

Tuesday

July 28, 2020

Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group

19:00 UTC-20:00 UTC

Rough Transcript

CART provided by A La CARTe Connection, LLC.

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

[Captioner standing by]

>> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Hi, Maureen, it's Michelle. We have Cheryl on as well. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, everyone. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Hi, Maureen. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, there. I think I'm connected now. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: I hear a little buzzing sound, but it's faint. Are you using your headset or not? >> MAUREEN HILYARD: Has it stopped? >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Yeah, it is buzzing. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: It's me moving around with my -- I'm just getting myself organized. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: We'll give you a second here and if it doesn't go away, we can have Ashley re-dial you. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Is it okay now? >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Yeah, actually it's gone. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: I think it's my headset. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Yeah, those things are so

touchy. Good. Thanks, Maureen. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Hello,
welcome Marita and Sebastien and Ricardo. >> MARITA MOLL: Hi.

>> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: I have your presentation ready. >>
MARITA MOLL: Thank you. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Your audio sounds
good, by the way. >> MARITA MOLL: That always helps. >>
MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Yes, it does.

Hi, Ricardo. Would you like to test your audio? Let my try to unmute
your line. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Sorry. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER:
That's okay. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Can you hear me now?

>> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: I can, thank you. >> RICARDO
HOLMQUIST: Thank you. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: You are quite
welcome. Thank you, Ricardo.

You're welcome, Heidi.

We have Alan Greenberg joining as well.

Welcome everyone that has just joined. We'll be starting in the next
two minutes or so.

Hi, Ricardo, it's Michelle. We're at the top the top of the hour, but would
you want to wait another minute or so to give others a chance to join?

>> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Not a problem. >> MICHELLE
DeSMYTER: Okay. >> They are probably just trying to take a minute to
get a cup of coffee because we just came off another call. >> MICHELLE

DeSMYTER: Yes, yes. >> [Laughter] >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER:

Welcome, Judith. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Ricardo, this is a
Michelle. We're a minute past, just let me know whenever you would like to
start, I'll have the recording ready to go. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

Another minute and we can start. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Certainly.

Thank you.

And welcome, Dave.

Welcome, Judith. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: We can start now, Michelle, if you want. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Certainly. Thank you, Ricardo. One moment please.

[This meeting is being recorded] >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: I would like to welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group Call on Tuesday the 28th of July, 2020.

On today's call on the English Channel we do have Ricardo Holmquist, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Marita Moll, Sébastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Judith Hellerstein, Dave Kissoondoyal, Jonathan Zuck.

We do not have anyone on the Spanish channel at this time.

We have received apologies from Clement Genty, Joanna Kulesza, and Bastiaan Goslings.

From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Michelle DeSmyter, on call management

Our interpreters are Marina and Paula.

And if you could please state your name for transcription purposes and to please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters.

With this, I'll turn the meeting over to Ricardo Holmquist. Please begin, Ricardo. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Michelle. Ricardo Holmquist speaking.

For today's call we have two statements that are in the final steps of

drafting. One is the ATRT3 Final Report. I will speak about that because Joanna is on vacation.

And then we have the Multi-Stakeholder Model update and Marita will give a presentation. I understand there's a draft that needs to be addressed to be finalized.

And we have another last minute update that we need to follow, sorry for that because of the inclusion of the OFB Working Group, some pieces were in the middle of the CPWG.

One of those pieces that were in the middle was the auction proceeds, that is really part of the OFB, but because the Final Report just came in at the beginning of this [indiscernible], so we have a last minute call for comments that needs to be addressed by this Friday, so we will need to see what to do.

There is a next call and AOB, I have a point for AOB, but if you have another one, just let me know by the chat or raise your hand at the end of the meeting.

So without any further ado, I will begin with the ATRT3 Final Report. The report that Joanna her group made. Unfortunately, both Bastiaan and Joanna are not available. Also, for the draft reading, commenting, so I'm going to do that. I was not part of the group, so sorry for any misinterpretation of anything being written there.

I'll read it -- the screen you are on right now, Michelle, it's a little bit down the page. Can you put it on the screen? >> Michelle? Yeah.

>> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Now this is pointing out for the Google Doc, but there is some in the page. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Ricardo,

which page would you like me to scroll down to? >> RICARDO

HOLMQUIST: Oops, it is right here. Sorry! I was trying to find the page where the statement was and I guess this is the one that you have on the screen right now. >> **MICHELLE DeSMYTER:** Perfect! >> **RICARDO**

HOLMQUIST: Yes, because Google Docs needs authorization, there was some misunderstanding, I guess, between Joanna and what was asked this week if they can share all of the information in the Google Doc, that's why it's not open because it was only part of the group that commented originally on the doc. So this doc needs to be open for everyone, so please go ahead.

I don't know if it is Joanna that needs to do that. If not, please open it. If it is Joanna, we will ask her to please open it. >> **HEIDI ULLRICH:** I'm sorry, this is Heidi. My understand something that we do have the workspace here and that's where any comments can be made and Bastiaan has said that he would be able to incorporate any changes to the statement later on this call. And he'll be listening to the recording as well.

Thank you. >> **RICARDO HOLMQUIST:** Thank you very much, Heidi. Yes, I understand that.

So I'll just go ahead. >> **SEBASTIAN:** Yes, it's currently on the page, on the Wiki page and you don't need to go to the Google Doc. I guess it was used in the beginning of the document, but if you go to the current page on the Wiki about ATRT3, join up with the last version of the document here with the changes. But that's a place where we need to make any comments now, I guess. We need to follow the Google Doc. Thank you. >>

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Sebastien. This is the one you can point out on the agenda of the meeting, you can point out that it is in the Google Doc for the discussion part of the agenda. And you have the Google Doc

there, but also the statement.

Bastiaan has typed this, the ALAC Statement on the Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team, ATRT3, Final Report.

The ALAC, on behalf of the At-Large community, congratulates the Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team for the completion of its Final Report and recommendations to the ICANN Board of Directors.

We recognize the amount of effort required by assess ICANN's implementation and recommendations from past Review Teams. We are appreciative of the assessment as well as the ensuing recommendations, which incorporate valuable input from our community. We strongly support the limited and focused number of recommendations proposed by the ATRT3 report, reflecting the pending implementation of the proposals from previous Review Teams.

We find the ATRT3 recommendations to be clear, appropriate, and actionable. We, thus, support all five recommendations and urge ICANN Board to adopt them as a strategic priority towards enhancing the accountability and transparency culture within ICANN.

The ALAC also considers that the Board and the ICANN organization should take into account all of the suggestions made by the ATRT3 in annexes A and B. They offer a good opportunity and advance ICANN's accountability and transparency.

In moving forward, and more specifically regarding the following recommendation, we advise the ICANN Board to:

Swiftly implement ATRT3 recommendations to evolve both specific and Organizational Reviews as per Section 8 of the Final Report:

With the creation of the wholistic review to allow a global view of ICANN various structures and their relations; with the pause of specific reviews; with a common process, with possible adaptation of each SO/AC/NC aimed towards ensuring continuous improvement of the ICANN community and the Multi-Stakeholder Governance Model it represents.

It goes on to talk about the policies and recommendations. Number three, the ALAC shares the ATRT3 Review Team's approach to the review process and the methodology behind it, aiming to sure that all elements contribute to achieving strategic objectives and their subcomponents are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Based, SMART, and that all reporting on these refers to well specified metrics to be reviewed on a regular or timely basis, as per Section 9 of the report.

And then you have at the end the recommendations.

I can't read these, these are very, very small. If you can enlarge that. Sorry for that.

The idea here is that if anyone has any other recommendation or any change that wants to be included, I understand that Sebastien put some of the thoughts here. I understand in the call we already have [indiscernible] that was a big part of this, also. I don't know if you want to comment on these comments. I'm sorry for the mutilation.

No hands up?

No one wants to comment, so that's the final version that we are happy with and we are very happy with the ATRT3 Final Report. And we are recommending the ICANN Board to adopt most of -- or, all of the recommendations.

Thank you very much to everyone.

And now it's time for Marita and the Multi-Stakeholder Model update. I bet she is tired after a long ALAC call, I guess. >> MARITA MOLL: Hello.

>> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Marita, we can hear you. Thank you.

>> MARITA MOLL: Good, thank you. My screen just went a bit wonky.

All right, thank you. Marita Moll for the record. Thank you for putting up my slides.

I see I did this in PDF format and I get this side -- I never get this right, but anyway, it still looks good, I think you can all read it.

I'm going to present what's come out of discussions, both on the Wiki and the last couple of calls about where we should go with the new requests for comments on the MSM Model.

And so let me just ask you to move to the next slide.

I have put up -- Evin has put up a draft document in which all of the stuff I'm saying right now is flushed out at a much deeper level, of course. And I'm hoping that some of you will be able to go and have a look at it.

The deadline for this particular exercise, I believe, is August 3rd, which is coming up real soon.

The first slide we talked about last time a little bit. There are now six issues that are priority, identified as -- oh, I've only got three here. What does the next slide look like? Oh, my goodness! This is the wrong group of slides. This is last month's slides.

So can anybody put up the slides I sent in this morning? >>

MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Certainly, one moment here. >> MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: You're welcome. >>

MARITA MOLL: They look a lot similar. I reused some of them. [Laughter]

I'll just go on speaking while we're waiting for that to come up.

Last time we talked about how the tone of the document had changed from the last one we saw. Brian Kute led us through some really excellent community exercises and getting our thinking together and helping us feel like a group we were willing to work on -- thank you, this is the one -- willing to work on something together.

And this one, I don't think Brian is involved any more, this one has some very different language, which may not be deliberate, but it comes through to me. And the last request for comments talked about the community identifying what he called "low hanging fruit" among the six issues, originally there were 21 that were then squeezed into six issues that would address everything in some way or another.

And so we were asked to identify which ones, you know, could be more easily addressed in a process way. So that, you know, we could go on with the other ones which had to be addressed understand a more wholistic way.

Can I go to the next slide, please?

Yes, and we still don't have a whole page there. Ah, yeah, a little further. There we go.

So these are the six issues that are remaining: Prioritization of work/efficient use of resources. Scoping. Those are the two I call process issues. There's a lot of work being done on them. The report shows quite clearly there's a list of ATRT3 as one of them consensus documents, PDP3, all kinds of things going on both in the.org and the community are addressing the first two issues, precision and scoping and prioritization. That's

on-going anyways, whether or not we were doing this work, I think.

Consensus, representation and inclusivity, we have a lot more say in that.

And then you have the three complexity, culture, trust and silos, roles and responsibilities, which need to be addressed in more wholistic ways. I'm a little concerned about the fact that these top three have been identified as high priority. And the next three are sort of floating around there on the bottom.

So we agreed last time, I think, pretty much that we wanted to make sure that this kind of thinking would not go forward, that we have to really address the fact that all the issues have to be addressed in order for the process to evolve and not just create an efficient version of the same model, rather than evolve the model as was originally intended.

Please go ahead with the next slide. Thank you.

I already said this, the following three identified as high priority issues.

I am missing more in that slide? Can you move down more? Maybe putting this in PDF was not the best idea. >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER:

That's all of the slide. >> MARITA MOLL: All right, next slide, please.

My suggestion with respect to this and in the text of the Google Doc there is all of this preamble, some of what I just said.

To correct this, I thought it would be good for us to ask there be a timeline so that we could be sure that there was an intention to address all of the current issues in the current five-year Strategic Plan. They say they're going to do it and there's all the good intentions, but I think that even if it doesn't work out that way, having something on paper that says, yes, we're

going to do this and then it means they have to re-evaluate it when it isn't done by that time. Kind of a little bit like meeting your friends for coffee. If you at least have set that date and you can't make it, you change that date or you address that issue. So that is one proposal that is in the Google Doc.

So I'm going to, you know, ask you to think about that. And let me know if you think that is a reasonable suggestion. You can put your comments on the Google Doc, but this is really, it's in order to restore the balance of attention to these issue that is are all priority.

Can we move to the next piece?

Silo busting. Moving out of the silos. That was a big issue in that we recognize we all work in silos and we have a trust issue and some of that certainly impacts on the fact we can't easily reach consensus.

Now one of the things that is pointed out in the Google Doc is that we're now living in a system in which some groups are more equal than others. And if you're going to have a multi-stakeholder system, this is not going to work well when it comes to culture and trust. So we feel that that needs to be addressed. Obviously, it needs to be addressed in talking about the roles and responsibilities, but we would like to make sure is that that stays on the agenda and make it clear that the system won't be evolved unless that is addressed.

One of the things I've also done, and we just talked about the ATRT3 report, is I have looked at that report and I have stolen [laughter] borrowed, implemented, put into this a number of the suggestions there. And one of them that I put in this section is the one about replacing specific reviews with a wholistic review. So that one wholistic review will have to address the

important issues of silos, complexity and trust.

And in that way, I think that we're also supporting what's being said in the ATRT3 review. This is not the only place where this comes in. I think I've included it in two other areas. So that is what that part looks like, just to give you a little preview.

Do we have -- oh, we do, okay. Let me -- I don't know whose hand was up first. Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, you are coming up first on my list, so why don't you go ahead.

Hello? >> MICHELLE DeSMYTER: Abdeldjalil, if you could please unmute your phone. He removed his hand. >> ABDEL DJALIL BACHAR

BONG: Sorry, sorry, I'm here. >> MARITA MOLL: Okay. Yes, did you have an intervention? Because your hand is up.

I'm not hearing anything. All right.

Okay, okay, hand has gone down.

Sébastien Bachollet, please go ahead. >> SEBASTIEN

BACHOLLET: Thank you, Marita. Sébastien Bachollet speaking.

Just to be sure I'm quite committed to the ATRT3 recommendations, but be careful the ATRT3 didn't replace any reviews by the wholistic reviews, but to do two things: To evolve the organization and review to have evolution done by the group with the members as a continuous improvement program and to have another review with a specific one because ATRT3 is only able to create specific reviews, but it's an important one to review the link between all SOs and ACs and, yes, hopefully it will address the question of the silos and how we see the whole organization.

The wholistic reviews, the only one was done and the last one was

2002, it's a long time ago and it's time to do it. We hope that the Board will accept this.

But in expressing ourselves, we need to say that it's not to replace, it's to add and at the same time we evolve the organizational review. Thank you.

>> MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. I have to tell you I wasn't involved in that discussion with the ATRT3 review and I have taken the wording pretty much directly from your report, but you need to go in there and make sure nothing is misrepresented. Can you do that? >>

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Marita. And I want to apologize, I just got your document late today and I was involved in other things, but definitely I will take time to read your document and to make appropriate comments. Thank you. >> MARITA MOLL: Yes, I'm aware of the fact

that there may be some wording changes that need to happen. And there are a couple of other areas, too, so you people who are experts on this and built that report, you'll be able to help me in making sure that gets properly represented.

So that kind of is the section dealing with how we can work on the culture, trust, silos and consensus and roles and responsibilities.

I didn't attack this paper in sort of answering the questions that were presented to us exactly because I felt that we were just being, you know, put into a funnel and it didn't give us an opportunity to really present our concerns.

I'd like to go to the next slide, please.

This slide is about what appears to be a really major omission in the way the issues have been presented. We have lost the recruitment and

demographics issues, which I found very strange because over three separate consecutive inputs to this process, we have highlighted that particular issue and how important it was and how integrated it was with the issue of -- what is it? A representativeness and inclusiveness.

So another really interesting thing in this report, on one of the pages you'll find a footnote at the bottom of the page that says the Business Constituency wanted to have recruitment and demographics as a seventh topic, but there was no inclusion for this, so they didn't do this.

Anyways, had we been asked, we certainly would have supported the inclusion of this, so I'm asking in this Google Doc that this be -- that that omission be corrected basically. And I'm -- I'd be surprised if anybody on this call doesn't think that recruitment and demographics is rather important part of this puzzle and we can't actually talk about some of the other things without some thinking around how we're going to get these people that we're going to include and be represented in the process.

So that is another major thing that I thought had to be addressed.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

Okay, this slide I call occupational therapy for the dispossessed.

[Laughter] A very good feminist and social activist person in Canada called [indiscernible] Franklin used to use that term when she saw that people representing the public interest were being asked the same questions over and over again and they were responding to these requests for input, but they never really saw anything coming out of it.

I read all the three inputs that we put in before, 20 pages worth of suggestions and responses to their questions and I didn't see very much in

this last one that referred to any of that. It seems to have gone down into a deep, dark hole, so I think thought that it would -- I'm sure that other groups, also, must feel the same way because I'm sure everyone put in all kinds of suggestions.

I'm asking here that we see a document that itemizes and analyzes the items so we can see what people suggested to do. What twiggged me was the footnote about the business community wanting to have a seventh topic on recruitment and demographics and it was not recognized. We were talking about that all the time. I thought, what else is in there, you know, that we should know about and can use?

We were specifically asked in some of the last iterations of this process to give specific, actually specific examples of things that should be done, could be done in order to improve the system and we responded to that. So I don't think that we should allow all of this to get lost. And I thought that a request that some kind of analysis be put forward before all groups, that we can see what had come out of this, was not unreasonable.

All right, let's go to the next slide, please.

Identifying gaps. There are a few things that we can add that aren't in the current, and neither have they been in the past articulations of reports we put forward. It's not on this slide, but this is another place where I see it might be appropriate to put something from the ATRT3 report in. That is the part that says, and Sebastien, you'll be familiar with this, ALAC fully endorses the recommendation to enhance current methods of prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies, and recommendations. That needs to be done through a community-led entity task with conducting a prioritization

process for recommendations made by Review Teams and Cross-Community groups.

So that is in that new Google Doc and hopefully you'll look at it and see and make sure that it's there.

And then in the complexity area where the document that we have is suggesting various ICANN Learn things, which are excellent, but some actually community-driven initiatives could also be added to that.

The next slide.

Another element, of course, that we can't ignore at the moment is what we are learning from the pandemic. A couple of things that have come out in discussions so far is that our hosting of various policy sessions have been good in breaking down the silos and that should be continued.

Excuse me [clearing throat].

And support for regional face-to-face meetings. Some of you may have suggestions on that, please feel free to put those in.

The last slide, the last two slides, go ahead.

The report is also asking that we evaluate. We give them some ideas on how to evaluate whether or not what we are doing is working. And this is what is actually in the report, the Board proposing an on-going evaluation method, which could be connected with the evaluation of the Strategic Plan. That makes sense to me.

Some other things they have suggested, evaluation based on meeting objectives within a particular timeframe or budget.

And the use of more subjective metrics.

These are things that the report suggestions. I don't have any, you

know, I think they're good. I don't know whether other people think that these are feasible or workable.

There's one other slide in which I think we could please go to the next slide. We could add this from the ATRT3 report, that actually says in the ATRT3 report that the At-Large community supports a metrics-based approach to community work and participation, among others through the ALAC Sub-Committee on Metrics. And that we agree with the recommendations on metrics and reporting presented in Section 9 of the ATRT3 report.

Here, once again, I'm depending on the people who were involved in this process to tell me whether or not that is an appropriate suggestion at this particular area.

So that is all of the slides I have, kind of a rundown of what that Google Doc looks like. And, yes, I'll take your questions or comments right now.

Are there any hands up? I don't see any. Am I missing anything?
No?

Yeah, I think this is a bit of a creative look at how to respond to the current request for comments. I didn't think that it made much sense to deal with it item by item as it was presented, in that I noticed that kind of stuff was ignored last time.

So, yeah, if there are no comments, we can carry on with the agenda, but I really do invite you to go in and take a look at the document itself and add or suggest other new things.

Thank you.

Ricardo, I think we're back to you. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank

you very much, Marita. Very nice presentation.

The only thing is since the Google Doc is not open to everyone, so if you can share what is in the doc now on the Wiki space, it would be great because we only have until Friday for any comments.

So if anyone wants to see the draft, there's no way unless you are approved previously by you. >> MARITA MOLL: Okay, I'll have Evin to look after that. She has already been working on some of this access stuff this morning, so we'll fix that up quickly. Thank you, Ricardo. >> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Marita.

And now we have a last minute from our pinch-hitter. We have Alan now to talk about the Final Report for the Cross Community Working Group on new gTLD auction proceeds.

Alan has worked a lot on this group. Also, [indiscernible] is here on the call.

Please go ahead, Alan. Thank you very much for this last minute intervention. >> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

Just a correction, I -- based on a request a minute and a half before this meeting, I agreed to draft the statement for the ALAC on this. I'm not in a position to do a presentation on the auction proceeds report itself. But I will give a bit of a background.

The group was chartered in 2016 and the ALAC approved the charter at its [indiscernible] meeting in November of 2016. We have had diligent and solid representation within the group by both the formerly appointed members and others within At-Large who have participated, so this certainly was not a case of us sort of sitting back and letting someone else do the

work. We have been active participants.

I was one of the participants -- one of the formally appointed members. And I can say we contributed substantially to the report and the ALAC supported the recommendations when the Draft Final Report was issued several months ago. So I don't see any reason why the ALAC would not ratify the Final Report as one of the chartering organizations.

Of course, ratification by the charting organizations, or at least the vast majority of them is a required for CCWG, Cross Community Working Group, for the work to be forwarded to the Board. So I am in the process of drafting a very short and terse message that basically says what I just said, that we're a chartering organization. We were active in it. We have supported the outcomes as written in the Draft Final Report several months ago, and the ALAC ratifies the Final Report and that's about it.

I'm happy to take questions. And I see Judith has her hand up. Judith is another one of the very active participants in this process. >>

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record.

To add to Alan, we put out a statement a few months ago when the earlier final comments came around and also in that statement, we'll be reiterating our compromise, which is why we went with Mechanism A as our suggestion and what we hope Mechanism A -- what we feel is required for Mechanism A to include. And so we're just putting that.

And basically we are just stressing the independence of evaluators in choosing people, applicants and others who apply for the grants. We'll put that in there as well.

You could actually, and maybe Evin, or someone else can put in the

chat a link to the Public Comment that we wrote from that statement so that way people can see it.

And if they have any final questions on it, please come up to Alan or myself to do it, but that's basically, as Alan said, we just have to do, we just have to formally accept the document, which we have, which we did when we came up with a Public Comment a few months ago. >> ALAN

GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith.

To be clear, the requirement that is we have are represented very clearly in the Final Report, so I don't think there's any need to ratify -- or to restate them at this point. Our comments were adhered to and the report is exceedingly clear on the independence of the selection group, regardless of the mechanism chosen.

Although we, you know, there is a preference on one mechanism over another, but I think the report validates that, so I think at this point all we have to say, unless we have some concern with what has been recommended.

I'll note when we last ratified a CCWG report, that was the CCWG Accountability, and we did have a concern about how some of these things would be implemented. Not the recommendation as such, but how they would be implemented and we did have a caveat in our report there.

As I understand it right now, I don't think there is anything in the report we are not supporting. In fact, the report is quite clear on what we thought was important.

So at this point, given that the ratification must be in by this Friday and we do need to have an ALAC vote on it, my inclination is to write a very short statement that simply says, we were a chartering organization of the CCWG.

We have been active in the process. We, you know, have submitted comments at every opportunity as appropriate. And we believe the report addresses all of the issue that is were critical to the ALAC. And we ratify the report. >> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, Alan, we had some issue with the mechanism, even though it was clear in the report, it was clear also for others and we mentioned that.

Thank you. >> ALAN GREENBERG: Any other comments or questions? If not, I'll have a draft out within the hour. It will be posted on the comment page.

If Staff can put a link to that page, I would appreciate it since it's not indexed right now in the Policy Index, or at least it wasn't a few years ago -- a few minutes ago.

And if someone can put that link in so people can look -- oh, I see, it's there, sorry. Heidi put it in. And it will be there shortly.

And Maureen, it's up to you when you want to initiate the vote. I'll be well ready for it to be initiated as early as tonight. It depends if you want to give the ALAC an opportunity to revise the report -- the statement first or if you are happy with what I described. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: If I can just jump in here. >> ALAN GREENBERG: Please. You're the boss.

>> MAUREEN HILYARD: [Laughter] I agree, I agree with you. We'll go with it. If you can get the statement to me. >> ALAN GREENBERG: I will get it out shortly after this meeting. If someone can read it over and make sure I haven't introduced too many typos into it and you can arrange with Evin to initiate a vote. >> MAUREEN HILYARD: That would be excellent.

Thank you very much. >> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all.

>> RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Alan, for this last minute request. Sorry for that.

I had a request for about five minutes and that was something that was missing in the list of comments coming for votes. That is something that will happen with this separation. Thank you for this.

And the link for the page is on the agenda, anyway, so you have it.

With this, we have next call. The only meetings we have right now for this week, we don't have comments that need to be done for the next 30 days, so I'm proposing to have the next meeting early in September instead of August, but usually [indiscernible] for most everyone, so if you agree, the next meeting will be early in September.

I think it's not required to have the meeting in August, I guess.

And with this, I have AOB and I don't know if anyone has something else.

The AOB I have, there was an APAC Strategic Plan issued about two weeks ago. But this plan, the region, the APAC region, decided not to have comment for this. APRALO was okay with that because they feel that most of the comments they already asked, they worked with the APAC region to have them included in the plan. But it was a surprise for me because all of the other regions had a comment period for their feedback.

But it seems that everybody is happy with this approach, so this the AOB I have.

If nothing else from anybody, that's all for today.

Thank you, everyone, for your participation. >> MICHELLE

DeSMYTER: Thank you, Ricardo, and thank you, everyone. The meeting has

been adjourned. Thank you. >> Bye, all!

[Meeting has been adjourned]

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.