

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) call on Monday, the 9th of January, 2017 at 2100 UTC. Happy New Year.

On the call today we have Yrjö Länsipuro, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Louis Houle, Gunela Astbrink, and Fatimata Seye Sylla. Joining us a little later in the call, we're hoping, is Eduardo Diaz.

We have listed apologies from Vanda Scartezini and Jordi Iparraguirre. From staff, we have Ariel Liang, and myself, Terri Agnew. Heidi Ullrich will also be joining us a little later in the call.

I would like to remind all 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, Terri. Welcome, everyone, and Happy New Year once again. I hope you had a good break. We still have a little bit of work to do, but I guess nothing that is particularly urgent, but still important. So, it'll be good, I think, for all of us if we can get stuck into our review and get that tidied up so that we can all get back to our normal lives.

The first thing I'd like to mention to you is that Tijani and I have been invited to join all of the January RALO meetings. In fact, we have just joined the NARALO meeting. Louis was there, as well as Eduardo. Louis, thanks for leaving that and coming to join us. I suspect Eduardo will be with us soon.

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.

There's also all of the other regional meetings scheduled at that time listed on the agenda, and there's also going to be a RALO leaders' meeting scheduled sometime on the 12th of January, which Tijani and I will join.

Just to give you a little bit of a sense of what happened at that meeting – thank you, Louis, for your comment in the chat – I briefly covered our activity and our process. Tijani concentrated in his discussion mainly on the petitioning process as part of the next stage, rather than the voting process. I guess that is the next stage – that the RALOs have to decide whether they are going to support a petition.

I would let you know that one of the candidates, William Cunningham, has exchanged a number of e-mails with us on the program admin mailing address, seeking to be put onto the slate. Staff have explained to him that the process is not one where he can simply ask to be added, but that it's defined as part of the BMSPC process.

So, he spoke in the NARALO meeting and mentioned that his reasons were that he was concerned about diversity. I tried to explain that the BCEC deals with what occurs and that diversity is perhaps better dealt with by the NomCom.

Louis, please feel free to add some comments to that perspective, and Eduardo, if you'd like to as well, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE:

It shows that people who don't know the organization don't understand the process that easily, and it shows that we still have to inform

outsiders, if I may say so, on that process. Clearly, Mr. Cunningham had some problems with that.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah.

LOUIS HOULE: Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: No problem.

LOUIS HOULE: You did a good job. Tijani and you with Heidi explained what happened and what we can do. Well, now we'll see what's going to happen within NARALO. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes indeed. Okay. Thanks, Louis. Eduardo, did you want to add anything about the NARALO meeting, or have we covered it all?

EDUARDO DIAZ: You mean with William, what he said about diversity and things like that?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That part?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah, or anything.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, I think that was related to the BCEC and the slate. Finally, people don't understand the process. They think that, if enough people do not apply, then we have to deal with what's out there. That's what was one thing.

The other thing is that they, apparently, don't know the process – that you can put your names through if you get EURALO and two more RALOS through to support you for the final slate.

So, to me it's not understanding the process. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes. I think that's right. Hopefully, he will take onboard what we've suggested about the NomCom. And if he's still interested, he can turn his attention to that process.

Louis, your hand is still up. You'd like to say something more?

LOUIS HOULE: Yes. I just found it very amusing because the [BCEC] members – one is French speaking and the other is Spanish speaking. So, about diversity, I thought it was amusing when I heard that.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Excellent diversity, as Heidi pointed out.

LOUIS HOULE: We're a [inaudible]

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Okay. So, I might leave that at that and move onto our substantial work of reviewing what we've done, our process review. I've prepared a few documents for you, and I'm hoping that you've all had a chance to look at them.

Firstly, thanks to the eight members who sent in their feedback on the process. I have consolidated that into the summary document, which just simply lists all of your input. I'm not sure whether we're able to put that up in the Adobe Connect. If we can't, I can simply work my way through it anyway.

We had fairly significant agreement from most people on many of the issues. I'd like to briefly go through them and highlight where I think we have pretty good agreement. Then there are a couple of issues that I'd like to seek further discussion on.

Firstly, we all thought that the evaluation tools that we developed were pretty good and we're going to recommend that they be used in future rounds. Please scroll through as we go through, [yourselves], to follow where we're at. The various documents that we developed – the code of conduct – we didn't think needed any changes.

On the candidate requirements, we did feel that maybe future committees might look at whether they finesse those requirements, and perhaps put in something on balancing the weight put on ALAC experience with a criteria that looks at their activity in advocating other types of end user interests. I've captured that in a draft recommendation.

With our expression of interest performer, there have been three issues highlighted in that, which we will recommend be looked at by staff to see whether anything further on the technology side can be done.

Gunela, you'd like to make a point. Please go ahead.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you, Julie. I just wanted to mention the point I made there about accessibility of the [EoI] form. According to the web content accessibility guidelines, I know that there's a lot of remediation being done on those ICANN websites, generally. I had checked that that particular performer has a number of errors in regards to being accessible.

So, I just wanted to point that out. I'm sure that Ariel or other staff is aware of that and are probably working on it, but I just wanted to raise it. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks very much for pointing out your comment there, Gunela. I haven't currently captured that as a recommendation, but I do need to do so in the report. I think that's something that we will need to leave with staff to work on in slower times. If we get all of the content sorted out, then perhaps those technical issues associated with that and the other little bugs that we found related to browsers not using English settings, related to uploading documents, and related to temporary saving – then those things, I think, can be worked on over the longer term by staff.

Thank you for highlighting that point that you made.

Instructions to candidates: we felt were pretty reasonable, although I did find a piece of paper where I'd written a note to myself saying that we need to seek commission of the applicants right up front to publish their Eols.

Now, they're probably not going to be published unless they're on the slate, but it would be much easier for us to have that commission right up front as part of the consent and authorization form. So, I'll add that in as well as a recommendation that I haven't currently got in the draft report.

Also, questions for referees. Now, we have a couple of suggestions here that I would like to discuss in this meeting about whether, for future rounds, we actually suggest adding in an additional question.

We've had comments from Vanda and Louis here. I'll just read them out.

Vanda says, "For me, a question about personality, teamwork, behavior under stress, and related questions helps to see the candidate from outside accomplishments only."

Louis had said, "Interpersonal skills of the candidate [inaudible] specifically." I think that they're quite closely related issues.

I'd like to ask all of you whether you feel that we should recommend adding a question to the referee's list that covers something like that.

I see some people are typing in the chat. Okay. Can I ask – hang on. Gunela said it needs to be formulated carefully.

Can I, first of all, ask whether members feel that we should recommend an additional question along those lines or simply leave it to future committees to make their own decisions about questions for referees? We're not making any decisions here about what's going to happen in the future. We're simply looking at recommendations.

So, if you feel that we should recommend adding a question along these lines for referees, could you please give me a green tick?

Okay. I'm seeing a number of green ticks in the Adobe. I'll just wait a minute longer.

Okay. So, everyone thinks so. What I will do, rather than formulate a question as such to be added, I will include it as a recommendation

rather than trying to amend the questions for referees. Okay. That's good.

Moving on to our process itself, we all seem to be happy that we needed to do the tools familiarization and that the sample Eols were quite useful. Something we could consider recommending to future committees is whether they actually raise their –

They're welcome to use the sample Eols that we have, but to familiarize themselves with the forms, some of them might want to raise some additional sample Eols rather than us doing it for them now. So, we could mention that in our report – not necessarily as a recommendation, but rather as a comment. That's what I would suggest.

Anyone have any thoughts on that? Louis agrees. Okay. So, I'll make it as a comment.

The usefulness of the initial evaluation to produce our own shortlist seems to be well-accepted, but the thing we really do need to discuss in some detail is the value and effectiveness of doing a blind evaluation. So, I actually included all your comments and I've done a summary.

Basically, Vanda and Louis said, yes, we should try to do a blind evaluation, although both recognized that some of the candidates are going to be fairly obvious no matter how you try to anonymize their applications.

Two said. Four said no, it really wasn't worth doing it blind. That was Yrjö, Fatimata, Eduardo, and Gunela. Cheryl thought that, in theory it's a good thing to do, but in practice it's pretty hard to achieve.

I'll open the floor for discussion on this point. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Julie. I just wanted to be clear on what I was saying when I said the theory and practice comment. I think it is a worthwhile effort to make because, whilst in practice there are obvious difficulties which have all been recognized, just going through the [attempt] exercise reinforces to the component parts of future BCECs that they need to be scrupulous in their looking at the criteria, not value judgement in that early-on phase regarding, "Oh, well, my great Aunt Mary is a good friend. Therefore..."

So, I just think it reinforces the inadvertent kind of professionalism that a BCEC needs to attend to, especially in those early phases. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. And you did say that very clearly in your comment. Thanks, Cheryl. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. In practical terms, I feel that the value of a blind evaluation is that there is not a chance of knowing who is applying. If you know two or three of them that have applied based on the information they

provided, what's the use of blinding the whole thing? Because you know the people who are applying that way.

So, it might work for a different process, but for what we're doing here – it basically [denotes] that we know most of the people that will be applying. That would be my experience. Maybe I'm wrong. It may be different in the future, but it's a work that we're doing that, really, we should not do it. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Eduardo. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I think that this blind evaluation is not a very good idea. Also, as I said in my comment, it's semi-blind because we know – and probably future committees also – a number of candidates. So, actually I would argue that this introduces an element of [non-equality] treatment of candidates. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Obviously, it's not up to us to make a decision. We don't even have to make a recommendation on this. What we can do is simply make a comment. We can include some of the thoughts that Cheryl has posed and say that a blind evaluation does have the advantage of forcing the members of the BCEC to look very critically at criteria and how the applicants meet them.

But we can simply make a comment and point out the difficulties in actually achieving anonymity when candidates are known to the committee members. And, candidates are not necessarily keeping confidential the fact that they've applied – neither do they have to.

I guess my recommendation to the group is that we simply discuss this issue and leave it to future committees to make their own decision about whether they choose to do a blind evaluation or not.

Can I ask if everyone is comfortable with that approach: simply making it a comment rather than a recommendation?

Louis is happy. Yrjö is happy. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: You know, we suffer through a lot of information in answering that question. Why don't we send this to the next group and let them decide based on all these comments?

JULIE HAMMER: That's exactly what I'm saying.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

JULIE HAMMER: This is part of the report which is what we would hope the next BCEC will look at very closely before they begin their work, as I did with the previous BCEC's report.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood. I thought you were going to summarize these comments. So, it's okay. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. So, I'll draft something to put in our report and then, when we are finalizing the report, you can have a look at that and see if you're comfortable with what I suggest we say.

Okay. Just to confirm, that report, I would hope, will be looked at very, very carefully by the next BCEC.

Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: As long as we also suggest that the process is good in itself. It's just that sometimes it's not worth applying.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes.

LOUIS HOULE: The comments that you made are, I think, very significant, and as long as we have all the information provided to the next BCEC, I'm going to fine with it. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Louis.

Okay. Moving onto the next question that we looked at, which was the effectiveness of the scoring process in the initial evaluation. We did a scoring on a scale of 1 to 5. Most people thought that was okay, although there were a couple of comments that I think we might well discuss.

Eduardo thought that maybe a scale of Pass, Not Pass, or Not Sure could be utilized, rather than a scale of 1 to 5. Yrjö also thought that there wasn't a lot of difference in the descriptions of the top two categories: Outstanding and Excellent.

I guess my question to the group is, do you think there is something we would recommend changing in our scoring process of 1 to 5, and do you think we need to reword our definitions of the scoring?

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. As I indicated in my comment, I think the process of a scoring upfront is good. What the scale or terminology associated with that scaling activity, I think, is highly negotiable and probably need to be

the remit – and at least the remit to review, in all subsequent BCECs as part of their start-up work.

I think we should strongly recommend the principle of the activity, but be very open on what you set as the criteria, provided it's the criteria agreed to by the community and the ALAC and the electorate, as well as some way of using this as a filter process is a good one. So, it's high principle as opposed to specific implementable detail.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl. Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you. I think having a scale from 1 to 5 gives us more options if you have [only three]. This time you only had like six candidates, but sometimes it can be [very frustrating trying] to rank candidates [inaudible] criteria. I think having 5 gives us more opportunities to rank the candidates. Sometimes, two candidates that can be really close to one another, but you can see that there's a slight difference, and having 1 to 5 gives us more options.

At the same time, I agree with Yrjö [on Excellent] and Outstanding. It's different to [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Thanks, Fatimata. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I think Cheryl just nailed it. I think the process is excellent. We should go and do this scaling. I think maybe what the next group should look at is the type of scale that they want to use. Some people like it; some have different ideas. But they should go through this process. That's really the important point. With the scale, they can decide. If they want to use 1 to 10, or 1 to 3, or No Pass, then they have the comments and they can decide. Thank you

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. All right. So, I will capture all those thoughts into some comments and possibly a recommendation that future BCECs make their own decisions on the scale that they use in their initial evaluation and the definitions and that we recommend that this is an important part of the process. I'll capture that in the draft report. Thanks for all that input.

Moving on to the next question. Everyone thought that the detailed evaluation was useful – and of course, it is absolutely essential. It's really a bit of a no-brainer. There was also pretty unanimous support for the ranking process. After we've produced our internal shortlist, we then rank them.

That was something that most people seemed very happy with, although Gunela mentioned that we could review this to consider other methodologies. I'm just not sure what other methodologies there might be, other than scoring or ranking.

Gunela, please go ahead.

GUNELA GRUBER: Thank you, Julie. No, I'm not sure of other methodologies, either. I just felt that, when I was doing the ranking, it was a little bit like the scoring and trying to think about the scoring up against a ranking. So, that's where I wondered if that's a correlation there, whether there was some linking or not. That was just my feeling and that's why I don't have any other suggestions. It was just something I was slightly concerned about. That's all I can say. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Well, I guess – would you be comfortable, given the support from the others, if we simply go ahead and recommend this as a process that future BCECs use? Because I have used it in a number of judging, and I've always found it very useful.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Julie, and you have my absolute support on that. The reason I raised my hand is, I do think it's important that we perhaps almost belabor the point to people in future BCECs who have not perhaps had the experiences of using these types of systems, these two different types of filters, for the want of a word – the second one being a forced discriminatory one – that we either provide some referencing or some adjunct text to help future BCECs understand the purpose and principle here.

Again, it's the purpose and principle, I think, that's the most important part of our recommendations, and less the specifics of the activities themselves.

So, if in some hypothetical future, there is an established and agreed-on alternative that does the same thing as our rankings, then that's fine. Go for it. Do you know what I mean? Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Okay. I'll make sure that, in the report, we actually explain that it's not an obvious difference between scoring and ranking and what the advantages are of doing one in the initial process and the other in the [inaudible] process. So, I'll make sure that that's clear. And, obviously, future committees will make their own decisions.

Okay. Now, the BCEC timeline. I've actually been doing a bit of work on that, and I'd like to come back to that when we get to having a quick look at my draft report. When I say "draft report," it's at the very, very early, preliminary draft stage. But I did have a look at the timeline, and there were a couple of issues associated with that that I want to go through with you, so I'll come back to that when we get to the draft report.

Operational procedures and guidelines – I'll also come back to because I've highlighted in that some issues that we might want to recommend a slightly tweaking of for future committees.

What I'd like to do now, having worked through your input on all of those review aspects, is I'd like to ask staff if they could put up my draft

BCEC report in the chat and give the people scrolling rights, and I'd like to go through this and talk about a couple of points.

First of all, a lot of this we've just been through. In looking at your comments, I've just captured some comments on the tools – that we spent a lot of time developing them. We included a recommendation that the evaluation tools developed by our committee should be used in future selections.

I've listed the various documents that we've developed and that will be maintained on the website for use in the future, should they be required – the code of conduct, the candidate requirements, the sample expression of interest form, questions for referees, and our e-mail templates.

I also mentioned there some of the difficulties with the EoI, and I've noted that I need to add in Gunela's point about meeting [inaudible] content accessibility guidelines. So, I'll update that.

But then I've included a few recommendations that flow out of that. One is that those documents should be used as a good starting basis for future committees. Recommendation 3 – that they consider including a criterion on advocating for end user interest. (Sorry, I've got a typo there. I'll fix that before we get too much further.)

Obviously, a future BCEC should "consider the inclusion of a criterion focused on advocating for end user interest to balance the weight put on ALAC experience prior to finalizing candidate requirements."

ICANN staff should work with technical staff on the EoI form to remedy the difficulties, and I'll add in the issue about the accessibility standard there.

Then, the questions for referees developed by our BCEC be used as an e-mail template in future rounds and, again, we agreed there that I was just going to make a comment, but not necessarily include as a recommendation the issue of teamwork and the –

I'm just looking back for the words that were used – oh, no, actually, sorry. We said we'd include that as part of the recommendation: interpersonal skills. So, I will weave that into the recommendations.

If there are no questions on that initial part of the report, let's now move on to the process. I haven't yet included any generic remarks like, "The process that we followed was fundamentally sound." I'll probably need to expand on the description of the process. Based on the discussion that we had on the blind evaluation, I'll put the appropriate words in there.

My question to you is, are there any other aspects of the overall process that you believe we should change? Or are we just really confirming that the process we followed was sound, and making comments about a blind evaluation and so on?

So, there are no other changes to the process? Okay.

What I really wanted to get to was this timeline. What I've done is looked back at what we did, and I've put in what is probably an overly generous timeline to try to give future committees a better idea of how

much time the BCEC should be allowed. I really need you, I think, to mull over this outside the meeting and provide me with feedback on it, unless some of you can see some significant problems with it at the moment.

Just a couple of aspects of it that I'd like to point out. I've allowed a fair amount of time upfront for reviewing past procedures and documents and producing the operating procedures and finalizing candidate requirements and finalizing the EoI form.

Basically, I've allowed four weeks between the first meeting of the BCEC and when the EoI form needs to be finalized. I think, if future committees get pushed for time, there's probably an ability to compress that. But I think, as our recommendation, we should suggest that this is a good schedule to be planning on.

What I've also done is weaved into this schedule the fact that the deadline for submissions is in Week 12. During that period when there's a call for nominations, the BCEC would be doing its tools familiarization as we did.

I had a question in my own mind because I wasn't sure what you would decide about blind evaluation. I've actually based this on doing the blind evaluation during the two weeks that we've put out the request for references, so I'll make that my clear that, in the period between when we get the applications and then request references and we're waiting for the references, that would be the two-week period that we do the blind evaluation.

I would then need to slip the announcement of a slate of candidates to Week 14 because we couldn't announce that prior to the completion of the blind evaluation. Otherwise, you would all know who people were.

I've then really followed the sort of timescale that we used. I've allowed for four weeks for the detailed evaluation, but you might consider that is too generous. The reason I did it was because we did not pursue any interviews with referees or interviews with candidates or anything like that. We decided that we didn't need to do that. Should future BCECs decide they do need to do that, then they need more time than we had.

So, that's a point I'd like to ask for your feedback on. Should we allow that full four weeks there for the detailed evaluation, or should we cut that back to, say, two weeks?

Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Well, it looks like, to me, plenty of time, but really, that will be a function of how many people apply. If two apply versus ten, that might change. So, four weeks sounds like a very good timeline to me.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. Gunela?

GUNELA GRUBER:

I agree with Eduardo. It looks very generous, but there could be a whole range of reasons why this amount of time is needed. There might not be

as much time needed in the initial stages of finalizing code of conduct procedures, etc., but there might be, depending on a future BCEC.

And, again, with the various evaluations stages, it very much depends on the number of candidates, if there any issues that need to be dealt with, and interviews, etc.

So, I think it's better to have a little bit more time than for a future BCEC to feel that they are really pushed to follow the timeline. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Gunela. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Julie. I agree with everything that's been said, and I do think it's not overly generous, actually, but a very reasonable timeline. If we make the point that this is aspirational – and my granddaughter, [Thea], agrees with everything I'm saying as well, as you can hear – it allows flexibility (she's fine), depending on the circumstances that future BCECs find themselves in.

So, to that end, I think what this timeline does is reinforce to a future ALAC and electorate – and we are often rather tardy, can I just say – that they need to get everything started sooner rather than later. We started, I would argue, about as late as we possibly could do reasonably get an outcome. We should have started a great deal earlier, and it was planned for the BCEC this year to start to a great deal earlier. There are a bunch of fluffy reasons, which I'm not going to go into because I will become irritated if I do. There was various holdups and things.

So, we're just damned lucky that we had a good team and a great leader who could pull it off in the time allowed. Future BCECs may not have those things, unless we permanently tie Julie in as Chair in perpetuity – which [she'd probably have] agreed to that, sadly.

With that said, I think this is quite a generous timeline, but not an overly generous timeline. We just need to let them know that this is something that will allow the flexibility that we think needs to be in the future systems. Thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Great. Thanks, Cheryl. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, let's keep the four weeks. That will give the future BCECs the opportunity to make interviews. Once you start scheduling the interviews and so on and so forth, that's an entirely different ballgame. So, time will be needed. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Yrjö. Okay. So, I shall leave that suggested timeline for future BCECs as is in the report, and I'll add in a few introductory remarks on that. Great. Thank you for that great discussion.

We'll come back to the operating procedures and guidelines in a moment, but there's a couple of other points that have arisen during our work that I thought I would like to suggest we include in our report.

One aspect is the terminology. We have consistently used the term “candidates,” and I think we’ve used it in –

Oh, Eduardo, did you want to pick on something from the last point?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

JULIE HAMMER: Please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me?

JULIE HAMMER: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This timeline looks very detailed and looks very fine, but those 21 weeks – does that mean that they’re going to have conference calls 21 times? Have you correlated this to the number of phone calls and conference calls that this group needs to do? Do you have an idea, or is one-to-one?

JULIE HAMMER: Eduardo, I [say] that that’s up to the committee, how they work. If they’re able to do a lot of work by e-mail, then they wouldn’t need to have a conference call each week. I think it’s entirely up to the

committee – what operating process they follow, how much they do by e-mail, how much they need to meet in conferences. I don't think that's an aspect that I was planning on making any recommendation about. I think that's really up to the future committee.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Is that okay?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, thanks.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Just on the aspect of terminology, what I'd like to recommend is that we actually recommend that the term "applicant" be used throughout the process more up until the stage that we announce the BCEC slate of candidates because what it seems is that using the term "candidates" throughout can create some confusion.

So, I'd just like to ask people's thoughts. I've drafted this as a recommendation, but I'd just like to get your thinking on this to see whether you agree with me or whether you think that we should continue to use "candidates" throughout the whole process.

Cheryl has agreed. Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: I agree. I just punched the wrong button. I agree.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, okay. Thank you. Okay, so I'll go ahead. What I've done in my recommendation is that I'll recommend that the term "applicants" be used up to the announcement of the slate of candidates. I've also recommended that ALAC staff – and I'll work with them on that – actually review all of the templates to see where it's appropriate to change that to "applicant" rather than "candidate." I think that will stop quite a deal of confusion in the future.

The other point that I'd like to suggest we discuss and include a recommendation on is who announces the final slate of candidates. In the rules of procedure, it's silent on who should actually announce the final slate of candidates, which is actually the BCEC slate of candidates plus any additional names that are to be added by successful petition.

I actually feel quite strongly about this because I feel we are charged with doing an evaluation. To quote from the rules of procedure, "The task of the BCEC is to identify applicants who would each make an excellent Board Director."

Now, by definition, we include, on our slate, all of those applicants, and we make some difficult decisions in that regard. To me, anyone added by petition is not part of our process or part of an evaluation. I think it is more related to the BMSPC process, that any additional names go onto the slate.

So, in my mind, it's more logical for the BMSPC to announce the final slate of candidates. That's not what's going to happen this year, and that's fine. I don't have a problem with that. But, I guess what I feel is that we've done an evaluation; for us to then be required to add names that we have chosen not to include is somewhat illogical.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. I couldn't agree with you more. I'm just thinking that – hopefully unlikely, but nevertheless possible hypothetical – of having something in the future akin to what I know has happened at the International Red Cross, for example, where, thanks to (shall we politely put it as greasing of the wheels) absolutely, [totally] inappropriate people end up doing final consideration, and in some hopefully even rarer circumstances, [are] actually appointed.

That's not what we want to see for our future, so I think to have a clear discriminatory line between those who have gone through a process of considered community-based – remember, BCECs are regionally-bound tools. They are an extraordinarily acute, democratizing and professionally-acting entity, and I think the outcome of a BCEC should be clearly discriminated in all future points until the end of the process from anything that two or more of the RALOs can be convinced to [inaudible] to join it. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl. So, everyone seems to be quite comfortable with that suggestion that we make that recommendation. Thank you for those ticks in the Adigo.

That then brings us to the top of the hour.

Thank you, everyone. Thank you for your agreement.

I won't, at this point in time, go through the things I'd highlighted in the draft rules of procedure because I'll now, based on some of the decisions that you've made in this meeting, go through and fine-tune them as a possible strawman for the future BCECs by making some changes, like the terminology – using the term "applicants" rather than "candidates" in various places.

But just for the continuation of our work, we've really covered all the points that I feel need to, but I'd like to offer you the opportunity of raising anything else that you think we might need to mention in our report that I haven't yet picked up on.

Is there anything else that you think we need to cover?

Okay. Louis is happy. Great. Thank you.

With regards to our future meetings –

Oh, Louis, please go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: Just to mention that we are very happy with the job that are President has been doing. In other words –

JULIE HAMMER: Is that the President of Canada or the President of the BCEC? [laughing]
Thank you, Louis. I greatly appreciate that comment.

Okay. For future meetings, I don't know whether you consider that we need to have a final meeting to review any final documents. I've got a couple of things happening in the next couple of weeks that will make it difficult for me to schedule a meeting until the 26th of January. So, that's a couple of weeks away.

What I propose we do is I'll update these documents and work them up and then circulate them by e-mail and ask for your input and feedback by e-mail on our report and on our recommended changes to our operating guidelines. I'll also look at working with staff on perhaps creating a – what will it be? – 2020 BCEC series of documents and templates, where we have actually already implemented the recommendations that we have made.

Perhaps, if we come back together, say, on the 26th of January, hopefully with much of that finalized and with that report ready just for a final confirmation, then hopefully our job will be done – the only aspect that I need to ask your views on is, when it comes to releasing the final slate of candidates (which may or may not have a petition's name added to it) are you comfortable – and, of course, you well know that that's out of our control – are you comfortable to leave that process to the staff and me to work with and just to get that done without involving you, or would you like me to bring it back to the

committee before it's done, noting that it really is not something that we are going to have say on?

So, my question is, can you give me a green tick if you're having to leave that to staff and to me to facilitate – that's on our slate of candidates?

Cheryl said yes. Everybody's happy. Good. So, I'll go ahead and work with staff on that as the time approaches.

Okay. So, what we'll do is we'll schedule a meeting for 2100 UTC on the 26th of January. Hopefully, we'll have done quite a bit of work by e-mail in the meantime to finalize our report, and we'll confirm that at that meeting. And we'll break out the electronic champagne bottle.

Any final business on this call before I let you go?

Oh, Cheryl, sorry. You'll be at a retreat. Fatimata will not be available. Thank you for the kind words in the chat. I greatly appreciate that.

Can I say, too, that I think this has been a great committee to work with? You've all been really diligent and hardworking, as have staff. Ariel, Terri, and Heidi have been fantastic. It's been a pleasure.

All right, everyone. Thank you for that. I look forward to talking to you on the 26th. Thanks, everyone.

Ariel, do you and Terri want to continue on and have a quick chat after the call?

TERRI AGNEW:

Certainly. Just let me confirm recordings of staff. Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]