
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At Large Summit Two Thematic Group Coordination call on Friday, the 6th of June, 2014 at 20 UTC.

On the call today we have Holly Raiche, Hong Xue, Rafid Fatani, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Allan Skuce, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Wolf Ludwig, Gunela Astbrink, Alan Greenberg, Seth Reiss, Fatima Cambronero, and Glenn McKnight.

We have no apologies for today's conference. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Susie Johnson, Carlos Reyes, and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Terri for this role call. And let me continue in our agenda with point two, welcome. As I said before, I appreciate a lot that quite a number of people, 12 I counted, could make it for this call, but for it was shortly concerned you to lacking participation in the Doodle poll at the beginning, and at there had to be some reminders sent to find out about people's availabilities and the final confirmation for this call was sent yesterday.

And maybe some of the people may have overlooked it. I just had a short verification. Some of you had been at our last Friday's call

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.

already, the first briefing call we had in the thematic groups. Some of you are new here. And I hope that those who are new here have seen the summaries we have circulated, me at the beginning of the week and Olivier, I think yesterday again.

And I hope that you therefore somehow familiar with what we discussed at our first call last week, where we basically discussed about the conceptual thoughts, and the format for this thematic sessions. What I suggested before, I hope that you are all aware that we have nine hours for each thematic group. What is quite a lot of time to, let's say, entertain people or to work with people and to keep them involved. What will be an incredible challenge for the subject matter experts, for the moderators, and also for the reporters involved.

And we need to be clear about the conceptual approach and the format we use for conducting these sessions. And you may recall from the suggestion I made, that on Saturday afternoon we start with an introduction to all the five subjects. We start with the sub-questions which have already been formulated by the subject matter experts for all of the groups. And we will warm-up on Saturday afternoon and go as far as we can, but as we still have Sunday all morning, we are not under time pressure and therefore I suggested that Sunday morning, we continue with a workshop style format, which can be more inclusive and participative particularly for newcomers than the usual session type.

So we have plenty of time on Sunday morning. And Sunday afternoon we need to prepare for the conclusion from each thematic group, and to prepare for the outcomes. And there, particularly the reporters need to set in and the reporters will be the responsible person in charge

afterwards, to collect and bring down conclusions, recommendations from each of the groups, what must serve as a basis for the final report or memorandum from ATLAS II.

So this is a challenge ahead. And I think we should be all aware about the complexity of this, etc., and therefore we decided at our last Friday call on this concept and the format already. And I would like to know whether anybody who hasn't been on the call last Friday, but is now here on tonight's call, has any further ideas or questions on this concept or on the format.

If you have, please this is your chance to step in and to ask, otherwise I will be rather pragmatic and tough and declare the format we suggested for all five teams will be approved. I see Jean-Jacques has raised his hand, and Alan and Cheryl. First it's Jean-Jacques. You have the floor please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, hello, can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, now I can hear you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Wolf. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. Just a general remark. Because of the way the thematic groups are organized, you remind us that there are nine hours per team. That's really a lot. But we shouldn't try to artificially fill up that time. So as far as thematic group three is

concerned, I think that we'll have roughly three or four subsections. That will have to be cut out in pieces according to the available time day by day.

But do you have any guidance or general remark about this problem of almost too much available time per team? Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks Jean-Jacques for this question. Before I give the floor to Alan and Cheryl, just a short remark. Jean-Jacques, be aware that up to, according to the listing on the screen so far, thematic group three is almost the biggest thematic group one, with 57 provisionally assigned participants and thematic group three has 58 provisionally assigned. And these are not even the final numbers, so be aware we might end up being, for sure, one of the biggest groups.

So many people. And to keep as many of the participants involved as possible. I really think we will, we can use the time for the discussion. But this is only my personal remarks on this. Next is Alan. Please Alan, go ahead, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess my position is, it's fine for us to make plans on how to run the sessions, but the people on the ground who are actually running the sessions may well have to make changes as we go along. I mean, I look at my group four, which at this point only has four participants in it. How are we going to use that time, you know, if we say something like that, is going to be completely up for grabs.

And I think the moderator, and the people working with the moderator, have got to have the discretion to change the plan on the fly, depending on how things are working and how we're progressing. So just a comment.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks Alan. I partly agree with you. Okay, basically, I think we need a concept to start with, etc., and to have some clear and common lines for the conduct of all of the sessions. But at the end, there is always some flexibility needed on the spot, in the situation, etc., and I hope that we are all experienced enough to handle this on the spot challenges. Cheryl, you are the next, please. Over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Wolf. Just checking over these measures. I'm not sure, Alan, that I saw you only had four just before we go on...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, on the spreadsheet on the screen, it says nine but five of us are running it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, if I... This is Heidi. Just to note, the updated numbers of the proposed allocation on the right hand side, off of the table. So currently...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looks like 20 to me or something.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Huh?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm not sure what you're looking at, but I'll believe you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Sorry...

WOLF LUDWIG: ...Alan. [Laughter] Go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. But I was confirmed that we're all working with numbers that are realistic, so yeah. 20, I think Alan, is not a bad number. You can certainly handle more in this amount of time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Cheryl, just for the record. Is it 20 minus five or 20 plus five? Does the 20 include the five of us that are running it?

WOLF LUDWIG: I guess.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's the same assumption I'm making, that it's not going to be an incredibly small number. But there is actually a degree of imbalance and we may need to redress it. This is where self-allocation is made, have to be overwritten by people being assigned for logistical purposes, depending on how the managers in each of the groups wants to do it. Wolf, just, the reason why I raised my hand however, is based on the context discussed at the last meeting, certainly group two has put out a somewhat more detailed plan.

And that is given the [?]. . . the working quite consistently and quite hard, but as [?] activities for most of the time, with the exception of the general introduction as a group of a whole on day one. We go fairly quickly into smaller group activities. Our aim was to make sure that the participants were particularly engaged, and we've got a guided system where those people who used something called a fish bowl technique, or a goldfish bowl, or a fishing bowl technique.

Whereby you can pretty well ensure everyone will get a voice, is how we're going to approach it. But then we're talking about matters that could be accountability. And if we didn't, that needs to be in our session. You know, this sort of wouldn't be using our own dog food [?].... So we designed it to [suit the thing?], and that's not what I'm suggesting we should do.

But I do want to put on the record that while we're doing our sessions our way, that said, I'm perfectly happy now that we've had a group of people, or close enough to our group of people, and we can share our plans and preparations with our group of people, in the very near future, I'm assuming sometime later today, every one of these names will have an email attached it.

So if we were to send staff our plan for our thematic group, they could pass it on to our thematic group participants. And I'm more than happy for that thing to go up on wiki pages and get shared with any other moderators to contemplate what we have done. However, I am particularly concerned that every group does have some form of mechanism that will give, and encourage, and nurture, equitable voice to develop the... The thematic groups, the way the way they've been designed, will be time allocation, will be almost make or break the success of the ATLAS as far as I'm concerned.

It is an integral part of the activities planned. And so early on, which is just the necessity of the design, that I would encourage, particularly the subject matter experts, about the moderators to be quite sure that what they're not doing is lecturing our people, but rather growing a

discourse and interactive process. We have five separate questions with an optional sixth question to be dealt with within our subgroup.

And I'm very happy the time allocation we have will allow us to deal with each of those as bite sized pieces, and then come back at the end of deliberations on each of those questions, and bring a subunit conversation together for reporting. So I'm wondering, is it that every group has the appropriate number of discussions for discussion, because topics are one thing but particular issues, or sub-issues, or questions on a topic, might also be critical.

And is it also the planning [?] that we get those out to all of our members of our, as it stands, groups. The reason being that certainly we have one or two documents that we would like to have after [?] subgroup people pre-read. Now these haven't been translated. It needs informed translation. They're going to have to rely on Google docs, but with the amount of time available to us, we would like to think there is a bit of ticking on the airplane leading [?] as well. Anyway, that's enough for now. Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Cheryl for this additional explanations. And I have noted and realized with great pleasure that your thematic group two has started with your discussions already, how to organize your session in detail. So if you, at a certain stage, could share your ideas with the other four teams, this would be of great help because you are in the somehow privileged situation, you have excellent people like Rinalia, Roberto, etc., and Carlton in your group.

And it can always be helpful to share good ideas, etc., and this may provide very good inputs for the other thematic groups. Thanks for anything in this direction. I see Holly's hand raised before and suddenly she disappeared. I don't know whether Holly still wants to add something...

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I'm fine. It's fine, thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So I have seen Gunela, Gunela, please, you have the floor.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you Wolf. Gunela Astbrink. I would just like to support Chery's suggestion about using the fishbowl technique. And I was involved in ISOC chapter leader's meeting where we used that technique for quite a large group of people and it worked well. You have to have a large room so that each group, let's say, 10 or 15, can sit and talk and not hear the other groups.

But certainly the moderators can walk around and facilitate and ensure that the process is working. This is probably not the place to discuss how fishbowl technique works, but certainly I found it a refreshing approach, and I would be happy to use that into the three, if I was [?].

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot for this input. Yes, as you said, we do not have time here in this call to go into details of certain approaches and concepts like the fishbowl, but as said before, any good ideas are welcome, etc. And you can share in your own group and of course with any other thematic groups.

If there are no further questions regarding conceptual approach and forming issues, I think to my impression, we can agree on the basics for a common approach. And therefore I would like to ask you again, this conceptual outlines we discussed last Friday and here again, can we consider them as broadly approved here in this group? I would like to have your confirmation [?] on the screen in the Adobe Connect, to just see and crosscheck whether we can take this as approved.

I see Cheryl, I see Jean-Jacques, Eduardo, some more, Seth, Holly, yes think we have now sort of solid reconfirmation on this. Yes, we have an overwhelming majority, therefore I declare this as approved. And we can continue then with the next agenda items which is for creation of thematic groups, groupings, and follow ups. As Cheryl has already said before, her team has started internally with further preparations for the thematic group two.

Cheryl also mentioned a very important point, what I think could be extremely important for any further preparations, particularly for the participants. If you can identify for each group some key documents, you consider useful and to be shared with the participants of your thematic group. This may give everybody a chance to have some links or some key documents beforehand, to read them and to arrive

somehow prepared in London on the particular subjects the people have chosen.

So this is an excellent idea. I think all thematic groups and teams should keep in mind and think about such input papers to be shared with the participants. This is another step and task, in my opinion, be listed for the follow up of the subject matter experts together with the moderators and reporters. And I believe we have to be a little bit pushy to remind all of the five teams to follow the best practice and good example of thematic group two.

To immediately start with further coordination work, and to work out each session in detail, as soon as possible, particularly next week. From my side, I must confess I cannot be much involved next week, because from Tuesday onward, I have the biggest project of the year, which is EuroDIG in Berlin. So I will be in Berlin all next week. I can cross-check some mail, but I cannot invest much time and cannot follow up so much in detail.

But I rely somehow on my other team members, Fatima and Jean-Jacques, etc. to continue with this preparatory work. Are there any questions and comments on the follow up and next steps for each thematic group and team?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Wolf, this is Heidi.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could I just confirm the two actions so far, and are there any additional ones?

WOLF LUDWIG: Just let me quickly check. [?] fishbowl technique to the leadership teams, excellent. Next one is staff to post the reference document on the fishbowl technique. Yes, these are the key action items. And I would add a third action item here, what is staff to have a look and push wherever necessary that thematic group leaders or teams follow up with details for session preparation, for their particular or respective session preparation.

These are the first action items so far. I see Cheryl has raised her hand. Cheryl you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Wolf. Cheryl for the record. Just on the resourcing, I know that the rooms are not particularly big, and I also remember conversations about room setups and microphones, etc., not being able to change layout. It's not going to be an issue for my group I'm sure because we're running in English, because everyone is English with one or two French speakers having an equitable capable language. So we won't be in a translation situation.

But I just wanted to check that the moderators and the staff have looked at any larger room that is going to be used to make sure that it does have a space setup for that sort of dynamic [?]... Now Heidi just

said all rooms will be a new shape. That is not a problem excepting for anyone who is choosing to do things like a fishbowl technique.

You don't need tables. The last thing you need is a table. You can, you know, move the tables to the side and if push comes to shove, you can circle around the table, but one of the advantages of a fish bowl technique is even if you've got a very crowded room with, you know, hundreds of people in it, you can break up into quite small circles and it doesn't matter what's going on behind you. But I just want to make sure that if there are logistical issues within the rooms, we look for those now.

The microphones are not something we're probably going to need in a group of a size of 11 to 20. You know, the type of thing. We don't want to be setup for more than we need, just like we don't want to be setup for less than what we need. But I also wanted, on behalf of the reporters, to ask for flip or paper charts or some form of recording mechanism to be available. If not, that's okay, but we need to know about that in advance, because again, one of the advantages of the fishbowl technique is that you can have everybody in the outer circle, who is not in the active discussion phase, making notes.

So everyone can do small notes and the reporters can take the benefit of others taking notes. But if there is going to be a flip chart available, that makes a difference. If it's going to be pictures, paper, able to be seen on the walls, put on a table and we'll, in the horizontal, than that's the use of the table. Just a few little, little, little tiny logistical things. So Heidi saying, you know, can't change the room, that's fine. But how

exactly the room is being setup for a small breakout group might be very different.

[Last year] from the logistics, exactly what it is, and exactly also what we have available such as paper and markers and stuff like that. So.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks Cheryl. I think you raised a very important point and question, because arrangements for the rooms, etc., play, as you know, an important role for the conduct of a session, whether it's the typical school class setup, what is not the best for any particular interaction. So the U-format would be much better. I had short checkup with Heidi in between already, when she was asking me whether we would need some flip charts, and I confirmed yes of course for Sunday morning, for the workshop type of session.

We absolutely need such tools like flip charts, etc. to make listings of ideas, etc. and to work in a most interactive way. Therefore I think we have to sort out such logistical [metals?] and tools needed for the conduct of the sessions in detail again. And this may be a next agenda item, to check out that each team knows before what we will be the room setup. Whether it will be U-style, etc. and equipment. We may have available for the moderators, etc. and for the team leaders to conduct the session.

Any further questions on this agenda item? And as said under four A already, coordination calls per thematic team would be very desirable to have and to organize for next week, prior to London. And we should have at least one person per team who will be considered as the driver

for his or her team. So as we see here and we know, Cheryl is well known for thematic group two.

We also need somebody who is taking over this driver, or [?] role, for thematic group one. Unfortunately, Evan and Avri are not on the call. Rafid is on the call, so Rafid could step in, in taking over to make sure, and Evan is here. So it would be upon Evan and Rafid to take this driver role for thematic group two. Let me scroll down on the screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, Olivier. It's for thematic group one Rafid and Evan. You just said two.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, I was speaking about thematic group one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. You just said two, so that's why.

WOLF LUDWIG: Sorry, sorry. Then it was a confusion from my side. Because I'm sure that with Cheryl, thematic group two is in best hands. So I was a little bit more concerned about thematic group one. And I would like to suggest Rafid and Evan for pushing thematic group one. Now it's correct, and not mis-understandable. So we would need the same for thematic group three. What would be Jean-Jacques and Fatima together with Gunela, who are all on the call tonight.

So it would be, besides Glenn, so it would be extremely helpful if we can count and rely on you for thematic group three. For thematic group four, just... Let me scroll on thematic group three. It would be Hong and Avri together with Holly and Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, can I...?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Thank you Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. So now that we're actually looking through the groups, you mentioned just thematic group three just now with Jean-Jacques and Gunela on this. Of course, you're on this as well, you're on that group as well. I've noted that Chester [Sung?] has been moved from thematic group four to thematic group three when he was allocated as being a moderator in thematic group four.

So we've kind of gone down, in TG4, down to one moderator. And then I've also noticed that there is Judith [Henerstien?] and Glenn McKnight, who are both reporters but one is for Saturday and one is for Sunday. Is that correct?

WOLF LUDWIG: Olivier, can I just step in to avoid any further misunderstanding? Please consider the final selection we made and not coming back, because in my opinion, it didn't make any sense if somebody is saying, "Well, I'm available for this day only." I think for the final contact of sessions, we really need to rely on and speak on people who are more or less available for a time, and we cannot have people in important carrier roles who are only available part-time.

Therefore I made my final selections according to the circumstances.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. So what is the final selection?

WOLF LUDWIG: The final selection, Olivier, you can find on the workspace. What is for thematic group four, for example, it's the moderator is Holly together with Chester. And before we made the sheet for Chester, Heidi and I checked with Chester whether he would be okay for bringing into another session and he confirmed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. I'm not saying, I agree with you on this. But now with regards to Glenn McKnight and Judith, they are on the sheet that's currently on the screen as being on thematic group three. And they were, they still are, as being the reporters for thematic group three.

WOLF LUDWIG: I don't know, Olivier, to what document you are referring, but let me just update on the wiki space, all the sessions I have. There have been clear decisions made on all of the functions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see them on three. I'll refresh the wiki page on there. Yeah, past two thematic group coordination. Let me just reload the page.

WOLF LUDWIG: Can we perhaps sort out this confusion later if needed? Because I really thought from the wiki space that this question and decision have been made clear more than a week ago already. And let me continue with the next on the list, which is Holly first, then Hong, then Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: My question is, Avri is listed in two places as, with the SME. So I guess I'm puzzled as to why she is there twice, but if this list on the screen is not correct and Olivier is putting the correct one up, that answers the question. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot for this comment Holly. Well I have seen there was a first draft of the list, but this final decision, this was the first input from Susie. And there are still some comments. Yes, now I see Olivier's confusion. But this point we cannot consider any longer, and I ask Heidi already to put it out, because you cannot be in two sessions in a leading role.

We had one more or less exception because Adam Pete was the only subject matter expert, and Avri was already listed for thematic group four, I think, and then she said, okay she can step in at the very early stage and help Adam to prepare the abstract and the five key questions. So far, Avri has this double role already, but for the conduct of the session, she of course she has to speak to one thematic group and cannot do both.

And the comments I now see, which are still on this spreadsheet, I think we shouldn't consider them any longer. Next on my list is Hong.

HONG XUE: Hello Wolf. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes please.

HONG XUE: Great. Okay. So I could partially answer Holly's question. So Avri, as far as I know, she participated in drafting the thought piece for transparency and accountability in group four. I don't know whether she was openly involved in drafting the thought piece for the other group, but we too work together to complete that draft.

My question for Holly and Adam, the two leaders for group four, is that whether you agree and feel comfortable with the rough draft. You too are all very distinguished experts on this topic. So you're very welcome to make any change, if we five, well, the collaborators of this group,

okay with the draft then we can circulate. Then with the 15, well, tentative participants of this group so we can move ahead. [?]

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Hong for this. Yes, of course, it makes sense for any group that there will be a close coordination now between the subject matter experts, moderators, and reporters who are involved in the same group to make, if necessary, final modifications, etc. And about Avri's role, I had some [?] communication with Adam Pete already, by telling him, "Listen Adam, in London itself, Avri cannot subdivide for your group. So priority for Avri has to be thematic group four, and not one." And Adam is already looking for somebody he may bring for his group, and there are informal discussions, nothing concerns that Adam is discussing with Wolfgang [?], if he has the time for ATLAS II, may help out.

And he's sort of a subject matter expert for thematic group one. So all these questions, I have checked in the meantime, are clear already. Therefore, let me suggest to really refer to the workspace ATLAS II thematic groups and coordination, the final selection for all the sessions have been made and that we do not here [?] old information from two weeks ago. Next on my list is Cheryl please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much Wolf. Cheryl for the record. And what I was putting my hand up for was to say that in my somewhat biased view, the subject matter experts are not necessarily needed to sign up for a nine hour shift. Let's be clear here. The critical part of the subject

matter expert work is the preparatory stuff, and the getting staff stuff. They are [?], if you are looking at that interactive process.

And I suspect all the moderators are for all of the points, this is what happens to them on day one and [?] minor stay, [?] is what is absolutely critical. And so let's not get too down in the ditches, if two could be [?] at any minute. However, what is important is to realize that some of the last names on this list, and I've already had a lengthy interaction with one of our subject matter experts, is already call the way for other, albeit not more important but far more than [?] enroll.

And so some of your leaders, as you've already seen, for various reasons will have to make some choices about when they are or are not in the room. This has to be sorted out amongst the leaders before the rubber hits the road, before you get started. And that's okay. I think you can leave that too. In the case of our grouping, we're already aware of demands that are on at least one or more of our subject matter experts and leadership team.

And so we'll just work around it. What needs to be discussed, and what I'd like to back on this group as a whole on this car, is how you wish to deal with not the fact that someone who is serving for us on the Board, may have to be with the Board for part of Sunday, not with us. That Cheryl has done her work with us on Saturday afternoon. But how we're going to deal with this four or five of my, you know, half a dozen people are not going to turn up for the full session because it comes to looking down this list, and there are a number of people in my group that I know are poor performers unattended.

And I want to know how we need to deal with people who are not contributing to the thematic group. Because we've all said, in the beginning, the thematic groups in many ways is absolutely crucial to the success of ATLAS. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot. Any further question and comments? I've noted that there is still some confusion about the sharing of [holds?], etc. For example, what would be the case for thematic group three, for the reporting there, we have two listed, what would be Glenn as a main reporter for thematic group three, and [?] as assisting sessional reporter. And I was told that Glenn is not available on Sunday and [?] is not available on the Sunday, so this is in my opinion, rather a problematic if some people in group functions are only available part-time, and I think we should figure this out bilaterally and after the call with these people, to make sure the key functions in London at this group are properly assumed.

In my opinion it needs to be done. I see Jean-Jacques's hand raised. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Wolf. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I share your concern at least for group three. So looking at the published lists on the wiki, I see that Fatima and I are the SMEs for TG3, moderators Wolf and Gunela, and reporting Glenn and Judith. Of course, as I was preparing to send off remarks and suggestions for the working of TG3 sometime this

weekend, it would of course be essential for me to know to whom I send that.

Glenn is the running for the reporting or if that is going to change. So can anyone tell me when we will have this final list reliably sent to us? Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well this is a good point, Jean-Jacques, and I think we have to follow up with both of them bilaterally. It's a problematic case, in my opinion. And from my point of view, it's difficult to compromise on such special time solutions or [?] sharing, etc. So I would like, after the call, that we have to follow up with these people, and to come to a good solution. Next on my list is Olivier. Olivier, please you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. Glenn has indicated in the chat that he will be available for both days, so I would have thought this is a nonissue at this point. Glenn...

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. If it's now confirmed that he is available for both days, I didn't follow all the details in the chat, so we can consider this as confirmed. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I would say so. Glenn is on the call.

WOLF LUDWIG: Glenn, can you quickly confirm? Because it's a very vivid chat going on and I'm not as quick to the moderation and to follow each of the comments in the chat. I see nothing from Glenn in the chat, and Glenn are you still on the call? There is no reaction from okay. But if you say so Olivier, that he has previously confirmed in the chat, then I think we should consider this as approval and his confirmation.

We are running short of time. Therefore the next thing is allocation of ATLAS II participants to the thematic groups and room particularities, limitations. We have discussed some of this already before. And these are details, we have to follow up on and at least the version of this spreadsheet you have now on the screen, is not a final version. It's still a work in progress. There are still a lot of inconsistencies in the spreadsheet, but I think we have to check this, Olivier, Eduardo, and me together with staff tonight. Olivier, you have raised your hand, you have the floor first and then it's Eduardo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. So I've done some analysis on the numbers and I will speak slowly for staff to be able to take notes on this, or I might just forward my notes to staff afterwards. In thematic group one there are 23 people at the moment, in which eight are Spanish speakers or French speakers.

It is the second largest group, so it will be given one of the rooms with the interpretation. We therefore have to allocate a room for 57 people, which leaves 30 more spaces at the moment that we can fill with people

who have not made a choice as to where they want to go, or with people that we have to move from other groups that are not currently being interpreted.

Thematic group two, there are 11 people at the moment. Nine English, one Spanish, one French. The two people that have Spanish and French are Miguel [?] and Tijani Ben Jemaa. Well, Tijani can actually remain in that group because he speaks English. That group only have 11 people will be in one of the smaller spaces. We have nine spaces left in this group for this topic currently for the [?] group, otherwise we have to reallocate Miguel [?] to a group that is interpreted.

The thematic group three is the largest of the groups with 53 people of which 33 are English speakers, 12 Spanish, 11 French. That's fine. We have another five spaces left, the room size is 58 maximum. So five spaces for additional people to be allocated to this. And I would suggest that it would be people who need language, either French or Spanish interpretation.

Thematic group four, we have one Spanish and one French speaker, for a total of nine people in that group at the moment. The Spanish speaker is Carlos [Guiterez], I know for a fact that he speaks English fluently, so he can remain in that group. The other people is [?] Thompson from EURALO, I don't know whether he is able to speak English. If not, he will have to be reallocated to his second choice, hoping that it is an interpreted choice.

And on that room we still have 11 spaces left [?] in this room do not move. In thematic group five, we have 15 people in total at the

moment with 11 English speakers, three Spanish, and one French speaker. The Spanish speakers are [?], [?], and [?]. If they do not speak English, then they will have to be moved to either thematic group one or thematic group three. The French speaker is [?], who will have to be moved to either one or three depending on their second choice.

There are five spaces left in this room, if there is no moving from people in this room. There are nine spaces left in this room if the current language people do move to other locations. Then the rest of the people, we have 41, 55 people left of which 11 need Spanish interpretation and 12 need French interpretation. So that gives rather a good choice to be able to allocate them to, a total of 23 people needed to go either thematic group one or thematic group three.

And of course, there is only five to go to thematic group three, the rest will have to go to thematic group one. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot for this comment. Next on my list is Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. This is Eduardo, Wolf, thank you. The table that you are seeing here is just the one that I did balance the group, and it's just a proposal and an idea. If you look at the top next to comments column, the numbers there, [?]... if you move a little bit farther, you will see a total of 175 people. What I did is knowing that TG1 and TG3 were the biggest groups, based on the survey, the second thing I did, I attributed

all the people that were Spanish speaker or French speaking to those two groups, TG1 and TG3.

And I did it with random purposes, you know, just to balance those groups as much as I could. And once I did that, the rest I just used to balance, you know, assign them to groups two, four, and five, like I said, randomly. So the exercise is, the numbers are on the table at the top. So I just wanted to explain what I did. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot. It is very helpful Eduardo, and I can imagine this is sort of a [?] to make such detailed selection. The problem mainly comes that a lot of participants didn't participate in this last survey. From my region, I was struck to see how many people didn't respond and didn't express that preference during the survey period. So it's finally ending up in this critical situation to make a choice for them.

And of course what you, Eduardo, did was when we have two thematic groups which are more or less already overloaded, and we now have to assign the rest of the people, we do it with the working groups, etc. There are not so many participants so far, and I think we cannot solve this problem here at the call. This has to be followed up by a small group. I would say Eduardo, Olivier, me, together with staff, and then we still have the question of language component of the certain participants that we cannot all offer simultaneous translation for all of the five thematic groups.

So there are certain limitation besides room sizes, etc. Even we cannot change, we have to deal with, etc. Therefore, I think the best way to

continue to follow up on this is, as I mentioned, the small group to sort out this question. Is there approval on my suggestion how to proceed with this?

If there are no objections, then I consider this as confirmed. And the last point on the agenda now would be that Heidi had a hard time working on the agenda outlines for each of the thematic groups, what still needs somehow to be accomplished. We agreed last Friday on this call that for a brief outline on each thematic group. You may use the abstract, which has been submitted before. We use the five key questions that the subject matter experts have provided, etc.

And this should give enough orientation for each of the five sessions to be posted on the agenda. Because another limitation as here was this has to be all translated beforehand into Spanish. And I think, as far as I understood the time, it's already over for having such personal translations made. But Heidi may give us a final update on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Wolf. This is Heidi. If we can get those in by Monday or Tuesday, then I think we'll be okay. And if not, then our At Large staff can do the changes, can do the translations.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. So I hope everybody has heard, you have a final deadline if you want any particular outlines on the agenda, you have to come back to Heidi until Monday latest. And I think we should here note this as an additional action item to all five thematic groups. If they have, want to

have any particularly particularities respected for their thematic group agenda, they have to submit this to At Large staff until Monday, next Monday latest.

Any further questions, comments on this? I see no hand raised. Then I think this was an extremely productive call. We have sorted out and discussed of the open questions, and we came up with broad agreement on most of the essentials. I'm aware that there are still plenty of details which has to be sorted out. But what cannot be sorted out during a coordination call.

So just as short summary, I think everybody on this call should be aware, depending on what thematic group he or she belongs to, please continue as Cheryl outlined at the beginning of the call, to follow up with your thematic team. Try to work on further session preparations. Try to think about materials, key documents you can suggest and you can provide.

And I would like all of you at the call to keep the action items in mind for your particular team. If there are no further questions, let me thank all of you for your active and vivid participation, etc. If there will be another coordination call after tonight, and this can only be next week because the week after everybody will travel to London already.

Just in case, I won't be, as I said before, available next week for the call, but I'm still available for staff, etc. and to continue the work over the weekend. Thanks a lot to everybody and good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]