MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Work Stream 2 prioritization small team call on Wednesday the 17th of February 2021. On the call today, we do have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sébastien Bachollet, Jonathan Zuck, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We have received no apologies.

From staff, we do have Evin Erdogdu, Heidi Ullrich who’s joining are n, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter on call management.

A friendly reminder to please state your name before speaking for the transcription. With this, we’ll turn the meeting over to Cheryl LangdonOrr. Please begin, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Michelle. Appreciate that. And I know we’re only a small group, but we’re a small team anyway. We’re just not normally quite as small as the gathering today. But we've got the important people here. In particular, we've got Jonathan Zuck who was hijacked into this because of his role as chair of the CCTRT review, and of course, that’s one of the subjects that we’re going to be looking at today to see where in the scheme of prioritization we are going to be putting our advice via the OFB towards the ALAC as they look at what priorities they should be giving these recommendations, not only out of the CCTRT and RDS—and of course, ATRT3—but across all of the very many—thank you, Heidi. Alan is going to join us shortly, and obviously, he's here for the same reason Jonathan is, [except from an] RDS perspective.

So that’s the reason we've gathered here today. But to start us off, if we can just pull up the action items from our last meeting of January 20th. Terrific. And I don’t think there's anything that’s outstanding at all. The next recommendations, which is the only one not tipped, is what we've got on the agenda for today. So all is good from that perspective. Thank you, Michelle.

Back to the agenda, and here, I just—you might wonder why we’re looking at a recap of the Work Stream 2 recommendations. And in fact, recap is not the best term here, but just so everyone knows and for our meeting’s record, we have presented the proposed rankings in terms of priority on three fronts: the overall level of prioritization for implementation from an At-Large perspective, and so we were recommending either high, medium or low for the ALAC to consider endorsing. We also had a second line in terms of implementation, whether or not we wanted to rank from a priority as high, medium or low, and this is to do with where it was in the thinking specifically related to the degree of effort as well as what the priority should be. And finally, we also gave an indication of what the degree of urgency was. In other words, in terms of timing, whether this should be a high priority, a moderate priority, or a medium priority.

Now, since then—and that has been presented to the OFB and I believe will be passed on for the ALAC’s consideration at their next meeting, but since then, Evin has, at the beginning of this month, asked us some clarifying questions, which we need to discuss here. And I just want to get Evin in a moment to just clarify whether this was a discussion that raised these questions just amongst staff and leadership of the ALAC, or whether or not these were questions from the ALAC that we need to somehow formally respond to back via the OFB.

But basically, what she's asked us to discuss today is a little bit more on being more specific, I suppose, a little more detailed on the criteria that we proposed. In other words, with the first one, the priority for the end user, the second one, the level of effort which was basically for the community or the Org, and the third, the urgency time frame, the question was the first ranking was to give the overall priority. But she pointed out that the Org were more concerned about two and three, so she asked us to confirm whether what we wanted was the ultimate ALAC to reflect the priority that overall ranking, or whether or not we wanted to indicate a greater level of importance for level of effort and urgency being the things that the organization are apparently more interested in. So this is the first thing we need to discuss. And I see you in the queue, Evin. Fear not.

The second one was we needed to perhaps give more details on the idea of the anticipated time frame, so what did we mean when we talked about low, medium or high priorities in terms of time frames.

So Evin, hopefully I've done justice of what you wanted us to discuss. If you want to introduce it further, and then we can get down to getting some responses for you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Cheryl. Yes, that was a great recap of the requested feedback. And just to your question, this was mainly for internal clarification. As you know, the various SOs and ACs are all taking a look at a Work Stream 2 recommendation prioritizations, and they overall are ranking according to their SOAC, but they have different ways that they're measuring it. and since it’s going back to Org and others for implementation, the general sense was that they wanted to understand the level of effort and the time frame more from that perspective. So in addition to how the SOACs view an issue as important to them, they also wanted to understand how can we then implement, and that would kind of be the level of effort and time frame piece.

They also did want to, in addition to that, try to get a sense of what the anticipated time frames as well would be. So for a low, medium or high priority, they wanted to get a sense of what does the ALAC think, would that be a number of months, weeks, years? Just to get a sense of that. So this was kind of an Org request. And as you noted, I think once these details are kind of clarified, the ALAC could endorse these recommendations during their next meeting. So, thank you. I hope that helped clarify.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It does indeed. Thank you very much. So let’s open a queue on that. Two issues. Obviously, the definition of what we meant in terms of time frame, and secondly, are we seeking to make any changes in the nomenclature we've used to answer the question that Org is interested in. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to comment directly on that, but on the timing, I thought I heard you say that it can be presented at the next ALAC meeting for adoption. I have a problem presenting something for adoption at an ALAC meeting which hasn’t been reasonably thoroughly reviewed by them. ALAC’s not supposed to be just a rubber stamp. So I'm just a little bit concerned if we’re actually looking at that kind of fast path. I would have thought that at the very least, there should be a webinar or something or other, or certainly enough time to give the ALAC time to consider and discuss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, delightfully, that’s not our problem, Alan. We are a mere tiny little working body, slaving away underneath the jurisdiction of the OFB working group. And so we do our work for the OFB, the OFB does what they bloody well please with the product of our work. And if they please to pass it on to the ALAC, it’s up to the ALAC to do with it whatever it wants in whatever way it wants to. Not [inaudible] off, I'm just making sure that our role is clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm happy with that. I thought I heard pass it on to the ALAC for approval. Got it. Fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What they do with it, my love, is not my problem. Ours is getting the work right.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand, but I thought I heard the intent was to pass it on for approval, and that’s what I was reacting to. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was passing on information that was included in the questions Evin raised, nothing more. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not our problem. Okay. All right. So, with that—thank you, Sébastien, you saved me, because I didn't want to just give you my opinion. Believe me, I have one. Over to you. Thanks, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would be very happy to have your opinion, Cheryl. I have two ideas on that issue. The first one is that we have done our job, and I think we explained to OFB how we proceed to do that. Therefore, I don't think I'm willing to change anything, except if the OFB or the ALAC come back to us and say, “Hey, guys, we can't understand what you wanted to say, you need to change the way you are doing the work,” and that will be another story.

My second point is that if somewhere in ICANN, someone is able to give all the SO and AC the same measurement, it may be a good way, but it’s not the case. Therefore, here also I think we can stay with what we have done, and I think it’s a good way to do it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Floor is still open for anyone else before I venture towards my highly opiniated impressions of where I would be going.

Okay, let’s save some time. Sébastien, you’ve echoed my initial reaction quite well. I believe that the reason we did our work—and will be proposing to do our work with the rest of the recommendations that are not the Work Stream 2 recommendations, which is what Alan and Jonathan are here for for example—is that we are quite clear that we understand what the priorities from Org will be, that their issues will be resourcing, difficulty in resourcing or difficulty in the process, and the timing or where in the scheme of things it might be able to be resourced for in future planning.

So we understand that, which is why we have columns relating to those two areas. So I personally think we have put in enough information so that whoever is representing on behalf of the ALAC what our priorities should be can drill down into those issues. However, our perspective has to be from the end users’ point of view, and of course, that is not going to be uniform or necessarily fit hand in glove with other parts of ICANN. So it’s that thrust and parry and discussion that has to happen around whatever table is created. And hopefully, with the amount of material we've also put in, we've empowered with enough information that advocate to put the case strongly. Where it fits in is, again, not our problem. It affects us, but we can't do more than we can do.

I would, however, suggest that we probably can look at giving some more specificity to what other people might need to understand by what we meant with our high, medium and low or minimal, moderate or significant categorizations. So I’d be happy to put a very brief little survey together for our group to just react to some time frames that we could bundle into those categories and some slight expansion on what would have made the difference between us saying something is moderate level of effort versus significant level of effort.

So to that end, perhaps in the next week, we can all respond to some very little tiny survey and get a little bit more feed into what then the ALAC can look at and maybe even pass on. So that probably isn't the answer that Evin was expecting from us, but I'm not sure that we can do more than that, because our job isn't to take it from the perspective of the Org. And we actually probably have done a good enough job of taking what we believe will be their issues into account.

So to that end, I think that’s probably as far as I want to take it before we do a little survey on that, if you're all in agreement. Or do you just want to leave things as they are? If you want to leave things as they are, then let us know in chat now. But if you don’t have any problem with responding to a little bit more detail on our categorization terminology use, then I'm happy to put that together in the next day or two and staff can help me get it out to you all, no later than the beginning of next week.

Okay. Let’s make that so, by the look of it. Can I just note out of chat—and welcome, Judith and Greg as well—that the dates Heidi popped in in terms of when the ALAC call and the OFB call is, we give updates to the OFB ad nauseum and in great repetition, so we've got a standing item on most of their calls, even if it’s just to say we haven't met this time. So we will be doing an update, of course. And I would have thought, however, that we will be spending more time telling them what we are doing with regards to the rest of the recommendations than we will be in terms of anything to do with the Work Stream 2 ones, which effectively, we've passed on to them already.

But I think the annotations that we may make as a result of our little survey will certainly be something we will update the OFB with, but I think we should also ask the chair of the OFB to make sure that those annotations are available to the ALAC, because I gather that the ALAC meeting is the day before the OFB meeting. So Heidi, have I got all the ducks lined up properly there?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfectly, Cheryl. Yeah. And thanks to Michelle for the correction.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So we’ll just have to make sure that Holly is attending the ALAC call and Holly has the annotations to bring to the attention of if there are any annotations for us to make, to bring to the attention of the ALAC in the discussion re: Work Stream 2.

Okay, so that was a longer recap than I had planned, but never mind. So now if we look into—Michelle, the next—I've got my agenda so tiny because I was split screening. If we move now on to agenda item five, which is now looking at the full list of recommendations—this Google doc which you're all familiar with, that is disturbingly the old version. Right. Evin or Michelle, one of you went to great efforts to remove the column in—might just be an old link there. Correct me if I'm wrong, but Evin, didn't you edit this to—you’ve removed the ... Yeah, go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes. Sorry. We should be getting the—well, actually, it says copy of issued recommendations. This should be the right one. In column I, we just wanted to remove the numbers that were automatic so that you can enter text. So I think this is actually the correct version.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That’s good, if we can—can you just do a test on that column to make sure we can put in text? Just so those of you who haven't had the joy of these tables to date, some of them were restricted to particular types of data that could go in. In other words, they would only pull up a color or they would only allow you to put in one, two or three or low, medium, high, and we wanted to have that changed. and Evin had that in a previous AI, and I'm pretty sure she did it, which is why I was a little bit taken aback when I saw what I thought was the original. But it’s probably just—excellent. Thank you. Right, I'm a much relieved woman. I appreciate that.

Okay, so we are fine with that after all. What we’re going to do is leave ATRT3 until practically the last, leave the MSM until after CCTRT and RDS, and look at the CCTRT and RDS ones as our next priority.

To this end, if you can now pull up, Michelle, our working document—in other words, our recommendations prioritization—you'll note that we now have tabs across the bottom. So what you’ve previously worked with in the small team is this first tab, and that’s all the Work Stream 2. This is in no particular order, I just happened to do it alphabetically as much as I could between the ones we decided to do next. So I just put CCTRT first, but we can switch those tabs if needs be, and RDS.

So if you pull up—let’s have a go at CCTRT just to begin with. You'll see this will be our clean slate that we will now start doing the overall prioritization, the assessment, the notes, and then the allocations of the other columns.

What I was hoping that we could get as input—and so what I'm saying now with CCTRT is equally applicable to RDS—is if we can get both the chairs who we’re blessed to have not only with us today but as part of our At-Large community, of both those groups, if they could be given some editing access to this document now—so that’s a staff thing to organize—I think we’d all benefit from direct input, be it opinion or be it cold hard fact that we've got wrong or that needs to be expanded in what we've put in these sheets.

So for example, all I have done is literally take the material from that master sheet that we had up just a moment ago. I have not changed it, I have not annotated it. I've simply fitted it into our template. But that may not do justice to it. So I would like to see, if you all agree, that we give Alan and Jonathan specific access to this working document now and seek their early input and comments. And to that end, we would welcome edits directly to the status column, to any annotations or additional material in recommendation that could be made as comments, but what we would really like is in this status/comment—not the one with the drop down menu, just do an example of the drop down menu, if you could, Michelle, so that they know what happens Just pull up any one of those.

You see, that’s limited to you either choose high, medium, low, or not applicable. So we’re not asking you to fiddle with that column—that almost gets done as a last thing by this group—but to have at it and feel free, but put your initials next to comments and information anywhere you like in your section or in each other’s sections—we’re very open—in this column here that’s highlighted, which I think is E, if my eyes don’t fail me. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I do have editing rights, by the way, so nothing has to be done on that. I wanted to make a comment on the RDS review, which is in a funny status. We’re a year and a half after submission of the report to the Board, and the Board has taken no action, despite the bylaw requirement to respond within six months.

Is it really subject to something that we’re supposed to be commenting on at this point, since the Board has chosen to do nothing? We don’t know to what extent the Board will accept any of these recommendations. Just a question. It’s a little bit of a funny status.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. Yeah. I'll open it up for comment and hopefully, Sébastien, for example, will make a comment in particular because we are also cognizant, of course, that ATRT3’s recommendations have gone through to the Board, and they make some very definite pressures on dealing with the recommendations from all of the review teams and cross-community working groups that have made these recommendations. And so the work we do in the small team will not be wasted or lost, because regardless of when the Board brings its own opinion to bear on the report from RDS, it’s going to have to fit into this prioritization cross-community exercise at some stage. So my reaction is, yes, and we may as well get it done, off our plates, move on to the next bit and see how we go. But Alan, I'll come back to you after I see what the rest of the group’s opinion is.

So, a few people on the call who could weigh in on this.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. My immediate reaction is that the Board has six months to take action. If they don’t, from my point of view, that means that all the recommendations need to be taken and put in place. It’s a duty they have to fulfill, and they can't delay things because they decide to delay things. It’s not the bylaws.

But for us, I think if you remember, I heard Org saying that there are 300 recommendations, therefore, I think they consider all the recommendations we have on the table to be taken into account by each SO and AC. Therefore, we need to go through, whatever the real status is with the Board. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien. Alan, do you want to just hold for a moment longer? I'll see whether Greg or Jonathan or Judith have something they’d like to put forward in response to your question. Either jump in or pop your hand up. Jonathan, over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. There's probably no review in existence that’s in greater disarray as far as the recommendations than the CCTRT, because it was the first one after the transition, and so it was handled very differently. So even determining where things stand right now is complicated, because there are things that have been accepted, there are things that have been considered implemented but haven't been. So it’s really, every one of them is sort of in a state of limbo. So a lot of this, I think, is going to be an issue on how we appraise the completion of these things as much as it is on the prioritization of them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that. And can I say, I echo in chat, just so we have it for the record, Judith has nothing to add, but Greg noted he’s sat in silent horror. And I think that’s possibly a reaction that many of us will have, but it’s a situation we’re in. So I see this as an opportunity to just get on and, as Sébastien said, do the review, do our own prioritizations, make note of when these extraordinary circumstances have occurred. And so Jonathan, anything that I've listed—because all I've done is take it off the listing and if it said accepted and it’s not or it says implemented and it’s not, that’s exactly the sort of thing we’re hoping you and Alan will put into the status and comments, and we also appreciate form both of you if you have a particular personal—and we’ll take it as personal—or if you can reflect a review team attitude to what priorities might be, we’d also appreciate that information to work with. Sébastien, and then Alan.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. To emphasize what you say, just to explain to both Alan and Jonathan that you and me within the ATRT, we get through this discussion about everything was implemented from staff point of view, but for our point of view, some, if not a lot, were not implemented. Therefore, we know what it is to go through something where it’s written, implemented, it is not. And it’s why we need to go through. Yes, definitely tell us where you think that it’s not implemented, and we need to take that into account for the future. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Thank you, Sébastien. So this, I hope you're all taking as an opportunity. Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things. I'll allow Jonathan to think the CCTRT review is most in disarray, but at least the Board has responded to it. May not be in the way he wanted to.

I have to disagree with Sébastien. If the Board doesn’t act, then it’s not adopted. The only way recommendations will be implemented is if the Board instructs ICANN Org to do it. And without that instruction, it’s all dead in the water. And having been the person who led that operation for a year and a half, I won't comment on how that makes me feel and how my work has been respected.

That being said, I will make my comments, and the review team did prioritize the RDS recommendations. I will give my personal opinion and the impact on At-Large, not the review team’s. I can reiterate the review team’s one if you want, but that’s not—my intent is to speak on my own behalf.

That being said, unless the Board plans to act, I still think this is yet another wasted effort on top of my first year and a half. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Alan. Hopefully, you can feel somewhat vindicated that we appreciate the work you and the RDS group did to such an extent that we've decided that it, along with CCTRT, needs to be our next most important subjects to review. So, take what little you can out of that, but I think this is perhaps an opportunity because we have this ability to roll an awful lot of this into the Board-accepted recommendations out of ATRT3 that says, have a look at all of these, and get the community input on what goes, what stays, what prioritization gets where in the greater scheme of things, then resource it and do it.

So hopefully, this is a good thing, not a wasted effort. And I guess the small team will be the ones that will be working with your input to try and make that happen. We’re not asking you to become a pledged member of the small team or suddenly become deeply engaged with OFB activities, but rather, assist us with your unique perspectives, because we’re going to do this regardless, but we’d rather do it with your guidance and input, specifically from the focus of At-Large, which may not have been something you could afford to do too much when you were chairing, we admit. So this might be an additional opportunity for quite deliberately and quite, I think reasonably, putting your thumb on the scale to try and have a specific At-Large perspective influence come into this document, hopefully get through the OFB, and eventually come to the ALAC’s attention.

So I think we've done justice to that part of the agenda. Please make sure you do double check that I've captured everything in those tabs correctly. I'll be asking staff to also reach out to both our representatives on—I think there was only two we had on SSR. We know Laurin because Laurin is much more frequent a presenter and pushes, but we did have two, and I think we should reach out to both of them. And then—three, was it? Thanks, Alan. So whoever the other one is, I don't know, but obviously, they were so under the radar I didn't even notice them in the list, because I did watch that fairly closely. But anyway. Or maybe they belong to someone else, not just us, and I assume they're there for them, not the At-Large community. But also to MSM, we’ll reach out to Marita as well to do the same thing for their sections. That’s not as time critical as yours though. Olivier, over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. I'm just checking on the recommendations here. I know that there are snippets and so on that are cut and pasted, I gather. Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it’s sadly correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So for a wider consumption, we might need to put a few explanation points on it, because some of them, because they're just cut and pasted, might seem like, well, is it for ICANN to do that, is it for the ALAC to do that, is it ... recommendation-wise. I gather these all pertain to ICANN altogether.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for offering to do that, Olivier. Excellent. [inaudible] to have your input on that. So that’s an AI on Olivier. Thank you, everybody. That'll be great.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Note to self, Olivier should shut his mouth. AI.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My dear, if you haven't learned that by now with me, I am astonished. So if we could have the annotations—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm just too eager today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that’s good. It’s all that fish going to your head. This is why you eat it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It’s wild salmon. Really nice, by the way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This was a pre-meeting conversation we had with staff. It’s all right. Okay, enough of this. Back onto the track. So for more your annotation, Olivier, as well as the others, if we could look at having it maybe by close of business Tuesday next week or Wednesday at a push so that then when we have our next meeting, we've had a few days to ourselves get into this document and start responding and reaction to what you’ve put in, that would be great.

Olivier, you can annotate a little bit longer if needs be, because that can be a work in progress, and in fact you may find—as we did when we went through the Work Stream 2 stuff as you will know, that once we get into our analysis of each, we feel that there is more material that needs to go in. But anything you can pre-prep that saves us that time in our meetings would be a very valuable thing indeed.

As time’s getting away from me, let’s get back to our agenda and see what we might need to do next. Okay. Let’s have a look here. Right. Preparation of the meeting presentation. I don't know why that’s still there. I thought I presented to them. I feel like I've presented to them every which way but west. We've had more run throughs of this material than I had hot dinners lately. Can someone help me?

Next week, the update. Okay, Heidi. Thank you. Okay, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just next week, Cheryl, that’s the action item on this group from the OFB for this next week’s call, the 24th call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. So it’s an agenda item with a delusion of grandeur. Okay. To me, a meeting presentation is a block of significant time complete with PowerPoint slides and a great deal of careful input. I think all we need to do is discuss what we’re going to tell them, and tell them in as short a time as possible. Or do I have that wrong? Heidi, do you have access yet to the agenda? What are they expecting from us?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The agenda has not yet been developed, but I think it would likely just be a similar update as was given two or three weeks ago. So about five to seven minutes. Is that about right? Actually, I think Holly asked for 15 last time, including discussion. Is that good?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The last time, we were presenting everything we’d done on Work Stream 2. This time, we’ll be telling them this is what we’re doing next and this is how far we got. I'm not sure if there's a great deal more to say.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That’s fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So how about what Sébastien and I do is just recap what we've said today, what we've done today—and I don’t think it needs more than just a couple of minutes, and if they’ve got any questions and input, that’s fine. They should be used to what we’re doing because they’ve seen it all before with the Work Stream 2 recommendations. They’ll know where we’re heading with our next two blocks of work. They’ll know we've engaged Jonathan and Alan directly, and we’ll be engaging Laurin et al and Marita.

So I think if we keep it at that level, then we should be okay. I don’t see a need for even a PowerPoint slide on that. At this stage, we’ll also let them know that we’ll be making some annotations—or we made some annotations—and how we came to any annotations we made. So, five minutes will be fine. Excellent. All right.

Well, time is in fact not my enemy after all, and it might even happen that we get an early mark. Wouldn’t that be a wonderful thing? Seeing as I've got another meeting starting immediately after this one, and even I have some biological needs.

So, I guess it now comes to next steps. To that end, I think you'll find the next recommendation on prioritization—I'm not sure where that link will take us, but I don’t think we need to do more than dive into RDS and CCTRT. Do any of the small team members have any problems with us working in both of those areas in parallel? Neither of them are, I think, an insurmountably difficult task with the aid of the two chairs. Or do you want to do one before the other? I got a thumbs up to that idea from Sébastien. If anyone objects to us working in parallel, put up a great big boohoo, X, or yell loudly down the phone line at me. That'll be fine.

Okay, so we’re working those in parallel. That’s good, because it means we can get on to then probably the MSM and then work on the SSR work with the benefit of seeing what it is that the CPWG and the ALAC comment—assuming there will be one—might have to play into our work on that as well.

All right, does anyone have anything else they want to suggest in our next steps? If not, I think we need to decide that we have probably—can we set, say, the next two or three meetings to get on with this work? Obviously, we've got stuff happening next week with both the ALAC meeting and the OFB meeting. Can I suggest we meet the week after? And perhaps even weekly for two weeks after that. Is that a problem for anyone?

Okay. Someone in staff can do the magic with the dates on that. I don’t want to, obviously, block—we don’t want to have a problem with the ICANN meeting week, but I see no reason why we can't do our work during the prep week. Does anyone have a problem with that?

In which case, with resounding silence affirming everything—and Heidi’s got the dates now of the 3rd and the 10th of March, which are both Wednesday s, or Thursday if you live where I do—then I think, ladies and gentlemen, I’d call for Any Other Business if there is any. And all I heard was a [inaudible] cockatoo telling me nobody’s fed the birds yet, so with that, I'm going to wrap this call delightfully ten minutes early, and hope that the rest of you make good use of your time, as I certainly intend to make of mine. And I want to thank staff because of the excellent support that you give us and this backend work on all of these documents and tools we’re using, and making sure that we get the right places and spaces in the appropriate agendas, and thank each and every one of you for today’s call.

You are all welcome at the next calls, but please, if you're part of the small team, use your own time as well in the document. If you can't make a call, it doesn’t mean you can't make edits and contributions. So with that, thank you, everyone. Bye for now. And Michelle, you can wrap up the meeting.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you, Cheryl. Meeting has been adjourned. Thank you, everyone. Please take care.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**