CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone and welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party call on Monday, the 13th of July, 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Remmy Nweke on audio only, David Mackey, Yrjö Länsipuro, Sarah Kiden, Bastiaan Gosling, Judith Hellerstein, Nadira Al Araj, and Amrita Choudhury.

We have received apologizes from Ali AlMeshal, Natalia Filina, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Alparen Eken, and myself Claudia Ruiz on call management. We also have Herb Waye on the call.

And before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and to also please keep your line muted when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. And are there any comments on the agenda? It's pretty much our standard agenda that we're going to spend the bulk of the meeting continuing to look at the application accreditation progress. And hopefully we may be finished today. I see no hands. So, we'll accept the agenda and start it. And could we please have the document on the screen?

And I'm going to have to put on hold because I have someone at the door. My apologies. And I am back. If we could … And again. One second, I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Alan needs to put a Do Not Disturb note on the front of his door. Most unusual. We can go for several days without anybody disturbing you and two people choose the beginning of your meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I hope that's the last time we'll get interrupted. If we could scroll down to the bottom of page two. There we are. Looking for the comment from Siva right at the bottom, scroll up a little bit. Thank you.

And there's a comment where funding from government or industry does not imply control. It might still imply a conflict of interest. That needs to be duly notified, even if the ALS is accredited. Is this an issue that we believe we need to look at? We're already asking that the government industry funding does not imply control. Do we want to add conflict of interest to that? Yes, no? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Considering we're talking about At-Large structures, whose sum contribution to the most meaningful things, other than some opinion on policy, would be the ability to perhaps vote if their particular regional At-Large organization doesn't work purely by consensus, I'm not sure how much conflict of interest in terms there would be.

I mean, we've established that they're not running other than for the best interests of Internet end-users, so I'm not sure how you'd even define this as a conflict of interest. So, I think that's a no from me on that [second part].

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any thoughts? Going back over all the experience, I cannot really see this as a problem. The only places I can see it as a problem are there are one or two ALSes that were accredited that, in my mind, should not have been accredited because they're largely industry organizations. And there I could see some level of conflict, but I think that's an issue on criteria, not really on a conflict of interest for a valid organization. So, I don't see a problem with this and I'm willing to note that this does not seem to be a concern of this group. Hearing nothing else, we'll go on to the next item.

Comment from Jacqueline, this the bottom of page three, saying "Since we're saying it's not necessarily a Wiki, maybe we should use a more common, a more generic term."

I think using the term Wiki there is reasonable because it is what we're using right now, and are likely to continue using it for at least the short while. So, although we could change it, I don't have a really strong feeling and my inclination is to leave it alone.

Is there anyone with strong feelings that we should change it? Given that the footnote says we may use some other vehicle. And I don't think we're going to lose the corporate memory of what a Wiki is, if not our Wiki. I don't see a major issue. Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, yes. I see your point because we often use Google Docs for policy comments now and [we use different other mechanisms.] So, the point is she's just trying to be more specific, saying in general. But I think if we have the footnote, then the footnote defines the word "Wiki," but I think she just wants to be more definitive.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I see a note from Cheryl saying, "We can always edit this later. This is not something that's going to be subject to Board review."

So, I'm happy to leave it right now because a Wiki is what we're using at the moment. Google Docs, which is a likely alternative, has access problems from some areas of the world. So, it's not likely that we will go to that in the very short term.

So, I think for the moment we'll just leave it because I think it's clear to people what we mean if we say that rather than a document management system. A document management system has connotations of something that manages thousands of corporate documents, and I don't think that's what we're looking at at all.

Next comment. There are a number of changes that were made in, I think the first one is Section 9. It's the bottom of page five on my screen, maybe somewhere slightly else. It's Item number nine. Okay, and a new sentence that straddles the page, I believe. So, if you could go down a bit to the next page. There we go.

And I've added the sentence: "The occurrence of part or all of an ICANN face to face or virtual meeting" and a reference to the pointer to where all of the meetings are defined during, "during the 90 day period will automatically extend that period for [seven] calendar days."

I think we decided on that last week, or perhaps the week before. And the only question I have, is it clear that if two meetings straddle the 90 days, or the extended 97 days, that it will be extended twice? Does this imply there will be only one such extension or allow for there being multiple?

How about if we say, "extend the period by seven days for each ICANN meeting." I think that will make it clearer. I see no comments, so that sounds good and several people say it sounds good.

Next one. "Should it become apparent that this norm may not be achieved, the ICANN chair or delegate may opt to extend the processing time by no more than 30 days."

Should the 90-day period be extended? I think that has to be changed in light of the previous thing. "Should this extension be carried out," or something, "the applicant shall be notified of the situation along with the rationale for the extension."

So, we're saying the ALAC chair may extend the period for not more than 30 days—and we'll come back to the 30-day number in a second—and if it is done, then the applicant has to be notified and given the rationale. Is 30 days sufficient, or do we want to make it a slightly larger number? I'm asking current chairs, past chairs, and staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, what number did you have in mind is slightly larger? 45?

ALAN GREENBERG: 45, perhaps. 60 sounds excessive because that adds two thirds to it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I think 60's way too long.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can perhaps …

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we don't it has to be extended by that period, but …

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it's a "could."

ALAN GREENBERG: What does the group say? 45, or leave it at 30? Amrita says 45. Any comments from staff? I don't think Evin is on the call. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I agree with Cheryl. 45 sounds good, 60 is too long. I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And by the way, it says "no more than." That doesn't mean the 45 day has to be exercised, we're saying there's an upper limit to it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. The next one is "The applicant may withdraw an application at any time. There is no restriction on resubmitting an application or a revised application." So, that just makes it clear. There was a number of comments on this. I think that's a clean statement unless anyone has an objection to it. I see no comments.

Okay. So, we have now completed the application process at this point. I see there's a number 10 here, which does not have any text to it. I'll have to double check to make sure something didn't get lost in the process. I think that was the number 11 that somehow got two numbers, but I'll double check that.

EN

All right. Suspension of an application. We had four items here that is the applicants could be suspended during due diligence, during the RALO review, or during ALAC review. And I decided it was a lot cleaner to write it all as one item, the intent is not changed.

So, "An application processing may be suspended where the suspension is requested by the applicant; or additional information is requested by ALAC's At-Large staff during the due diligence process; at the request of RALO leadership; or at the request of the ALAC."

And I put a question there. Should the request actually have to come from the ALAC chair, from any ALAC member? Coming from the ALAC would require a vote or a decision of the ALAC. That's probably not right. So, it's either any ALAC member or ALAC chair. I would tend to think it should be funneled through the chair.

Any strong comments? If there are none, then I will put the word "chair" in and leave it at that. I hear no comments, I see nothing. So, I will take out the brackets and put "ALAC chair."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've got a hand up from Sarah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see, and also from you. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN:	Hi. I don't know why I feel like we should just leave it as "ALAC" just in case someone within ALAC asks for information. So, I don't know if that would mean that the ALAC chair still has to make the request. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, I guess I don't want the staff sort of taking action from one person which is not vetted by someone else because the question may well be answerable by someone from the region, it may be answerable from the RALO. And I think it should go through the chair or delegates to make sure that this is a reasonable request, not something on the spur of the moment. And do recall, we have political issues that we said may come up from time to time where one person or another may not be completely unbiased. Nadira, please go ahead.
NADIRA AL ARAJ:	Yeah, thank you. I just want to, following that, because why then we have RALO leadership? And then we have ALAC chair? Either we have them both, kind of a focal point in both, the RALO and the ALAC, like RALO chair and the ALAC chair.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I guess we decided RALO leadership would act as a group and there were comments at the last meeting where we've said we have had occurrences where a particular person in the RALO leadership may not be in a position to act on a specific ALS application. And I'm happy to

EN

put ALAC chair or a delegate, which allows the ALAC chair to step aside if the ALAC chair is in an awkward position. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've picked it up, actually. I was just saying we also discuss the [or] delegate aspect for an ALAC chair that feels compromised or if the ALAC feels they're compromised. So, I think that covers it.

The focus needs to be in the ALAC, Nadira, because it's the ALAC that does the actual accreditation. It's not the RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I don't think Nadira was questioning that, it was just the question of do we say ALAC leadership or ALAC chair. And I think in the case of ALAC chair or delegate, we're covering that. All right.

"Whenever an application is suspended as under part one of this section, that suspension shall be lifted upon the request of the applicant. An applicant that is suspended at the request of the applicant or waiting for information for more than 90 days shall be considered to be withdrawn. At-Large staff should give appropriate reminders/warnings."

So, this covers the situation, which we've had more than once, where we ask for more information and we get silence. And in some cases that results in an application nominally being open and processing for close to a decade, I think in some cases. Last time I checked, we had applications in process on our website that were indeed a dozen years old or something like that.

All right, I see no comments.

"When notifying the applicant of a request for additional information, the applicant should be notified that the application is suspended until the information is received and there will be a 90-day limit." We're just saying make sure the applicant knows about this rule.

And I think that covers the section on suspensions. Any final questions, comments?

There have been a number of wording changes here, but I don't think any of them are controversial to be called out specifically.

All right, de-accreditation. And let's not debate the term right now, but looking at the concept first.

The first item is "If an ALS voluntarily decides to give up its ALS status, the situation should be duly documented and the ALAC informed. ALAC members may request an additional investigation to ensure that the request is voluntary on behalf of the ALAC," I'm not sure what that phrase means. I think that goes …

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think this was something else. I think it was to make sure that the request by the ALS was voluntary and not something that was forced on it, and then you just conflated something when you combined something.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. "And may request that a formal vote of the ALAC be required. A simple majority in accordance with rule 12.2.1 is required."
	So, what this is saying is if there is a request from an ALS to withdraw accreditation, it does not require a vote of the ALAC. The problem with requiring a vote, and I do have an optional one here, is what happens if the ALAC doesn't do it? What happens if the ALAC says, "No we're not going to de-accredit it?"
	So, I'm inclined to say, "Under no conditions is an ALAC vote necessary, but it is necessary that the ALAC confirm they're satisfied, that it is in fact a voluntary request."
	So, I'm not quite sure how we cover it. Do we have a vote or a consensus call confirming that the ALAC believes it's voluntary? It really shouldn't be a vote to be de-accredit or withdraw accreditation, but we're really just confirming that is a request, but we'd want to make sure that it does receive the review of the ALAC.
	I see we have some hands up. Maybe someone can tell us how to get through this. Cheryl, please go first.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Well, perhaps you could go to Judith first because I might be following up more easily that way.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Hi, yes. So, I've done this a lot, [of de-accredited], and what we've done is we usually post the email that we receive from the ALS on the Wiki.

EN

There's a page that is created and when we post this on the page, and then also repost—And if they sent us an email saying, "Well, we want to [disappear, drop off]," we post that on the page. And so it's clear that it was voluntary because we didn't demand it.

There are cases when we ask them if they were not going to participate, and that we sent them emails and then we also put those emails in the trail. But in some cases, we've just gotten emails saying, "We are no longer interested or our group, we thought we would grow and we thought we would expand and we thought we would cover this. And that was our intention, but now the person who really instigated and was going to take responsibility has left and we can no longer handle it." And I think that is sufficient. And I don't think there's any reason to get the ALAC involved if the ALS writes and tells us this and we post it on the Wiki in the decertification part. So, maybe that helps people explain the process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, can I jump in?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think we lost Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully I can be heard. Okay, hopefully I can be heard.

And thanks for that, Judith, and of course you've described very much the RALO aspects of all of this. And I think that much of what you've said and outlined is captured in the following points.

But in the situation of an ALS voluntarily requesting, voluntarily deciding, that it would like to, as you said, our focus has changed and we no longer wish to be engaged in ICANN policy work or whatever, I personally don't see the requirement for any form of voting to be written in here at all.

I don't think, however, that it should not be minuted or noticed. I think it is important, particularly if an ALAC member has requested that additional investigation is undertaken to ensure that the ALS is indeed voluntarily requesting the de-accreditation, that there needs to be a formality in how that information trail is recorded. And that's in keeping with what we've heard Judith say as well. And hopefully Alan's back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can now, yep.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi Alan, yes we can hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I don't know what was wrong before. I was talking, but apparently it wasn't getting through. All right.

So, I think what we're saying is, it must go to the ALAC. We want to make sure that that there are no objections which are not addressed, but we don't necessarily need a vote. That implies to me that we say it's a responsibility of the ALAC chair to ensure that the ALAC is satisfied, that there are no issues. And it will essentially be a chair decision based on the lack of complaints that are not answered.

We want to make sure that if one ALAC member says, "I'm not satisfied," and all the other ALAC members are satisfied, and the chair believes there is not an issue, that one ALAC member can't stand in the way of the removal of accreditation.

So, I think by wording it carefully, and I'll have some wording that we'll look at next week, but I think we can do it that way without a vote. Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan. I have a suspicion that the vote here actually refers to the vote of the ALS because if there was a doubt that the requests from the ALS was voluntary, then it will be actually logical to ask the ALS to make a vote. But I don't know, maybe I'm wrong. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, I don't think we're in a position to tell an ALS how to make a decision. We have to rely on whatever we get from the duly appointed reps of the ALS.
	Some ALSes may have a history of voting, some may not. So, that's outside of our purview I think. But I think I have a way to go forward here. I'll need to come up with some careful crafting of words. But I think I understand.
	Second one is "A RALO may request de-accreditation of one of its ALSes. The rationale would normally include non-adherence to ALS minimum criteria, but other issues may be considered. The ALS must be given adequate opportunity to correct the problem, problems, generally being given no less than 6 months to do so."
	And we have a comment from Judith. "This sentence should go after point three, not here." Okay, I'll look at that.
	Any comments on point number two other than the editorial one?
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yeah.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Judith, please go ahead.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Sure. So again, we've done this many times. I think you may want to have more of a sequence in here. What we've done, and we were told

to do, was send a series of emails and waiting. If they don't answer the first one, then we wait another time and we send another one. But you have to have at least three tries to get them to do something.

And also, I understand there's also a process where the first time they get put into non-active status, and that's a process on the way to de-accreditation. And maybe we want to do that because what we've done is every email that we've send out to the to the Rep, and if we don't hear back from the Rep, we wrote to the chair of the organization, and then we documented them on the Wiki.

And so, I think maybe that could also be put into this helpful information of how to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so essentially, you're saying there should be an audit trail going forward. And lack of response ultimately can result in loss of accreditation, but there should be an escalation and attempts to communicate.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. And then I think we have to show at least three times but with like a month between. Maybe they're just not there or things like that. Sometimes we waited like three weeks to a month for each try to make sure.

And then also, hunt down more people than the ALS rep because sometimes the organization did not know they were an ALS or the rep left.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we'll now have better documentation because of the other processes we're putting in place. So, noted.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. But I think we should put down here that we have this paper trail or do something. And also give them an option. We have given them an option that if the ALS is not interested, but individual people within them, or maybe one person who was doing it is interested, let them know of different ways they can [inaudible], like if the ALS doesn't want to do it, they could still join as an individual.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Got it. All right, next point, and as Judith noted, maybe the order of these needs to be changed.

"Any RALO actions in relation to de-accreditation should be thoroughly documented, all requests must be documented, and all efforts to reach out to an ALS should also be documented." So, I think that was covered in what Judith just said.

"A super-majority vote of the ALAC is required for such de-accreditation, meaning the ALAC can override decisions of the …"

Okay, sorry. That's a quick comment from Peters asking, "Does that mean the ALAC can override decisions of the RALO in this manner? So, how can an ALS be seen as working within the rules of the RALO?"

The answer is simple on that, and I don't think Peters is on the call. I'm not quite sure, but I'll answer it in the chat and in the document as well. Ultimately, it is an ALAC decision and, yes, the ALAC can override the RALO, and it would obviously have to have some rationale for why it did so.

Any further comments on number three? We're still on de-accreditation number three, we're going on to number four.

"ALAC members may request de-accreditation of an ALS. The RALO leadership must be consulted and given an opportunity to explain why the ALS accreditation should remain. In all other respects, the process followed for case 2 shall be followed."

And again, there is a comment, which I will answer in the chat. I think I already did answer in the chat. "Why should an ALS member be allowed to request it?"

The answer is ultimately the ALAC is responsible for deciding what is a valid ALS and what is not, and if someone is meeting their criteria. And to say the ALAC has to wait for a RALO, if for some reason the RALO has a problem with doing it. And for instance, one could imagine that it could be an ALS associated with RALO leadership, and that might be problematic.

So, it is ALAC that has to come up with it. There still needs to be a rationale, which can pass muster, but this is part of the formal process, since it is the ALAC that is doing.

Now, we could change this to say that " An ALAC member through the chair can request de-accreditation." That would add an extra level of verification on it. And I'm happy to do that if someone believes that's appropriate. I don't think it's a really onerous thing and I don't believe it's ever happened.

Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, yes. Can we also say that they need to put documentation? So, maybe if the RALO has not asked for decertification, [and] has not posted anything under the decertification page, maybe the ALAC can request those decertification and then post documentation, all the audit trail, on this page. Because I think, if anything, if an ALAC is going to do this without the RALO doing it, we still need documentation and we need the page and we need data.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed, and it refers to everything else in case number two, and we've already discussed that under Item number two. So yes, no disagreement there.

Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. I think I want to support you in the adding of "through the chair" on number four. I think it's probably wise to have that belts and braces approach that members should actually make that request

through the ALAC chair. It is that additional safety net, but also it fits in with what we've said would be the responsibility of the chair is a focus point in other parts of the document. So, I just wanting to support that. [Thanks.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so I'll make sure the wording parses, but we're saying ALAC members may request de-accreditation of an ALS through action of the ALAC chair or delegates. And I'll make sure that all the wording flows, and make sure that we're covering the documentation aspect as noted by Judith.

All right. There's a comment here. I'm not quite sure where this comment came from. I'm having trouble understanding. It may be part of the comment from Peters. I'll read it in any case.

"Giving ALAC members power to request de-accreditation of an ALS must be based on agreed conditions that must be met by the ALAC before exercising such powers. It must not be a blanket check. RALO should be allowed to exercise such control of an ALS because they are in the best position to assess and evaluate ALS based on a performance matrix."

So, as I said, I'm having difficulty with Google Docs knowing who it is that has said this. I think it's Peters, but I'm not sure. But I believe now that we're putting it through the ALAC chair and since the ALAC ultimately has control, they have to be given the opportunity, even in the inaction of RALO.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, if you could scroll down so we can see that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think scroll up a little bit. So, the first part of number four shows. Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, is that Liz? Then it's Liz.

ALAN GREENBERG: Liz … Sorry, on mine. I don't even see … Ah, there we are. Yes, I think it was Liz's comment originally.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [Sarah, do you know?]

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case …

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Regardless, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Regardless, I think we're in a good position right now. There's no way we can remove the ALAC being allowed to take action. The only

question is how do we word that? All right. We'll look at it again after it's all cleaned up.

Okay. "In cases two and four," and once we clean up with the documentation, it'll make more sense. "At-Large staff will notify the ALS of the de-certification decision and provide information on requesting a review of the decision."

All right. If we can then scroll onto terminology, a little bit just below that in the document.

Okay, the bylaws use the term "accredit," "certify," and "dis-accredit." As far as I can tell, they use the words "accredit" and "certify" somewhat interchangeably, different clauses use different words. I would suggest that we really want to use only one word.

The term "certify" is not one we have used and, in fact, only some of the bylaws use it. We have used the term "accredit." In both cases, the dictionary definitions say this could be a reasonable thing, because in both cases, meeting certain standards is sufficient to either certify someone or accredit them, but since we have used the term "accredit," I would suggest we don't want to change that. I would suggest that, should ICANN Legal and the Board agree, we get rid of the word "certified," so we're using consistent terminology.

Hold on, my main screen has just changed. Okay.

And I see some comments. "Accredit" is the is the preferred term. If they refuse and want to keep "certified," so be it, but I don't think it makes a lot of sense.

EN

The removal of accreditation is interesting. In ICANN's formal documentation, the other place we use "accredit" is for registrar accreditation. And in the vast bulk of documentation associated with registrars, they do not use a verb for removing accreditation. Because the process of accreditation results in signing a contract, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the term that is used as termination of the agreement, which implicitly says you are no longer accredited.

There are occasional places where the term "de-accredit" is used in regard to registrars. We also have a proposed policy on privacy proxy providers within the GNSO. And the term that was used in that document is "de-accredit."

So, on the other hand, if you can scroll down a little bit, if you look at dictionary usage of the term, "de-accredit" is not defined by anybody, as far as I can tell, with or without a hyphen. "Disaccredit," with or without a hyphen, normally without, but sometimes it shows up with, it seems to be the formal dictionary definition of reversal of accreditation. And it is overwhelmingly used if you look through Google searches compared to the term "de-accredit."

On the other hand, within ICANN, the term disaccredit is essentially used only in one place. It shows up in a whole bunch of searches, but they're all echoing the bylaws.

So, the term disaccredit, as far as I can tell, is used only once within all of ICANN, and that is within the bylaw associated with the ALAC. There are, however, multiple uses of the term "de-accredit," both within our

EN

documentation, the privacy proxy, and occasional registrar documents to use "de-accredit."

Given that the term "de-accredit" does not really exist as a formal word and we probably should not be in the business of inventing words within our domain, I would suggest that we remove all references to "de-accredit," "disaccredit," and use terminology like revocation or removal of accreditation. Comments?

I've made my stand that I think we should avoid coining the word or using a word that does not show up in the dictionary, although ICANN does it in enough other places, and simply not use the term "de-accredit" but make some reference to removal of accreditation or withdraw accreditation.

Does anyone care enough to comment? Judith says she agrees with my recommendations. Nadira, please go ahead.

NADIRA AL ARAJ: Yeah, I prefer the "disaccredit." Kind of easy for a non-speaker in English. And it appears in the dictionary, as you explain it here.

ALAN GREENBERG: But it doesn't seem to be in the vernacular of those of us doing this business. So, that's the real question.

NADIRA AL ARAJ: That's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have some people saying we support the removal of "de-accreditation," and Daniel and Nadira say they like "disaccredit."

Anyone else want to make a comment on that? Or has it been left up to the chair to make decision? Hopefully not arbitrary.

All right, then I will think about that and leave it up to the chair.

At that point, we are done with this document, other than a quick review of the things that have been decided in this meeting. And that should not take much of next week's meeting, at which point, Heidi, can we be assured that Evan will be on next week's meeting?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Alan. Heidi had to drop, but I will confirm with you via email.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Presuming Evan can make the meeting, we will look at the application process, application form, and see what has to be done with it on the next meeting.

If it turns out Evan cannot be on the meeting, either, I will quickly decide on some other use of that time, or will postpone the meeting. So, keep an eye on email.

And there is light at the end of this tunnel. Thank you very much for your participation and I give you back a whole seven minutes of your day. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks all.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining and enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]