EN

NATHALIE PERGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the ATLAS 2 meeting on the 30th of April 2013. On the call today we have Baudouin Schombe, Eduardo Diaz, Satish Babu, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Natalia Enciso, Darlene Thompson, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Pastor Peters, Roberto Gaetano, Siranush Vardanyan, Yaovi Atohoun, Jordi Iparraguirre, Fatima Cambronero, and Juan Manuel Rojas. We have two apologies from José Arce and Adela Danciu. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, Gisella Gruber, Carlos Reyes and myself Nathalie Pergrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Staff will be taking action items only for this call, and the transcripts will be available within the next 48 to 72 hours. Thank you very much and over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you and I hope that you all can hear me here. I am in a developing part of the world, so [not 0:01:03] London and telecommunications aren't as good as in the developed part of the world, which is north London.   So hopefully some top London [CROSSTALK 0:01:14] I won't be cut off a few more times.

Welcome to the ones for this meeting to do with the second At-Large Summit Corporation. You've got the agenda in front of you, the first point is basically reviewing the meeting with the public participation committee that we had over in Beijing. There were actually two things.

EN

There was a meeting with the PPC, which was a closed meeting where both Heidi and I went to meet up with the PPC, and we could [then went 0:01:53] At-Large Summit formally and answered a few questions that were asked of us with regards to the proposal. As you know, the chair of the PPC is Sebastian [Ba-sho-let 0:02:09].

His colleagues were well informed about the whole proposal that we had. The meeting was very short, it only lasted 10, 15 minutes, just asked a few questions and we just answered those questions. I'm not sure, Heidi do you wish to add anything to this specifically?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think, Olivier, you covered it. Just, again, you'll see that I tried to incorporate some of those comments into the revised proposal. And the remaining one on metrics.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah. So this is the… The proposal that you currently have now on your screen is a revised proposal based on some of the questions that were asked from us, that were not in the first proposal. [CROSSTALK 0:03:06]. I'm sorry?

FEMALE: All right. Sorry Olivier. Can whoever desperately needs to introduce themselves get it over and done with as opposed to just letting staff know?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.   So no one needs to introduce themselves.   Good.   So the purpose, for example the one which said to allow ICANN to showcase a key component of [INAUDIBLE 0:03:32] environment to the rest of the world, [at a time that is for 0:03:35] ICANN and to the internet, [not to the mobile 0:03:38].

One of the questions that was asked was along the lines, well, the people, the At-Large factors that will come to the At-Large Summit, will they mix and mingle with the rest of the ICANN community?   Will the rest of the ICANN community be able to mingle and mix with them?

And although this might be something that we feel as being quite obvious.   And the aim was not specifically written in that document, we added, I'm not sure maybe it's further down.   And one of the aims is to get [INAUDIBLE 0:04:15] to mix with the rest of ICANN, and to have the full experience of what an ICANN meeting is like.

There is a question from Eduardo in the chat, "Why did we have to go to the PPC?"   The Public Partnership Committee is a board subcommittee that deals specifically with engagement with, well outreach and engagement of stakeholders in reach, etcetera.

That's the part of the board that deals with it.   The equivalent, now, in the staff structure is the Global Stakeholder Engagement.   In fact, the Public Partnership Committee works very closely with the Global Stakeholder Engagement department now.   And we need to pass all of our plans...   Our plans are all based on the idea of in-reach with ALAC and outreach with more At-Large structures.

These plans have to go through the PPC. Now whether the PPC needs to get its green light before it moves on to the Board or not is questionable. The PPC could just comment on the plans and effectively be the first step into passing this information onto the Board.

Now one thing that did take place in Beijing was aside from this Public Participation Committee meeting which took place early on, on Sunday morning, we had a meeting with the Board later on. And the question was asked by one of the Board members, the question was asked regarding the ATLAS 2, at the At-Large Summit.

And the reason, I guess, is because the rest of the Board had not heard very much about this. And I think it was time to… Well it definitely appeared to be the right time to share this with the rest of the Board. So the rest of the Board suddenly doesn't wake up to the fact that At-Large has asked for this, and has prepared this proposal, and suddenly to have to vote on it before even knowing about it.

So that meeting which we had with the board, with the board heard about this, was very significant because several Board members came to me afterwards and asked for the question. I know that some of you, and some of your colleagues on the ALAC were also asked questions about the At-Large Summit.

And so as a result, the full proposal is now well shared among Board members. And I think none of the Board members can say, "Well we never knew about." So that's really the level of what's happened so far. Now the process is that the proposal goes through the PPC, then it gets passed on over to the Board Finance Committee, because, obviously, this is a financial request that we are making.

And the Board Finance Committee will be looking at it and giving its response before it reaches the full Board. The Finance Committee is chaired by [Sherene Shall-a-bee 0:07:37], and he is one of the people that has come to me afterwards and asked for further information.

In fact, prior months, there had already been some email discussions about the project itself. So the Board Finance Committee itself, I would say, fully aware. But they have not started looking at this as far as I know. Maybe Heidi could update us on that. But they're certainly that this is coming their way.

And the response so far from both the public, the PPC and the Board Finance Committee is a rather positive one. Not that doesn't mean that it's in the bag already, but it certainly means that no one so far has turned around and outright objected to the concept of an At-Large Summit, of a second At-Large Summit.

Which is a good, good news. But as you all know in ICANN, everyone can say yes to something and that thing might not happen. So we certainly have to continue in the direction that we're moving forward with. And we have to continue bearing in mind that there could be a grand of sand somewhere along the line that might stop it from happening.

And this is one of these unknown unknowns that we have to be prepared for, and it might well be that we can dislodge that grain of sand if that appears early enough and we're aware of it and I think whatever blockage there might be. That's the apparent status. Heidi, did you have anything else to add on the latest – with regard to the PPC or the…

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I only – two things. One, this is Heidi, that the entire board was sent the revised proposal and the slightly revised budget. And secondly, that the June board meeting will be June 27th. So at that time, the Board will rule, make a decision officially on the Summit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. You've jumped to number five, that's agenda number five already, but that's fine [laughs]. But yes, okay. If you want now, we can have a quick review of the revised proposal and that's the one that's on your screen.

I guess, are you unable to scroll? I think you're all able to scroll.

FEMALE: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can all scroll at your own pace. This is not that much… There hasn't been that many changes. There is an emphasis on the fact that the venue will be the ICANN Hotel. As I said, I was concerned that there wouldn't be enough mingling going on.

And the other thing that was added was that in addition the ATLAS 2 meetings are likely to include meeting in which other members of the ICANN will be invited to participate. Have the ATLAS 2 being in the same venue will allow for such greater participation by all member of the ICANN committee and At-Large Summit.

EN

This cross-pollination is something that appears to be very high on the agenda, everyone's agenda. The breaking down of the is definitely a way to move forward. Are there any questions or comments at this point in time? Yes, Yaovi, you have the floor, or you have the room. And you might be mute…

YAOVI ATOHOUN: My comment is…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can hear you now.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Oh good. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you now thank you. Go ahead Yaovi please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you. My comment is about the [figures 0:11:28]. This summit combined with the ICANN [ATLAS 0:11:35] [INAUDIBLE 0:11:36]… My comment is about [INAUDIBLE 0:11:40]… because multiple subsequent problems [INAUDIBLE 0:11:47] apparently [X-COM 0:11:48] [INAUDIBLE 0:11:48]… there needs to be until [we get to the 26th in 2014 0:11:53] until the evening.

So I guess our assumptions before that [INAUDIBLE 0:12:01]… ICANN meeting and the Summit [INAUDIBLE 0:12:16]… that Friday. Okay. [Did you check around? 0:12:24]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you Yaovi. Your voice is a little bit muddled, I don't know how better you can make it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. [INAUDIBLE 0:12:38]

FEMALE: Try again Yaovi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay. My comments are [INAUDIBLE 0:12:52]… instead of ending it all [INAUDIBLE 0:12:59] … on the 26th, we focus [INAUDIBLE 0:13:04]… 27th because we are [INAUDIBLE 0:13:08]… so that while at the [INAUDIBLE 0:13:15]… So to summarize [INAUDIBLE 0:13:26]… thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So Yaovi what I've heard, this is Olivier here. What I've heard from you is that you're saying that you are looking at the schedule and you think the final At-Large meetings on the 26th and

you're asking why we moved the ALAC meeting to the 27th and the ExCom meeting to the 27th of June. Is that correct?

And your suggestion was because it was due to time basically, not having enough time. Is that right? Have I gotten it wrong? If anyone else could…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think you're close, it's Cheryl here. I think you're close to the issue Olivier. I wasn't sure whether he was asking whether it was a timing issue or a purely budgetary one, that's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Okay. Thank you Cheryl for this explanation. I notice that Yaovi is disconnected, I hope he is able to hear us. The 27th, the 27th of June, yeah. Yaovi, I hope you can hear us on… The reason for the ExCom and the At-Large meeting being not held concurrently with the ALAC meeting is two-fold.

The first one being this cross-pollination. If you are going to have an ALAC meeting, you really want everyone in ALAC to attend obviously. And so if you were to hold an [AFLAC 0:15:04] meeting at the same time, those members of the ALAC would not be able to attend the [AFLAC], the At-Large Summit.

The other thing is one of rooms. We have a limited number of rooms that can be used. You have to remember that the requirements that At-Large has are a bit more than your average requirements. We require

EN

interpretation. We require scripting. There needs to be At-Large staff also that needs t be there.

So we were told that we would not have enough rooms with interpretation and with all of the other needs we need to have, that are large enough for both an [AFLAC] meeting and an At-Large Summit meeting to take place simultaneously.

And this actually has shaped some of the schedule that we put together, because if you recall in Mexico City – or for those of you that were around in Mexico City, we had many sessions that were entirely separate from each other [INAUDIBLE 0:16:13]. But then the Summit took place in a different hotel venue than the main venue.

This proposal, next year, the Summit would take place in the same venue. So we are somehow restricted by the number of rooms that we can use [Audio Fadeout 0:16:30]… long-winded way, I guess, of answering the question why we're moving the At-Large schedule and the ALAC meeting over to Friday, not doing it on Thursday.

We're using that spot that usually ALAC meets on a Thursday to have a final At-Large Summit meeting, morning Thursday. Yaovi if you're back on? Don't see Yaovi back, okay. Any questions or comments onto what I just said? Or any other comments?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: [INAUDIBLE 0:17;21]

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yaovi you're back, yes. Did I answer your question correctly? Did you hear or…

YAOVI ATOHOUN: No I didn't hear, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh dear. Okay. Well, we'll have to get you to download the transcript and read…

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I can work with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs]   Because I gave an explanation, a long explanation, long-winded explanation. Eduardo you have the floor. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this is Eduardo for the record. I just wanted to suggest, you know, a large interaction with the ICANN meeting, maybe some of us can become mentors to new ALS that is going to this Summit. Let's say if I'm an expert in the [AFLAC], there meetings across the AFLAC meeting that has to do with that, maybe that mentor will be able to get those ALS interested in that thing.

And help them going through the meetings. That's just a suggestion on getting the maximum support for those new ALS, to mingle with the ICANN, during the ICANN meetings. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes thank you very much Eduardo. That's a very valid point and if I could add, I think there would be several such ideas that we are going to have to pursue in the leading up to the ICANN, the At-Large Summit. The reason being that I think there is a lot of return on investment that is being asked of us, and we're probably going to have to look at this.

In fact, there was one question that was asked by the PPC and that question is, what metrics do you have that will be showing a return on investment for ICANN? So in fact, that was supposed to be on the agenda page but it's just not.

That's strange.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was added. Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was added. Yes, go ahead Cheryl, because I can't see it on my agenda at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Yeah Heidi indicated that the agenda needed to be refreshed earlier, but we had certainly noticed that there was a call for metrics. And it's actually to that that I wanted to speak, following from Eduardo's excellent suggestion on mentoring.

I think mentoring, but also subject lead or subject experts with shadowing whereby… I mean, mentoring is very different thing in my

view to. I'm interested in who is… Can you explain what it is? Or how can I be interested in security and stability issues?

I think we probably need to poll our team [our team days 0:20:24], and see what their particular interests are, which is something we did do in the first ATLAS. We probably should then assign them, because they'll probably find too many people will want to be in to fewer areas of interest to various parts of what is going on in the mainstream of the ICANN meeting.

But in terms of the metric, not only could we offer subject leads, mentoring, and shadow facilities, facilitation with shadowing facilities, from some of our moldy-oldies. That we could perhaps also offer it to not only any fellowship people that are out there, but any other newcomer in the ICANN meeting.

In other words, what we would be doing for our own, we could offer, not necessarily have them take up, but at least offer the sign mechanisms. Thank you. And that's measurable of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Good follow-up on this. I guess we have to start moving on this as well and maybe preparing a first draft of a document to outline what different lines we're going to have.   But I when [CROSSTALK 0:22:00] was speaking, I realized one thing, which was – which Yaovi mentioned, when we look at the budget, the updated budget page, it says "Dated Sixth of June 2013."

And that's not [formally 0:22:16] for a long time, we are not [laughter] of June, that could have been part of the note. Heidi asks, on your

suggestion, whether we should include this in the revised proposal. I think that because the question has been asked, it would probably really make sense to add this.

I don't know how others feel about it. I don't see anyone jumping up or down or saying no or yes, I'll take it that silence means silent approval.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here. I've got this huge lag on the Adobe Connect for me from time to time. So I'm typing and you're not seeing it for another three or four minutes sometimes. So I was certainly supporting you in that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl. Yes, I can see… Yes, it was the mentoring or subject leads would be good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Hang on. I said I typed that while Eduardo was speaking. I then just spoke into the matter, and more has gone on, and you're only just seeing it now. So I've got a big lag in my chat thing saying so, sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I believe you may be stuck in a time warp somewhere.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Eduardo hopefully is…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Eduardo Diaz, go ahead, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Tell them, [that a 0:24:04] more or less logical, I think it's a great idea.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will support you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Eduardo I'm not sure if I just caught the last of your sentence, the last part of your sentence, you said this was a great idea, let's move ahead with it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That's exactly what I said, yes.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And the great idea, I gather, worked on the follow-up to Cheryl's proposal. Is that correct?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm trying to piece things back together, it's all arriving in an out of order fashion. There is a sentence before the beginning. Anyway. Okay. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: As I see the schedule proposed here, I realize that it is more capacity building action than a Summit than it was in Mexico. I see that we have plenaries on Saturday and Sunday. Plenaries with ALS, I don't understand what you're going to find those plenaries. What do you say in those plenaries? Will we be giving them information? Will it be giving them knowledge?

Or what would be in those plenaries? And then I see that the final At-Large meeting will be on Thursday at twelve, but I don't see any policy issue discussed. I remember that in Mexico we had four policy issues to be discussed and we formed four groups for it.

So if this time we will have not a Summit but a capacity building or action it will be different, and I don't think it will be good for us. It will be down looked. We need to have policy issues discussed, and we need to have recommendation at the end of this Summit. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes thank you very much Tijani. Your points are well taken, and in fact I think it's all a matter of language. The state that we are at, at the moment, is to just to provide an overall framework to where we want sessions and how many sessions we would like to stage.

The plenaries, as they're currently called, the ones that take place both on Saturday and on Sunday, are actually working sessions which include capacity building, which include any work that the ALS might have done or would have done, and then lead up to that Summit.

I think that we need to do pretty much as in the last Summit, we need to engage ALS and get them to work before they set in London. And with the results of their work being presented in London, and I think that's what we see by plenaries.

With regards to the policy, the final plenary really is the one that I think that we can have policy dealt with, and policy discussion will take place with the ALS. I see that Evan has put his head up, so I'll let Evan… Tijani, first Tijani do you wish to respond to this? Because we're not going to the details yet exactly of what those sessions are going to be.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know Olivier, and this is exactly my worry. If you plan to have the policy discussed on Thursday only, we will not have the same kind of, if you want, input from the community, from the At-Large community to the whole ICANN as we did in Mexico. So in one day you cannot discuss all of the issues you want to discuss with specific groups that can deepen the question.

Because everyone cannot be a part of all of the issues, cannot discuss all of the issues, because we have people who are better skill in this area than the other, etcetera. So this is my worry, I don't see that we will have the same kind and the same quality of output as we had in Mexico. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I've got Evan at the moment and I heard hands up, was that Darlene?

DARLENE THOMPSON: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Darlene, I recognize your voice. So first, Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I just want to speak in support of what Tijani just said. Some of what I have been hearing over the last few minutes is starting to sound like the Academy, and these are two very, very different events with two very, very different objectives, and this may go to metrics and it may go to other things.

The objects of the Summit, as I understand, is policy. The objects are not necessarily better rounded At-Large members and that kind of thing. While that is good and it's desirable, it's a side effect, I think, of the Summit as opposed to a primary objective. And I don't want to take

away from the Academy which also has similar things about building leadership and capacity building and that kind of thing.

So I don't want… I think we need to be conscious of not having the Summit look too much like the Academy and vice versa. And so I definitely want to agree with Tijani and say that this should be policy based, it should be objectives based, in such a way in saying we have these issues that At-Large needs to be aware of, that At-Large needs to come up with opinions, and policies, and advice on. And have the Summit done that way.

And so, I'm starting to see a little bit of mission creep here and I'm just conscious of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. I'll let Darlene speak and then I'll respond to everyone one at a time. So Darlene Thompson.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson. I agree with what Tijani and Evan just said, however as we mentioned there will be some very new, very new ALS there. And I agree with what Cheryl said that it would be good to have a mentorship program where they're paired up with a – I resent the term "moldy-oldie," but [laughs] applicable.

But still, I think we need to balance it off a little bit with a little bit of information giving, you know, here's what it's all about. And the Academy itself is strictly for leadership people, not for ALS. So I really

think that we do need to have a little bit of Academy type stuff for the ALS, the new ALS that are going to be there.

But I think that should take a back seat, definitely to the policy so that we do have some very specific deliverables and some really good outcomes on this. But I don't think we should cast that completely aside. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you very much Darlene. And I see hands going up and down at the moment, Tijani next, etcetera, and others also that have come in the queue. I just want to reframe this a little bit. At the moment, we are only dealing with a framework, the number of sessions that we're going to have.

We decided two main days, to full days at the beginning, Saturday, Sunday, and then a full day on the Thursday. What we do with those sessions, whether we make it a plenary session with everyone sitting there, whether we break it up into smaller groups in the main room, bearing in mind though that we will only have one set of interpreters. What we do, we have a full year to decide.

At the moment, the only thing we're working on is the framework of what we are asking for in our budget. Now, the contents, the stuff we're going to talk about, this is what this working group is going to be working on in the next forthcoming months.

But having a discussion today as to what we want to discuss in each one of the workshops, or whether this is infringing on the Academy or not the Academy and so on, is irrelevant to the discussion today I'm afraid.

EN

We're way too early to discuss it. And I suddenly see lots of people putting their hands up, so go ahead. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank Olivier, Tijani speaking. Yes you're perhaps right, but I wanted to be really clear that it is absolutely different from the ICANN Academy. Absolutely, that's not the ICANN Academy at all. Not, no link with the ICANN Academy, it's not a link. Here we have a Summit.

And an At-Large Summit is something very, very, very important for us and for ICANN. It is the way to express the mind of the whole At-Large together, here, in the same place about policy issues. It is what made us having this credibility.

Because you remember that from the Summit until now, we have a big, a huge credibility, and I think because it is our work on the Summit. We need to stick to this. We need to stick to discussing, to getting to the ICANN. The point of view of At-Large, the whole At-Large, not the [availability 0:34:53] of At-Large only, the whole At-Large together, is a Summit.

So you are perhaps right, Olivier, it's not the time to speak about it. But if you put it here in the project, this is not absolutely right because we will need a lot of rooms, not one room for Sunday and one room for Saturday. No, we will need more than one room.

We will need… For also we would need more than one room. So even for the planning, for budgeting, etcetera.   Perhaps also we need [interpreters 0:35:29] four times this – four times [interpreters 0:35:37], then what is written here. So I think we need to be little bit clear about

what we need, what we want to do, so that the budget will be written in the same direction. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. And I appreciate what you've asked for this, but I'm a bit concerned now that the budget has been done, that we're suddenly changing the request for the number of interpreters and the number of rooms, and this sort of thing.

I'm just a bit surprised that we're doing it at this stage, because the costs associated with having more than one room and more than one set of interpreters [INAUDIBLE 0:36:26] is just going to be multiplied by the number of interpreters and the number of rooms. It's one of these things.

I'll go through the queue and we'll see. Sandra Hoferichter please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Sandra speaking. Can you hear me?

FEMALE: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can. Go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello? Okay. It's Sandra speaking for the transcript. I think that it already has been mentioned, but I would like to propose that we define

EN

a sort of an overarching… When ICANN is asking for an output, for a complete output, I think we should have a complete topic to discover. Because these overarching things we can actually build on an agenda [INAUDIBLE 0:37:14].

And I think that this is very first step, and a very good step, to deliver an outcome if you [INAUDIBLE 0:37:24]. This type of correction, or this type of specific issue on under a specific umbrella.

Just to give you an example, for Euro [Audio Cutout 0:37:35]… the European ITF, the overarching issue is internet propriety, how to serve the public interest. I know that public interest is also under discussion with ALAC or within ICANN, just mentioning that [INAUDIBLE 0:37:55], and I think during the Beijing ICANN meeting.

I think that a session like this, or an overarching theme like this, where the entire ALAC, educated or not, by educated they are familiar with ICANN [audio cutout 0:38:11]… They can at least put their input into such an overarching [exception 0:38:16] of theme, and then we can write a report of whatever, producing the [media 0:38:23] and then we can do more of a complete output, what ICANN is asking for.

And just another point, I also agree that the Summit has absolutely nothing to do with [or including 0:38:35] or ICANN Academy. And ICANN Academy is not only leadership training it is the real [Audio cutout 0:38:43]… building in, or it should be in the future of the [world 0:38:48] capacity building program through the ICANN and not leadership training which is supposed to take place during the HM portion.

But definitely not during the Summit. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. And your point with regards to the ICANN Academy, I don't know how the ICANN Academy crept into this but I don't see the ICANN Academy mentioned anywhere in the proposal. So that, you know, there has never been a point or question that this would have to do with anything with the ICANN Academy.

With regards to defining an overarching theme, that's I think an excellent idea. The question though is, do we need to do that now? At proposal level? Or do we need to define it later on? Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: May I just… Sandra speaking. May [Audio Cutout 0:39:43]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, yes please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: My proposal will be to define the overarching them as early as possible, in order to give the decision makers a clear guidance that we are looking to achieve an outcome, or trying to achieve an outcome. It might influence their decision. That's just my opinion. I would start to define it very early. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Sandra. So define it as early possible, but maybe not define it, not now as such. And now as in during this call. My main concern at the moment is this proposal which is what goes through. If this proposal is not agreed, we can just pack our bags and we won't have to define anything beyond that.

This proposal is the core document at the moment. Does anyone believe that we need to define the overarching theme in this document? If you do, then…

FEMALE: Hang on Olivier. Actually should listen to Jean-Jacques before you…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Okay. I'll listen to everyone in the queue first, that's a good point. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor. Can't hear you at the moment, you might be muted.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can you hear me? Hello. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you now.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can you hear me?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you. Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Oh good, wonderful. First, please forgive me, I'm late on this call. I only just arrived with the connection. So two points. First is in direct reply to your main concern today Olivier, which is about the program and how we push through this thing. So on that first point, I would like to mention that in Nigeria, this is an unique opportunity to really enhance outreach especially through remote participation.

Because even though we would like to expect hundreds of participants, I think the real impact of the ALAC, or the At-Large Summit at this point, in one year and something, will be to fully use what has never been used fully yet, which is a combination of all of the technical tools now available.

I think that would really have an impact. This would also fit in nicely with a new phase in the history of ICANN, when a new CEO has a very clear mind about the way forward, he has a new communications team which has been reinforced. So because of all this, I think we can achieve something quite significant in terms of outreach and progress in public participation.

Without, I underline this, without additional budget specifically for our summit, because the means will be available in any case for the general purposes defined by the CEO and his communications team. That was my first point.

On the second point, I very much support Sandra's suggestion of an overarching theme. And like herself, I would say the sooner we define

EN

one in a convincing way, the better our chances of getting that through. Now, Olivier, I take your point that may not possible to define it precisely on this particular call, but I just like to give it a try.

I think that one of the things which will be really, really important in one year's time, when you look at the legislation which is coming up in several countries, that will be a risk of additional curtailment of individual liberties and civic rights. So I think one theme we should have great resonance throughout the community is the internet rights and privacy rights.

And all of that, of course, is only one part of maintaining or enhancing the global public interest. So I think it fits in with the overall orientation that you and others have given to ALAC and the At-Large over the past few months. Which is, as we saw in our writings, a greater emphasis on the global public interest.

And this is really one of the items which is most important to be addressed in that sense. So, I support Sandra's suggestion very much, and I would be willing to work on that with you and others. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. And so I uploaded effectively your suggestion for the overarching theme of internet rights and privacy rights. That's done. Next, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Olivier. I have tried to put my hand down again, I should put out – it's Cheryl for the record. I should point out that I

should put my hand up to speak to this matter before you replied to the earlier section. So that's the lag I'm working with.

But I've got the benefit now of having listened to the rest of the speakers proceeding me, so I'm going to take the opportunity. What I was going to say was let's get out of the weeds and stop playing in the minute, but you said all of that Olivier.

What you need from this meeting in the now 10 minutes that we have left for it, is to get some clear guidelines on the proposal and how it is to be put forward and the next steps. I wanted to agree with the concept of working with the budget pretty much as it is written.

I would suggest that I support whole heartedly what Tijani and others have said, and that the accent needs to be on policy outcomes and policy development. There is consequently, however, some need for finding ways to get people up to speed. We should point out some of that will be done in a propriety mode, and that we will be using – use [INAUDIBLE 0:46:37] and indeed contributing to the cost and materials for all of the various, by then, on offer into outreach and educational facilities that may be it can for ICANN.

So that does pick up on some of what I think Sandra was looking towards, but also what Jean-Jacques was saying. I disagree absolutely with the building the ultimate model. I think we need to recognize that, you know, primary room and a few ad-hoc rooms at available times is about all we'll get.

And if we start altering the budget, what we'll get is a no, so let's work with the resources and logistics we know we have, and then do a design

EN

of program which will be happening later, probably even after we have approval. And make sure that we work with what we have got, and we work effectively in a measurable way.

That said, I whole heartedly agree with the concept of an overarching theme, and would like to suggest that the proposal is slightly altered in the following ways: that we remove terms like plenary from all of the sessions other than perhaps these final or beginning ones, or just have one of those, because I think it's a matter of words there, Olivier, that people are looking at the term plenary and just seeing a slightly different format rather than the place hold that it is now.

That we label those as working sessions and we put an asterisk on those working sessions that indicates, you know, a policy development working sessions. Evan has put through the chat, a very nice skeletal structure of generic mechanisms for policy.

We could have that as a footnote so that they know what the overall principles are. And we say that we would be working towards an overarching theme with related some things yet to be decided. But a working example of an overarching theme at this stage would be, for example, the public interest.

It really needs to be whatever ICANN is interested in at the time. In a perfect world it might be public interest, but we do need to make this relevant and rewarding and measurable for ICANN as well.   I do however also think that we need to make certain that the language used in the proposal is not ambiguous.

EN

I think what you heard in this discussion, Olivier, is that there is too much ambiguity and it's open to interpretation in some of the text. So whilst I would support the proposal in principle, I think you do need to do some text edits based on today's call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl, and your points are well taken certainly with regards to renaming the Saturday and the Sunday session from plenary to working sessions. I think that is an excellent point, an excellent idea.

I know that it was mentioned by Heidi in the chat that there would not be other rooms available on the Saturday and the Sunday, but there certainly will be other rooms available throughout the rest of the week. So if we have working sessions, and then breakout sessions with small groups that meet up in an ad-hoc way, or meet up in smaller rooms, that's certainly something that is workable.

At this very moment in time, at the moment, we really are just looking at this document. Your point is well taken with regards to the ambiguity of the document. I will work with staff to try and do the parts which might need to be cleaned up a little bit.

I note that Evan has mentioned he is uncomfortable with the wording of purpose item number four. Part of the way this is worded is, of course, to maximize the value that this would have to ICANN. And certainly the showcase of the bottom-up multi-stakeholder environment is particularly important at this point in time.

Very few people understand what the multi-stakeholder environment is, and know how it works. So it's one of these things where we're writing it like the – solution, but how do you rewrite it? So that's to show that there is a value for ICANN in this Summit to take place, not just for At-Large structures, not just for the community, but ICANN, the organization as a whole.

We'll be looking through this with Heidi and see what can be added. If you have any suggestions for replacing text, I invite you all to either send them over to the email mailing list, or to put them on the Wiki which we have. Because I'll be in Los Angeles for the next couple of days, I will be meeting face to face with Heidi, and we'll be writing and working on this face to face.

I will also be meeting with [Sabie-na Cal-burt 0:52:18], the CFO, so there will be a chance to discuss this face to face, strengthening the model, strengthening the [INAUDIBLE 0:52:29] model. I see Satish, your hand is still up from before. Are you still waiting to add something or was that a new hand? That's not a new hand. Okay, fine. Next is Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.   Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. You asked if we should define now the theme. Perhaps we don't have to define [precisely 0:52:59] the theme. But we need to say, and to make it clear, that we will work with more goals because we will discuss different themes, different issues. This has an impact, as I said, on the rooms.

And, as you said, perhaps Sunday and the Saturday we will have not more than one room, but you can have other rooms in the other days of

the week. So I can propose you, I will send you an email with the skeleton, with days.

I will say day one, day two, day three, day four, without precise [INAUDIBLE 0:53:34] …or any other day. And this is… I think this is the way that we give a document that is close to the reality to what we want to do, because if we get it like this, it will not be relevant with what we will do after and perhaps we will have problems to find other rooms to find [cough] to find a way to work, and to have the output we need to have. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. You mentioned an email with a skeleton, do you think we should include that skeleton in the proposal that we're sending out? Or is this something [CROSSTALK 0:54:22]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: …you can use it to re-write this document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because, again, I'm really concerned about going too much into details and not enough as an overall framework of the proposal. Remember, the more we go into details, the more we will be bound to these details once we get going and start building the sessions. If we need that as a more global, a more rough plan, then we will have much more flexibility once the program committee gets it together, once we start looking at the subjects that we will be discussing, once we will be looking at the exact structure of the Summit, we will have more leeway

to be able to decide that in time based on the feedback from our RLAS and based on the needs that you will be feeling in the next six months.

So I'm a little weary about putting too much detail at this stage, and then having to backtrack in the future and say, "Actually we said we were going to have four parallel tracks and now we found we need five parallel tracks."

FEMALE: Here, here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Yaovi Atohoun.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: [INAUDIBLE 0:55:43][

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, not very well.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Oh let me… Is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Please, go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Oh okay. Thank you very much, Yaovi speaking. I just wanted to add [INAUDIBLE 0:56:03]… My second point is that this is a [INAUDIBLE 0:56:18]… to lift each other. So [INAUDIBLE 0:56:24]… And the last one is that, we need to prepare a [INAUDIBLE 0:56:38]… participants, at least two months before the Summit. So my position is not that you have to go somewhere, I think you have the participants [INAUDIBLE 0:56:49]… in a group, which I think the maximum [INAUDIBLE 0:57:01]…

…everybody. So I don't think there is someone that I can work with to tell people because [INAUDIBLE 0:57:09]… I hope that two months before the Summit [INAUDIBLE 0:57:20]… and then the Summit is [INAUDIBLE 0:57:23]… then it's no good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yaovi. I must say, I had some trouble hearing all of what you said. But you certainly… I think that as time goes, as we will approach the time of the Summit, we will be able to focus more on specific points, and get down to the details of each one of the sessions we want to go and pursue.

The importance of interacting with the full community is something that has been told to us by the PPC, and so we having larger sessions that just might be topic based sessions, or actually will be topic based

EN

sessions whether ILS is with the wider ICANN community, is one way to [Audio cutout 0:58:22]…

FEMALE: That could be very attractive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Roberto Gaetano. Roberto you have the floor.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. This is Roberto Gaetano. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Roberto. Okay. I think that… I would like to come back to the issue about the overarching subject. I think that we badly need that for two reasons. The first reason is just a practical thing. Having lived… I mean, I was on the Board when we had the first Summit, and I can really say that when there were discussions for the first Summit, there was a lot of opposition by the other parts of the ICANN community simply because we were competing on money and resources.

And if you remember, the first idea was to have the Summit in Paris, and then because of considerations about the fiscal year and so on, it was shifted then to Mexico. When it could have been… In spite of the

fact that the summit in Mexico was very effective, it could have gathered many more people in Paris just because of the location.

And so I'm worried about this thing happening again in London. London is a key location because of the commonwealth – possibility people from the commonwealth to have easy Visa and so on. And so I think we have to use all the tools that we have, all of the arrows to our arch that we have, and not to have that delayed.

And one of the objections will be, "Oh, you guys, you don't have a clear idea about what you are going to achieve, and we don't have a clear idea of the added value of a Summit for ICANN." So if we go and present something that is like a slogan, a buzzword that says, "This is what we want to achieve," and then we put some content into it, it will be much easier to overcome the difficulties and the objections that we are going to have in the Board against the Summit.

The second reason is for us, I think we have to start building tension on this Summit. I think that we have to be able to use this Summit to go out to the At-Large community to start building interest and having more, adding force to it in a certain way. In terms of what could be the overarching theme, I think that one of the issues that we're going to face very soon, and that it is an overarching issue by itself, is the role of the At-Large and the role of the user community that is changing now in ICANN and the ICANN multi-state column model.

This is something that, as an overarching subject, can open up to different themes. Like, for instance, how can the At-Large community support ICANN's model and support ICANN in having this model be the winning model in the competition that is world-wide.

And I'm thinking, for instance, about the IT, you wanting to take a part of the, I would say, of the policy management of the management of the resources of the internet, is that really in ICANN's [ram it 1:03:22]? So basically, also to use the fact that now with the new CEO, there is a certain, how can I say it? ICANN is becoming more sensible, and we have seen this with the opening of the two new offices in Istanbul and in Singapore, there is more attention to world-wide, and to diversification, and to establish ICANN presence where it's not present enough.

And I think that we can say, "Okay. If we have this Summit, if we gather all of the At-Large structures world-wide, and we bring together the At-Large community, we can participate, we can contribute to this enlargement of the consensus for ICANN." And I think that we can have a lot of support in the Board on that.

One of the issues that I'm absolutely convinced, is that right now I can have a multi-state program model, but this model is a bit unbalanced. So some parts of the ICANN community, like registries, the registrars, and so on, have a bigger voice, whereas the At-Large community has a lower voice, it is difficult it is to make itself listened and understood.

And I think that we have to bring forward the concept that with the At-Large Summit, we are going to empower more the At-Large community and give them a better voice, which at the end, is going to be an advantage for ICANN as a whole. That's it.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Roberto. That's very, very interesting and useful input that you've brought here. What I've taken out from your, the various points you've made specifically, is your support for an overarching theme. And I heard the one that Jean-Jacques has suggested, the internet rights and the privacy rights.

I've heard the one that you suggested, the role of At-Large community in ICANN. If I may, because we are running out of time on this call today, if I may ask all of you on the call to perhaps in the follow-up email and discussion, suggest what you believe the overarching theme should be.

And I think that would definitely get us to be able to identify an overarching theme earlier rather than later. And I certainly see that there is value in being able to define an overarching theme. And perhaps then, with the regard to the proposal itself, we might be able to say if we have identified the overarching them, we might be able to say what the overarching theme will be later on when we are in discussion with the PPC and with the Board Finance Committee, and with the Board.

Or what we might do is to actually say, "Yes there will be an overarching theme," and that, of course, will be definitely up to us as time goes on. And therefore be able to say that our metrics will be measured against the overarching theme.

I'm a bit concerned right now that we have spent the hour and we have not actually managed to pinpoint the metrics part of that document. And one that says to be decided where we don't know whether we are going to be measuring the amount of participation, whether we're going

to measure the amount of policy document that comes out of At-Large, or are we going to measure the amount of participation by ALS, active participation by ALS?

Or are we going to actually have a metric which basically tells us how much more balance the [model 1:08:11] is take over model compared to how unbalanced it was before. It's a small concern that I have. Just finishing quickly on mentioning that we can contribute to the enlargement of the consensus for ICANN, that's a very valid point.

And I think that it has been somehow described in the purpose of all the ALAC to strengthen the bottom up structure of the At-Large community. But it might well be that here we should be saying actually saying the multi-state global structure of ICANN.

FEMALE: Multi-equal, multi-stakeholder structure of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …equal multi-state [INAUDIBLE 1:08:53] model or multi-equal-state called the model [audio fadeout 1:08:56]… That's a very good point.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well that's something [CROSSTALK 1:09:03]… himself, so we're playing right along with that.

FEMALE: Yup.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's right. Yeah, thank you Evan. And Heidi if we can take a note to add this to the purpose of holding the ATLAS to make use of the words they have used. I see Tijani and Jean-Jacques [INAUDIBLE 1:09:21]. So first Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. One of the main metrics that we can use is the amount and the quality of the output we will give to ICANN regarding the policy issues. I think this is one of the main metrics you can use. Also the participation and… Another metrics, another good metric is, what will be the impact of this Summit on the participation of the ALS? And on the recruitment of the new ALS?

Those are the metrics I see for our Summit. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Tijani. That's noted. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, you might be muted at the moment.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Exactly. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Go ahead please. Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. So about metrics. It seems to me now as it did a few years ago when I was on the Board, that sometimes this is something of a trap because when you are bound, or you allow yourself to be bound by a whole set of metrics, than you are judged mainly on those metrics and not on sometimes more important issues.

Whether it's membership, whether it's people or number of pages produced, that is not always the most valid or important indication actually. However, I do see the point raised just a couple of minutes ago by someone else who said that policy might be one measure. I think that diversity is another one.

It's not the idea of counting the number of languages or geographic variety that we managed to represent in the Summit, but something we should put forward in any case to underlie the fact that it is a very wide open committee to come from really across the world, etcetera.

So I think that in the course of the Summit itself, we probably cannot develop policy which would be separate from the usual, who should I say? The usual discipline and work of the At-Large structure. But one thing we could do is to underlie the importance of two, three themes which we think are of great importance especially in the coming years, what I would call challenges.

One of them I underlined earlier was internet rights and privacy rights as part of a wider concern which is the global public interest. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. That's well taken and so I'll add that. So the internet rights and privacy rights… You're basically suggesting the global public interest to be the overarching theme.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here. I can't put my hand up put me in the list, will you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead Cheryl. You're next in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh thank you.   What I see from Jean-Jacques is the very useful opportunity of, with something like the public interest as an overarching, that there is good opportunity for extremely important subset discussions to have.

And I think that's very healthy for two reason reasons. One of which is the most important one, in my view, and that is that it will allow ownership and attraction for our participants into areas of particular interest, which is always a much healthier thing than forcing everybody to, you know, queue over stuff that they're not particular passionate about.

But the other thing is, it will also give us the opportunity, if we have a suitably important but none the less general overarching theme, to allow the participants themselves to also contribute to the primary topic choices, which is what we did in ATLAS 1. Where we actually, I think it was Tijani mentioned, the four strings. In fact, we ran seven strings

Tijani because we also had some ad-hoc ones and there was the sub uniting in one of the primary workgroups.

But those topic strings that we ran out of ATLAS 1 were relevant at the time for ICANN, but most importantly, in my view anyway, was they were developed by the community that was engaged in the ATLAS anyway. And they were called down, if memory serves, in some 13 topics that were put through as a result of survey, etcetera.

So it also gives us the opportunity to make sure that the participants themselves contribute. I did also want to say one thing on the metrics and that is the very wise words about having them as a trap, the certainly can be.

Metrics are important, return on investment is important, but don't underestimate the usefulness of just having [demonstrables 1:15:08], and [demonstrables] are things one can list such as geographic, economic, and language diversity can simply be measured by simple numeric. It simply this many people from this type of area has turned up, that is useful for PR, it's useful for all sorts of things, but it is not an achievable, it's not something that you're trying to benchmark. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. I note that the time is already 20 minutes past the top of the hour, so we are running out of time. I think that we can continue this discussion specifically on the metrics and also on the overarching theme on the email, and I ask you all to take part quite

extensively in the discussion on the email. Because we shouldn't just have to wait to be on a conference call to voice our points of view.

I wanted to touch quickly on the operation of the [AFLAC] to organizing committee, because obviously this working group here is a committee that is going to be tasked with organizing something. We need to know how it will work and how it will work out. First thing that needs to happen is for a chair or a set of co-chairs to be selected by this group.

Currently, I'm just assuming the intern chair of this group…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I interrupt you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm going to put on my, "Been there, done that" t-shirt hat. Can I strongly encourage you to have co-chairing in the operation of your organizing committee? I think co-chairing is extremely important. Can I equally strongly encourage you to ensure that the serving chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee is one of those leads? But not the whole lead because you're busy enough.

But there is a lot of times when being the chair of the ALAC helps getting things done, is basically where I'm coming from. And also, it is important as chair to be [across all 1:17:42] of the sub things that are happening, and something that's as important as ATLAS.

EN

I was wondering rather than just have a single… Previously there has been groups that has worked with chairing and various five chairs, and some of the workgroups in ATLAS one did it that way. I don't think there is any difference at all between the effectiveness of how one puts in the [mink literature 1:18:14], but apparently it is important to some people.

It's probably preferably if you have a set of co-chairs rather than a chair and a bunch of vice chairs. But I'd like to put that proposal to the meeting, that what we do is have a, at least at this stage, two if not three co-chairs, and that the chair of the ALAC is one of those.

A name that immediately comes to mind to join you in that illustrious group would be Eduardo and perhaps you can call for any other name at this stage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl. And you made a very good point. Indeed, I think that the size of the task itself is too much for just a single chair. And I certainly would wish to be, if we were to go for the co-chair environment, I would wish to be one of the chairs since I'm in constant discussions and sort of backroom discussion that takes place directly with separate members of the Board, etcetera.

The difference between a co-chair and a vice-chair is that when you have a main chair and vice-chairs, there appears to be, although there really isn't, but there appears to be this measure of hierarchy.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I don't like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it's not a case here where we're basically in a pissing competition. I think what we have in front of us is…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …coming up with a team that would make that thing work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That will succeed in having that going on. And…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So co-chairs, you know, would basically be able to divide the work among each other and share the responsibilities and not have everything on one set of shoulders. Which I believe, considering if we do get the funding for this, is a significant project and therefore is a significant pressure on the shoulders of the people leading this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now you mentioned Eduardo and I would second actually your suggestion. I think that Eduardo has shown some interest in leading this group. And I guess, he is on this call. I don't know if anyone else has shown interest, I certainly have not others publically giving their interest to lead this group as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we ask, very briefly Olivier, if anyone else wants to put themselves forward? Or put someone else forward, that they do so now? Recognizing that this is not the end of the game, but it's getting the whole thing started. And that there will be plenty of sub-committees and everything else going around for everyone to have their piece of the action.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think everyone is going to have some fun, trust me on that one.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Who is this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani. How many co-chairs do you need?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Two or three to start with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Two or three I think is a good number, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Two or three. Okay. Perhaps I can volunteer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can volunteer too? Okay. Excellent.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. So we've got… And Eduardo, did you want to say a couple of words? Because I realize that you were mentioned and then I didn't give you the floor for any explanation. I mean, certainly you've made your intention known and you've also shown, you've sent out to the list for charters for the group.

So that's certainly been a very impressive step forward. Eduardo? A few words? We can't hear you at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. What I'm hearing, Olivier, is that you have a proposal now for a [tri-umbrage 1:22:33] of co-chairs, and I think that's a good way

forward. It's a reasonable, regional, cross-section. We don't need to look at regional balance here, but I was just pointing out that we don't have everyone from the one piece of the world, which is a good thing.

And we do actually, interestingly enough, have a reasonable representation across our languages as well. So can I suggest, unless someone objects, that stands as subject to approval on the mailing list about the proposal for this meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, correct, let's do that Cheryl. I note that here, so Eduardo, Tijani, I note that is also proposed to be a, volunteered to be a co-chair, required. And I note that all of them are from… All the candidates are from different regions.

So that's…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have no problem with that. And there is no one I'm not sticking my nose in just by the way, but all aspects are [INAUDIBLE 1:23:35] so if you still need Asia Pacific, I can always add on that you're not running this without my interference I can assure you [laughs].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well…

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes now we can hear you Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes I was going to answer the question for, yes I'm interested in co-chairing or chairing this group. I think there is a lot of work I put together, you know, that draft charter that I think helped do this all together.

So I think we can, you know, Tijani or whoever else is interested, we need a couple of more people to add to this group. So yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, I think what you got yourself there is a leadership team, and I think that's a very good place to be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah I think that's very well-rounded leadership team. We've got Eduardo, Tijani, Dev, myself, and Cheryl [INAUDIBLE 1:24:38]. And that seems to be, we actually have balance. Maybe not gender balance, but we definitely…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hey, I'm worth more than the average, don't you worry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughter] that was an easy shot for you, wasn't it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right [laughter].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I think we've got a plan moving forward on this. Now another question I was going to ask you quickly was with regards to engaging the ALS. How soon do we want to engage the At-Large structures into building the program and building all of this? CROSSTALK 1:25:15]…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …you can't do it before you get approval, but you need to be prepared to go live as soon as you get approval.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, and this is why I'm asking the question now because if we are going to do this, we need to have several things prepared. The logistics need to be prepared. So I'm not saying, "Let's start engaging the ALS," definitely not. I'm just saying, what structure do we need to have ready when we will wish to go forward with the ALS?

Now I'm asking this now because the answer, we are likely to receive an answer before Durban, and so asking this question in Durban when we have to then move forward and sworn with the available waste of time. As long as we know what kind of house we need to build in advance, then staff will be able, in their own time, to start building that house for our ALS. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. No, I remember in previous meetings that [Wolf 1:26:25] was going to working with other people. I don't know if you got anyone to work with him, put together some kind of survey, get ready so if this gets approved then we're throwing out ordinary letters to have this survey as part of a [INAUDIBLE 1:26:45] …to participate. If you wanted to participate, then you will fill out this survey type thing.

I think it will work on getting something that, getting that going, to get it done like, I don't know, the beginning of July. If this does get approved, you know, we can have something done before that. So we can be ready to do it right away. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah I agree, Eduardo. I think what would be better however, is if – and we need to get back to Wolf on this, is if it was possible to be ready to go out in the first or second week of July, because then it will catch up most of the regional meetings going on during July. And it will take you at least two months more to get the responses back.

Because it will be at least through to September before you get the responses back. And even then you will have to be biting at their heels.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo for the record. So you're saying that it might be too late?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. I'm saying yes do it, but don't do it the end of July. We need to have that survey ready to go the first or second week of July, if we get the approval.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Well, that's what I meant. I said at the beginning of July.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry, I heard end. My error, go on.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. I said right after it gets approved.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, absolutely, yup.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. We are running out of time, and I think we have a stand now with regards to the ALS engagement as well, knowing that the survey is really our first next step. I will work with staff to

redraft or amend some of the points in our proposal to make the less ambiguous, and bearing in mind the different points which were made here.

And we will be circulating this over onto the mailing list to get one last set of comment. In the meantime, if I can ask you all to start the discussion with regards to the overarching theme that we wish to develop, and discuss that online.

And I think that's pretty much all we need to work out for today. The question is, with regards to the next call, now I'm going to have to ask Heidi this one, because I'm not quite sure where the calendar is for this, she knows better. Heidi? And you might be muted.

HEIDI ULLRICH: What was the question? I didn't, I heard about the calendar, but I didn't hear the first part of the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, it's up to you. Would you like that to be in two weeks then? What would you do?   I'm assuming that we're going to be finishing the proposal while you're in town, later this week, and then we can just have it reviewed and then maybe in two weeks have another call?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that leaves the question for you Heidi, because I wasn't quite sure when we're going to hear back from the PPC and when we will have more information. Do you believe that this is in two weeks' time? I thought   [coughing 1:30:11] the next Board meeting that will be meeting is sometime in June, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: June 27th. Yes, June 27th is the next… Well, there is the main meeting, but then I believe that meeting is to have this on the June meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So what I was going to suggest then, because the June 27th is in four weeks. I was going to suggest that we have another call in two weeks' time, but that will be dealing specifically the survey, with the building of the survey. How do you feel about this on the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Are you asking me…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …not until the 27th, waiting until the 27th to one get an answer from the Board, and two, less than two months, goodness, sorry, yeah. [Laughter] One, yeah, but I'm jumping on, I mean they… Waiting until the 27th is a waste of time. We have plenty of work to do until then.

But certainly building on the survey is an important thing. So in two weeks' time we can have a call. If we haven't made much progress until then, we can always cancel it or reschedule it two weeks later. But at

least we'll have the placeholder and a goal to get something done until then. Everyone fine on this? [CROSSTALK 1:31:41] …provide some feedback as well, I guess, at that point from the discussions that I would have had later on this week in Los Angeles.

Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can I suggest to have this meeting, the same day, an hour after today? [CROSSTALK 1:31:59]…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Eduardo, it's midnight, two or three AM, and five AM in Asia Pacific. So sometimes might need [laughter] rotating.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. [CROSSTALK 1:32:20]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If we go back to using the same time, that works for me. But you'll be very unpopular with some people around the world Eduardo so [laughter].

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay [laughs].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As one of the co-chairs, I might say, "Well you might not wish to do exactly the same time." [Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sharing the pain is often more useful than not sharing the pain. Now that said, your leadership team can meet at this time because I don't have a problem with midnight and one AM calls, but I'm making it very clear, when it gets to be inclusive of more people including the ALS, you need to be flexible and you need to rotate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, let's for the time being, have another doodle and see what would be the best times. Gisella has mentioned here we go. Send a doodle out for Tuesday the 14th of May with a wide range of options, and we'll take it from there. [CROSSTALK 1:33:18]

I don't want to make that comment to our call, it's already been an hour and a half, we're supposed to be an hour. I thank all of you for attending this call. And I think we have made some progress, so that's good.

And let's continue this work online on the mailing list. Thanks to everyone. This call is now adjourned.

VARIOUS: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]