
ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let's give it a go.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. We'll get the recording started now. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's first meeting of the At-Large Ad Hoc New Meeting Strategy Working Party on Thursday, 21st of May at 15:00 UTC. On today's call we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Yasuichi Kitamura, Beran Gillen, Maureen Hilyard, Satish Babu and Sébastien Bachollet.

Apologies noted from Carlos Aguirre, and from staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could 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. This group is being convened to try to come up with a plan for what At-Large and ALAC in specific do with regard to the new meeting strategies, and since the B meetings are the one which is the largest departure from our normal processes, or what we've done to-date, there will certainly be a focus on those. I think we'll also be looking however at the overall repercussions and implications of the new meeting strategy. one of them which came up the other day, which I don't think anyone had thought up actively, was since the purpose of having GAs and Summits is typically to...

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.

At least one of the reasons is to expose ALS representatives to an ICANN Meeting in all of its glory, we're probably restricting ourselves to only A or C Meetings for those types of events, which makes the scheduling of them a little more complex, because there simply aren't as many meetings in a year to choose from. Moreover, it also implies that, if you look at the meeting agenda, we tend to be saying that certain regions will be used for B meetings, if not exclusively, then to a large extent.

That also is going to make it particularly difficult to hold GAs and things like that, at a non-B meeting in those regions. I think there's a whole host of implications we're going to have to look at, and I don't think we want to restrict ourselves to one single aspect of this meeting strategy. The other issue that we're going to want to talk about, that we want to do in the near future, hopefully perhaps in this meeting or very soon after, is to identify a Chair who'll take responsibility for seeing this process through. I'm Chairing this meeting but I don't intend to be the Chair on an ongoing basis, although I do intend to participate.

I guess I'd like to open it, to start with, of how would people like to select the Chair? Do we just want to ask for volunteers and pick among them, if we have more than one? Or do we want some other process? Any thoughts? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. I think that since there are people who are not present now on this call, we may ask on the list for volunteers, and among them we try to choose one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem with that. Anyone disagree or want to support it with a tick? Otherwise I'd accept that as the recommendation of how we go forward.

BERAN GILLEN: I missed what Tijani said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani said that since we don't have everyone on this call, his suggestion was to put a call for volunteers for Chair out on the list, and if we get more than one, somehow come up with a way to decide who it is.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you. That sounds good.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we only get one it's a really easy decision. All right, we have a way going forward. The next thing is how often do we believe we need meetings? The first D Meeting is scheduled for June next year, I think. Is that correct? The first D Meeting is scheduled for Latin America in June of 2016.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So we have about a year in theory until the meeting, but of course meeting planning starts a lot before the meeting, so we really need to have a plan by the time we leave Marrakech, and that is in March, which is about ten months away. We have a fair amount of time, but it's not completely outrageous. I think once a week is probably overkill at this point, although we may have to go to weekly meetings later on.

I'd suggest either every two weeks or once a month to start with. I have a slight preference for saying every two weeks, because once a month puts it out of our reach a bit too much. We have two speakers - Sébastien then Tijani.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

I am fine with once every two weeks. I just want to be sure that everyone's aware that the new meeting strategy will be implemented, starting in Marrakech. It could be also useful to have a thought about this first meeting, which will be an A Meeting, but it will be the first one, and whether [unclear 07:33] that will happen during the whole year next year; the one in Marrakech, the one in Latin America and the last one which will be [unclear]. Yes, that's my point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Yes, you're correct. The first official meeting of the new strategy is in Marrakech, but it's a meeting very much akin to what we're doing right now, and I don't think it's going to require a lot of innovative planning to be able to handle that one. Certainly to the extent we want to address A Meetings, we're going to have to do it in

time for Marrakech planning, which starts immediately after Dublin, but I don't think it's...

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Alan, I'll slightly disagree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Sébastian. We seem to have lost Sébastian, who was disagreeing with me. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I think that if we make it once every two weeks it would be good, because we'll have to skip some calls. For example, if we are [by 09:04] a meeting of ICANN, people are travelling, et cetera, so we'll skip some, and I think that one meeting every two weeks would be good to prepare ourselves for 2016. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Is there any strong preference? Do we try to move them around to accommodate people in different time zones, or just try to find a time that's acceptable to all? I can certainly live with both. Anyone have a strong preference? Moving meetings around tends to be both difficult to do - based on experience - and a little harder for people to plan, because the different meetings times tend to mean that different people can attend different ones.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Is today a good day to have it, this time?

ALAN GREENBERG: If we say Thursday at this time our life is easier; we don't have to do a Doodle. I'd suggest perhaps that we verify that on emails to cover the people... Because we don't have a significant number of people on this call, but I'm certainly happy to attempt to suggest we do it every two weeks, starting with this meeting, same time, same day, and see if there are any strong objections. That makes our life a lot easier. We have a couple of checkmarks. I think we've come to closure on that. Sébastien, if you're back and want to comment, please do. You were disagreeing with me on...

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Yes. Now, it's not I am really disagreeing with you. I just think that we have to be careful that there is, I will say, small changes, but those changes could be important to how we schedule At-Large and ALAC Meetings, because, for example, the proposal is to have all the second part of the afternoon and beginning of the evening with cross-community meetings, and that could impact how we organize the whole day. The second, very important point, is that we'll have two public meetings.

That means the first one must be prepared in advance to raise a question we want to raise during the meeting and be able to have some discussion during the meeting and get a possible answer or way forward at the end of the meeting with the second Public Forum. It's not to disagree with you - I just think we need to take that into account, even if

the more important change is, as you say, [unclear 19:18] the B Meeting.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For clarity Sébastien, as we are scheduling the meeting and doing the planning, we're certainly going to have to be looking at the new meeting schedule associated with it. What I was talking about is to what extent this group must provide guidance to doing that. Certainly, because of the change in how the days are laid out and what the days are used for, that will have a major impact and input into the actual scheduling process. There's no question about that. I was only referring to the guidance this group will be providing to help do that. I think to a lesser extent that will be for the B. I may be proved to be wrong, and in which case so be it.

All right. The last thing is working methods. I think we've pretty well established that we do most of our work via a combination of mailing lists and Wikis. Wikis work when we're trying to develop some formal proposal, and mailing lists for part of the normal conversation. We've also used Google Docs and things like that when we're actively in the midst of drafting something, if it's a joint drafting effort, and I think this group, like others, will be flexible and try and pick the right tools at the right time. But certainly mailing lists and Wikis are the prime vehicle we'll be using, unless there are any really strong objection to that.

That being said, I think that we are at the stage where I think our administrivia is over. I'd like to turn it over to either Heidi or [Tanzanika

14:09] to give us an overview of where we are right now. I understand there's a potential conflict for [Tanzanika].

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Hi everyone. Thanks Alan. [Tanzanika] of the meeting staff was planning on reviewing the schedule for the new meeting strategy, but she unfortunately is unable to join us as she is currently on a call presenting about the BA Meeting. I'm going to quickly run through the actual [unclear 14:38] that was just posted this morning. If you could take a look at this new one, it's slightly changed from what had been posted earlier. Gisella, if you could make sure that's on the AC? There we are. Perfect. Meeting A, which this group will need to provide information on to the meeting staff - [IBA 5:00] - will now begin on Saturday.

The change is that it was going to start on Sunday, but very recently, it's officially now going to start [at 1:00 15:11] on Saturday. So it's a six-day meeting. This will be the spring, our March Meeting. Sébastien noted there are two Public Forums; one on Monday, one on Thursday. There will be a Welcome Ceremony on the Monday, as normal, and there will be a lot of days committed to [unclear 15:30] community work. If you can take a look at that. I don't think I need to go through every day. Meeting B, this is the second meeting of the year, likely always in June. This will be a four-day meeting, primarily for AC/SO work and community outreach. They're hoping these meetings will be in areas ICANN couldn't go to previously, given its larger size of the A and C Meetings.

This one is expected to be around 800 people, so a smaller format. Again, only four days. The first day, Monday, will be on outreach. That is a key area that this group might want to look at - is what the outreach might look like. Day two is inter-community work, as is day three, and then day four is intra-community work. Again, that meeting B is the primary meeting that meeting staff would like to hear from you about, but they're very interested in hearing your views on all meetings.

Meeting C is the third meeting of the year, at the AGM. This is a long meeting, seven days. Two Public Forums, one on Monday, one on Thursday. The first day is Saturday with a lot of outreach and capacity building and intra-community work. Then inter-community work for the Sunday. Very similar to what we currently have on day three - Monday, the Welcome Ceremony, high interest topics, and Tuesday will be AC/SO reports to the community [set back 17:11]. Additionally, more high interest topics on the Tuesday, and moving to Wednesday, very similar to the Tuesday.

The actual Thursday will be the Board Meeting, and then day seven on Friday will be intra-community work and wrap-ups. So that is the new schedule. Now, other groups, other SOs and ACs have already presented their schedules, and we're going to be looking at what the GNSO presented. This is something that the meeting staff have looked at and have said that this is a very good format. So if this group would like to take a similar approach in how they'd set the schedule that they would like to see in these meetings, this might be something of interest.

You'll see that what the GNSO did is they highlighted in yellow their meetings that they'd wish to see during these. So for Meeting A they'll

be having meetings all the way through. That is their schedule in detail. Meeting B in a similar format, all the way through, and in detail, and [unclear 18:44] is Meeting C. It's just highlighting what they'd like to do and with the detail. Again, the meeting staff will be meeting with the ALAC [MBA 18:57] as well as all groups, and that's why I'm glad you decided to meet every two weeks, because this is something they'd really like to hear from you on by the time of BA.

Obviously, they'll be chances to revise as we go along, but if you could get the overall format by BA then meeting staff will be able to discuss that with you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Heidi. Could you please give us scrolling to the document that's there right now? I have a question. Can someone define intra-community and inter-community, and specifically define community? It's not a trick question, it's a serious one. If you look at the GNSO, they are clearly treating communities as the different component parts of the GNSO, because they're taking intra-community time and having their normal weekend sessions they always have had. The question is, what is community? I have a follow up question, but I'll let that one stand. Seb?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

That's a very good question, Alan. The idea of the Working Group was to allow inside an AC the intra, and to talk about work between parts of total SOs or other SOs, or ACs with ACs, and it will be inter-community. That was the idea, because we felt that this second part, the exchange between silos, as we were talking about, that the ACs and SOs were not

done enough, and it's a question. If the GNSO is considering itself as a silod organization with only five days to meet, then we'll need a ten-day meeting, I guess.

We'll have to revisit the whole meeting strategy, but really, the idea of the group was to allow work between SOs and ACs as inter-community work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I read the original schedule wrong. Saturday/Sunday is intra, so their use of Saturday/Sunday is correct, but on the other days it's not quite the same. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Inter-community for us is our meetings with the other constituencies of ICANN. It means our meetings with the Board, the ccNSO, et cetera. Intra-community is our work of ALAC inside the ALAC - ALAC with the Leadership, with the RALO Leadership, et cetera. All our work of ALAC. That's' all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As I said, I did misread the schedule. The question was driven by my incorrect assumption. How do we want to proceed? My feeling is this group is too large to draft something, and my inclination normally is to charge a small number of people with coming up with a proposal and then have everyone else tear it apart. That tends to be a more effective way of coming up with an end product, but I'm willing to listen to others' suggestions. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I suggest that as the GNSO has put something together, to use that, to debate it, to come up with our own schedule - use something like that and just brainstorm between two or three of us and present it to the whole group, and then we go from there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you're agreeing with me.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I am. I am.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just checking! In that case, do we have some volunteers? Again, I'll do this on the list because of people not being here. But be prepared to volunteer if indeed you have an interest in working - volunteers to create the straw man.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I can be part of that group. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. What else do we need to do at this point? The Agenda had a review of the current At-Large meeting schedule. Is Gisella on the call at this point and can she speak?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you're on.

GISELLA GRUBER: Fantastic. I'm just going to put up a document that several of you have seen, which is the Excel format as opposed to the individual Wiki pages. I think those who've been on the ALAC call as well as the ALT call recently have seen this. There are only a couple of changes so far, and otherwise all this is reflected on the individual Wiki meeting pages on the BA ICANN 53 workspace. I'm not sure if everyone wants to go through the schedule again, but the basic structure of this is we start on the Saturday with the ALT Meeting.

What's been added this time in BA is the RALO Chairs' Meeting, due to the fact that they're going to be attending the Friday Roundtable with Fadi - the SO/AC/SG RALO Chairs' Meeting in the afternoon, followed by a dinner. So on the Saturday they'll be having a meeting, followed by a meeting with Rinalia, as Rinalia is not able to attend the ALT Meeting on the closing Friday of the ICANN Meeting, or should I say the Friday following the end of the ICANN Meeting, because we're the only group to have a meeting on that day.

The Sunday and Tuesday are generally kept for the ALAC Working Sessions, with additionally on the Tuesday the meeting with the Board and the GAC, as well as a Working Group. The Monday of the past few Meetings has been essentially for the CWG and the CCWG, as well as the

high interest topic meetings and the Welcome Ceremony. What we've done this time around, due to the lack of actual meeting slots we've been able to find for meetings, is the NARALO Meeting on Monday and the At-Large Technology Taskforce Meetings, there are a few overlaps but that's unavoidable at this stage of trying to put this together.

Wednesday we have our RALO Meetings as well as our traditional At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting and the AFRALO Meeting. The evening will be our Showcase, as well as our Working Group, which is the ICANN Academy. On Thursday we've managed to fit in the wrap up session, which will be in two parts - a very early start and then the lunchtime session, due there again to the CWG and the CCWG Working Sessions. We have the Public Forum as per usual in the afternoon, and we end on Friday with the ALT Meeting. As a heads-up, there will be no music night in BA and no Gala either.

The change you've seen at the moment that we're working on is possibly the ccNSO and ALAC Meeting moving from the Tuesday, a very early morning, to the Sunday, some time in the afternoon. I'm sure everyone will be delighted with that news. And we've also been notified on the CCWG Session with the Board on Sunday afternoon from 15:00 to 16:00. That is my update so far. Thank you. If you have any questions I'll open the floor now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a question, Gisella. You've been doing this for a while. As you look at the new meeting schedule, what is your reaction? Is this going to make your life hell? Make it easier?

GISELLA GRUBER: As it stands now, just taking one look at the block schedules, it's just a puzzle. I think a great way forward would be to be able to come up with a similar proposal as the GNSO, and if we're a small group working on that, I think we could be quite efficient and making moving ahead for A, B and C, make it quite clear on the meetings we'll be scheduling and possibly make it easier. But until we've put this, as well as the A, B and C together, it's a little bit of a chessboard.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have one more question, but we'll go to Tijani first.

GISELLA GRUBER: Tijani, are you able to speak?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I am able to speak. I sent an email to you and to Alan about a new meeting scheduled by the CCWG with the Board, and it's on Sunday from 15:00 to 16:00, which is really in the middle of our work as ALAC. What will happen?

GISELLA GRUBER: Tijani, we've made note of this meeting on the Sunday afternoon from 15:00 to 16:00. We're not actually going to just stop the work we'll have on that day. I'm just checking what we've put in... We haven't yet identified which meeting will be at that time. We're trying to move

groups around to fit in best with the CCWG Members not actually being there, so hopefully by the end of the week we might have clarity on that, or early next week. It's not ideal, put it that way.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I know.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The other thing I want to raise, and I'm not asking for an answer or not, but with the strong delineation between inter, intra and things like that, I have a little bit of concern that we have people within our communities who tend to focus on specific things. I worry there are going to be potentially large parts of the schedule where, because we are sharply saying what's going to be happening during that kind of sessions, what kind of meetings are we scheduling, that we may have people who, I presume, will not go sightseeing but will stay around, but not necessarily be particularly focused on what's going on.

I'm expressing a concern. That's going to have to be something that plays out, and maybe the result is people get wider perspectives on what they're interested in. If so, that's probably a good outcome of it. There's stuff going on in the chat, and I haven't quite understood what the discussion is about; about what we're restricting two RALO reps and not, so if anyone wants to actually speak instead of putting cryptic remarks in the chat, I wouldn't mind. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I was just looking at we do have the five reps for this particular group, and I wondered if we're going to be putting forward a discussion paper, that the group that's formed does select reps of the different RALOs - especially as in some meetings, like this small B Meeting, it will be different RALO groups, like the ones we're planning for, the RALO that's actually going to be hosting that meeting, they should actually have some input. But I'm easy with whoever is involved in that initial paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Maureen. Some jurisdictions actually have enacted laws against slavery, so we probably can't force people to do it, but we can certainly point out if a given region is missing from the list of volunteers. That was a joke, for those who weren't aware of it. Tijani, is that a new hand or an old hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's a new hand. Responding to your concern about intra and inter-community work, it certainly has some disadvantage, but it has the big advantage that our work in the intra-community Working Groups and all the Working Groups where we're all there - in the Finance, everywhere - we are not obliged to lose our work in ALAC to go there, which is the case now. This division between intra and inter, in my point of view, is a big benefit to us. We'll not be obliged to be here or there - we'll be here and there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understood. Thank you. One thing we haven't talked about yet is travel. Currently we fund travel for these meetings for the 15 ALAC Members, two RALO Leaders, and Liaisons who aren't otherwise funded - the three prime Liaisons to the GNSO, ccNSO and SSAC. Are we presuming that will be the same? I'm assuming that overall we have the ability to fund the same number of people in a year. I'm also assuming that certainly in the past we've had some discretion of how we use those individual funding slots.

So it's conceivable that we can say that certain people do not attend the B Meeting, or C or A Meeting, but other people, perhaps a wider group, attend something else. I'm just wondering if anyone has any thoughts on this. No one cares? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Sorry to be always speaking, but your question is intriguing me. The re-organization of the meetings is not to make people come or not come, or some people come and others don't. It's to make the meetings efficient and avoid the problem of having allocations of wide meetings. That's all. I think we need to keep, at least for the 15 ALAC Members and RALO Leaders, to come to each meeting. I don't think it's wise to change that in another way, because it will be a real mess and it will be a real problem. I don't want to be inside the re-organization of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I wasn't suggesting we do it. The question was raised by ICANN Management at one point, and I think it's a valid question to ask. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I was going to say to Tijani that yes, this was made to make sure the meetings had a more efficient flow. When we interviewed many of the SOs and ACs they told us that they couldn't be in two meetings at the same time, and that's how the inter and intra thing came about. So you do it one time and then you do it in-between. In any case, I don't remember having the conversation of which people will go to this meeting or not, and we look at Meeting B, which is really our work, and we were able to go to a specific place that we couldn't before, to do more of the outreach.

In other words, I don't think these kinds of people should go to all of the meetings, and if there is flexibility and all those things that are important to think about, and which persons should go or not, that might be different, I think. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other thoughts? I'll give an example of the kinds of thing one could do, and I'm not advocating, but just using imagination. If a B Meeting is explicitly for outreach, clearly outreach within the city we're working with is something that's going to be easy to achieve. Outreach within the region is not. We might choose to say that the Regional Leaders who, in many cases are not as involved in Working Groups as the ALAC Members, from a region where a B Meeting is not being held, don't

participate. That frees up eight slots that we could bring other people into participate in the meeting, from within the region.

Again, I'm not advocating, but that's an example of the kind of thing we could do, if it meets the form of the meeting to a better extent. Just something to think about as we go forward. It's not necessarily anything that's good or bad, but we may want to look at it and not restrict ourselves from it. Yes, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Alan. I think the way you are thinking, the idea you're proposing somehow, I think that's a very good idea, especially for the B Meeting. If we can bring in more people from the same region, we will help in the outreach. I believe that. The question I have is, is this change something we can bring to the ALAC and discuss it there as a group and see what people think about this B Meeting in order to have more people from the same region to help with the outreach, than bringing in people from other regions to outreach to a region they don't know?

ALAN GREENBERG:

For the record, I think that anything we do is going to go to the ALAC, but you raise an interesting point - that we may well have, as we develop our plans, we may well come to specific questions that we want a wider input from than those in this meeting, and go back to the ALAC or At-Large in general and ask for opinions. I think the ALAC does need to get involved certainly at the end, but perhaps as we go forward. I'll point out, although it's perhaps obvious, that if we use a B Meeting for

example to get more people from the region, that also means that there are some people we are not bringing to some meetings. Because the total number of travel slots, I don't expect, is not expected to grow - at least not because of this process. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. If I follow your reasoning, that means that we'll not need the Regional Leaders at each meeting. It means that once a year we'll lose one occasion or one meeting with the RALO Leadership.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excluding the RALO Leadership from the region we're in. That is the implication of that, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know. Yes. So second point: if we try to bring more people in from this region where the B Meeting is held, this will minimize the chance of the opportunities for us to bring them again for a Summit or for a GA, because I don't think ICANN Management will accept to bring them twice or several times like this. I prefer to think of this question very carefully. It may have implications - very big implications. First of all, I think that the interaction with the RALO Leaders is very important, and we need to make them more effective in our meetings.

If that's right, then their contribution is not that big. But we must make it more important, because this is, if you want, one of the objectives; to make our community more effective. Second point: I want to avoid any way to minimize the chance to have our Summits or GAs. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. A couple of thoughts on that. First of all, if we have at extra eight travel slots, for if we're talking about the B Meeting, that's not going to be instead of a GA, because we don't have any regions that small. So clearly we're reusing those slots for something else, other than trying to have a fake GA. I don't think the two necessarily interact, but you're absolutely correct - we're going to need to think carefully about everything we're doing, and almost any suggestion we make, and certainly the things that are already in the plan all have implications and second-order affects that we have to consider. That's why we're together here.

Again, I wasn't trying to push that as an idea, but it's the kind of question that I think we need to investigate. You are very right - we may well find out that our Regional Leaders are not as involved in the things that we're going to be doing at a B Meeting. The solution may well not be, "Don't bring them," but, "What do we have to do to get them more involved?" I don't think we want to restrict ourselves to a particular solution, even when we've identified a specific problem. All right, we're getting towards the end of the hour. The next Item on the Agenda was "way forward" and I think we already have the way forward.

We're going to be putting together a small group that will start drawing up some plans, and let the entire group and if necessary the ALAC for individual issues comment on them. Is there any other thoughts on what we want to cover in terms of how we go forward at this point? We will of course need someone who'll lead that small group. That may end up being the Chair of the overall Working Group, or it may be someone

else - a Working Party. Anything else anyone wants to raise? Or we can terminate a few minutes early.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, just to clarify that the work of the small group, has that been identified? Or is that still to identify on the mailing list?

ALAN GREENBERG: The work of the small group essentially is to start drawing up plans akin to what we've seen from the GNSO proposals on how to go forward.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, but has that small group been identified yet?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're going to do a call on the mailing list, because we don't have very good attendance at this meeting, and it's not sufficiently wide.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Great. That's a good first step. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else we need to cover? Then I thank you for your attendance here. Please participate on the list. Perhaps by the time we have our next meeting in two weeks, I won't be Chair anymore. Thank you all. Have a good day, whatever's left of it in your part of the world. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]