GISELLA GRUBER: We'll get the recording started now, Alan. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's ALAC Leadership Team Meeting on Thursday, 16th April at 21:30 UTC. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Ron Sherwood. Apologies noted today from Tijani Ben Jemaa. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. The first Item is the policy development page. I think we're going to spend a little more time on this one than we normally do in these meetings. There's a category of things that are stalled, and there's none there, but in fact a couple of these are sort of stalled, perhaps just because of other work on people's plates. We only have a few in the category of either awaiting decision or awaiting work. The first one awaiting work is the rights protection mechanisms review. Leon, can you talk about that?

That's something you said you think we need a statement on and you're willing to draft it. I'm not 100 per cent sure what the content is going to be. Having looked at the paper, I can understand why it would be of interest to an IP lawyer. I'm not sure why it's great interest to ALAC right now.

---

*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.*

LEON SANCHEZ:    Thanks Alan.  You're right.  Maybe from the user perspective it might not seem too attractive to make a statement, as opposed to from an IP lawyer's perspective.  I'm in the process of reviewing the document.  I haven't finished, and as you said, like most of us, I've got a lot of things in hand, so I haven't been able to finish reading the report.  I intend to do so this weekend, so I can have a draft statement later next week, before we go into the sessions with the CCWG.

Of course, this might change as I make progress in reviewing the document.  I might find in the end that from the [unclear 00:03:33] it might not be suitable to do a statement to begin with.  I'm working on it, but I haven't made much progress.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay.  Thank you.  I did take a little time and go over it.  For those who haven't read the document, which I assume is most sane people, this is a preliminary document looking at the rights protection mechanisms associated with new gTLDs, and starting to frame issues that may be important that will lead into an issue report, that will lead into a PDP.  It's the beginning of a very long process.  Well over half the paper talks about the Trademark Clearinghouse and sunrise periods and things like that.

I don't think they're particularly relevant, too, from a user perspective.  There's a bit about claims notices, and the Trademark Clearinghouse, and that is when there is a collision issue, you try to register something that overlaps with a trademark, you get a warning.  My comments on that would be the same ones that we made three, four years ago on the

papers that led to the Trademark Clearinghouse, and that is we're afraid the claims notice may not be understandable by users and things like that, but we really have no input at this point on which to base those statements on.

If we thought perhaps the whole process would be ignored and not looked at in greater detail, we could certainly put a statement in saying we have concerns, but since I can't really see a review not going ahead on that, from my perspective I'm not sure it's worth a statement, but I'll let you read it and you may find something that I'm missing. If we can go onto the next item, we have a number of statements we require a decision on. Sorry, we have a hand up. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much Alan. A question I have is should we perhaps look at the overall system of [URS 00:06:05] and Trademark Clearinghouse and all these things, and effectively identify whether we have seen any end users being negatively affected by those systems? I was going to suggest that this is something that I'm surprised should have been forwarded to the Registrant Issues directly, and maybe also the New gTLD Working Group, although I am aware this Working Group is probably going to be missing a Chair shortly, or maybe already is, but Registrant Issues definitely. It's a registrant issue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you Olivier. From my perspective, until I actually read the report last weekend I didn't even realize it was relevant to those groups, so I'll claim innocence on that one, or blame, if you wish. My real point I'm

making though is this is the beginning of a very long process, and I'm not sure we have a lot to add here, other than yes, we need to look at this in some detail, and we need much more user experience and feedback ,but I can't see us going forward with what's going to come out of this, without that happening anyway.  That was my take on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   If I can respond?  The reason why I'm identifying any issues that we might have, even in the very short statement, if we might think of such issues, is because when it comes later down the road, where we will have either a PDP taking place, or some work taking place, we would be able to point back at our initial point and say from the beginning we had identified this, and that might strengthen our points.  If we don't find any problems, that's fine as well.  Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:   Leon can take that into consideration as he looks at this.  Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:   I tend to agree with you.  There's not much there with involving registrants at this stage, but I ave to say the Privacy Proxy Services, I thin are front and center.  I can't tell you how many two o'clock meetings I've been on where the real issue has been access to users of privacy proxy services by really IP claims.  It's sort of intruding, and it's like a watching brief at this stage, but it's starting to become an issue, and so Leon, if I could have a look as well?  Alan, you're right, it's not an issue now, but I'm telling you it's on the horizon.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Yes, but I don't think there's a direct connection between what that report is talking about and those.

HOLLY RAICHE:    No, I'd agree with you.  I'm just saying IP stuff is crowding around the place.  I know it's going to circle in at some point, but not right now.

ALAN GREENBERG:    That's quite clear.  May we go onto the next Item?  Thank you. Internationalized Registration Data EWG Final Report.  This is essentially a group put together again as a lead-in to a longer process, and looking at whether we need internationalized data and whether we need to be able to have registrants enter data in languages other than Latin character set, regarding their name, their address.  From my perspective, it's a no-brainer that that clearly is the case.  The report is coming out and saying basically that, and I don't really think we need to comment on it at this point.

The only thing I caught in reading it is they may be a little over-aggressive in allowing people to register names in their native script, but I think if anyone's going to react and say, "Let's be reasonably cautious about this," it's going to be the registrars.  Because some reading of the report might say that every registrar must allow every script, and clearly that's not a practical thing, depending on what market they're aiming at.  I didn't see anything other than, "Yes, we need to support

internationalized data in WHOIS data," and that's a train that's left the station.

It's just a matter of the exact details, and I can't see us responding to anything, especially since it closes in about five days.  Comments?  If not, that's a decision.  Ariel, so noted?  So noted.  Next one is the budget and plan.  Tijani says he will get to it net week and we will have a statement to talk about and then vote on.  Timing is pretty tight, but he feels confident we'll have something, so I don't think we need to talk about that any further here.

The last one is the proposed implementation of the GNSO PDP recommendations on inter-registrar transfer policy C.  Now, this one I find fascinating.  It's fascinating because the PDP was approved by the GNSO some time around September of 2012, approved by the Board two months later.  The Implementation Working Group was convened about five or six months after that, and has been working for a year and a half implementing what was essentially a very small and very well contained PDP set of recommendations.

I don't have a clue why it's been taking that long, and to be honest I've found the documents they provided very, very vague in trying to tell us what the issues are they're coming and asking about right now.  Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:          In sitting in on the IPRTD, some of the reference was back to C, in the decisions that were made in D.  I think this may have some relevance to us, just because of the fact that in the IPRTD we talked about C and talked about, "What are we going to do?"  I think you have to read the

Final report of D and then look back, and that's probably why some of the recommendations look strange, because I just remember sitting through a lot of meetings on D with reference back to C. Maybe I should have a look at that and read it in light of the recommendations on D, because they are intertwined.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're certainly welcome to. That doesn't explain why it's taken two years to get to the stage where they're asking for comments on the implementation, and to be quite candid, there is no document they're pointing to that I can find on the Implementation§ Plan. So I'm not 100 per cent sure what we're commenting on, but if you can lend some sanity to that, I'm glad to have you do it, but note the timing is rather tight.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other issues on policy statements? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think on this topic the text that they are asking people to comment on is actually the text that is in the overview, so effectively it shows the change, and this is just the implementation of that change. But I agree, it's highly technical in nature and I think it's going to be particularly difficult to comment on it in any meaningful way at this point in time,

putting forward the end user point of view. Although inter-registrar transfers are very important for anybody who registers domain names.

The technicality, the level of depth involved in that, is a bit baffling, and regards to the amount of time it's taking to reach this point, I'll reserve my judgment. It looks like this is something that was overdue for many years, and it's slowly getting to that point where there might be something that would be better than before, but I'm sure there will be a review of it after a year and then we'll start a whole process of PDPs again. That's my very sarcastic remark!

ALAN GREENBERG: My concern Olivier is I understand what they are saying, but the only reason for coming out for a comment on the IP is that the IP is veering away from the recommendations in any really noticeable way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have to remember there's been a fracas with regards to policy versus implementation in the GNSO, and that Working Group on Policy and Implementation has still not reached maturity either, so in the meantime it might be that for such processes, staff have been very careful indeed to make sure they're not accused of changing policy by implementing things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, with due respect, I'm well versed on the policy and implementation, and that's the whole point. If they're asking for input at this stage, they are not specifically saying what they're asking for

input on, and the only really input thing is they're not implementing exactly what was recommended, but something that has variation because during implementation they found a problem, and they haven't identified that. That's my concern. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to point out the problem that you've got is that in the Working Group D we decided against some of the things in C and that's why the whole thing is so confused, so that's why I'm saying that's why you need to go to D and see what we did - which was look at C - and then read C through the prism of D. That's the only way you can make sense of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Luckily for us, you've volunteered to do that. Thank you. Next Item! Update on CWG and CCWG. It says Leon and Alan. I will turn it over to Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. Well, we've got the CCWG. Right now we are just about to have a session next week, on Thursday and Friday. So far the template from Working Parties 1 and 2 are almost finished, and we hope to have our Draft Document Proposal for public comment, and the plan timeline to release the document is by the end of April, and we'll be aiming to have this Draft Proposal finished during on session of work at the end of this week and maybe have our document ready for public comment next Tuesday, and we'll of course run a PCP so at Buenos Aires we can have our intense day of sessions.

On the 19th we'll be having this whole work day, intense work session, on the CCWG. We are aware this collides with the ICG session, and there has already been some communication between Co Chairs of the ICG and CCWG, so we can of course try to collide as little as possible and we can have those Members that are both in the ICG and CCWG participate as fully as possible in both sessions. Right now, there's a call within Working Party 1 an hour ago and it was very interesting.

They've made a lot of progress with their Draft Document, and they're going to incorporate too the integral document that [unclear 00:21:41] and staff are drafting, out to comment, and I think we still need to iron out details with some sort of mechanism. We're waiting [to hear 00:21:56] from Working Party 2, [unclear], which is the [problem]. We note that they are also in progress with their work, but we don't have a document yet, as we do for Working Party 2.

Of course, this Working Party has made excellent progress also, and I believe that the [unclear 00:22:27] Working Party has already finished their work, and they are beginning to first draft all of their documents. We will be having documents on a [brief 00:22:45] so we can analyze them before our intense session. I think that's where we are with the CCWG at this point. We're [unclear] to work with the internal lawyers. There has been a lot of interaction with them.

We held a couple of calls, not only with the larger group but also within the Legal Sub Team Group. We're planning to have them participate as well on those Working Party calls where they are required to provide their legal advice, so we can assure that any proposals are legally viable and that we're not going to clash where we can't prevent, from the legal

**EN**

point of view, what we are proposing.  Now I must open the floor for any questions.  I see Cheryl's hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you Leon.  Just to clarify, the Stress Test Working Party has not exactly completed its work - if only - but what we have done is put out a Version 10 of our ongoing reviewing of the documentation that we've been running.  We've run 25 stress tests now, as far as we can based on assumptions of what Work Parties 1 and 2 will be putting out as accountability mechanisms and community powers.  Of course, we can't actually finish our work until that's all settled.  But we do keep running through them.  We've done two, if not three readings on all of the 25, and in the last couple of weeks we've added on 26.

Quite specifically, half a dozen of those stress tests relate specifically to the needs of the CWG, so they're IANA-specific stress tests as well - or if they're not quite IANA-specific, they're specific to IANA transition issues.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you Cheryl.  A question for Leon - you noted the overlap with the ICG, which is a whole day overlap.  There's a smaller overlap potentially with the Chairs Group that typically met at 16:00.  I think that's now moved to 17:00, although I'm not 100 per cent sure of that.  I presume if there is an overlap, the schedule will be arranged to try and minimize the impact of that.

| LEON SANCHEZ: | That's correct, Alan.  Yes, we're definitely looking into any overlapping sessions that might happen between the ICG and the CCWG.  I believe Patrick Fältström is already looking into this, and we are pending a reply from him. |
|---|---|
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Yes, but I'm talking about [Yasur's 00:26:46] meeting, which is a conflict for anyone who's a Chair of a group within ICANN.  Patrick's involved, I'm involved, Greg is involved, and a number of other people have a potential conflict.  It normally starts at 16:00.  I think it's now moved to 17:00, I'm not sure, but just to make sure it's on your radar? |
| LEON SANCHEZ: | It clearly wasn't on my radar, so thank you for raising this.  I'll definitely go back to the CCWG staff so we can have a look at it and try to interfere as little as possible. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you very much.  We'll be talking about interference when we get to a later Item on the Agenda.  On the CWG, the group is making pretty good progress.  There is a draft document that's supposed to be coming out next Tuesday, or maybe Thursday.  Although there are still a number of things that are not resolved, and a couple of things that may well end up being controversial, the not resolved are the exact structure that IANA will take within ICANN - but it's definitely a "within" at this point - and there's certainly going to be a lot of controversy that if it's a |

corporation associated with ICANN, who's on the Board is something that's far from settled.

There are a number of other issues: whether in fact it's an incorporated or a non-incorporated department is still unsettled, and separation I think is going to end up being more controversial than people are pretending right now. But an awful lot of the details are being fleshed out, and I can see us coming up with a proposal to make to the ICG. We have a number of other people, or at least Cheryl and Olivier on the call who can comment. I see Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. The timeline is such that we should expect, as far as Working Group Members are concerned, something before the weekend. We'll then spend the weekend pointing things out, and then until the deadline of the Tuesday - and the public comment period is due to start on the Thursday, which is two days later than is originally thought - it's going to be a 28-day comment period. One thing that was mentioned and discussed - among at least the At-Large Members that were on the Skype chat - was that we should stage some kind of a webinar for our community.

It might be worth thinking about this right now and flagging it. I don't know if we want to do this as an internal webinar, or we want to have someone like Jonathan Robinson or Lise Führ on the call, or ICANN staff to provide us with a set of slides. I don't know how you want to do this one. I think we need to discuss this, because 28 days is a very short amount of time, and this is going to be more than 95 pages - I believe

probably a 100-page report that we're going to ask our community to comment on, plus the fact that yes, there will be webinars, they will be organized by ICANN.

They will not be organized in languages other than English, as far as I understand.  If that's the case, we really do need to have a webinar that has interpretation in English and in French as well.  Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you Olivier.  Yes, I was going to bring that up at the end, because the same is true for the Accountability paper.  I'd think we want to start scheduling something soon, in coordination of the Co Chairs of the group, to make sure our timing is good, but I think we need to start planning the timing of this and getting people lined up as soon as possible.  Or if we only start when the papers come out, another week or so from now, then we're making sure that we can't have the full period of time with which to start talking about people, or even a significant amount of it.  I think that's an AI for staff - to start working with the staff from the CWG and CCWG, and in coordination with the Co Chairs to try and figure out a reasonable time.

I guess I'd like some input from people on whether they'd like people other than At-Large to be talking?  I personally don't think there's a great need for that.  We have people who are pretty knowledgeable on all of the subjects, including one of the Co Chairs of the CCWG, and I'm not sure that we need to bring other people in on it.  On the other hand, they will be producing documentation for the webinars that are being

held ICANN-wide, and I'd think we definitely want to make use of that kind of material.  That's my position anyway.  Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I think I agree with you on this, unless there is a wider issue where we'd want to have a more neutral voice for some of the descriptive work.  Because of course the concern is that we might influence our own community into what they're thinking.  That would never happen of course, since we're very neutral ourselves, and therefore I'm sure we'll be absolutely fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:             Other thoughts?  Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Of course we're going to try and influence our communities!  Good Lord above!  That said, one thing that strikes me is that what we should do now is request that the Q&A session that was proposed in the CWG meeting earlier today - there was an existing two webinars for the 24$^{th}$ or 25$^{th}$ in my world - there was also then the proposal for later on, and I'm assuming probably a fortnight or so later, that there would be more of a Q&A session run.   I think that Q&A session should have simultaneous interpretation to a couple of language channels, and that our community members should be able to take advantage of that. That would save us perhaps doing two lots of outreach webinars in our own community.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Cheryl, with your vast knowledge of the ICANN hierarchy and such, should that request come from staff or from us?  We've not been particularly successful getting language support in these CCWG and CWGs otherwise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      I think the exception here is because it would be clearly community wide outreach, and therefore it's not a matter of precedent - it's a matter of this has to go beyond the participants and members, therefore the argument can and should be made that language support is important. The documents themselves are going to be interpreted, so there's already the buy-in to that extent.  Now, my guess is probably staff-to-staff would be sufficient, with them asking specifically if a formal request from the ALT and Chair does need to be put forward to make it any more actionable.  But I think it should probably be all right on just a staff-to-staff request.  Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:          All right.  I think I'm going to follow that advice, because that was my inclination as well, and task staff with requesting simultaneous interpretation in a reasonable number of languages for those sessions. If indeed you get any pushback or feel you need something from me, then I'll be glad to do it.  But let's be optimistic.  Heidi asked which staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      You, Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG:     If Heidi chooses to delegate it to someone else, I'm not particularly fussy.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     That's her business! You give it to her and she does what she likes with it!

ALAN GREENBERG:     To be clear, Heidi, At-Large staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Yes.  I wouldn't suggest you try it for the two informational webinars that will be running on the 24th, and the material from which we'll be able to get hold of and use in our own webinars.  I would suggest it's pushed for for the Q&A session, which will be hold a fortnight or so later.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I personally think it should be for both, but I'm willing to accept your wisdom and say just for the Q&A. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks Alan.  I'd go along with Cheryl on this, with regards to the goal of what we want.  As far as the first session is concerned, we will have our own webinar that will be interpreted within At-Large, so that, I think, is not something where we can push for the two webinars that the CWG and CCWG - actually, it will be four by then, because I gather the CCWG

will also have two webinars. Who knows? Anyway, the number of webinars by the CCWG and CWG will be interpreted. On the other hand, the Q&A session is very important, ICANN-wide, for community engagement.

What I would say though, about the means and how to ask, we know the intent. If staff, as in Heidi, sends the request, I think it has to be clear that the request doesn't come from here but comes from the ALAC. I'd suggest that since the majority of the ALT is here, we might have a consensus call as to whether we're all behind this request, and as a result Heidi could then say that the ALT and the ALAC Chair are requesting this in an official manner - thus putting a lot more weight on our request than just by Heidi inquiring and saying, "Is it possible to have this in other languages?" Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you Olivier. To be quite candid, if a request comes from this group, it is coming from the ALAC, and Heidi can put whatever words she wants around that. We're empowered to do this kind of thing. That's why we're here. This is not a formal decision of the ALAC, it's simply what we need to do to support our community. Heidi, to the extent you want to put words in my mouth, you may, but if you feel guilty about it you can pass them by me first. Anything else we need to talk about on the CWG or CCWG? Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I do have one other question for Leon, and it's to do with some of the pushback we've seen on the CCWG regarding the amount of work. As

you know, both in the CCWG and CWG there's been an enormous amount of work that's been done in recent weeks, or should I say recent hours?  It looks like one long hour!  Understandably, we need to do all that work because we have deadlines to pursue.  I know that on the CWG we've managed to all pull through and go without having too much pushback, and I think the results have been very surprising in a good way.

Is there any chance that the CCWG might be delayed by a slowdown of the CCWG's work, because of this being both formulated I believe by some Members of the GAC and also some members of the cc community?

LEON SANCHEZ:          Thank you Alan.  First to answer your question, we've in fact had a little pushback with regards to the workload that we've been assigning to the different Working Parties and of course to the larger group.  But if you really take a look at the pushback we've received, you can tell that there's maybe five or six people complaining about the workload.  This doesn't mean that it's not to be taken into account, but we are a group of 161 people, more or less, and with people participating maybe from 50 to 60 people on a regular basis on each of our calls.  When you have maybe five, six or even ten people complaining out of a group, that's much larger than those complaining.

Of course, we take those concerns into account, but we're being very clear that we're establishing this sprint so we don't delay the CWG in delivering their proposal, because we understand there are

dependencies on the work we need to do.  I think we're also backed by our rapporteurs, which have most of the load on their shoulders.  They're the ones that are really doing the work in the CCWG, and as long as the rapporteurs are okay with the schedule for next week, I think we can go through with it.  Yes, pushback - you'll always have some people complaining, but I don't think it's something that might delay our work, and I'm pretty sure Cheryl's going to add to what I'm saying.

Just to finish this, I was raising my hand because I've just passed along to the CCWG staff the concern about the Chairs' Meeting in Buenos Aires, and we're already looking into it.  So that would be my answer, Olivier.  I don't know if that addressed your question.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you Leon.  By the way, I think we've trained you too much to be a Co Chair, because as soon as you get the microphone you're assuming the responsibilities.  I have a personal question for you - am I one of the complainers because I had the nerve to point out that the times were privileging certain people around the world?

LEON SANCHEZ:          No! You're not one of the complainers.  Well, it's good that you raised this at this point, because I remember seeing an email from Tijani precisely commenting on how we're getting into a very accelerated phase of work and that this might of course lead into having decisions taken without the proper review and study of the different documents, and a very big load of information that we're all receiving on a day-to-day basis.  I don't remember having seen any reply to Tijani's email.  It's

not on the Agenda, but I think it might be something that we want to really talk about and have our positions lined up.  I don't know if this is the right moment to comment on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:    There is a real danger that if you're pushing people too hard, only a very small number of people will keep up and therefore the decisions that are being made are not really ones of the Working Group, but of a very small sub set of it.  Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you.  A couple of things.  First of all, I think we'll print out T-shirts for the Co Chairs and rapporteurs that say, "Resistance is futile!"  Secondly, I was rather amused that Heidi took Leon seriously when he asked what the word "pushback" was.  That's very kind of you, Heidi, but boy, does he understand what pushback is now!  On a serious note, a couple of things: first of all, to your last point, Alan, I'm not seeing any decline - in fact, quite the opposite - in the numbers and diversity of people engaged in the various work party, sub party, and sub-sub party meetings and calls that are going on.  So despite "the sprint" this is not having any effect in terms of getting bums on seats, certainly.

In terms of the work, I think it's worthwhile noting that immediately before our call here today we've had a very productive, albeit it somewhat tense, at times, but well managed Work Party 1 call, where a huge amount of the backlog of drafting from Work Party 1 was cleared up.  I think that, for example, looking at some of the voices that were concerned about our ability to complete this in time, without sufficient

due diligence and consideration, some of that voice I don't think will now be as much of a problem, because that work's been significantly if not completely done.

The other thing is that we seem to occasionally lose sight of the fact, in all of this, that we're actually putting out drafts for public comment - not making the final decisions - and you've got to think about the community's ability to have enough time to do this.  I think their points, that the Co Chairs have started to make and will continue to make, back to those who are saying, "Slow down, we move too fast, why do we have to meet anybody's deadlines?"…

When I hear that, "Why do we have to meet anybody's deadlines?"  I often think, "And what is your subtext reasoning for that?"  So with that all said, yes, Leon, you have, at least as far as I can ascertain, your rapporteurs' support in this.

LEON SANCHEZ:          Thank you very much Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you Cheryl and Leon.  Cheryl, just for clarity's sake, I wasn't really talking about the people on the Work Parties not contributing - I'm more worried about the rest of the group not following what each of the Work Parties are doing.  I know in my case, I had a problem with something Work Party 2 was doing, and I just realized that I really don't know where they are right now and whether the problem is fixed or not, because I just haven't had…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     But Alan, that is exactly the purpose of the intensive work day - for the Committee as a whole, to be dragged screaming and kicking if necessary, up to date.

ALAN GREENBERG:     If you can keep me awake during it.  Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     The purpose of my comment and question was due to the fact that both purposes are in the public spotlight as processes by which Internet governance is being performed in a multistakeholder way, if some categories of stakeholder are pushing back and saying, "This is a pace of which we're working that we cannot sustain," rest assured that those who are opposed to the multistakeholder model will actually make use of this.  I put this in the same bag as the "misguided comments" - and I'll call them misguided - by the ICANN CEO.

You'll recall a while ago, I think it was in Singapore, that was then used not only in the press to criticize the process, but also clearly being used to discredit the work of the naming community and the latest CRISP presentation - the one of the RIR - which was presented at a recent ARIN Meeting.  Boy, do I wish I'd been at that ARIN Meeting, because I would have raised hell on that presentation.  But, unfortunately, being busy elsewhere and maybe on another continent, I wasn't there.  Never mind. In any case, we have to be aware of that, and so as Leon is one of the Co Chairs of the CCWG IANA, please watch your back, all of you.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you Olivier.  Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:       Thank you Alan.  I was trying to get in earlier just to flag again, I think Olivier just mentioned about that whole stakeholder engagement thing. Just to mention that tomorrow the ccNSO are having an official Council meeting - and inviting anyone who'd like to come along - to actually get updates from their perspective about the CWG and CCWG meetings.  I think I mentioned in my report earlier how they are focusing on ensuring that their Members are better informed about this whole thing.  I think this is what has been discussed in our meeting.

So this special meeting is actually being held, and the actual Council meeting is next week.  Again, it's good to see that other groups actually making sure…  I'll be listening into those too, because I'll probably be at a basic level, and I'll be able to understand more of what's going on, but yes, I just thought I'd raise that.  I'm sure Ron would have mentioned it as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you.  The ccNSO has a particular problem that ratifying the outcomes of these CCWGs is something that has to be done by the whole Membership, not just by the Council, and getting those votes out, especially on such a complex issue, has been problematic in the past.  Of course, there are quorum issues and things like that.  A recent ccNSO survey that was done, which people hoped would have some good

input, did not have enough people contributing to it to be meaningful, so voting on the outcomes of these things is going to be really problematic, and they really are going to have to make sure their Membership is aware of what's going on.  It's an interesting problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      [Off the record comment].

ALAN GREENBERG:      The next one we're going to do a lot quicker than perhaps it warrants, and that's a next step on a lot of Working Groups.  In almost all cases, it was something sitting in my court that I haven't done yet, so I'm going to review the status of them, but I don't think we're going to take 15 minutes in discussing most of them, but there is one or two things we do need discussion on.  The Outreach and Engagement Committee, which we agreed in Singapore to reform, that process of a call for Membership and Chairs will be going on soon.

The next one is Future Challenges.  Now, that group has not been particularly active for quite a while now.  Evan is leaving.  Jean-Jacques has to a large extent not been active in our community other than his activities on the ICG.  Do we want to continue with this group?  If so, how do we chair it and what mandate do we give it?  This isn't our decision purely, but I think the ALAC needs some leadership from its Leadership. Any comments?  Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    By Evan leaving, I note that he has given up on his responsibilities in NARALO.  Has he effectively given his notice for everything that he's in charge of?  Because being in charge of the Working Group, you don't need to be on the ALAC Leadership as such - neither ALAC nor Chair of the region and so on; we have some Members that are Chairing the Working Groups, and it's not as onerous time-wise - so has Evan effectively said, "I'm completely retiring from At-Large activities?"

ALAN GREENBERG:    No.  He's not said he's retiring from At-Large activity.  He said perhaps not in the proper venue for these groups, that he is retiring from chairing these groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    All right.  Perhaps this might have to be announced, and perhaps at that point we can discuss whether another Chair shall be selected, or whether this group should be wound down.  Ultimately, I think it would probably have to be the decision of the group itself as well.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Maybe.  Holy next, and then I'll give you my opinion.

HOLLY RAICHE:    Just a question.  I'm not sure that we really need to do anything.  They've really got nothing on their plate, and I don't know if anybody else has got any issues that it should deal with, but I'm not sure that

there's anything for it to do, and maybe as Olivier says, somewhere in Buenos Aires we ask, "Do we continue this?"

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you Holly.  That's exactly the question I'm asking this group now. Let me put my stake in the ground.  The group was formed as a think-tank of the ALAC and the At-Large to look forward to things that are not crises situations immediately.  It came out with one major paper that, to a large extent, said, "This is how we should reorganize ICANN."  I don't think that paper is much alive anymore in pretty much any form, and although the group was potentially going to do a number of things over the last couple of years, it hasn't really done much of that.

So the question is: this was a brainchild of essentially one or two people, both of whom are not particularly active.  Do we continue this group, unless someone can come up with a show cause why we should continue it, and who's going to do the work?  My attitude would be that the default is that it disappears, unless someone can come up with a work plan and a concept of what it's going to be doing.  Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    I agree with the points you've made here.  The only thing I would say is on process.  I think it would be unfortunate if we were to charter and close down Working Groups without due process, and on here, the reason why I mention having to ask and go through the motions, is to follow the same process for every group.  The reason being, of course, that in some cases we have a number of other groups that haven't done

anything in a year, and yet when there is a demand for them to kick into action, we're then able to get them to take into action.

Ideally, of course, I'd like to see all the groups work all the time, but due to the nature of how things are changing dynamically in ICANN and the nature of the topics out there, sometimes there is nothing for a group to do. Certainly going through the motions of asking the Working Group Members and then asking the ALAC, et cetera, would then make it an orderly shut-down, if it were to be shut down. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff, do we have any Working Group Members? I don't believe this group has met in a long time. Could I put an AI to identify who the Working Group Members are at this point? Let's see how many of them are still around and doing something. I wasn't proposing us shutting it down. I wasn't proposing doing things without due process. The question is: where do we believe it should be going?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are quite a few Members of the group. Ariel has put a link to the home page of the group. Many people are there, but they don't seem to have done much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That's the point. I'm going to propose something to this group, and you can disagree with me or not when the time comes. If we could have an AI for me to follow up on Future Challenges Working Group? The next one, the New gTLD Working Group, I think is exactly in

the category that Olivier just mentioned; that I believe there's value in having it as a standing Working Group, and I believe we should find a new Chair for that one. If there's no objection, we'll go onto the next one: the CROPP reconfiguration.

You'll recall that we had a very extensive discussion in Singapore. We tried to take a decision on the list and ended up with a number of people objecting strenuously, and it became obvious that we hadn't properly consulted with Dev who'd been leading it. That has since been fixed. I believe I have agreement from Dev as to how we go forward. I also have agreement from him that he's willing to continue Chairing that group, and I plan to reactivate essentially what we decided out of Singapore, and hopefully do it in such a way that we will not have discussion infinitum but we can actually come to closure on that.

In parallel however, there is a push right now to see if there is any CROPP slots that can be used before the end of the FY. Should any proposals come in, the existing CROPP Review Team will continue to process those. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    We have an issue that's taken place in LACRALO where there's been a Member that was replaced, but without knowledge of the process by which a Member should be replaced. To remind you all, the current process of CROPP is to have a representative from the FBSC and a representative from the Outreach SC from each region. So the request for change has, I believe, been initiated by having the named

representative changed in the FBSC and then the FBSC notifying the CROPP of the change.

In the absence of this taking place, does the previous line-up stand at that point?  Or does the new line-up stand?  Because some people, when we were discussing the new line-up, did volunteer in some regions to move onto the CROPP.  So there's a bit of confusion in that, and a potential flash point.  I'd be happy with some clarification please.

ALAN GREENBERG:          At this point, the previous CROPP Review Team stands - that is the people.  If any of the people are not willing to continue to do that, or are not capable of continuing to do that, we'll have to handle that on an ad-hoc basis.  The new CROPP Review Team hopefully will be created relatively soon, but I don't want to be standing in the way of a CROPP request, should one come in in the next three days.  So it's conceivable that someone is on the CROPP Review Team, who was on the FBSC, who's not currently on the FBSC, but they are still there because we hadn't reformed the CROPP Review Team.  Does that answer your question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks Alan.  Just to summarize: if a person is on the FBSC and has not stood down from the FBSC, and they are the named representative on the CROPP Review Team, unless they stand down or have expressed their wish to stand down, they are still on there.

ALAN GREENBERG:          On the CROPP Review Team?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I would believe so.  Remember, all you have to do is put your name on a mailing list to be on the FBSC.  It's not a particularly onerous issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.  That was the first question.  My second question is there has been some discussion within the CROPP Review Team that the CROPP itself might be used for requests to send people from a region to the regional ICANN Meeting - in other words, to focus in a little more, let's say in LACRALO you could have a CROPP request for sending people to an ICANN Meeting.  Now, this was not understood to be the case previously, but there was some concern that some regions might have not used all of their slots, and this could be a valid way for them to come to an ICANN Meeting and effectively experience it.

I expressed absolute concern about this, due to the CROPP only being there for two days and three nights, and for the fact that for some regions they're very large.  So I was very reticent for having this being allowed officially, especially since if that's the case then I just see a long line of people queuing up and each one of our ALSes asking for CROPP requests.  I'm a little concerned that this might also set a precedent, weakening our other requests that we might have for GAs and for more of our ALSes to come to ICANN Meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG:   I'll give you my response - and you've already seen it on the list, Olivier - given that we only have five CROPP requests a year, we'd have a hard time servicing all of the ALSes, so I don't think that's really an issue. What my reply was - and it was essentially the same as Janice's reply - is if someone can make a good case for why this is a useful thing to do with the money, then she believes it's a valid thing, and I say it's a valid thing. Now, I want to see a valid case why bringing someone to a meeting for two days, in the middle of an ICANN Meeting, would in fact be effective.

Maybe they have funding from somewhere else to cover the other nights, so that's certainly one of the possibilities, but I think they have to make the case. I would not want to rule it out, just because it happens to be an ICANN Meeting. We have sent people to other meetings, which are longer than two days, and have accepted the fact that they can't participate in more of that meeting. I'm not sure we need to be specific about ICANN Meetings, but it all comes down to making a good case, and I think we have to get a hell of a lot more cynical of making sure that they are making a good case - not just rubber-stamping everything that people ask for. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:   Thanks. I certainly, as Olivier knows, come down more on your side of the viewing here than on his. One point I haven't made to the CROPP list, but I do want to make now, is that I see a benefit for this; for such a short period of time, specifically with the post-FY16 B regional meetings, which the very nature of them are only three days on the ground, so

would fit perfectly for bringing some additional people in to encourage and get them up to speed on how the wonderful world of ICANN Meetings work.

But specifically, one of the rationales I'd be wanting to see, and one I'd be arguing strongly to accept as a good reason for using money in this way when an application comes in, would be, for example, if there was a pivotal piece of Working Group activity going on that such a person had been strongly engaged in or perhaps leading, or if there was a particular piece of capacity building opportunity that was running at that time. I'm less concerned, by a long shot, than you are about all of this, Olivier, and much more in the "let's see what shakes out and let's not say no to it". But I think the B meetings could have some opportunities. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you Cheryl. I'll point out that although we have been told a number of times that the O in CROPP stands for outreach, the current expectations out of it in fact talk about outreach and engagement. It's far wider than we were…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      We need to be CROEPP.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Yes, we don't need longer acronyms. Anything else? No. The next one is the At-Large Review Working Party. Can we have a very short update from Holly as to where we stand? Are we still missing people? I know we're still missing people from North America.

HOLLY RAICHE:          You answered the question!   We are missing someone from North America.  Other than that we're chugging along very well.  We've had responses from Larissa.  We've contacted the Working Party Members, asked them to go back into their Membership to address some of the issues that Larissa has identified.  I expect there'll be a teleconference with the Working Party and Larissa next week, and there's a 90-minute meeting of the Working Party with Larissa, hopefully, in BA.  So it's humming along very nicely.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you.  Heidi or whoever's dealing with our newly reactivated Chair, Garth, for NARALO, had anything as to naming someone from NARALO?

HEIDI ULLRICH:         We've been in contact and the latest, as of yesterday, is he's working on it.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Okay.  That's fine.  Next is the two Working Groups on ALS Criteria and Certification Process.  They have not come into existence for all intents and purposes, and that will be rectified very quickly.  Anything else on Working Groups before we go on?  As I said, we're now only a half hour late.   Next Item is establishing of a At-Large new meeting strategy Working Party.  Tijani, who's taken the lead on that, is not on this meeting.   We can defer discussion.   Does anyone have any strong feelings? It looks like we really need to put together a group.

My preference is that it not be solely the people who participated in the ICANN-wide group - that we get some new people and new ideas. I really think we want to make sure we're not saying, "We came up with this idea, and it has to stay exactly as it is." We're looking to try to build out from what's now being proposed into some practical plans. I think we need to get some new people involved in it. Any thoughts from anyone? I see no hands. Olivier, briefly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you briefly let us know what the question is? I don't remember why we'd need a Working Party for the new meeting strategy. I thought the new meeting strategy was already set by the Board, and so be it, we're done.

ALAN GREENBERG: The problem is that we're now going to come up to a new meeting, and we have days allocated that we're supposed to be doing different things on, and we don't know what that means. For instance, when we come to a B meeting we're supposed to do a day of outreach. What do we really plan to do?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Get Leon to deal with our schedule!

ALAN GREENBERG: Solved.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Alan, just to let you know - and Olivier, I'm sure you know this - that within the GNSO they're now moving ahead on this, and they have formed a group, from what I've heard, and have built a nice scheuld about how they see Meeting B in particular. It would be useful if there were more than one Members than just one. Leon's a key part, but perhaps other regions might have views on that as well. I'd encourage you to form this group quite quickly. It may be a discussion prior to the start of the ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires.


ALAN GREENBERG:        I think one of the issues is - if you recall the discussions we've had in the ALAC on this -, and the focus is in particular on the first day of B meetings but there are issues related to the other meetings; that we have varyingly been told, "This is outreach and thou must not do anything else that day except outreach." Outreach might be inviting people in to meet with you, or you going out to all the local schools. We're going to be faced with 27 people being brought into our meetings and have to be kept busy, used, involved in these days, and I think that's going to take more strategizing than simply saying, "We'll find some schools to go to."

I believe we really do have to do some planning and figure out whether this is possible. My understanding is that ICANN staff are going to be coming to us soon and saying, "What is you want us to help you organize?" It's not going to come top-down, it's going to come bottom-up, so the purpose of this group is to start talking about, "What is it

we're going to do, and how are we going to use these days?" I've stunned everyone, put everyone to sleep. To start with, we're going to do a call for membership and we're looking for at least one person per region.

I don't think there's a particular reason why we have to limit it to one per region, and go from there. If anyone has any objection to that then noted, but otherwise we'll talk about that at the next ALAC Meeting. Done deal. No comments. We have 20 minutes allocated to talking about ICANN 53. There's a very short item, which we'll do first - travel slots. Heidi, can you report where we are with who's giving up travel slots and where they're going at this point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:      Okay. Currently those that are giving them up are [Faran 01:18:29] and that slot is going to [Assun]. Humberto has given up his slot and that is going to Jason Hinds. It was in the Caribbean area. I think that is it. Sorry, and Evan has now resigned from the Secretariat, and there was a consensus call going on within NARALO to keep Judith in. She's now going to replace Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG:      She will be the traveller at that point. Humberto, what's the reason that he can't make it? Is it a personal issue or something else?

HEIDI ULLRICH:      He is going to be doing an internship at the [unclear 01:19:24] Institute in Germany.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you.  And Beran is not going because she would have had to travel to Nigeria to get her visa, and ICANN would not have provided enough money to cover her cost to do that, so she's decided not to attend.  Not a particularly good situation in my mind, but nothing we can do on the very short term.  I turn it over to Gisella and Leon to briefly talk about what's going on in terms of the schedule and then I have an item about our Meeting with the Board that I'll be talking about.  Olivier, you had your hand up about something I'd already covered?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Yes.  I've just learnt about Beran not being funded to get her visa in Nigeria, and I'm outraged.  How can we, on the one hand, preach that we're inclusive and that we're getting all regions to participate, and then twitch on something like this - a Member of the ALAC?  If it was just a participant of some sort then fair enough, but I'm shocked.  I wanted to convey that.  I'm genuinely shocked on this, by the way.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you.  Having been Chair for four years, nothing should shock you.  You're not the only one who's outraged.  The timing is such that there's nothing we can do about it at this point.  It will not go unnoticed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    May I suggest that a letter from you, and perhaps not thinking there'd be any way to resolve this and actually have her travel - but certainly an official letter to show your disappointment to the relevant authorities?  I

don't know who that would be. It's something we need to put on record, because if we start accepting things like this then we may as well not have anybody from Africa involved in our business, because of the fact that there are so few embassies in Africa, and Africans need visas in many different situations.

Yes, this is a matter of principle, and I'm sorry to put it through here, but I think it's very important. This is our job - to make sure that ICANN is inclusive. This is a very serious matter.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, may I quote a former US President? Read between my lips: it will not go unnoticed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly, if I may? You might wish to remind the CEO that he, specifically, was asking the NomCom recently, the previous NomCom at least, to look at Africa and Asia, including Central Asia, to ensure the diversity of this organization. Of course your part of his organization has done a very good job of being global, but clearly we now have new messages that say we have to stick to emerged economies, first world economies and people that live in transport hubs - in other words white, Anglo Saxon, [Protestant 01:23:02] male, probably.

ALAN GREENBERG: With the exception of groups of course like the ALAC, that actually have to have someone from Africa. But the rest of the groups, we want to try to avoid [unclear 01:23:13] cause problems!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        Clearly none of them can travel, so we can't have them!

ALAN GREENBERG:        Read my lips: it will not go unnoticed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        I know!  I know!  It's fucking ridiculous!

ALAN GREENBERG:        Former Chairs may note that I have occasionally called on you for advice and comments on things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        It doesn't stop us getting pissy!

ALAN GREENBERG:        No, it doesn't, but we are going to run out of time, and I for one have not eaten very much today, and I'm hungry.  All right, Gisella?  Leon?  Somebody may let you talk this time.

LEON SANCHEZ:        Thank you very much Alan.  Well, we have a draft here that Gisella has so diligently prepared for us, and I've been reviewing it and I really don't have much to say, since all the work's been done so far by Gisella.  I

believe there are still some slots pending assignment, and I would definitely turn to Gisella so she can take us through this draft schedule.

GISELLA GRUBER:     Leon, thank you.  I did send this out via email earlier, which I'm currently looking for but can't find.  We have a few points to address here, and if you'll bear with me for a second, while I bring it up on my other screen and get my notes, that would be very helpful.  Sorry for this table.  It might not look very clear to you, but it will make sense as we run through it.  I've added on the table now the Thursday and Friday sessions, just to remind us of what sessions we have running on those days.  We get to Saturday - now, our first change - Leon, I know you've ben keeping an eye on what's been changing, but we did have a call with Alan, one of our staff/Chair calls, and we discussed the BA schedule.

What we've done here is, new to the BA Meeting, is that on the Friday for the SO/SG/AC Meeting on the Friday afternoon, which is then followed by dinner, our RALO Chairs have been invited.  They'll already be in BA on the Friday afternoon, which means on the Saturday when we have the ALT Meeting, there seems to be a void in their schedule.  We thought this was a very good time for them to meet with the ALT and David Olive.  It also then frees up the 7:00 AM painful meeting on the Wednesday morning.  The only thing we need to confirm on this meeting is the timing of David Olive.

One of the suggestions was, depending on David's availability, we'd switch with the ALT Meeting, and we'll know that over the next couple of weeks.  I'm working with Susie on that one.  So a question further to

this change is whether the RALO Chairs are invited to the ALT Dinner on the Saturday evening?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Anyone have any thoughts on that?   We've definitely said the ALT Meeting is still closed.  The question is the dinner.  My only caveat is, as far as I'm concerned, we don't tend to get that rowdy, and with dinner no longer being the formal meeting, it's nice to have us as a small group, but on the other hand, since they're going to be there, it's a little awkward going off without them. I can certainly live with them being there, but noting that it's self-paid and we do tend to be a bit on the high side, so that may be a concern for them, or not.  Olivier and then Leon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    As long as Gisella is able to find us a good restaurant for that many people, then I should think that's fine.  I just remind you though that in Singapore we had what I thought was a small group, but has become quite a big group with staff, with Liaisons, with everyone.  It's always been a mediums-sized group to start with.  I don't know if it's easy to find a private room for a larger group than that.  I'd certainly want to avoid ending up on a several-tabled, scattered, crowded, noisy restaurant - in which case at that point it just becomes a purely social thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:     It's quite possible that we will end up with several tables.  Private rooms tend to push the price up significantly, at least in some venues.  Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:       Thank you Alan.  Just to keep in mind that dinner-time in Argentina is rather later.  We usually have dinner by eight o'clock where we're at, but in Argentina people like to go and have dinner by ten or eleven o'clock at night, so it might be both an advantage and a disadvantage.  An advantage because any place we choose might be silent enough for us to work and of course have our chat without it being very noisy.  The downside would be that some restaurants or some places might not be open at this time.  Just a comment to keep in mind.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Yes.  My recollection is that if we put it off until eight or so then we're probably okay, in terms of finding some open restaurant.  We're only talking this one meeting.  By the time we get to Dublin we're talking about the whole ALAC - assuming the budget is approved - the whole ALAC coming in on Saturday.  So we're really talking about one meeting.  I'm willing to make it available to them and see what kind of update we get, noting we're going to have to have agreement early enough so that Gisella or whoever's arranging it can have an accurate headcount.  No disagreement? Done. Back to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:     Wonderful.  Thank you everyone for the input on that.  We now go through to Monday.  The meetings that I've put on this, hopefully you

can see them, but as I said, you do have them in your inbox. This will give you a better overview on the Excel spreadsheet. The meetings on the Monday, I wanted to know whether we could arrange any Working Group meetings parallel to these. Just as an aside, in Singapore we did have the Academy Working Group on the Monday, at lunchtime. It wasn't great - not a good time, not the best turnout.

Possibly Monday might just need to be kept free for the CCWG, CWG and the SO/AC high interest topic meetings. I just wanted your input on that. There's an Internet governance public session from 17:30 to 19:00 PM.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I suspect it's going to be pretty much a dead-loss. There's enough of us on the ALAC who tend to be some of the key people on various Working Groups that are involved with the other meetings, that my gut feeling is that it's probably a dead-loss. Anybody else have any thoughts? No? You have your marching orders, I guess. That could change as we go forwards, but at this point…

GISELLA GRUBER:          Thank you Alan. Yes, it may change with the block schedule changing, but already if I've got a good idea that Monday… I also thought so, because we're just going to run into complications again. Lovely. As you can see, to be moved, NARALO's monthly meeting. Don't worry, that was more me for… The monthly meeting is usually on Monday at that time in BA. I just need to see if I can move it elsewhere during the week.

We then get onto Tuesday, which is going to be an extremely full day starting at 7:15 AM with the ccNSO/ALAC Meeting.

We then have the At-Large Board Meeting. Now, with the change of format I don't have confirmation yet of the timing and how it's actually going to pan out, but I've kept that time in there, and we now have an additional meeting, which is the GAC and ALAC Meeting at 9:30. I've informed the GAC that if we do have the At-Large Board Meeting from 8:30 to 9:30, it would be much appreciated if we could have a little 15 minutes just to get to the room and settle in, otherwise that actually takes that time out of our one-hour allocated time with the GAC. I haven't yet heard back from them.

The APRALO in the meantime have requested their monthly meeting on the Tuesday, which we've kept to the same day, but we are likely to move that to the Wednesday. Moving further down on the Tuesday, we have ALAC Working Session Parts 1 and 2. I still haven't had time to have a private discussion with Leon whether he's okay with all these timings. I've put Olivier's group at the end of the Tuesday, from 16:15 to 17:45, hoping everyone will feel fresh enough to be able to have a good meeting at that time of the day. Olivier, do you see any inconvenience of your group meeting at that time?

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　That's the Internet governance, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     The Internet governance?   No, that's Tuesday - I see here we're on Tuesday; the At-Large Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function.  Is that correct?


GISELLA GRUBER:     Yes.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I don't know if that could be qualified as Olivier's group, but… Yes. IANA issues.   Would this be both IANA Stewardship and Accountability as well?  I think the two are now operating as one.


GISELLA GRUBER:     Yes, the name will be changed.   That was a copy and paste from Singapore


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     In which case then I wonder whether I'll ask Leon and Alan and others here: do you think we'd need more than the amount of time that's given here?  It's 90 minutes that's been given there.  Should we need another 30-minute extension after that?


ALAN GREENBERG:     It's hard to tell, because I'm not quite sure where we're going to be at that point.

# EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Regardless, I think 90 minutes is fine, because you're going to lose people after that anyway.  Mentally, you're going to lose them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I was going to suggest a break in the middle.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     If you're going to be kind…

ALAN GREENBERG:     If you have a break in the middle people just don't come back, so good - let's put the CWG second and I won't have to come back!  Olivier, let's leave it as it is right now, and Gisella, keep a note that if we can extend it without impacting on other things, then we might as well.   But I wouldn't put it as an absolute constraint.

GISELLA GRUBER:     Thank you.  Just for planning purposes, we can think about it until the meeting forms are due.  My thinking then is either we try and slot a Working Group in at the end - and you'll see why, because the week seems to already be very full, and we haven't placed all the Working Groups yet - and we'll also need an extension for Spanish interpretation.  So in discussion.  I'll leave it at that.

ALAN GREENBERG:     If we thought the last couple of meetings were bad, this one is going to be much worse.  We still cannot even guess what meetings are going to

be imposed on us until the last week before the meeting, or the week of the meeting, as it was last time. I think we have to try to be conservative.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the NomCom main meeting as well, so all the interviews happen, all the deliberations happen. You've got all your NomCom people well and truly engaged more than any other meeting that they go to in their own stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. Maybe we should keep in mind that the aim of the CCWG's session on the 19th is of course to go through the public comments received, in order to improve or refine the proposal that will be of course subject to public comment. I'm not sure at this stage what will be the output of this intense session, but I think that we might as well be having maybe a second draft, or some sort of document that we'll be putting out for review, mainly by the SOs and ACs.

So having this session on the IANA stewardship process, and with the comment [unclear 01:38:23] that we've been finding with the update on the CWG, and then the CCWG, maybe we should keep in mind that we might have to review any outputs from the intense session of the 19th, from the CCWG. This might force us also to push a little bit into the time, to extend the session. I'm guessing that maybe this slot that we

have of the Working Group, from 18 to 19 hours, depending on the need of certain Working Groups, we might as well hijack that session.

So we can extend our IANA Issues Session maybe for two hours, or two and a half hours.  That's depending of course on the need of reviewing any outputs from the 19th.  Does that make sense to you?

ALAN GREENBERG:        I guess my comment is the counter-argument is there's also engagement sessions that the CWG and CCWG are planning.  I think there's one joint one, and is there one separate one for each as well?  No, they're public sessions.  I know there's one on Monday.

LEON SANCHEZ:          On Monday, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:        I know there's a CCWG on Wednesday, and I think there's also a CWG engagement session.  So we're not in isolation and we're not the only opportunity to get people up to speed.  I suggest we leave it as it is right now.  Gisella has her marching orders, and if we can extend it without impacting other schedules then we'll try to, and if we have to restrain it, we will.

LEON SANCHEZ:          Okay.  If you agree, I'll go back to the different Working Groups and touch base with them on whether they'll be needing any sessions for BA.

As we did with Singapore, we'll prioritize with hot topics so that we can make the best use of everyone's time. If we can allow this slot to remain free, just in case we need to extend the IANA issues session, then I will look into it with Gisella so we can have this spare time to be able to extend the session.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Yes. It's the same to me if we extend it, but understand we may have to shorten it again to put a Working Group in. I don't mind which way we go. Olivier, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks Alan. May I then suggest perhaps another alternative? It's that rather than having one session that's 90 minutes in length, treating both CCWG and CWG, we split that in two and have one one-hour session on CWG and one one-hour session on CCWG? Then at the time itself, when we meet face-to-face, there can be some changes and one can maybe take 30 minutes on CWG and the remainder of the time on the CCWG? But that will afford us with some flexibility. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Unless I'm missing something, all our options amount to the same thing - that if we can possibly find more time for our engagement with At-Large on the subjects, we will. If we have to constrain it, we will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Or another alternative would be - and it really depends whether we'll need something done by the end of that week - we could just have that first part in 90 minutes, and then we could find another session that's one-hour in length later on in the week so that people have time perhaps to draft or kick ideas around, or to think about things? Because of course when one meets face-to-face it often is very difficult to come up with something right away, there and then, on the spot. That might be another way of looking at it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not clear we're going to have to draft something on the spot, based on where we are in that cycle, but you're right - we don't know at this point. Anything else on this particular topic? Or can we turn it back to Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. We'll wait to hear back from the different parties. For now we've got those different slots held for IANA and, as Alan said, if we need it for a Working Group we'll let you know. Going onto Wednesday, depending on how Tuesday is going to be finalized with the Board Meeting - and I know that Alan's going to touch on this afterwards - the APRALO Meeting will have to be on the Wednesday morning from 7:30 to 8:30. Just confirming that we're not going to schedule anything opposite the Board and GAC Meeting, which people I think will be pretty interested in attending?

ALAN GREENBERG:           That's correct.  We don't play to schedule anything against them.

GISELLA GRUBER:           Nothing?  Wonderful.  Then we've got a time for a 60-minute Working Group.  Again, the AOC and organizational review supporting ICANN accountability - is that something that…

ALAN GREENBERG:           Gisella, may I interrupt?  Looking at the schedule, I presume they'll extend that coffee break, in that case, opposite the GAC meeting?

GISELLA GRUBER:           Don't worry about the coffee break!  The AOC and organization review supporting ICANN accountability, can we schedule anything there?  Or is that something everyone's likely going to want to go to?

ALAN GREENBERG:           I suspect we can schedule against that if necessary.  I'd like to think everyone finds that riveting, but I don't believe that's the case.  We may need to be careful about what we schedule against it, but I don't think it's completely sacred.  Any disagreements?  Cheryl, are you okay with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Yes, although I'll be in that meeting, so that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I will likely also be.  If we schedule anything against it, we're going to have to be careful what we schedule against it.

GISELLA GRUBER:     Something that sprung to mind was, for instance, the LACRALO monthly meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:     That's certainly a possibility.  There are a couple of other ones that might fit.

GISELLA GRUBER:     I'm just putting here that both you and Cheryl will be in that.  That already cuts out accessibility metrics, et cetera.  Then the slot that we've kept over the meetings is the At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting from 12:00 to 13:30.  Then we've got the AFRALO Meeting.  In the afternoon we've got the CCWG Engagement Session.  What you see on your schedule there about the policy and implementation is not confirmed at all.  That is something we had from Singapore, and which I've currently put in there as a placeholder in case it does get scheduled.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  I'm sure there's going to be something, but at the rate we're going with our things we may not have something.

GISELLA GRUBER:     With the CCWG Engagement Session, is everyone going to attend that?

ALAN GREENBERG:    I think we're going to make that a mandatory one for our group, so I suspect we'll call that an ALAC Session, and we do not want to schedule against it. I presume someone else will speak up if they don't agree with that. I can't imagine that not being relevant to everyone in our group.

GISELLA GRUBER:    Wonderful. Then we've got a 90-minute session. We'll see which Working Group we'll put there, before the LACRALO Showcase, which is likely to be on the Wednesday evening. Coming onto Thursday we have the CWG Working Session, CCWG Working Session. That means that the morning has gone, and we have the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap Up Session, which is now only one and a half hours. Is that going to be sufficient? We don't have much of a choice to start earlier.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Almost surely not. What choices… It doesn't look like we have much choice. It's sandwiched into the lunch hour. What time do things start earlier that day?

GISELLA GRUBER:    Alan, all I have is 8:30 as a start that day - the CWG is at 8:30.

ALAN GREENBERG:    So we could do a 7:30 to 8:30 if we need to.

GISELLA GRUBER:        Yes.  We could have a one-hour slot there.


ALAN GREENBERG:        Pencil that in.


GISELLA GRUBER:        Okay.  Which means we don't have much time to schedule the other Working Groups, so it's going to be a question of finding time we don't have.  So the 7:00 meeting means not having 7:00 meetings may again, in Buenos Aires, not materialize.


ALAN GREENBERG:        I think that's life.  There are just so many of these CWG/CCWG Meetings, that they're tying it up.  I don't think we have a lot of choice.


GISELLA GRUBER:        Unfortunately not.  Now that we've gone through this, I'll work with Leon and Alan on this; keeping the ALT updated on what we're doing, and try and find reasonable slots for all the Working Groups that need to meet.


ALAN GREENBERG:        I'll note that since breakfast is provided with the hotel, that makes it even worse.  That means we're not likely to get breakfast provided and if people want something they're going to have to be up even earlier.  I think to the extent possible, we don't want to make anything earlier than 7:30.

GISELLA GRUBER:          Yes.   Apparently breakfast is served 6:00 onwards, so we have no excuse.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Well, but at the same time we're trying to make sure people get at least a few hours sleep.

GISELLA GRUBER:          Absolutely.   Last but not least, I sent Leon and Alan the NCSG… Something that was mentioned during the Board Meeting; whether we should meet up with the NCSG or not.  Do you remember that?

ALAN GREENBERG:          I believe the context was that Wolfgang said the NCSG is planning something, and I think that was before ICANN…  Something that he was talking about - that we might want to think about talking to them. That's my recollection of it, anyway.  I don't know if anyone else recalls anything different, but I'm pretty sure he's talking about some activity prior to ICANN, and anything prior to ICANN this time around is completely ruled out.   NCSG might do something, but I don't think we're going to be able to participate jointly with them.  I don't think that's an issue right now.  If anyone remembers something differently, we can go back to the transcript and…

GISELLA GRUBER:     That's what the transcript…

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  Are you sure it was this?

GISELLA GRUBER:     Yes, I'll share it.  I'll speak it out.  The transcript for the Board ALAC Meeting in Singapore, Tijani said: "Yes, for Marrakech there is a lot of activities planned and one of them is engagement of the local community, so we have a program for the new generation, and also we have a program for engaging with the local At-Large community - and not only At-Large, the local ICANN community."  This is what was the question.  Wolfgang Kleinwächter answered: "To avoid reinventing the wheel and duplication, my strong recommendation is that the ALAC coordinates with the NCSG.

"They have the same discussion.  They plan to organize at each ICANN Meeting a special workshop or symposium with the local community in coordination with the local university, and it would be perfect and feed into the cross-constituency collaboration if you would do it together." End of transcript.

ALAN GREENBERG:     He's definitely referring to something that's held outside of the normal ICANN powers.  Normally the NCSG Meeting is typically on a Friday.  So I don't think it really applies now.  But you said this was a quote from which meeting at the Singapore Meeting?

GISELLA GRUBER:          At the Board/ALAC Meeting in Singapore.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Then why was Tijani referring to Marrakech, which was where Singapore was supposed to be held?  I'm confused.


GISELLA GRUBER:          I tried to read through and pick up on it…


ALAN GREENBERG:          I believe it says that, but I'm not sure I quite understand.  Olivier?


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Perhaps could you follow up with Wolfgang on one side and with the Chair of the NCSG, who I believe is Rafik Damak, in case there is something?  I don't know where we all are with regards to our travel, but if the NCSG is having a pre-event event, it might be worth having someone from At-Large being there, because I do think that they have asked for funding, for pre-event events, and they have received some in the past.  Unfortunately, the ALAC had completely missed out on that, and that might be one of the things that Wolfgang is pointing out.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you Olivier.  If you could add an AI for me to follow up on it?

GISELLA GRUBER:      Back to me, we're on Friday.  We have an ALT Meeting, and that is the
                     end of the BA Meeting draft so far.


ALAN GREENBERG:      The AI is to follow up with Rafik, not Wolfgang.  Thank you very much.
                     Anything else?  Is there anything else on this Meeting, or should I go
                     onto 7.b?  Nothing from Leon, nothing from Gisella.  7.b - not going to
                     talk about it a lot.  There was an announcement from Steve Crocker
                     today on new formats for Board/community interaction.  There will be
                     an opportunity to have a targeted AC/SO Session, or ALAC/Board
                     Session.  The format will be slightly different.  It will be a round-table,
                     typically six Board Members and six representatives from the ALAC At-
                     Large, that we identify.

                     The topic or topics are selected by us, if we want one.  If we say we have
                     nothing to talk to them about then that's okay too, but I think we'll
                     probably come up with some.  We will be spending a bit of time, as we
                     go forward, coming up with a topic that we hope will be useful to us and
                     hopefully to the Board.  In addition to that there will be one or two
                     sessions of - the Agenda points to the document talking about this -
                     which will be community-wide.  That is, topics of interest to everybody
                     will not be held one-on-one with the Board, but will be held in a wider
                     environment.  I won't go into the details.  You can read them yourself.

                     I both was told, and can tell from the details, that a significant amount of
                     time and thought went into this.  I think it's going to be worth trying,
                     and certainly providing feedback, but the success of these are going to
                     be completely dependent on identification of topics and selection of the

right people to be the speakers. We're going to put a little bit more effort into this than we have in the past, to make sure it is in fact a productive and useful session. I'm encouraged that they didn't go off and simply implement the first thing that the Board had suggested when they were talking about this in Singapore.

They've ended up with something quite different from what they were originally talking about, and I find that rather promising. Whether it will work or not remains to be seen, but I think we have to do our best to try. Any quick comments on that before we go onto Items? No hands? People are completely tired. All right, the next Item is the April Agenda for the ALAC Meeting that's coming up. This Meeting, Gisella, correct me if I'm wrong but I now believe it's been scheduled at three different slots. Every time we find a place to put it, a CWG or CCWG Meeting is scheduled on top of it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes. We had a good slot next Thursday but that's just been gobbled up by one of the CCWG Meetings. As it looks now - I was jut following up with individual ALAC Members - I only have Hadja and Rafid who haven't responded to the Doodle poll, but as it stands now, it will be the following Thursday, Thursday 30th of April from 19:00 to 21:00 UTC. Sandra Hoferichter is the only ALAC Member who can't attend at that time. We'll be sending the notification out tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I yearn for the days when people scheduling other meetings would check to see if there was a conflict. I guess we

now have a hierarchy of meeting schedule and precedence; that we just have to work around the CWGs - said with just a slight bit of bitterness, Leon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Alan, I've got to jump in here, because Gisella should follow up on this. I've certainly bitched and moaned at the staff involved in the CWG and CCWG to check with other staff, specifically Gisella, and they're too bloody stupid to listen to good advice, someone needs to say something.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Cheryl, to be honest, I get the impression it's not the staff but the Chairs who are calling these shots, but I may be wrong on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Well, all I know is we've wiggled those two-hour and sometimes two and three-hour blocks now for the 24th and 25th, all over the 48-hour cycle, and they certainly could have been wiggled to avoid the ALAC Meeting, in my view, if they'd taken notice of what was said to them.

ALAN GREENBERG:     You noticed the bitterness in my comment, so we're completely agreeing with each other. Hopefully whenever we schedule it now, they will not plop another meeting on this next week, but I'm not holding my breath.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, just to say that I spend absolutely hours on this scheduling with checking all the calendars, checking the CWG, checking the CCWG, checking the calendar invites that come through, and I have… Grace and Brenda probably don't like me, because whenever a calendar invite is sent and I see any kind of conflict, I need to know who is on that meeting, if there's a conflict… And I've asked already for next week. I've said, "I've got a very important meeting to schedule, it's an ALAC Meeting, a very important meeting to schedule, and I need to know what the likelihood is of it again being pushed around."

I said, "I can't have it done again." As you said, I don't know what powers they have, but every day, I'm constantly in touch with all the schedules, and even Cheryl's NomCom schedule. So there's been a lot of work put into this, and yet the CWG and CCWG will take… They're the first ones to get the slots.

ALAN GREENBERG: I appreciate your effort, and I think Cheryl and I have supported you on that. Someone needs to tell them that they don't have first choice, at the very last moment, for scheduling meetings without considering what other things are scheduled. At least, they shouldn't have. They seem to at this point. We're not going to solve that at this meeting, but if you need anyone else to write nasty letters, I'm sure we can find someone. Items for the Agenda - if anyone has any, please let us know. Any Other Business? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much Alan.  I have two Items for Any Other Business.  The first one is to do with the CCWG on Internet Governance.  I wanted to find out where we were on this and how we are going to proceed.  The Working Group itself, as one of the people there leading the charge or something, I've not received any negative feedback from any of the communities so far for proceeding with the change.  So it will very soon officially ask the different ACs and SOs for a change in their Charter.  Just to remind you all quickly - what's required of the ALAC is…

ALAN GREENBERG:    Olivier, may I interrupt?  A vote will be started tomorrow night.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.  I just wanted to make sure with you - is a vote going to be started on the original…?

ALAN GREENBERG:    The vote is being started on the Charter, modifying "observers" to "participants" and not requiring appointment by the ALAC, and Ariel doesn't know yet, but appointing you as Co Chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.  I need to make sure this is done correctly, because what the vote should do is there should be a vote that votes on the Charter, as it was originally received by the ALAC.  Then, I don't know whether you want to do a vote or something, but there should be something that there's no objection from the ALAC to amending the Membership of this Charter.

Because if we vote on a Charter that has the amendments already in, then we're voting on a Charter that is different than all of the other ACs and SOs, and that will trigger a whole thing of all the other ACs and SOs needing to vote…

ALAN GREENBERG:     Please read what is in the chat.  Tell me if it's okay.  If it isn't, tell me how to change it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Yes, I'm not sure.  I'm not a process guy on this.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I am a process guy.  We're voting on the Charter, as written with the understanding that we'll be interpreting the terms differently.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, excellent.  That's perfect then.  Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:     There will be another sentence, which I forgot to include when I sent it to Ariel, saying we're naming you as a Co Chair from the ALAC's Chartering Group, essentially.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Fine.  Ariel, I'll send you some words.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks for this, Alan.  Should I just ask also at that point - once that is through and once the vote has been done, if there could be a call for Members?  I'm surprised that we have so few people from At-Large involved directly in this.  Internet governance is something that our Members are very strong on.  There are a lot of people from NCSG, a lot of people from other parts of ICANN, but not many from At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Olivier, as soon as the vote is announced, I think it's fair game for you to presume it will be approved and call for Members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Excellent.  Thanks.  So that's one.  The second one is a CCWG on the Use of ICANN Auction Funds.  Now, this is one where I'm not entirely sure on whether you, as Chair of the ALAC, have received the call for Members for this new CCWG that the GNSO is proposing?  I was on the GNSO call a little earlier today, and there was a discussion on a letter that was received from Steve Crocker, and understood to be on behalf of the Board, in response to the proposal that the GNSO has made.  What has happened is at the moment there's an estimated $56 million worth of funds in the kitty coming from auction funds.

The GNSO originally wanted to have a Working Group in the GNSO about this. Of course, there was interest from other SOs and ACs, and it was quickly understood that a CCWG would be a better option. The pushback has been now from Steve Crocker, it appears. Although he hasn't said, "We don't want that." What he has mentioned in his letter was that ICANN was currently looking at engaging all sorts of communities, including communities outside of ICANN, to find out what to do with those auction funds, and that the input from the CCWG on such a use would be considered.

That's not at all what ICANN had originally said when the kitty was put together a few years ago. There are real concerns about this, and I don't know to what extent we can already get engaged on this, to push for the CCWG and not start getting scattered around and have funds being given over to Net Mundial initiatives and others. I'm only citing Net Mundial as an example - not judging Net Mundial - but on those funds finally funding all sorts of things, and actually not coming to the ICANN community, who has worked very hard for this. Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:         Thank you. I'll tell you what I know. We were told the GNSO is interested in forming a Working Group, and were we interested in making it a CCWG and would we participate. I told them yes, in no uncertain terms. I've heard nothing back so far. At least, I don't believe I have, so you're giving me new information. I know nothing about this letter from Steve. We'll look into it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     All right.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     If you can send me a pointer to the letter or something else like that, that would be fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks Alan.   What I'll try and do is locate it on the GNSO call documentation and I'll forward it over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you very much.  Anything else?  Not a thing.  37 minutes later. Everyone enjoy their breakfasts, dinners or lunches.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     That's not too shabby.  There's a lot of work to do, Alan.  Don't be tough on yourself.  You did well.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**