth of experience from the NomCom on this committee, and perhaps a couple of you can quickly put together questions like that. Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, I was going to raise other points, I don't believe I need to repeat. I agree with Cheryl and Yrjö. And I would like to raise the point of [stability?]. Because time is very short, and there will be, in the middle of this time, it will be in the regions that take care, you know, in United States and England, I don't know where, it's Thanksgiving time.

And probably, this will also get the same from the Asian area, where it is [inaudible], if not [inaudible], it's another, first of all. So, it's something that we need to pay a little attention, because when you receive two or three, many people will receive two or three, you know, demands for make some references for a candidate.

Maybe they have not much time to do that. So, one or two days of flexibility, we should give them to not, you know, use this as a prejudice for the candidates. It does that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Vanda. So, I'll now go to Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you. This is Gunela for the record. Yeah, look, I certainly think that it's useful to have a set of questions to the referee, but also to provide a space for general comments, and that's for all of the candidates. But when we get towards the short list of candidates, I only think that a phone call from one or two committee members, is really valuable.

Rather than email, because when you have a discussion, you get the feelings for what a referee might think. Sometimes things are unspoken, but there could be, kind of voice that could be inferences as well. So, there is a lot of things to consider there, but I personally would follow up with Vanda's point there, short list of candidates.

I also wanted to ask about the tidying up of the EOIs. I'm not clear on how that is done, to what it's done, what is covered. So, could I please get an explanation of that? Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Julie speaking now. I'm assuming that Ariel, Yrjö, and Vanda's hands are all up, but they're old hands. If that's the case, could you please lower them? If not, I'll come back to you.

I don't know how it's done. Perhaps Ariel might be able to enlighten us about what happens there.

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes. Thanks Julie. This is Ariel Liang for the record. I raised my hand specifically to answer Gunela's questions about tidying up. So, the most efficient way to export the EOI and share with the referee is to click this ellipses symbol on the top, and then say, export to PDF. And then you can see, I downloaded the PDF form, and then that's the EOI, basically.

And then it contains all of the information that the candidate has put in, but it cannot remain in this format. So, for example, the photo can be a little distorted, and then if the candidate putting the taxing of, you know, bad formatting, that will remain the same, because as staff equally decide not to retouch the EOI, it would just look as the way it is when you export it.

So, I guess back to the point of not having [inaudible] means we're just simply exporting the PDF, exporting the EOI PDF format without doing

any extra manipulation or reformatting of the data. I hope this is clear now.

JULIE HAMMER: Yup. Yeah, so I see that there was a little bit of distortion with the photo. I'm not sure that I would have a concern about that. There has been quite a few issues raised. Gunela, you raised an extra one that I will come back to in a moment, and that is phone calls to referees, because that's, in a way, similar to our next point to talk about, and that's candidate interviews.

So, I'm not going to ignore that. I'll definitely come back to that. But what I'd like to do is come back to the points on the references. So, I'm getting the sense that the majority of people think that we should come up with a template that we send to referees, which has a few pertinent questions, and an area for them to make a comment about anything else that they wish to, in a similar way to NomCom.

Can I ask if that's the overall view of the group? Could you please show me green ticks of you want to come up with a list of questions?

Okay. So, thank you. We will do that. In conjunction with that, can I… Given our time constraints, can I ask for one or two people with NomCom background to volunteer to put together, very quickly, that little list of questions that Ariel can then develop into a template? If you're willing to volunteer to do that, could you please…

And I'm specifically looking at the NomCom experienced people here, could you please raise your hand? Vanda, thank you. Yrjö, is that a hand volunteering?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: This is Yrjö. Yes.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. So, Vanda, Yrjö, and Fatimata. Thank you very much. I'll work with you on that, but we do need to do it very quickly. So, thank you so much for volunteering. The second point, tidying up EOIs… Yrjö, did you want, you wanted to make a comment. Thank you.

Right. Tidying up EOIs, I have to say I think that we have an enormous amount to get through in a short period of time. I would like to propose to you that we just ask Ariel to export the EOIs as PDF. If the photos are a little bit distorted, we would hope that the referees know the candidates well enough that they could still be recognized.

If the EOIs are a bit messy, as presented by the candidates, then I think that's a reflection on the candidate, not necessarily anything else. So, I would like to suggest that we don't do any tidying up of EOIs, that we simply get them out as quickly as possible to our referees, and do that within a couple of hours, if that's at all possible of the close of submissions.

So, could I see if people are willing to go that way please?

Okay, thank you. The deadline for submission of references. I hear Vanda's point about being flexible there, but I think we're making, by [inaudible] questions, we're making life easier. I think the difficulty with being flexible is, where do you stop?

You know, how do you defend if you've given one candidate an extra two days to submit a reference, but then another candidate, you deny if it's three days late. I really think it's a published deadline. I think it's very difficult to defend, not sticking to that deadline. So, even though it's a very busy time, I think I would like to propose to the committee that we strictly stick to our deadline for the submission of references.

Vanda, I know that that's not your view, but I would like to ask others what they feel about that. Cheryl had put a green tick before she stepped away. I think she probably had to go to another meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No I haven't. I'm still on audio. I'm actually looking up global holidays and celebrations for December 2nd, and they're about, so far, I haven't found any.

JULIE HAMMER: No, just that Thanksgiving is within the two week period.

So, I'm asking… I'm not sure whether I've lost connectivity, but I can't see any green ticks. So, I'm asking if people are agreeable to enforcing the deadline.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Agree.

JULIE HAMMER: Eduardo, thank you. Louis, Gunela.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have a question.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, go ahead Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: What does it mean, tidying of the EOI?

JULIE HAMMER: That was what Ariel was just talking about. If when it's exported as a PDF to send to the referee, say the photo was distorted, that Ariel would spend time working on the photo to make it look nice. If any of the formatting looking a bit messy, she would spend time just correcting formatting.

I guess what I'm suggesting is, I feel that that could take quite a lot of staff's time, and I don't feel we have the time to do that. If the information is there, then that's the most important thing to get to the referee. Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Yes, hi Julie. Gunela for the record. I just put in the chat about, if we're not doing the tidying up of the EOIs, and with regard to distorted photos and some formatting issues, could there just be a note sent to the referee with the EOI stating, no formatting has been done. This is the original product.

So, the referee realized that it's not to do with the applicants, it's the system. So, it looks better that way.

JULIE HAMMER: We can certainly do that, and that's a good idea. So, I'll ask Ariel to take a note of that and we'll make sure that that's in the covering email to the referees. Thanks for that. Okay, so I'm sorry that this meeting is going over time, but there is a couple of more important things that we do need to discuss.

One is another thing that was raised in the discussions with Jordi and Vanda, is whether this committee is itself doing candidate interviews. Secondly, Gunela has raised the issue of whether we make phone calls to referees. So, I would like to ask if there are interviews on that, and Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now I'm back in the Adobe Connect room. Cheryl for the record. I didn't realize my Adobe Connect had crashed when I left to go and search out everything from pagan to Hindu holidays and celebrations. However, now I'm back.

I think the referees, to the short list of candidates, are well worthwhile reaching out to. I think that's important. I'm less committed, but I am able to be convinced, about doing interviews for the short-listed candidates, sorry, for the short-listed candidates to create a final slate.

My reason being is the final slate, we're not appointing, we're a nominating committee. We are, in fact, putting a slate together, that then goes through an additional phase of diligence. And in that phase of diligence, the community has opportunity to Q&A, and interview, and have webinars with, and all sorts of things, with these candidates of the final slate.

So, I feel less committed to do candidate interviews, and I feel highly committed to see if we can reach out to referees for our final slate, for moving our group from a short-list to final slate. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, thank you Cheryl. Any other views? Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I tend to agree with Cheryl, but would it be possible, you know, if we're in the, getting to the final slate, if we can contact the candidate, just to acquire more information if it's not clear? That doesn't preclude us for not doing that, right?

JULIE HAMMER: One of the, it doesn't. One of the things that is in the process that Vanda, and Jordi, and I are developing, is quite early in the process, the

ability to send questions and clarifications, to both candidates and referees via email, if there is something in there applications that is not entirely clear. So, that's already in the process. But that's a different thing to, I think, discuss it.

Having an interview is really a more formal process, and would need to be quite well-structured, and basically, you'd really have to decide what you were going to cover in the interview, whether it's just going over the EOI again, and I think if you did it for one, you'd probably have to do it for everybody to be fair.

So…

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm with Cheryl here, yes. You know, in the NomCom, we interview the final slate, but that's because we are deciding on that. Here, really the community that is going to vote for them, not us.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, yes. Okay, then, yup. So, all right. So, anyone else want to express a view? I can't see anything in the chat. So, based on Cheryl and Eduardo's comments, what I'm hearing is that we will not aim to conduct candidate interviews, but we will consider reaching out to referees as we are approaching selecting our final slate of candidates.

So, I will need to include that in the process. So, first of all, can I seek your agreement to no interviews of candidates?

Thank you. And Louis, you don't agree?

LOUIS HOULE: Well, yes, I do agree, but I want to leave the door open. I just don't want to close the door. It's not, I don't think it's going to be necessary in the process that we're following right now. Just don't close the door, and we will probably won't have to use it.

I hate the idea of saying that we close the door, and if we need [inaudible] information, it would be a catastrophe for everyone. So, it's all, that's all I wanted to say.

JULIE HAMMER: Yup, understand. Yup, no. So I'll just say that, our intent is not to make candidate interviews part of the evaluation process. Put it that way, but that doesn't mean we must not contact the candidates.

Okay, so, the second question is, we will include in our process, the possibility of contacting and discussing candidates with referees, that we will include that. Gunela, you have a question.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: No, this is Gunela. No, I'm fine, thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Right, okay. So, I'm asking, we'll leave the door open to contacting referees, and we will probably do that as part of our process, and I will include time in the process to do that. So, I can see three green ticks. Everyone comfortable? Yrjö, thank you.

Thank you, okay. So, yes to, right. Okay, so that covers all of those questions, and that completes agenda item four. We're 11 minutes past the hour. I'm going to whiz through the rest of the agenda, because it's really just there for you to note.

I've highlighted where the meetings are going to be, first of all, and the date to the ALAC in Hyderabad. Secondly, our joint meeting with the BMSPC. [Inaudible] before, I think this meeting is really one more for us to let the BMSPC, and any audience, know what's happening. We won't be discussing anything confidential.

And many of you have other commitments, so I recognize that. So, if you're unable to be there, I will definitely note your apologies. I already have apologies from Cheryl, Eduardo, and Gunela. If anyone finds that they're unable to make it to that meeting, please let us know, and we'll note your apologies.

Okay. Any other business? I highlighted at the beginning the 21:00 time slot is pretty late for the Europeans, but seems to be okay for most other people. Once Europe comes out daylight saving, it should be a little bit better. In the schedule that Vanda, and Jordi, and I are developing, we're going to have to, I believe, go to, at some stages, two meetings a week, and what we are going to be proposing is, 21:00 on Mondays and Thursdays.

Very quickly, can I ask if anyone has a real issue with that? Because I note time of day is almost impossible to find, and 21:00 or 20:00 were the best times that we could find. Would anyone like to just make any comment that? Or, shall we just proceed with that as our plan?

Fatimata, you're not going to be able to make Mondays?

That might, your comment might be related to the… Sorry, I just noted your comment, Fatimata, it might be related to the ICANN 57 meeting. Yrjö, thank you for agreeing to those timings.

Okay, so I misunderstood Fatimata. Thank you. Okay, Louis, thank you for that. Vanda is okay. Thank you. Eduardo. Just waiting to see what you have to say.

In the ALAC calendar? No, we will be sending around a schedule. It will be on our pages. They'll be listed as meetings on our pages, but we're also developing an Excel spreadsheet with the whole process on it, which ended up being a much more complicated process than I thought possible.

But I'm sure those of you on NomCom are surprised. So the dates will be set well in advance. So, they'll be posted on the Wiki, but not on the ALAC calendar. Fatimata, all of them will be 21:00. We'll be getting that schedule out, hopefully within the next week or so, but Jordi, and Vanda, and I just want to do a little bit more work in the background first.

So, we'll get it to you in good time. Okay, thank you all for your feedback. My sincere apologies for going 15 minutes over, but I really appreciate everything that we've agreed during the meeting. Ariel and I will get the outcomes up, and the actions us, as quickly as possible. Vanda, I'll be in touch regarding moving forward our schedule on our little subcommittee, and Vanda, Yrjö, and Fatimata, I'll be in touch regarding the questions for the referees.

Thank you all for your fantastic contributions. Really appreciate how active this committee is. You make my life so much easier, and it's just a pleasure working with you all. Thanks. Thanks so much. And thank you to Ariel, Terri, and Heidi for helping us run this meeting yet again.

See some of you in Hyderabad. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]