RAF FATANI:	…Purpose of this meeting really is to discuss and move on from our initial discussions that we've had in Buenos Aires on the Drafting Strategy on the new meeting format. Without going into detail of what some other people are going to talk about today, I think it would be important for us to focus on Meeting B, on the Outreach Strategy. Going into the Agenda, we'll be reviewing the…
GISELLA GRUBER:	Raf, sorry to interrupt. Do you mind if I do just a quick roll call so that it is on the recording and the transcript?
RAF FATANI:	Absolutely, yes.
GISELLA GRUBER:	Thank you very much. Welcome to the At-Large Ad Hoc New Meeting Strategy Drafting Team Meeting, on Thursday, 9th of July at 15:00 UTC. On today's call we have Yasuichi Kitamura, Satish Babu, Sébastian Bachollet, Beran Gillen Vanda Scartezini, Eduardo Diaz, Raf Fatani, Alan Greenberg and Sandra Hoferichter. Apologies noted today from Tijani Ben Jemaa and Maureen Hilyard. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If I could please also remind you to state your names, very important, for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Raf.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. Going to the Agenda very quickly, we'll be reviewing the Team's activities at ICANN 53. Eduardo will be discussing the Drafting Team's schedule and reporting on that. Unfortunately Maureen won't be with us, as Gisella mentioned her apologies, so I'm uncertain if someone else is going to take over from her regarding the think tank coming up and outreach initiatives. We can talk about that and brainstorm some ideas, and then we can set out tasks for our next meeting.

In Buenos Aires I went to a Cross Community Working Group, the time that was set up with the GNSO, with regard to all the other ACs and SOs and what their intentions are with regard to how the new meeting format was going to affect them. Notably the GNSO had its own line of thought on how they were going to approach this. They intended to almost business as usual, surprisingly. What I understood from them is that they were trying to squeeze in as much as what they were doing in the past in the shorter meeting, rather than trying to find creative ways and maybe understand the reasons why we've changed the meeting format.

I've spoken to them and I've also forwarded them our initial draft that Eduardo has kindly provided, which you'll be seeing on the screen in front of you, if you're on the AC, and trying to see what overlap we have in working with the other ACs/SOs in the times when we'll be meeting them formally during our working week. Essentially on Meeting B there is a big focus on the outreach, the shorter day, and we really ought to think about what we intend from that day and what we intend to achieve from this, bearing in mind the purpose and the goal of why we have a whole day for outreach in the shorter meeting.

With this, I'll leave the discussion to Eduardo who can update us on the Drafting Team. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Basically, I went over these tables the last time we met here, and I haven't changed any of them, I just added to the Wiki the same guidance for the table format for people to start changing them if needs be, on the tables. I think the major getting all these meetings synched, Meeting A and Meeting C, with the other ACs and SOs, eventually it will happen. With this I mean that we can set up what we think would be good for us here, and eventually all these things are to be merged with the Meetings Team, who will have to figure out how to put this all together so things don't overlap.

I think the most important part we need to concentrate on is this Meeting B, especially the outreach activities. Like you say, Raf, the GNSO is doing "business as usual". There will be other organizations that I'm pretty sure will be very interested in doing outreach or inreach during that meeting, and what I think we should do is think about what we want to do on even the first day. If we can get that defined somehow, it will really help us to move forward with our task.

For example, there are a lot of comments on that basis; about doing outreach, inreach. I think we have to be more specific about what is it we want to do - do we want to do outreach activities in the morning? Do we want to use up the whole day for outreach activities? Do we want to use only half and then start working on our work? Do we go out of the ICANN facilities to do outreach? Do we bring people in? How do

we get the global engagement staff to help us bring people in or do whatever outreach activities we want to do?

Even if we want to do inreach with fellows that will be in place at that meeting, then we should do that too - more specifically for our region, or the people that are interested in doing this inreach. Those are the questions that I have, that I haven't been able to somehow put onto paper. There are lots of comments in the Wiki that help. There's a comment by Vanda that is somehow saying that we should be finding out where the B Meeting is.

I just sent a message to Maureen saying there is a calendar already in place, up to 2020, which says where the different regions are where Meeting B is going to be. We don't know the specific place within that region where it is going to be, but the time of the year, which I think is the mid-meeting, is already set. Rafid, back to you. I don't know how you want to manage the hands up. Do you want to do it?

RAF FATANI: Okay. Thank you Eduardo. Just briefly on that point, and then I'll pass it on - we have on the list Vanda, Alan and Sébastian with their hands up - just a quick note. The GNSO was one of the only SOs in the ACs/SOs meeting that we had, in which they indicated that their intention was very focused on inreach rather than outreach. That might not be our priority, but they were also open to discussion with regards to how we could collaborate with each other. With that thought in mind, Vanda, you have the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I am thinking about the outreach issues - two things. One, if you had the opportunity I had in Buenos Aires, to join the [NPOC 09:30] Group with the NGOs. They probably will be a good partner for this outreach effort, but I am sure that each strategy, like the LAC Strategy, Africa Strategy and Asia Strategy, we certainly can work together with them to bring, for each region, more people from many of those efforts that have been done in those regions, to attract more people from all the stakeholders. It's something that we could design to work together with LACNIC, AFRINIC and the LAC Strategy in ICANN.

So everybody can work together and bring more people for each region. I believe that is the most important thing, because there is a lot of efforts in each region to attract more participants, and not only for the NGO areas or users' area, but also to business and all the ISPs, and all people that haven't heard about ICANN. That's my suggestion: we get together with them. Each region can put some effort into fulfilling this [unclear 11:16] there.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Vanda. I know that Eduardo in the chat has said that we should also tap into the ISOC Chapters in the regions. That's interesting. On that note, I think there is much disagreement in terms of outreach to the communities within to do some outreach into the regions, but something I think we need to establish first before we do that is to see where we stand as the ALAC and as the At-Large community in terms of how we want to approach our own strategy and how we're going to use this outreach post before we reach out to other parts of the community

and say, "Would you like to join us?" With that, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think there's a step ahead of what we're doing of, "What are we trying to accomplish, and what are the end points that we're trying to…? Are we trying to achieve some particular thing? Or fix a problem? Is it consistent with the other priorities that we have?" For instance, the recent comment said we should reach out and attract the local community. I've also heard more than once from several RALOs that we don't want a concentration of a lot of ALSes from one city or one country. We want to spread them out. Yet these two are not necessarily consistent with each other. I think we need to look at what we're trying to achieve before we look at the specifics of how we're going to do it. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Alan. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I really think that we are concentrating on one day of the meetings, and specifically Meeting B, and I think it's very important because it's a new type of meeting and we will not know exactly what we want to… I will come back on that. I urge you to discuss also the content of the A, B and C Meetings, because as I see it today, from my point of view, it's not reaching what we wanted to achieve in the Meeting Strategy Working

Group. Also I will come back to that. The first one, about the outreach. I agree with Alan that we don't want ten ALSes or…

The goal is not to have more ALSes from one country but more ALSes from the region. I'm not sure that the goal is just to outreach in where we will be in the city, where we will be. I hope that we will have some people coming from the country around. It will be easy to travel and we will be able to do it that way. On the other hand, I think it would be a very good opportunity for At-Large to reach out to our Member - don't take this word as within the discussion within the CCWG on Accountability - but if we can, for example, have a meeting with the Members of the ALSes of the country, it could be a very good way to exchange and have more people aware of what is done at ICANN.

I had some discussion - I am in [unclear 15:32]. I am having meetings with the ALSes and with other people from the community here, and I really think that they have ideas on what to do in the country, what to do to do outreach. They can try to do something at the university level, at a [unclear 15:57]. Maybe what we don't need to concentrate on only is taking our word out, but the ICANN words. That means that maybe the goal will be to send a "delegation" from different parts of ICANN to one university and another "delegation" to another university or to [unclear 16:18], to have an exchange with the local people.

Maybe at the end it may not be one more ALS, but it will be more participants. Maybe we will be able to convince the government to participate. It's all that needs to be thought about. I remind you that one of the images we had was what was done in Durban; to go to a school and to help the school. It's also something we need to open to

the country and do something different. Raf, I don't know if you want me to stop here, because I'm talking about we are talking [now 17:06], but I would like very much to come back to the content of the A, B and C Meetings and how the work will be organized, as [unclear 17:18].

RAF FATANI: Thank you Sébastian, yes, and we'll get to that. The first question I think I want to ask everyone - and I've noted your hand is up Alan - is in terms of outreach what are people on this call's thoughts in terms of what they anticipate, what the purpose of this outreach would be? Would it be reaching out to communities to increase the ALSes? Is it reaching out to the communities to encourage them to engage with ICANN as a whole? Or is it part of outreach to get them involved in an understanding of where ICANN sits into the wider Internet governance debate?

Before we discuss what we are to do, I think we need to see what the purpose of this is, as Alan mentioned earlier. Alan, do you want to kick start the conversation on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a quick comment. Sébastian said that he had hoped, in the mind of the original Working Group that recommended this, that we reach out to the region, not just the city we're in. I'll note that as far as I can tell we did not do any budget requests to provide funding for that, not have I heard of anything ICANN wide that is putting any budget into this process. If that indeed is incorrect and there is budget for it, it would be really good to know.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Alan. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I wanted to give you some information. I get that valid point. You need to know that the discussion about the budget or what the financial consequences are of the re-organization of the meeting was not in the purview of the Meeting Strategy Working Group. It's one of my disappointments that we didn't set up a group to follow the implementation, and implementation group, and specifically the question reltated to the budget. I think it's something we need to ask a whole - not just as our request for our own activities, but how we will organize this day and where the budget is to organize that. It's a very good and valid question, I think.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Sébastian. Agreed - the budget is a crucial element to this and plays a big role in how we move forward. But again, I urge we turn this discussion into what we think we intend to do. I know we've talked about inreach, outreach, but just to be clear - the inreach could also be team building activities that helps engagement between all the ACs and SOs - so the painting the school is Durban is a great charitable event, but also what that does is it creates engagement between the communities that can go out there together and hold a paintbrush together.

I think that's also part of it. But the discussion that we need to have now is where we want to go with this. Is it inreach capacity building? Is it

outreach? If it is, what's the purpose? Can I really narrow down this discussion now into what is the purpose of this outreach? Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to say a few words about the budget, if I can. I'm thinking about something that Alan said a few minutes before, and I'm wondering about this. If we, instead of bringing to the meetings all the RALO Leaders and the Secretaries, what if we bring only these RALO Leaders and use the Secretary slots budget, which represents say four or five slots of budget money, that we can use to bring people from the region? I think that will be cheaper, and five will mean bringing ten people instead of five. I'm thinking outside of the box, and I don't know if that's possible with the reach that we can do with our budget. In any case, that's one thing I wanted to say.

About the outreach purposes and inreach, I think what Alan said before makes sense. If we know exactly what our goals are, of what we want to achieve with this outreach, then it will be easier to define what the outreach things are we're going to do, or inreach, or capacity building. Instead of talking of only outreach, my suggestion is that we talk about what the goals are we want to achieve by using this day. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Eduardo. Satish, I see your hand is up. The floor is yours.

SATISH BABU: Thanks for that. Regarding the question as to what we're trying to achieve, in my opinion it would be two. One is raising the visibility of

ICANN and showing the local community, the particular country, even the region, that we can engage with these communities. The second is for us, as At-Large, trying to see how we can connect with these communities around the venue of the meeting.

Now, one of these points that we discussed at Buenos Aires was that if we are looking at the outreach in terms of raising the visibility of ICANN as a whole, then should we be coordinating with other parts of ICANN so we don't duplicate? Whether it's concerned with the budget, or with the actual activities, there is perhaps a need, especially when it comes to [particular entities 24:24] which has a lot of [unclear] in common with At-Large.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Satish. Sandra?

SHO: Hi everybody. Can you hear me?

RAF FATANI: Yes, we can.

SHO: Wonderful. I was in the Meeting Strategy Working Group and I just wanted to remind ourselves what was the purpose of the structure, like that in the B Meeting. The first thing was it should be a meeting to get the work done. Getting the work done means the policy work with each

SO and AC, and also the interactions with other ACs and SOs and SGs on policy issues. No Welcome Ceremony, no discussion or update on what the website is doing, no discussion or update on Language Services, and no financial year discussions - just to get the policy work.

It was also said whatever is needed for this community, we will find the budget for this. At this point we said it would be good if we enrich such a Working Meeting with a component of outreach. I said at At-Large two weeks ago, and in Buenos Aires, and I'll mention it again - I think the crucial part here is that we're not planning anything what the ALAC might do on its own, but we collaborate with all the other SOs and ACs and do a joint outreach effort. This could mean that we assign one or two people, or even more. We have a mandate to collaborate with other ACs and SOs about what to do for outreach.

I know other stakeholder groups in the GNSO are doing quite a lot of things already, and they have more experience than we have so far. I would rather say to them, "Send one or two ALACers and let's reach out firs to them to see what they are planning, and then see what we can do jointly." Because otherwise we are going to have overlapping communities. When we have a clearer picture, then I would propose we bring in what we think might help with our community.

Let's not limit ourselves, but the plan was to limit the outreach, whatever it might be, to one day, but for the rest of the week to get the work done, and the interaction with the other SOs and ACs was the most important thing. Here, by the way, I think if we do a joint outreach together, we foster this collaboration with other ACs and SOs. It's about breaking down the silos finally.

RAF FATANI: What I was trying to say at the beginning of the meeting is I did meet with the other ACs and SOs, and the GNSO specifically had, in terms of their Agenda on the B Meeting, it was predominantly [cuts out 28:18]… I'll just repeat that, just in case that was missed out. I did meet with the SOs/ACs in regard to this, and to see what they were doing. in terms of the GNSO specifically, you just mentioned Sandra, the GNSO are intending to hold their own inreach activities where they stay in their room.

They're hoping that other ACs/SOs meet with them to discuss what they do. Personally - not as a group - I don't think that's the right approach, because if we all do this then no one's going to visit any other rooms, and we have gone back to square one in terms of our outreach. If indeed the purpose of this is to create collaboration between all the SOs/ACs, then a team-building ethos should be at the heart of whatever we discuss now.

Going back to that, I also think that we should probably take an approach where we should have an inward looking moment to see what we want to do with this opportunity - because it is an opportunity. We should see what we want to do with it, before we approach the others in terms of seeing if they want to collaborate, or we want to collaborate with them. We can take the lead on this. Maybe one way forward is actually on the Wiki we can set a timeline on there and say, "Let's have a few ideas," and we take a vote on a few ideas and see where we want to go with that.

That's one approach. What are other people's thoughts on this? I do think we need to see what we want to before we start talking about collaborating with other people. We will eventually collaborate with other people. I think that should definitely be at the forefront of our Agenda, but we need to see what we want to achieve out of this. Any others?

BERAN GILLEN: I just wanted to buttress what Alan said - that we need to decide what it is we want out of this, before we can even take a step towards actually working towards it. In my own opinion, I don't know about anybody else, but I'm thinking we can maybe use this outreach to get more ALSes in the region that the Meeting B would be held in more active. One of the reasons why we're reviewing the ALS criteria is because some of the ALSes are dormant or not as active as we would want them to be.

We could use this Meeting B as a way of getting the ALSes in the region that Meeting B is being held in to be more active, by engaging them in some way or another. That's just one of the thoughts I had, which I'll put on the Wiki of course. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: I think that's a brilliant first step. Thank you. Yes, I think these are the ideas and proposals we'll need to put on the Wiki, and then we'll have to review it. Maureen's team will have to look at this, and the think tank will have to look at this, and see what they come up with. Then we'll propose it to the bigger group to make some choices.

But I need to emphasize that these choices need to be made, and we need to be very clear before the Dublin Meeting, as the other ACs/SOs proposed, that we hold a call between us, a cross community call, to discuss what each individual AC/SO has in mind, and see where we have overlaps - either in thought or overlap on exactly what we want to do - and then build on it from there. Would anyone like the floor before I move on?

Okay. Next meeting, I think an Action Item for staff, if we could please have a next meeting in three weeks, if possible, to give time for the Wiki - so we get more engagement? If we could send out an email to the At-Large encouraging them to input some ideas into how they see we should use this opportunity to our best advantage. In our call then in three weeks we should discuss the options that were presented on the Wiki, and make a decision on how we want to move forward with that. Does anyone oppose that idea?   Does anyone have any other suggestions? Great. Lots of engagement. Eduardo, you have the floor. I think you just beat Sébastian there.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I think we should use the Wiki and try to nail down exactly what we want to do, and then we go from there. I have several ideas that I can put on the Wiki, and we can use those ideas just to joggle our minds. I think we can go from there. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Great. Like Alan mentioned, nothing should be off the table. Let's be creative here, no matter how outrageous we think it is, or how possible

or impossible we think it is. Let's put it on the table and then discuss it in more detail. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I just want to say again that I would like very much that we discuss also not just this Monday of the B Meeting - even if it's a day, we need to discuss how we want to achieve those meetings and the organization of the working days and so on, because I don't think for the moment we are in the straw man made by the GNSO really, to accomplish what the Meeting Strategy Working Group wanted to do. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. Yes, Sébastian. I did forget that. That was my own fault. I think part of that is actually seeing from our own template draft that Eduardo has put forward, I think the first port of call is seeing where our overlap with the other ACs/SOs is, especially when we intend to meet them on specific days. We need to make sure that if we say we have a slot that's available for a meeting with the GNSO, that they indeed have that same slot and they don't intend to do something outrageously different on that day.

So coordinating that first step, that would be on the cross community call, which we'll send out an email for and encourage all the At-Large to participate in with their ideas. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I suppose the concept of nothing being off the table, but at the same time let's make sure we don't continually… If someone doesn't get their way, we don't continually reopen the same issue time and time again. For instance, the one on some of the regular attendees not coming and bring other people in instead, we discussed that very early before the discussion really took off, and maybe we should re-look at that. But let's try and be disciplined and not go over the same issues time and time again, if there were strong consensus on the results. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Alan. Very much agreed. The idea is when we meet in three weeks' time all the items will go up on a PDF and we will discuss them one by one. We can evaluate them, give them a scoring system, as it were, if it makes it easier, and them move on from there so we can disqualify what we think is not a strong contender, and move forward with our top three contenders, and we can discuss and choose something to move forward.

Again, not to move away from Sébastian's point in discussing the other meetings, A and C, and in terms of how we intend to organize these meetings. Sébastian, is that an old hand, or would you like the floor?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I think Eduardo was before me.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Sébastian. I have a question to you, Sébastian, and I need some clarification. I think we should discuss all the Meetings - A, B and C, there's no doubt about that, but when we were discussing these meetings, I saw the idea here is to discuss it from the perspective of what ALAC wants to do, in relation to what the meeting strategy format needs to be. Later on, somebody has to come back and look at what other organizations are doing with their strategy for this meeting and somehow mix them together.

I'm under the impression that we should know prior to see when we can meet with the GNSO, the ccNSO, and if there is an overlap here or there, we know for [unclear 29:58] that the GNSO is doing business as usual. I don't know what that means, but I think somewhere down the line Meeting Staff have to come up together with all these ideas from all the organizations on how to put something together that makes sense to everyone. At that point, that's when I think us and the rest of the organizations, we'll find out how we can juggle things around.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. Maybe one way is also trying to engage with… maybe in our next call, for Meeting B, once we've narrowed down our thoughts on what sort of outreach we want to do, we invite some of the Regional VPs on Outreach, and maybe also invite Nora Abusitta, who runs the Next Gen and Fellowship Program, and see what ideas they thought they could contribute to this, and other ideas to put into the pot for us to discuss and see if it's something that we want to go ahead with or not. If we do, then I'm going to make an assumption that there would be more

support then financially, if they're going to be running with it. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: The question from Eduardo, yes and no. Yes, we don't want to go into detail on where we will meet with the GNSO, when we will meet with the Board, and all that. But I just want to remind you that the goal of this meeting was to try to organize the day differently; to try to get the work done in the morning, and at the second part of the afternoon to have cross community work on hopefully at least one of the same topics that was discussed by the SOs and ACs in their own meetings.

It was to try not to have one day when we're all meeting up, but to have each day like that - like we see eventual progress and we are not [elated 42:48] during three days and at the end we get all of us in [the work 43:00] was done in each part of the organization. It's really to try to find a way to be more interactive and more participative with the others. I think it must be a staff meeting, and who know today they are supposed to help each and every SO and AC with that.

If you look to [unclear 43:29] and nothing has a [critics] about what Eduardo has done, but I really think that we need to try and have our internal work done in the morning, and the beginning of the afternoon, and to try to have all the exchanges with the other SOs and ACs in the second part of the afternoon. I guess for almost all the Meetings, but more particularly for the B Meeting - but applies to A and C too.

The other point is that the fact that in the A and C Meetings we will have an Open Forum at the beginning, it may allow the community to push

the main topics that need to be discussed during the week in front of everybody, and allow this type of work to be done the next day. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Sébastian. Just for clarity from staff, could you please clarify for us that the new strategy will start in Dublin, and Dublin will be an A or a B Meeting? Then so when will the B Meeting start?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Sorry to interrupt you Raf, but the Meeting Strategy will start next year in 2016. The first Meeting will be in Marrakech. It will be an A Meeting, and then the B Meeting will be in Latin America - we don't know yet where - and the C Meeting will be in… Eduardo, [unclear 45:28], if I'm not mistaken? I won't say it's a US, but it's a part of [Eduardo's country], I guess. It will be a C Meeting, because it's the end of the year and it's the general one for ICANN.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. Everyone hopefully has noted that. That in mind, Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to point out there is a calendar. I don't have the link right now. There is a calendar with all the meetings until 2020, and it shows you where Meetings A, B and C are going to be on a regular basis. Like Sébastian said, Meeting A will start with the Marrakech Meeting, and

then there's B in Latin America and the C was approved by the Board in Buenos Aires that it's going to be in Puerto Rico, and that's going to be the C Meeting at the end of last year.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Eduardo. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not directly related, but something we should remember is we did make a sort of decision that B Meetings are less than optimal for Regional Assemblies, because one of the concepts of bringing people to a Regional Assembly is to expose them to ICANN, and a large part of that is the public meetings - not only the Public Forum - but the meetings aimed at education, discussion, bringing people up to speed; not just Working Groups aimed at people who are actively involved. That's going to be problematic for us.

                         If B Meetings are typically held in Latin America and Africa, we may not have good opportunities for Regional Assemblies for those. How that is all going to interact with this is clearly going to be something we're going to have to resolve, and how we do outreach in any given meeting may be different if we have a Regional Assembly or if we don't have one.

RAF FATANI: Absolutely. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Alan, I am not sure that the B Meeting is not a good opportunity for a Regional Assembly. For me, it's the reverse. It's a good place, because of course we will not have a Public forum and we will not have a Board face-to-face meeting in front of others, but the rest, the three days of meetings, will be interesting to look at and to participate in. I think if we don't do that, we will not have any General Assembly for Latin America, and if we can bring them to participate in the Outreach Day it will be an outreach and inreach at the same time, and it could be a good way to do new things on this day, and the [unclear 49:16] [more general]. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: I see Alan's hands went straight up. I'm assuming he has a response to Sébastian directly. Could you make it short please?

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said before, things we decided a year ago, or six months ago, or three months ago are certainly on the table. I was just reporting on what was decided. For the record, 40 per cent of meetings have to be in Latin America and Africa, and B Meetings are only 33 per cent, so clearly some Latin America and Africa Meetings are not going to be B Meetings.

Regardless, it's something we can consider, but that was something that was considered already and made a tentative recommendation that probably B Meetings were less than optimal to expose people to what's going on in ICANN, because of the lack of information type sessions, and sessions for people who weren't already embedded in it. I'm not trying

to have a debate on the issue, I was just reminding people of that discussion. Thank you.

RAF FATANI: Thank you Alan. Yes, and it's very important to bear that in mind moving forward on how we're going to be conscious of this. I'm also very conscious that I've hogged the mic here, and I have a Co Chair. Beran, if you have anything to say or add, please do jump in. Okay. We initially had Maureen that was going to identify some of the outreach and inreach activities they've come up with in the think tank. Do we have anyone else that's going to report on her behalf on this?

I hear radio silence. I'm assuming no then. Moving forward to the next meeting, could we please have our next meeting set up for in three weeks' time? Another AI would be could we have an email sent out encouraging participation to the Wiki with regard to input on how they'd like to move forward? I note that Gisella on the chat has put: "Three week's time, Thursday, at 15:00 UTC." Any Other Business? Are there any other AIs or things I've missed out that people would like to highlight before we end this call? Three weeks that is, Gisella.

Okay, well, no hands are up. Thank you very much for everyone who's participated in this. Again, I encourage you, as I encourage everyone and I encourage myself, please do put your input on the Wiki before our meeting. The aim of the meeting is to then discuss all the inputs and have a vote on how to move forward on this. With that, I'd like to end the call. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]