
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the At-Large Summit II Organizing Committee call on Thursday, 22nd of May 2014 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Eduardo Diaz, Baudouin Schombe, Pastor Peters, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jordi Iparraguirre, Matthieu Camus, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

We have apologies from Roberto Gaetano and Carlos Aguirre. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Kathy Schnitt, Susie Johnson and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Terri. Welcome everyone. Who wants to speak?

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: This is Sivasubramanian. My name was left out.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Your name is, sorry?

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: Sivasubramanian from India.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. I will get you added.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you and welcome everyone, again, to our third ATLAS II call today. The Agenda is on the Adobe. I want to know if anyone wants to make changes or add to the Agenda. If not, let's jump right into it. I didn't hear Carlos Reyes on the call, so I'm not sure if staff are ready to answer some of his AIs, or if we keep Carlos...

CARLOS REYES: Hi, I'm on the call. For some reason my AC dropped as well.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, Carlos, can you...?

CARLOS REYES: Great. For AI #29, this is regarding the ATLAS II participants' Wiki page. I update this every day, depending on the information that we receive, as a few ALSes have dropped, and we've added one as well. That information is up to date. This leads into my next AI, which is AI #35 about the thematic working groups. A survey has gone out and as of right now we have 78 responses.

Once the survey closes I'll start populating the information about the thematic groups into the participation page as well. Then the last piece of that will be the assignment of the mentors. Once my AC is up and running, I'll type that in.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Carlos. I have a question. When is the deadline for the survey?

CARLOS REYES: Per last week's call, we gave a one-week timeline, so tomorrow the survey is due.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Do you know how many responded to the first... The second... This is the third survey?

CARLOS REYES: Well, the first survey had 92 participants, so we're a little shy from that, and we're about a little over half overall.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Any comments about... Thank you Carlos for the update. Any comments? If not, we'll go to the next one, which is Gisella. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm just wondering what's happened to those remaining people who've not completed the survey. Will they be assigned a topic or a room, or how does that work? This is a significant number.

EDUARDO DIAZ: My understanding from these calls that those who did not respond we'll have to assign them to the thematic groups, that we think are best for them. There's no other option. My feeling is that when people get there and they say, "I don't want to be in this thematic group," I think some of that will happen, but I don't think that most of the that we're going to assign... They'll just go to the thematic group that we have to assign them to.

That's my impression. I don't know if that's the same impression that others in the group have. Does that answer your question?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, but as I noted in the chat, who's going to be assigning them? Is it this group or the Events Group? Is it the Thematic Group?

EDUARDO DIAZ: My understanding is that that will be the Events Group, in coordination with the Thematic Group.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Tijani's group will do it, which includes the Thematic Group. They will do it. Thank you. Gisella, you have one small item? She can tell us about this coordination for the ATLAS II Thematic Working Group.

GISELLA GRUBER: Eduardo, just to say that that AI is in progress. I'm just checking on the call. It's likely to happen in the latter part of next week, and a doodle poll will be going out shortly. I am coordinating that at the moment. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much Gisella. Next is Tijani. Is he on the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, he's not. We're trying to get in contact with him but he's not responding yet. We'll continue to try.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, let's move to the next one. I know Wolf is online. Wolf, can you give us the status of the Thematic Group coordination?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, I think as it was mentioned before, we should try to find a date next week for the call, but that is in my opinion that the latest option. I've prepared a concept for the session conductor already, and I exchanged with Olivier that we can agree on some basic lines. I will share it with you tomorrow. I think we should have a clear idea on how to proceed. We have nine hours for breakout sessions in London, which is a lot of time.

We should have a clear idea and concept of how we'll step-by-step conduct these sessions. I made a proposal on this, and I think all SMEs

and all moderators and rapporteurs need to know exactly, and agree, on this procedure. Then we'll all be on the same level and I think the sessions can be conducted in a productive way, and to a certain extent streamlined in the way we conduct them. Then the SMEs can concentrate on content and substance for precise input.

The key moderator function is to facilitate discussions and have an utmost inclusive discussion process. These are the basic ideas of this concept, and I'll share it with you tomorrow.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Wolf. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Eduardo. Wolf mentioned bringing something up to us tomorrow. Does he mean by email, because I don't see a call?

WOLF LUDWIG: By email, because I was contacted by some of the SMEs already on what the next steps are, do we have further discussions. So they urgently need a response and inputs from our side, like these conceptual thoughts. I will announce to have this phone conference next week, and I think we'll at least need a second call with them altogether.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so since this is going to be by email, and then there'll be a follow up call next week, I wonder if it's the right time now to bring forward the

discussion of the composition of those session moderators and rapporteurs? Wolf and I have been corresponding about this, and I thought it would be good to bring this up to the group. It sounds like earlier rather than later is probably better. Are you okay with that Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes. I have some very clear ideas on that, simply based on the experience from ATLAS I. What had, in my opinion, a very clear strategy at the time, thanks to Cheryl pushing up, etcetera, and really guiding us in a good way, which was essential, to make ATLAS I a success. I remember at a final stage there was a small group of people, a kind of core group, who took over the responsibilities working on the final details for Mexico.

I had a quick look now on the workspace, and will all the SMEs involved, and the suggested moderators, and suggested rapporteurs. This would be a group of 27 people. I simply think this group is too big, according to my experience this is not always useful at this stage. I underline “at this stage”, always to be as inclusive as possible. I think really we should stick to the most experience people we have, and we should do a selection.

We should do a shortlist of the suggested moderators and rapporteurs. This should then be the group to work out the last details. This needs to be done in a very quick Ping-Pong way, with At-Large staff, to get the final update for the Agenda and for the sessions. We do have the potential, but at the moment too many people are involved, and do not

contribute very actively, and permanently, and on a daily level. In my opinion it makes more sense.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Olivier, do you want to add to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. My point of view was that the number of people that are involved now, I felt, was okay, because it just brings two pairs of eyes, rather than just four. If we have to divide groups into smaller sub-group, for example, the very large groups might have to be divided into smaller groups and we might need more people organizing things. That said, having heard Wolf's point of view and explanation...

I was not involved in the organizing of ATLAS I, so I can't judge from this. What I do know is that ATLAS I worked well. What I felt was maybe it would be important for this Working Group here to decide on which direction we want to go on this. More people or less people, specifically for this. I realized when Wolf mentioned 30 people, it does sound like a lot.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. If there is a decision on more or less people, you will not be surprised to hear me say less people. Seven is an ideal number. You can

manage with five, but I'd encourage you to probably aim for seven, okay?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: I can more or less support the direction that Cheryl just mentioned. Let's review two essential people. I understand Olivier's point, and the concerns raised by others already. I think the whole ATLAS II organization process is done by various working and sub-working groups, and the multiple calls we had over the last month. The process so far was really inclusive. It was almost more inclusive than we had for ATLAS I, when less people from the beginning were also involved.

Okay, At-Large wasn't as big as we are now, but once the process was inclusive from the beginning, at a certain, crucial and critical point of the organization process, I think you can [re use 00:17:07] it to a number of a few people who are good, who know each other very well and rely on each other. An element of reliability, in my opinion, is extremely important. So let's do it and it will be much more productive.

We have four weeks ahead now, and I'm really, day-by-day, getting worried about the time factor and the time we lose. We cannot have a lot of bottom-up discussions anymore. We have to find quick agreements, as quick as possible, and have to come up with the final results before London, and this means we have three weeks left for doing something like this. This can be better done in small groups.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Wolf. Tijani please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Eduardo. I joined the group late, so I don't know which groups you are talking about. Are you talking about the Organizing Committee as a whole? You want to reduce it to seven people? Or are you talking about a specific sub-group?

EDUARDO DIAZ: We're talking about the thematic groups only. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I understand the thinking behind having a smaller group for those thematic groups, for the end result to be as punchy as possible. The question I'd like to ask is, what does one do with the larger groups? As we know, there's likely to be two larger groups and three smaller groups, hopefully. The larger groups might be in excess of 50 people. They might need to divide up, when they prepare their work, into slightly smaller groups.

I just wonder if one moderator is going to be able to deal with all of this. Do you have a suggestion for that? Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. I'm sure we can manage it, as we did for Mexico. We need to make sure that those people, who are in this thematic group team in the end,

that they're committed, that they promise to be present in London, that the moderators and rapporteurs promise to be available for the sessions. As soon as we have this commitment I think we can rely on them. Okay, if suddenly someone gets ill, that's another issue, but basically, with people who you agree to do certain jobs, I think you can rely on them. That's been my experience so far.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Olivier, I am confused by something you said, because I was assuming we were discussing those who are acting in a management and leading activity for the actual activities of the thematic groups in London, as the number needing to be small, effective, efficient, and able to pull it all off in less than 29 days. In other words, more of an organizational and agreement on mechanisms role.

If you're however talking about bums on seats in the rooms of the thematic groups, I still would argue that breaking it up smaller is wise, rather than dealing with a room of 50. Unless you have a very experienced moderator managing it, and you have great diversity in your experiences, I believe, in your moderators.

However, if you've got a mechanism of a preferred moderation process already decided by a smaller group, then there's no reason why the group of 50 individuals who are now interacting at the thematic level in the breakout room, can't be broken up into smaller groups. I'd

encourage that they are, and that following a pro forma, but nevertheless fairly openly designed set of tools – and you’ve done that yourself, in for example those of you who were in the room during the large group strategy planning.

We had third parties come and do that in ICANN; gather a smaller number of people around a circle and have a lead work with each of those circles, to go through a number of discussion points and then come back, in the traditional breakout group mechanism, to report to the larger thematic group.

When you were asking originally what we were talking about from Wolf’s reporting, I was specifically responding to the management and design, and über-leadership of how it all gets done between now and London, thematic groups going. Because you raised the matter of “the thematic groups on the ground in London” with the participants, then I’d also suggest that with the right planning you can break it up into smaller numbers as well. Not all topics however may lend themselves to that, and that needs to be considered by a bunch of people who know what they’re doing.

Finally when you’ve got people who are being allocated to the thematic groups, it’s absolutely a key objective to try and load-balance. In other words, have people more equally distributed across the topics. Sorry I took a long time on that, but there were two directions being discussed.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thank you Eduardo. Responding partly to what Cheryl pointed out, and Olivier's question in the chat, perhaps we can find a compromise. According to the concept I drafted, and will forward tomorrow, I divided the nine hours we have into three parts. The first part is starting with the breakout sessions on Saturday afternoon. We will have quite some time for the introduction into each of the five subjects, with the assistance of the SMEs, who will be the input persons.

On Saturday afternoon we can do the warming-up of the whole debate. Even then we can discuss what the key aspects and key points and question are. We can list them in each session, and on Sunday morning we have the whole morning to continue in workshop format. In the workshop format we can sub-divide the groups, and then we can [in 00:26:24] some of the additional moderators, rapporteurs, etcetera, listed for the sub-groups.

We can include them in the workshop part on Sunday morning, and then in the afternoon, according to my concept, we need to time one and a half hours, at least, to wrap up and come up with more or less concrete policy recommendations. There the rapporteurs will step in, having a very important role. We have to do the listing of bullet points. We have to do the listing of results.

There will be quite a number of people involved in this process, but I think with such a sub-division into three parts for nine hours, it will be a good way in which we can come up with good results in the end. My

concern is that the whole thing, the whole conduct of the breakout sessions, should be done in a result-oriented way. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Wolf. Tijani, please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I would like to say two things. First of all, this concern about the number of people in charge of the thematic groups – I think that the thematic groups were part of the Event Group, and when we decided to put Wolf and Evan as responsible for this group, we didn't decide who'd be with them in this sub-group. So I don't think there is a problem, because I think you're speaking about the Events Group, which is very large. That's right, but now we can decide on a smaller group of seven people, if you want, for the thematic groups.

Second point, which is important for me, is we need to make at least one or two calls before London, for each group, so that people can decide on the [referral 00:29:10] documents so that parts begin to... Let's say we will not discuss the substance as substance, but we have to prepare the debate and the work of the group by teleconference, prior to London, as we did for Mexico. That was a very good experience, I think, because in Mexico I was in group number three, which was the New gTLD Group.

I think we had, I think, two teleconferences. We identified the [referral] documents, we chose our moderator... There was a Chair and Vice-Chair, and a rapporteur. This time we will have a moderator, a rapporteur, and a subject matter expert. I think that we can do that by

teleconference, so that in London we will start working immediately, when we begin our work. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Pastor Peters please?

PASTOR PETERS: Good evening everybody. I just have a quick question, and my question is I am yet to [sight 00:30:37] a draft of the agenda for the Summit. As a result, I want to know if the breakout sessions will be on the same day and time? This question is for the proposed of those who may want to participate in more than one thematic group. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Does anyone have an answer for Pastor? Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: It's clear the first part will be on Saturday afternoon, as I've said already; one of the last two blocks on Saturday afternoon. Then we have all Sunday morning for the thematic groups. Then we have, in the afternoon, another one. We have one and a half hours for the wrap up of the results in each, and from each, thematic group. So it's basically on Saturday afternoon, Sunday morning, and one more session on Sunday afternoon. This is the timescale. Nine hours altogether.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Wolf. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Peter, the breakout sessions will be parallel sessions. They'll be at the same time for all the five groups. You were asking about people who want to participate in more than one group. Normally, everyone has to choose one specific group, but if someone is interested in more than one group, he can perhaps go to the other group, but he will miss the debate in the original group. This is the situation. Thank you.

PASTOR PETERS: Okay. Can I quickly say something? The reason why I asked is for instance, I either put my name down to moderate one of those thematic groups, on global Internet, and then [unclear 00:33:09]. I would have also loved to take part in the At-Large community engagement in ICANN. If I wanted to moderate in the global Internet, as well as offering my services as a volunteer for that... I also wanted to [learn 00:33:36] much more from the At-Large community engagement in ICANN.

Then I would be [shortcharged 00:33:43], because there is no way I will be playing my moderator role in the global Internet, and then at the same time in the At-Large community engagement in ICANN. All the same, I take your explanation and I'll just make do with "the global Internet – the user perspective". I'll just participate and play whatever role I'm given there.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Pastor. Olivier, you have your hand up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Eduardo. I understood Pastor Peter's point and that's well understood. We've got the five thematic groups that will have the four breakout sessions. There is a schedule somewhere, which has got all of these on a simple page, rather than it being in sub-pages and so on. Coming back to our discussion that we're having here, I heard Wolf's point of view. For the record, and to make it absolutely clear, we are looking at the session moderating and the session recording. The session moderators and the session rapporteurs.

There are sometimes two or three moderators, or even more – five moderators for a session – and there are sometimes two, three, four or five rapporteurs for a session, which I understand is lot of people. This is how you reach seven people in total. On the subject of SMEs, it's probably okay to have them share their position. I'm starting to understand that for the session moderation and recording, we might wish to reduce this.

When a large group needs to break down into smaller bits, maybe I could propose the following? We would have a named moderator, and the other names listed on that page are kept as the preferred moderators when there will be breakout sessions within the breakout sessions; in other words, smaller groups being made out of the larger group. Of course, they would probably not be called upon when we have a small group anyway, because a small group of, let's say, ten people and two moderators, just doesn't make sense.

I guess a small group of ten people probably wouldn't be enough to break into smaller bits. That's it. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm afraid I don't understand, because for me, every session has to have only one moderator and only one rapporteur. This is what we did before and it's what is done for other events. I don't understand why we have five moderators for a single session? I think that we asked people to volunteer. We have some names volunteering and we have to make the choice.

I don't think that we have to put every volunteer as a moderator or rapporteur. It will be a mess. We will have more moderators than people participating in the group. What is that? I don't understand.

PASTOR PETERS: May I suggest where we have about three or four volunteers for any thematic group, we could divide them that two could moderate and one or two could do the reporting. In which case, everybody would be involved in playing one role or the other. I agree with Tijani that we cannot have more than five moderators on a particular subject matter. [Least that 00:38:16] one or two moderators, and then two reporting. In that case, we balance up the roles.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Pastor. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks Eduardo. This is a typical example that now the whole debate is getting more confused than clear. I think we were clearer last week. We have five groups and for each group we have the people listed as SMEs for the input. We need one moderator in charge for each of these breakout sessions and thematic groups, and we need one rapporteur in charge for the reporting from each group.

As I mentioned before, for the breakout on Sunday morning, when it will have, in each group, more for the workshop format in the morning only, then in case a group may decide it makes sense to subdivide and work in small sub-groups on a particular sub-question or issue, then it makes sense to have perhaps one assisting moderator for the workshop formats. I don't see though that we need necessarily a co-rapporteur.

I think we should review the number of people in charge and responsible, as much as possible, because we cannot decide on the spot who volunteers for this and that. The people need to be clearly briefed before they arrived in London. They need to know what they have to do and what their role is. In the end, what provides quality is that people know exactly about their roles and what they have to do. This again brings me to the point that this group, which will follow up on the thematic groups and breakout sessions, who will do the final coordination, should be as small as possible. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Wolf. Olivier, you have the floor, and then I'm going to close this conversation, because we're going to run out of time and I want us to cover a couple of other updates. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'd like to have closure on this, because it's an important thing. The longer we let this go, a number of people will think they're moderating, or reporting, and then one day we'll have to tell them, judging from where the conversation is going, "Sorry, you're not. Someone else is doing the job," and they'll be very annoyed. I'd like to clear this up as soon as possible.

I think from the discussions that have taken place here, everyone is agreeing that there needs to be one moderator per session, perhaps with an assistant moderator if the Working Group decides to sub itself into more than one [piece 00:42:15]. Yes, on the screen at the moment, "thematic.pdf", you scroll down to "session moderation" and you'll find that there are two, and sometimes three or four, moderators per session.

We need to cut that down. I think that's the only way we can do that, and certainly that's what I heard from Wolf. I'd sense then that if we are looking at having a main moderator and then an assistant moderator, I'd be okay with that as well. I think that probably would do well, and I can see some other people agreeing with it. When do we do that? I'd suggest we do that ASAP, because if I was one of the two moderators there, I would start work already on my side.

Then I'd be told, "Sorry, you're not going to be moderating," and then I'd be a bit upset. We need to know about that. One thing that we have to make sure on, and be very clear with, is that participants in the Working Groups will be allowed to change from Working Group to another. I

don't know how many times we let people change from one Working Group to another, but I understand that some people are interested in more than one thematic topic, so they will want to go into more than one group, such as what I heard from Pastor Peters just now.

I'm sure other participants will be like this, but certainly the session moderators will have to remain with the group that they're moderating. They cannot move. That has to be made clear to the moderators as well. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Exactly.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much Olivier. Tijani, I'm going to allow you to go now. I just want to comment and say that the idea is for Wolf to select – if that's the best word I can use – the people that you think will be the right people for reporting and moderating, based on your experience all these years in ICANN. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Eduardo. We already have criteria to use to choose the moderators and rapporteurs, thanks to Wolf who did that. So that's something we can do very easily and very quickly. My last point about what Olivier said, about people changing from one group to another, normally each participant will choose or be assigned to one specific group. For sure, during the Summit we will not bind people and prevent

them from going to another group, but they are officially in one specific group.

This is the way we can work, because this is the way we can decide on the rooms. If we let people choose any group during the Summit, we'll have one room full and one empty. Normally, each one has one specific group, and they have to go there. If people choose to go to other groups during the Summit, they are free to do that, on condition that the space allows it. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Tijani. So we have an open AI for Wolf Ludwig and Tijani, I guess, to select [unclear 00:46:06] and moderators and assist the moderators. I think Olivier's idea that we have more than one moderator, to have an assistant moderator that can serve and help with the process... Let's do this. We are going to have another conference call next week, and let's see if next week we can wrap up what we've discussed today.

If there are not any... There is one thing that Tijani's mentioned, and that is the idea of having conference calls for each thematic group, specifically from each session. People are going to work [within 00:46:52] each session to have calls with those people individually before London. You mentioned, Tijani, that that worked very well for ATLAS I, and I don't see why it cannot work for ATLAS II. Let's try to get that coordination before London, so as you say, Tijani, when we get there we just start working.

Okay, so let's move ahead. Fatima Cambroner, I haven't had any update from the Mentoring Group yet. The Communications Group couldn't participate in today's call, but they wanted to say that the social media strategy has already been done, and there was a [Creators 00:47:53] Working Group call before this one. That's moving ahead. There was a consensus of using the hashtag #ATLAS2 for the media strategy.

There is also the group that is working with the website. They'll have a draft website online next week, in English, for all to see. Please make sure that you see it and make comments when it's available. There was also a consensus of using ATLASII, with two "II", or ATLAS2, with the number, .icann.org, as the domain that will allow us to get to that webpage. Other than that, that's about it. [Ray's 00:48:58] not in the call. Olivier, if you want to give us a brief overview of the sponsorship? I think it's the same status as last week?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Eduardo. The sponsorship hasn't really changed very much. Basically, one of the things that have changed is that I've gotten a response from the EURid, .eu people, that I asked for money, and they are already sponsoring the ICANN Meeting itself, so they're not able to sponsor us separately. Microsoft is a no as well, because again they're sponsoring the wider ICANN meeting.

The people who have .london as one of their clients got in touch with me after we sent out some information the Board and to other parts of ICANN about the At-Large Summit, and they might have an interest from

some of their clients. I've sent them a presentation and hopefully we'll be receiving some... I haven't gotten any feedback yet, but I'll try and tap some feedback by tomorrow and find out if we've got a chance of getting a little bit more funding.

So far we're not particularly short of funds, as such, but we are very tight on funds and it would be good to have another sponsor in addition to the current ones, which are Afillias for a pub dinner on Friday night, PIR for a lunch on Sunday, and Google for the Fayre of Opportunities and a few other things as well, around it. If we had another sponsor in addition to that, it would help. We wouldn't be as tight on funds and we'd be able to have a few more things for our ALSes; maybe a few goodies, maybe pay for some [strings 00:51:20] in the Fayre of Opportunities.

Just earlier, doing the Fayre call, we found out there were some additional costs and so on. We'll just wait for a few more days and see if we can get some more funding. No response from Facebook, still, although they had pledged that they were going to proceed forward with sponsoring us, and there's no response from VeriSign either, although again they had pledged that they'd be sponsoring us. That's the status at the moment. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Olivier. I also want to add I recognize Olivier for his great effort in the sponsorship and getting the sponsors. Basically you've done this all by yourself, so I really appreciate it, and I believe everybody appreciates your effort on getting this sponsorship. Last on the Agenda

is Cheryl. Cheryl, I know you added the status in the chat, but maybe you want to verbalize it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for the opportunity, Eduardo. Very briefly, there's very little change from last week's update, when Carlos is taking it from the chat, I apologise from hitting the dollar sign and the return. My fingers were stumbling. It is in two parts, Carlos, but I'm sure you'll make out the details. We are waiting, and I'm hoping that it will be next week that we'll get some feedback from IT staff working with Carlos on a couple of matters. We continue to find best mechanisms, to really collect more data sets, to make a return on investment reporting more efficiently. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Cheryl. With this, we are almost at the top of the hour. If there is anything else, any other business, that you want to bring to the table...? If not, I suggest we have another conference call next week. The time is going to be determined, I believe? Gisella, correct me if I'm wrong. Or are we going to take it back to the 16:00 UTC time?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Eduardo. Just with regards to the timing, we have the option of the initial time of 16:00 UTC, or the time that we have today, which is 19:00 UTC. I know that it's more convenient for Cheryl. Just as an aside, we do have the ATLAS II Fayre of Opportunities call at 17:00 UTC next

week, so that would mean back-to-back calls. If everyone can maybe say if this time suits them better, or the 16:00 UTC time suits them better?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I was going to say, for me it's okay either way. I don't know about the rest of the group?

GISELLA GRUBER: If everyone else can maybe use their green ticks, and say if they prefer this time, which is 19:00 UTC? Any green ticks? Jordi yes, Siranush yes, Cheryl yes, Ali yes. If we have a few more yes's then we'll confirm it by email this time. Jordi, Siranush and Ali are all yes's. Eduardo is yes, Olivier is yes. I think that in order to just be able to run both calls on the same day, we could keep this time, if everyone's okay with that? If there's anyone that says otherwise then we'll revert back to 16:00 UTC. Thank you Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Olivier, you wanted to add any other business?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Eduardo. Earlier we spoke about the overall schedule, and there are two schedules, which are currently out there. There is one very detailed schedule, which Heidi has worked on for days and days. That is effectively is our detailed schedule that was in the chat a little earlier. There is a more overall schedule, which is more of a helicopter view, which has also been [unclear 00:56:35] one of the pages

that say... It's an Excel schedule. The last time it was updated was the 9th of May, so it's a little out of date, but I'd suggest that this gets updated as well, because it provides us with an overall view of the week.

Certainly, if you look at it, it's an easy way to see how things are going on the day. If you want to look on the Saturday, then on one page you can see what's going to happen, and then if you scroll further down you'll see what's going to happen on the Sunday. It's quite straightforward. That's the thing for the time being on this. We'll probably go through the schedule next week, since things are still moving around at the moment.

I felt it was important to point to really. I keep losing the Wiki page on which that 9th of May Agenda is. If staff could put it in the chat, that would be helpful, and then of course the chat will be available for everyone to consult afterwards. That's just what I wanted to add to this. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Olivier, do you want to add to the Agenda next time to go over this schedule briefly? Is that what you want?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We can use this and the other; pointing people to both, as long as they're working together, and they agree with each other. I've been working off this schedule that's on the 9th of May Agenda page. Staff has since updated the detailed schedule, but it's just for us, when you're discussing, and when we tell people to have a look at things, I

sometimes find the detailed schedule to be a bit overwhelming, because you have to scroll page upon page. It's got a lot of the ALAC things on there and so on, so it's probably easier to look at it on a simpler page like this. Nobody's put it in the chat yet, so I'm going to have to look for it and put it in the chat somehow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, with that Olivier, the more detailed schedule is still important for all the participants to have, and actually have with them, in some electronic form, during the ATLAS II and London event. That's how they know what they're doing, to engage both with the other ALAC work, and of course the other ICANN meeting more widely. Having the overview one, as you're talking about, is very important, particularly for us to focus just on the ATLAS II.

It doesn't mean that the other one is not valuable. It's hugely valuable, and particularly on the ground during the whole event. Otherwise people don't know the vast opportunities they've got for engagement.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Cheryl. I just want to say that staff should make sure that we have these two things in synch; this one plus the other one. If they're not in synch, we may be looking at things here that are not necessarily represented on the other one. If there is nothing else, I suggest we adjourn this meeting and meet next week. Thank you very much for being here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]