
GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes Alan, we'll get the recorded started now.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's ALAC Leadership Team monthly meeting on Thursday the 30th of July at 20:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Julie Hammer, who is on the Adobe Connect but not on the call, Ron Sherwood, Maureen Hilyard, Yubelkys Montalvo.

Apologies noted from León Sanchez, Silvia Vivanco, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and possibly Tijani Ben Jemaa, on the CCWG call is running parallel to this one.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself Gisella Gruber.

If I could also remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I don't know when you downloaded the agenda. It did get changed after I said it was final. So if you downloaded it more than several hours ago, it's probably slightly out of date. But nothing that we can't handle on the call.

All right. The first item is the policy activity. And there are a couple of issues that we need to decide on this call. The first one is, I think, and that's the most important one right now is the GNSO one. Olivier, the last... I had made a suggestion for a new addition at the end. I can live

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.

without it, but last I saw, you sent a message saying you wanted to make sure you were comfortable with it because it is going to rock the boat.

The addition for those who didn't see it, is a statement essentially saying what we've said a number of times before, that we believe that the GNSO Counsel, with half of it controlled by contracted parties and it is not clear that on critical issues, they can make decisions that are in the public interest, because of that imbalance.

Olivier, do you have any feeling at this point? Do we want to say that? Do we not? It's up to you at this point, whether it's included or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. It's just the Internet is a little overloaded tonight. There is something else going on in the room next door, a bit heavy on this. So if I do break up, please stop me while I speak. Now this last paragraph that you have suggested adding, will indeed rock the boat. But then the previous paragraphs we've had in there, and our response to some of the other questions in the document, will indeed, also point in the same direction.

What I wanted to check was that we do not, as a community, get attacked...

...having not read the report with enough depth, because we do assert, yes Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: What we do assert is that the, okay. What we do assert is the GNSO, the [inaudible] consultants, or the contractor, has not performed any kind of analysis of the, both the SO and AC structure, the face of the GNSO, but more in particular, the actual structure of the GNSO Council with the bicameral house.

There is actually, in several cases, there are instances where it mentions the fact that they had a look at this, but that the previous review had undertaken this, the creation of the bicameral house, etc. And this review as therefore, not in scope for... Or rather, the bicameral house and the structure of the GNSO was not in scope for this review. We have to go against that and say that it should be in scope, and I just wanted to make sure that our wording says that we are aware that they had considered that it was not in scope.

It's just last one read through the statement, rather than actually [wanting to] come up with additional language or take some language out.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I chose not to specifically rebut that. I don't believe it was out of scope. And as it says that, I think they're actually wrong. It was not listed one of the original intents of this review. Along the way, there were a number of other people who said it should be within the scope, and it was not ruled out. The only thing that was ruled out was whether there is a need for the GNSO or not, or some words similar to that.

So I don't believe it was out of scope. They also said that this new structure was relatively new. Well it's now probably four years old, at least, maybe longer. I've lost track. And that's not all that new. And there have been some very significant other changes. The lack of, the vertical integration issue, where registries can now own registrars, takes the differentiation between the two stakeholder groups on the contracted side, and makes that a lot fuzzier.

And I believe it's fair game to raise. They can choose to ignore it again, but I think it's reasonable for us to raise the issue and let them say, no we're not going to look at it. It's another one of these going on record so that later on, when you know, if there is a problem, we can point to it. It's not an I told you so issue, but just to continually raise the issue of public interest.

So I think it's reasonable. So it will ruffle some feathers, but it's nothing we haven't said in public forums already.

Olivier, are you still there? We appear...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: ...heard you give me the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Olivier, the floor is yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: I haven't heard you given me the floor, so.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. Thank you. The point is as follows. Page 24 of the [Westlake] report mentions, the GNSO structure and purpose are not within the specific scope of the review, although it would envision that matters relating to the GNSO structure might arrive around aspects of the review.

And then if you look further down on page 25, point two, and I'm telling you this for the record, because I have sent you an email for this matter. In section 3.2, defines the scope of the [Westlake] review based on the RFP. And the RFP, and this is again taking a cut and paste from the report, the RFP [inaudible] the proposed scope of work for this review as follows.

And number nine says, an independent reviewer to conduct an examination of the GNSOs organizational effective in accordance with the ICANN provided objective and quantifiable criteria. Note that the

assessment of whether or not the GNSO has an ongoing purpose, will not be considered as part of the current review. Which is exactly what you've mentioned there.

So they do say, we're not questioning the purpose of the GNSO, but there is the possibility of conducting an examination of the GNSO's organizational effectiveness. Now what I do find interesting is that the, that's the only one where the [Westlake] has interpreted this as, well let's just look at the working groups, let's not look at the bicameral house, let's not look at these GNSO constituencies, except in the matter of creating more constituencies in the non-contracted house, which we have mentioned in our statement, is actually going to weaken further by dividing further the non-contracted parties.

So, further down, yeah I think I'll stop here and then try and read maybe a couple of more points in a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Olivier, I really don't want to spend a lot of time talking about this. You know, I think we need to come to closure. And as I said, I'm willing to let you make the decision, I personally think that it is something that's important. I'd like to hear from anyone else.

I will point out that they conveniently ignore that fact that although they are strongly recommending that there be more constituencies within the non-contracted house, if there is a new constituency added on the business side, all hell is going to break loose, because they won't be able to allocate counselors as they are right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: The contracted party's side.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. The non-contracted party...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier. Non-Contracted. [CROSSTALK] Alan, if I could just add one more thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. There appears to be a delay. So [Westlake] actually on page 81, reviews the BGC's recommendations, the Board Governance Committee's recommendation of the last review, and that's recommendation number 10 and 11, restructuring the counsel membership, and council term limits.

And the observations of the consultant were that the council was restructured, following the BGC recommendations. Term limits were introduced at the same time. The council appears functional. It is constructed to balance the various interests. And the analysis that is then provided, and it was just a one liner, the current structure has been minted relatively recently, it is not broken, and we do not recommend any change at this time.

And that's how [Westlake] closes the door on the issue of GNSO counsel structure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I'm saying I disagree. Holly, your hand is up, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I guess I can start with the [inaudible]... who I remember standing up in the public forum saying it's broken. And saying I don't want any more constituencies. So, you know, [Westlake] aside, I'm sorry, it's still an issue. And when you start to hear statements about public interest and who represents it, there is a feeling sometimes, in these non-contracted parties that, in fact, they are representatives.

And I have to say, well I'm sorry, but you know, they nowhere near have the vast coverage that we have in terms of geography, in terms of language, in terms of etc. etc. So I don't see how we cannot say something about it, whether it's in scope or out of scope. I just, I really think it's...

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're supporting keeping some form of the statement I wrote in.

HOLLY RAICHE: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: We either need a decision today, or we need the ALT to delegate to whoever Alan and Olivier and whoever else to talk about it afterwards, because we have to submit it by tomorrow. I think tomorrow is the deadline. Anyone else want to weigh in on this?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just one more thing. If it makes people more comfortable, we can preface the statement with, while this issue does not appear to be within the terms of reference, nevertheless, it is an important issue because the ICANN objectives for GNSO are about public interests, and therefore we have to say, well look at the structures. And how they actually work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. It wasn't within the specified terms of reference. I do not believe it's out of scope. And they confirm that themselves by saying they think it's working and case closed.

HOLLY RAICHE: And Alan, just to say, they do mention ICANN objectives for them, which includes public interest, and that's [inaudible]. So I think there is an in, even though it's not an in in the normal way. I think we can hang it on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: As Evan has been want to say over the years, we can comment on anything we want.

All right. How about Olivier and I talk about it afterwards, we'll come to closure and put something out to vote. Is that agreeable with everyone? If anyone else says they want in, then Holly we can put your whatever in also. I saw Maureen's hand up for a moment and then Olivier's. So Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. Just for the record, then I take it, I will review whatever is in there at the moment, and I will work with you to find language or perhaps, amend the language that's in there to reflect the support that we've received on this call. And the input that we received during this gathering input.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. If you can stay up, then we'll do it right after this call.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately impossible immediately after. We'll work it out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have tomorrow as well if you're not otherwise occupied. The other items are translation transliteration, and I believe Ariel has listed that as stalled. I'm not quite sure why it's stalled. We've got a strong recommendation from Satish, saying there is nothing, we have nothing particular to say.

This public comment is prior to Board approval. So unless we are explicitly telling the Board, do not approve it, there is a fatal flaw in it, I think that is a no comment, unless someone else knows something otherwise. Olivier, your hand is up, I don't know if it's an old hand or not.

It was an old hand. Anyone know of any reason why we don't just mark that one as no comment?

No? Then it is done. Ariel, are there any others we need to discuss? There is one that Maureen is drafting a statement on, I don't think we need to discuss it on this call.

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, there is one... Sorry. This is Ariel speaking. There is one more public comment that's from a very important issue topic, is the next generation gTLD administration directory services to replace WHOIS preliminary issue report. You asked Carlton to review that report and he posted a comment there, but we didn't get further input on that.

I'm pasting the link in the chat. So we have a bit of time to decide to do, but I think we should, if we want to issue a statement, we should start working on that. Sooner or later.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My recollection in this comment was that the preliminary issue report was quite complete. Unless he identified things that were missing in it that we want, that we believe they should be adding, I'm not... And Holly is the other person who has worked, to some extent, on this. The

whole concept of the preliminary issue report is to make sure that there is no factual errors in it, and to make sure that there is nothing missing that should be covered.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah. I did have a look at it. In one sense, there is nothing to say. I agree with Carlton. In another sense, it's an absolutely huge issue because it says, well what information should we collect it, why? What do we do with it? Which basically is all about the questioning the whole WHOIS concept, and what is retained, and what is published, and stuff.

And it actually make a lot of the discussions going on, the WHOIS implementation team, and the privacy proxy team, it's like we're going down one path saying, why do we need the data? And the other, what are we going to do about the people with the data? There is a direct contrast. And it is a huge issue, but for this paper, on... I accept what Carlton says. We don't need to say anything because the report is okay.

But this is just going to be huge. It's going to be years on this issue. Frankly.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And that's not particularly surprising. We may want to say that we want to divide the project, it should be divided into things. Ariel, what is the deadline for submitting something on this?

ARIEL LIANG: It's September 6th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have plenty of time. I would suggest anyone else who has an interest in it, take at least a brief glance through it. I will certainly try to do that, and let's try to come to closure at the next meeting, or prior to that.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll have another look, but you know, in one sense, it's just a huge issue that's going to take everybody's time for the next few years.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not particularly surprising.

HOLLY RAICHE: No it's not.

ALAN GREENBERG: It has occupied a lot of people's time for the last decade. Ariel, are there any other issues we need to do? We've now spent 25 minutes on a five minute item.

ARIEL LIANG: Very quickly, on the IDN related public comment. We have an Armenian community member volunteer to write about it, it's [Marine], but she may have some technical issues. So [inaudible], but difficulty to understand that report. So, I'm not sure what will be the best way to help her, because it's related to Armenian script and it's very technical as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, are there any other issues other than that one?

ARIEL LIANG: Nope, that's the only one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll talk to her, and try to make sure that she understands what it is that we're looking for in a statement. I appreciate her volunteering, but she really needs some hand holding to make sure that she understands the concept of what we're responding to. So I'll take that on, if you would put an action item for me on that. I'd appreciate it.

All right, the next one is the CCWG. I don't think there is an awful lot to talk about the content. As you know, from the last reports, there is a huge amount of work going on. The CCWG is still meeting right now, in it's fifth or sixth hour today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it just stopped.

ALAN GREENBERG: It just stopped. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Been here for a little tiny while.

ALAN GREENBERG: CCWG has met for five hours today, and is close to finalizing the proposal that will be going out for public comment within a day or so. There are two things I think we need to decide on in this call, or at least start discussion on in this call. The first one is, we are going to have to have a public comment issued within 40 days or so.

And this time it would be nice if we didn't do it all in the last week. There is no real need to because things are not, the ground is not changing under us, as it was last time when we were in the midst of drafting.

My personal preference is to the extent possible, we should try to put out an ALAC consensus point on any issues we want to raise. To the extent that that is not possible, we will do what we did in the last CCWG comment, and that is put out the varying positions of people within At-Large.

But to the extent possible, we're likely to have more effect if we can actually make a specific statement. I'm happy to do some of the drafting. I would like someone else to be working with me. And I will, do we have, I don't know if we have any volunteers on this group, or if

León feels comfortable in doing that, or maybe Cheryl feels comfortable in doing that, I'm not sure.

But I think we don't want to put it off to the last moment. I think we have general agreement that although it may not be exactly what we imagined, most of it is something that we can live with. I know I have some concerns with some of the areas that I think we need to flag whether they change or not. And I'm sure there are other ones that other people have. Olivier, your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And having, of course, followed all of the accountability track and the work of the CCWG has been subjected to the flood of recent emails and headaches, I would be happy to help you out with the drafting, or even perhaps give it a read after you put together a first draft.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think like the previous ones, the first thing is to identify in bullet form, what the issues are we want to raise. And to the extent we can get people to contribute at that stage, we will not have to rewrite the final documents 1200 times like we did last time.

The second issue is, I think we need to quietly start the discussion of, assuming all of this goes through, at some point there will be voting power for the ALAC, and the question is, how are we going to organize that? We do have five votes, which implies there will be some regional

component to this. It is, however, an ALAC vote, and I think we have... I believe that is important.

I don't think that dismissing directors or something, is something that we should be going out to a poll of ALSs for. It's going to be hard enough getting the people who are heavily involved in this process to be well informed. And I think being well informed is an absolute critical part of this process. Any thoughts?

Cheryl has a tick mark. Anyone else want to speak on this? There is no rush, of course. We're many, many months off from every having to exercise any powers, but I think we want to start laying the groundwork for something.

All right. I see a couple of ticks saying we should do something about it. I haven't heard any objections. And so sometime over the next few months, we need to go back to this one. I just wanted to raise the issue that it is something that has to be on our, within our periscope view.

The next item is selection of the ALAC member for the working group on IDN implementation guidelines. My recollection is we have three candidates, at this point. We have one person from Nigeria who, as far as I can tell from his CV, has no, speaks no languages that require IDN, and has no exposure to IDN. Ariel, I know you were supposed to have asked, or you have asked him, has he responded at all?

ARIEL LIANG:

This is Ariel speaking. He didn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The second person has apparently significant knowledge of IDN, he is an Arabic speaker, he has been involved in related issues. It is not clear what his relationship is with At-Large. And again, Ariel, you asked him that. Did we get a response from him on that?

ARIEL LIANG: This Is Ariel speaking. Yes he did have a response. Do you want me to read his response? It's very short.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Quote, "I am not officially affiliated with any At-Large structure. I have years of experience working with the IDN users, and have been following At-Large work extensively. I deal with IDN issues daily, and will definitely be collecting many of the At-Large members for discussions during the course of this work. I will be discussing with them how this document can help promote the IDN business and technology."

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And lastly, we have, I understand, I have not seen it myself but I understand we do have an application or expression of interest from Satish.

I guess I'll open the floor, at this point, to suggestions on where do we go. The ALAC gave the ALT discretion in consultation with the IDN working group. I feel a little bit uncomfortable since Satish is one of the applicants, tossing it to the IDN group. At the time, we made that decision, my understanding was he had not applied. But I guess I'd like to open the floor on both, how do we make the decision, and to the extent that it is an ALT recommendation, if nothing else, then which do we select?

And I see no hands. Olivier, I know you had an opinion. I don't know if you wish to speak or not. Holly, your hand is up.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think it's clear, knowing neither of the... Well, not knowing the person who has been working a lot on IDNs, maybe a vote, but in the vote, I think we need to understand exactly this person who has got a lot of IDN experience, but we don't know this person, up against Satish because I'm not familiar with how much Satish has been involved in the whole IDN issue as well.

I think, almost like to see both reasonable candidates put forward a statement on why they would like to be involved, and then let us have a poll of some sort.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I believe both of them have put in such a statement.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Could we maybe publish both?

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel has put them all on a Wiki that is accessible to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we have until tomorrow, I believe, or Monday to make a decision. We don't have a lot of time on this. In answer to your question, Satish has been the one who has penned a number of our statements on IDN issues, so I'm presuming we have given him that responsibility based on knowledge and not pure whim.

So that's number one. Olivier, I'll let Cheryl and Olivier speak for themselves. Go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thanks. I was, it's Cheryl for the record. I was just going to say what you're really needing to decide between is a known and an unknown. And I would certainly suggest to Holly that I have no doubt about Satish's ability in the IDN world. He came from being an active participant in the IDN working group while I was still involved, to leading that group, and indeed as Alan just said, penning a number of documents.

So it's really the choice between a known and an unknown. And I would caution you to realize that we have had unknown come and bite us in the bum before. So beware.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. What I wanted to try and find out is whether that unknown person, or person who is not a member of At-Large, or an At-Large structure, but is following At-Large, was actually involved in the IDN working group. And if that's the case, I actually also wonder whether, if that's the case, whether our chair of the IDN working group knows that person. And then perhaps we can work something out between them.

What I would say effectively is, if the chair of the IDN working group could be the penholder, but work with this person, it might be a potential solution to actually bring more people in our community that have knowledge of these issues.

That said, yes, having just that unknown person as a sole pen holder is probably not something I would recommend.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, my recollection is, and Ariel correct me if I'm wrong, is he is not a member of the working group, and has not been a member of the working group, and isn't on the mailing list. He has said he has followed

what they were doing. I'm not quite sure what that means. So I'm at a bit of a loss. I haven't looked at the requests from whomever this request came from.

Are we only allowed to send one person? Are we allowed to send alternates? Exactly what was it we were asked? And forgive me for not looking at it myself.

ARIEL LIANG:

Alan, if I may. This is Ariel speaking. We are only limited to select one member. So only one person. And about the person's relationship to IDN working group, he said he is an unaffiliated member, but I do not really understand what that means. And I double checked all of the mailing lists, that an At-Large member would subscribe to, he doesn't subscribe to any of them at this moment.

But he is known to one of the At-Large members. Ali AIMeshal, he knows about this person and they're from the same country, and he met him before. And he said, Ali said that this person is the ICANN 53 Fellow. So perhaps we can get more information from Ali about that person.

And lastly, how that person got to know about this position and approached ALAC, I receive an email from this person, I just posted a link in the chat. I think he is, yeah, ICANN staff, and he said the stakeholder engagement in the Middle East, and he forwarded that person's profile, and told me he is interested in applying to become an ALAC rep for that group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Heidi is saying we probably have a few more days and an alternate is a good idea. Can, yes, Heidi could you confirm if they would allow a formal member and an alternate member.

[Music]

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I like the music.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I don't mind the music, but I'm not going to compete with it. Olivier, you in an email, I don't remember if it was a public or a private one, said you were a little bit concerned about Satish being overloaded. I guess I don't have that concern. I've been a person at times, who has applied for things when I'm already overloaded.

And you know, if someone is willing to make the commitment, I'm not going to judge for them whether they're overloaded or not.

Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do indeed. I just wanted to say the point made that Ariel pointed out in response to your question, Alan about can there be only one, or

whether the proposal that Olivier quite sensibly put forward could work, I think it can still work.

If you choose to, you know, introduce fresh blood into the system, and support this person, and particularly if Ali is able to work back channel with him, and I can certainly work back channel with Ali, you could make it clear that any ALT slash ALAC endorsement of this relatively new individual, Fellows are relatively new individuals, and they are still untested, or worthy of being tested, should go with an expectation from you that he works informally about extremely closely with the leadership of the existing IDN working group.

And it will be under the close scrutiny of the ALT in terms of performance metrics, and contributions. That might give you the luxury of taking a risk and minimizing it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Heidi will check whether we do have the option of naming a person and an alternate, that's number one. Number two, Cheryl, can I ask you to speak to Ali, and find out to what extent he believes this person...?

Obviously he believes this person can do the job technically. The question is, can this person really interface with a bunch of people he doesn't know and hasn't worked with before? And not simply take his own positions and put them forward as At-Large positions. It's really the question of how well does he know this person and his character and his style of working.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can do Alan, and more importantly, I'm quite confident that culturally we can make that happen regardless.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. All right. If you can do that, Heidi come back to us with a statement of exactly how much flexibility we have. And then we'll try to work together to make a decision close to Monday, if not by Monday.

Next item on the agenda, is the...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. [CROSSTALK] ...ALAC development section, next steps. And this was, in Buenos Aires, it was agreed that the ALT would be developing the details of this development session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As I hope you all know, this is a session which take place on the Friday, after the meeting in Dublin. It is a session to get the new ALAC, which will be largely similar to the old one, to work together to perhaps do some professional development, to get the people familiar and comfortable with each other, and especially try to integrate the new people into the group, assuming there are new people.

Again, we don't know to what extent there will be. And the real question is, what do we do? Now, Heidi the GNSO has, sorry. The

GNSO has done this twice. The last time, I'm told, was less successful than the first one. And I'm told that unlike the previous ones, we may not have a budget for external facilitation, which certainly did happen in the case of the first GNSO, in which I participated in. I don't know to what extent it happened.

Cheryl, I believe was there, to the second one. Cheryl, can give you us a two sentence answer as to how effective did you feel that day was?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I was only able to attend the first part of the day. Sorry, I had my microphone on the lowered position while I was drinking coffee and I forget to realign it up.

I was only there for the first part of the day, which was very much the meet and greet and team building. That worked well. I left partly through the, after the structuring function, which is also useful. And during the strategic work. I believe, however, that based on what I saw, it was well worthwhile.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Heidi, could I ask you to dig up for us the agendas of their two meetings? So we have some idea of what the model is that we're basing ours on. We don't have a lot of time, as you know, to organize this and make sure we have committed resources to it. Heidi has suggested that there are ICANN staff will be at the meeting that can act as facilitators.

So Heidi if I can ask you to, give us as examples, the previous two GNSO ones, and give us a very brief one paragraph CV of the people that you're thinking of as being people we can rely on, then I think we will take it from that. I don't think there is a lot of merit in discussing individual items on this meeting until we have something in front of us to look at.

Is that something you can do?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan. This is Heidi. Yes, I can do all of that. I've actually reached out to the staff person, and asked if she would be available. She has yet to get back to me, but yes I can definitely take a look at the last two GNSO agendas. May I also bring up some other issues that would be good to know your response to or your thoughts to very quickly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. The first one, Alan, as we discussed was, did you still want an ALT meeting that day? If so, what time? And also what time for this development session? Another...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give my answer and we'll see if anyone else has other answers. I believe an ALT meeting will be useful. We don't know to what extent

we're going to be able to have them in the future, although I think Heidi came back and said for Marrakesh, there is a good chance we'll be able to do something on the Friday, or whatever the day is, after the official meeting closes, but don't count it for the B meeting.

I think was the answer you came back with. So yes, I think we do want an ALT meeting for this one, a debriefing. If we have two options. We can either hold it before the development session, or after. After, people are going to be totally exhausted, we're likely to do something, some social event afterwards, and the chance of getting Steve, or David, or anyone late in the day, is virtually nil I would think.

So my recommendation would be to start perhaps earlier than we want to get up on the Friday, and do the session before the professional development session.

HEIDI ULLIRCH:

So Alan, this is Heidi. Would that be an 8:00 start, just to let you know. Gisella is going to give you some details. But it looks like the earliest to the convention center would be 8.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would think 8 until 10 or something like that, if it's 8:30 I won't cry.

We need to decide how many hours we need for the professional development, and we know that can't go much past 5:30 or 6. People would just be dead at the end of the week anyway. So I think we need to figure out how many hours we need and then work back from that.

But I'm assuming we can squeeze, if we push things tight, we can squeeze the ALT meeting into two and a half hours or something like that, without suffering too much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Alan, this is Heidi again. So it sounds like, right now, ALT in the morning, 8 to 10, and then development session, approximately, 10:30 to 7:30 max, with a social event following.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think so. I don't really want to commit those times into concrete right now, but yes. I think that's reasonable.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Approximate yes. Okay. Could we move on then to other issues related to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Another one then, interpretation. Now the ALT does not have interpretation, and for the rest of the development session, going late into that day, I have heard that we are promised Internet, but not interpretation.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking, if I remember correctly, about the ALAC proper.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do not know... Of the people we know will be there, who have some problem with English, we only talking only about [Hija], I believe. I think her term is...

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. It is not [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: [Haj] is being replaced by Sheun.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So there is no one that we know needs interpretation. We of course, have no clue who the Latin American person replacing Fatima will be. But I would like to think that they have sufficient English. And professional development sessions, especially if we break up into little groups and things like that, just do not work really well in, with interpretation.

So my inclination is to say no interpretation, but I welcome other input at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi again. Just to reiterate. There are no funds for interpretation, and having interpretation would require the interpreters to stay a full extra day, all of the equipment to stay an extra day. So it is a significant extra cost, which we don't have any funds to cover.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you ask us do we want interpretation, which we can't, which we have no money to cover, unless we go around the table and take contributions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, your rules say ALAC works in English. ALAC works in English.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand the rules do say that. I seem to remember I had some part in writing those rules. I also seem to remember an At-Large review which says the ALAC works in English. I don't think we need to discuss this a lot more.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. We'll move on then, as Olivier says.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm hearing no one object.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And my final question is that you've mentioned a social event for the evening. What were you thinking for the lunch? Do you want to have that onsite? I know that, the conference center does not have a kitchen, so it would basically likely be only sandwiches, etc. Maybe [CORSSTALK] on site.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was assuming we would be able to go out for dinner, unless people had other commitments.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, for lunch I meant. Sorry this is Heidi. For lunch.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh heavens.

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me guess. We don't have any budget for that either, correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think we have budget for that, yes. There is a budget for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a budget for it, but there is no availability of food.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well it would mean either sandwiches or you would need to find some place close by and then quickly go there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or we can order out. I bet you Dublin has order out places.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We can put that into the parking lot, and Gisella can look into it. How is that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we can probably find something to order out, whether it's pizza or something else. And we can even canvas people ahead of time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Moving right along. I put a next item of leadership training program. To what extent have we communicated with the regions warning them that they're going to have to have a name by a certain date?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I had sent reminders to all of the RALO chairs, secretaries, VPs where there are, as well as the ALAC leaders. And we have a good number of people who have indicated who they would like, with the exception of EURALO, who has not committed yet. APRALO has one possible other person.

And let's see, LACRALO has identified two people, and NARALO has identified two people. AFRALO is taken care of.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Do we have those names posted somewhere or available for us to look at, at least?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I can either [inaudible] to you, or I can send that to the ALT chat, if you would like.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you do that? And remind me, last time, how was the selection made?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Selection for the ALAC representatives, the At-Large representatives, will be made by the ALAC. So the deadline for all is the 31st of August, and after that, if the ALAC could approve those or endorse which ones they would like very quickly, that would be very useful.

For the other ACs and SOs, it is up to those...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. You told me the formal process. How was the decision made last time? Each RALO is suggesting two, somebody made the triage, how was that done last time? I may have been involved, but I have no...?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For AFRALO or, sorry Alan... Okay. Basically, Sandra can work with you. She's looking for a balance of new and experienced.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sandra will work with me, to be confirmed with the ALT, and then ratified by the ALAC. Is that the process that was used last year?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we can use that, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, done, settled. Next issue. CROPP. Are all the crisis problems addressed with CROPP? Or am I going to get another email tomorrow saying something is not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not convinced they're all solved just yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is we will either use the old CROPP team, or some subset thereof that are still available. I think I saw emails saying Dev believes that will be done in sufficient time. If anyone believes that is not the case...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We kind of got the horse and cart confused yet again, because we've got the existing CROPP review team, which appears to be more than willing and able to deal with this issue. And indeed, some of us have already put to the list, our comments on the AP proposal, which is the one of particular concern.

But, Dev is saying, of course, that the outreach and engagement working group has to meet and approve the regional strategy first. Which is another two or three days hence, which is therefore another week, closer to, if not being possible, for APRALO again, for I believe, the third year running, to not put in sufficient CROPP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The item is on this agenda to alert me that there is a problem then. You are telling me... When is the outreach and engagement committee meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple of days hence. The girls should know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, everyone, it's Monday the 3rd.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And how many weeks does that give us before the APRALO application? I think it is so close to deadline, it has to be...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, sorry to interrupt, this is Heidi. I have worked closely with Dev on this, and the 3rd is the last day that the subcommittee can choose it to get it in time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we need a pre-ratified, pre-agreed to by the CROPP group on Monday, and we need the strategy approved by the outreach and engagement on Monday. And if for some reason, any one believes that is not going to happen, please talk to me privately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I shall do then, because I have my doubts.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev is on the call. We were just talking about you. I didn't realize you're here. Yes please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I have communicated to Janice and Rob, and they're kind of tentatively saying, basically they are saying they are on route to various locations, but they'll check in with constituency travel, and see you know, what can be done. So there is that.

There is something else regarding the CROPP ROT though, and it [inaudible] Monday, and it's not going to affect the APRALO proposal. But there was a conversation in March, this year, which called for, you

know, a reconstitution of the CROPP ROT team. And you know, there was some decisions made, but then it was put off.

And I imagine what happened that well, everybody is busy so we never got around to it. And the discussion was that any appointees to the CROPP would have to be ratified by the RALOs and so forth, and things like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: They do not have to be...

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If you recall that discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev, the decision that was made was that the CROPP review... Two issues. Number one, until there is a new CROPP review team, the old one, or whatever parts of it remain alive, make the decisions. So there is no reason to delay because of that, number one.

Number two, the constitution of the new CROPP team would be made up by selections representing each region by, selected by the members of the finance and budget subcommittee, and by the CROPP, and by the outreach and engagement committee. So I am assuming that Monday or soon after, very soon afterwards, you will have five [CROSSTRALK] to contribute to the new CROPP review team.

I have asked for a budget and finance committee meeting to do the same. They do not have to be ratified by the RALO.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Good to know. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: The RALO has already put people on the committee. If they're putting someone on the committee who they then think is not going to be a good candidate for the CROPP review team, I have to ask why did they put them there to begin with?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I won't talk about a certain RALO, but okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's why we're having the choice made by the whole outreach and engagement and the finance and budget, so it's not purely an appointment by the RALO. And that's Cheryl's request, so I'm presuming she's happy with that. And she has a smiley face on.

Anything else on this issue? The optics and the public relations of this Asia Pacific CROPP excursion not going ahead are bad, so let's try to make sure that we move whatever has to be moved to make it work.

Any further discussion on that one?

Seeing nothing. The next item is a question for the people on this group to start with. When I get emails, some of them get filed automatically in mailboxes, because I don't necessarily want to look at them immediately. There is a significant problem because the mailing lists are generally set up to eliminate multiple mails. And I believe that can be changed on a person by person basis.

Does anyone else have problems that things get filed away in a mailbox they don't look at, and they never actually see the message which also may have gone to the ALAC list? Am I the only one who has that problem? Or are there other people?

Nobody else has the problem. No one else is on the call any more. Is there anyone alive out there?

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm the only one with the problem. Okay, I will solve my own problem then. If it was a general problem, I was going to suggest something, but if it isn't, then I will make sure it gets fixed.

The next item on the agenda is ICANN 54. We have 25 minutes, I would like to go on to the next item, which I don't think will take very long, and then go back so we don't cut the Dublin meeting short again like we did during the ALAC meeting.

Are there any action items from the ALAC meeting that we need to discuss here? If they're just action items for me or for staff that are clear, we don't need to discuss them.

Anyone on staff? Heidi? Ariel?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I'm just looking, but nothing really stood out that was urgent, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The last ALAC meeting had more attendees than I've ever seen before in my life. Do we know why? We had people we hadn't seen in two years showing up. Does anyone have any idea why we were suddenly popular?

No one has any idea. Okay. Heidi, your hand is up. Does that mean you want to speak?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, I'll put it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So no one has any idea. All right. I was just sort of curious. And lastly, we need to do something at the beginning of the meetings so we know what ALAC members we have, and whether we have regions covered.

If anyone has any neat tools around, then suggest them. I have one idea in my head, but I'm not quite sure how we implement it. I think we really want to try to get to the point where we're starting these meetings on time, and we're not doing really well right now. So just a heads up that if you have any thoughts on what we should do, then speak up.

I did, by the way, go in and edit the agenda for that ALAC meeting, and add a line that was missing, that is absences. ALAC members who hadn't sent their apologies and didn't show up. And I'd like that to be a standard item from now on please.

And I now turn it over to Gisella, since León, I believe, is not on the call. And the rest of the meeting is yours Gisella. Other than any other business, if anyone has any. Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, thank you. Gisella here for the transcript. Just to say with regards point of the ALAC call, the ALAC members on the call, what I do try and do on the top right hand pod, is put the ALAC members, I specifically [inaudible] ALAC and then EN which means other English participants, and I do the same for the other languages.

What I can do under ALAC is put all of the regions. And I usually have the names of everyone, and put them in bold as we go so that I can read through the attendance, and then I also know who is not on the call, and those names of the ALAC members not on the call, will now just be moved down to the line that you've just added.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That may be good. We probably don't need to delineate the regions once the agenda, once the meeting starts. But as a start, that maybe a simple way we can handle that. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: It's just... It's Gisella again. It's just a good visual on your right hand pod. I just keep putting the names in as people come on and you will have a clear vision on who is on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No I like the idea of bold, that's good.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. Coming on to the next point of the Dublin meeting, we had a staff meeting yesterday, and meeting team were kind enough to join the call and were going to get bombarding with questions. The main questions that I asked for now was, as we are at a conference center, and we have two [inaudible] setup.

I want you to know the timings of the meetings. We're not able to confirm the timings as of yet, because bearing in mind that whatever time the meetings start, tech has to get there ahead of time, interpreters as well, security clearances to get into the building, etc. So there is a quite a heavy logistics behind starting a meeting earlier.

We would need to start at 8 AM, and let's plan on finishing at 6, 6:30 PM. If the meetings can be extended, we will be notified, in which case, we have a little bit of a leeway. There will be food stands as well, with regards to getting a take out, I'm sure I can arrange something for the Friday, depending on what the budget allows. I'll follow up with Heidi with that.

And also, I'm just thinking ahead for any ad-hoc, informal meetings, etc. Often people tell me, can you just organize drink? We just want an informal meeting with this working group, or can you get [inaudible] to meet up with me? We've got to bear in mind that with Dublin it's going to be a little bit of a chessboard, because we're in several different hotels, with the number 6, 7, or 8.

We are not going to be able to have our usual breakfast meetings, lunch meetings, drinks, dinner, etc. Or it will just need to be in a centralized, in one of the hotels. I did ask for the room allocations for the ALAC members, liaisons, our main contacts so that I can have that. And if you do need any meetings set up, I can at least assist with that, because I'll know where everyone is.

That's all information we've got for now. Are there any questions on what I've just said?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No questions from me. I guess, we need to soon start soliciting people for what do they want? I don't think we need to walk things in right now, but I think we want to start putting together the list of meetings

that people want, and open sessions and topics to be discussed in the ALAC closed sessions.

We do have the Saturday this time. So we have a full extra day that we've never had before. And so we have a fair amount of flexibility, and hopefully time to have some substantive discussions over things. But that does mean we want to think about what it is we are going to want to talk about, and to the extent possible, we really want to do our homework and have discussion papers or things circulated well ahead of time so we're not doing everything cold.

So I think the onerous is on us to demonstrate that we're using this extra day effectively, and that's going to require a fair amount of planning, I think on the part of all of us. Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I do Alan. Sorry. This is me having not followed up from the last ALAC call, and I had intended to contact Gisella and León, I'm going to do it now, sorry.

I just want to raise the issue regarding the ad-hoc accessibility working group normal slot in face to face meetings. I would like very much to have a 60 minute allocation, at least a 60 minute allocation, but if at all possible, we need to have it at a date and time where wider ICANN community member participation is maximized. And Heidi will understand my rationale for wanting to do that.

But it's extremely important that we have it at a day and time where it is highly likely that anyone from the ICANN community is able to attend. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Anyone else?

Back to you Gisella, then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. Cheryl, to respond to your request, just what we... I'm working on this with León and with Alan. We will be sending out a note to all of the working groups to find out who would like a meeting. We are going to try and prioritize the active working groups, if that makes sense, and I will ready note for the accessibility.

So seeing that that is the first one that's come forward, even though I haven't sent the email out yet for the other ones...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Preemptive strike, Gisella, the preemptive strike. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Absolutely. We will make sure that it is put at a much, I will take into account what you said, so that the wider ICANN community can attend the meeting. And also see when the block schedule comes out, that we try and avoid as many conflicts as possible. And we'll all work on fine tuning that.

With regards to what Alan said with the topics, etc. yes. I'm open to any suggestions. I know what Alan would like to see, as opposed to seeing the schedule that I usually send out, which you will still get, this allows you to get an overview of the duration of the Dublin meeting, where you'll see the [inaudible] running, the CCWG meetings running, the GNSO meetings running of interest.

And this will just give you a broader view on it. I know that you would like some bullet points, and this is what the ALT will need to be working on with León, Alan, myself, and Heidi, on the topics that you wish to see on the agendas.

As Alan said, also, this has got the extra day of Saturday, but we would like to avoid any last minute agenda building, and just to make sure that we're all arriving, we're all clear on what we are going to be discussing, and if there is any additional input, even from the ALAC, we can request this on the last ALAC call, prior to the final schedule being published.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Gisella. There will of course, be last minute changes. And hopefully we have enough time with the extra day, that we can build a little bit of slack into it. But the major topics, I think, we want to have them known ahead of time, so people can do preparation. But it's going to be a challenge.

And I think we're going to have to, as I've said, demonstrate that what we're doing is in fact, a good use of the extra resources that we've asked for.

Anything else on Dublin?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. [CROSSTALK] I think Gisella is going to mention the same thing. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. I also see that Holly has her hand up, but she's dropped from the AC. Holly, are you still there?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sure Holly wanted to say that she wanted to schedule a meeting, but we don't need to schedule meetings on this meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay then, Alan. So Gisella and I were not reading each other's minds. Gisella, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry....

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly is back.

GISELLA GRUBER: I think that Heidi may... I just wanted to get into the social events, just so that I'm clear on what we need to be scheduling logistically, and also maybe it's selfish, but I'm going on holiday in August. So I would like to make sure that I've done as much work as possible before going on holiday.

And the good news about Dublin is that we're more than likely to have a gala even on the Monday evening. So we'll keep that free for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to have to interrupt you Gisella. Fadi announced today that the gala runs Monday through Wednesday, and we might have some opportunity for actual meetings on Thursday.

24 hours a day. Sorry. He did actually say that, but it was done presumably as a joke, at the end of the meeting. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: So that's already good news, seeing that's been reintroduced, and it's a great opportunity for networking, and I know that the community does appreciate that time. And I'm sure it will be wonderful in Dublin. It will involve Guinness somehow. Another point is the EURALO General Assembly, which will be held on Wednesday, two 90 minute sessions, times not yet confirmed.

And in the evening, as opposed to having a showcase, we'll be having an EURALO networking event, likely to be a cocktail etc., but more details to come on that. So we'll keep the Wednesday evening free. Just to get back to the social events. Alan, a question for you. Will we be having

an ALT dinner? And if so, when? My question being that this time we have our day on Saturday, which is the additional day, the strategy day. Do we have an ALAC dinner after the Saturday evening?

Do we only have an ALT dinner on the Saturday evening? Because I also heard mention of a dinner on the following Friday, at the end of the development session.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I want input from others on this. My gut feeling is for the ALT to skulk off and go to a dinner after a full day of work among the rest of the group, is less than optimal. At this point, it's not clear when the ALT will be meeting at all. I would tend to suggest that we can, since... And I don't know how possible it's going to be to try to ensure that the ALT is all checked into the hotel by noon, so we can do something on Friday at, in the early afternoon.

I suspect that would end up being problematic, that some of the people will not be able to show up, unless they're given permission to show up the day before. And Heidi, to the extent that you may be able to finagle that, that would be optimal.

If we go into this meeting with no ALT meeting, no discussion ahead of time at all, it would be the first time in meeting years that we've done that. And I don't find that really heartwarming. I think the discussion ahead of time is something that, you know, ends up being a very useful thing for us to do.

So I guess I'm looking for some inventive ways to staff help to try to make sure that we can arrange that.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if I may, it's Gisella here. [CROSSTALK] ...options to have a, it all depends on what time we can get into the conference center, and if we can have breakfast meetings. I think the request one we may be able to do this, is to have an ALT breakfast, for instance, worst case, on the Saturday morning prior to starting of the strategy day.

ALAN GREENBERG: That certainly is the worst case, but it really is the worst case. Of the...

Sorry, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Or, again, not optimal, but again it looks as though the ALT is kind of slipping off, is to keep the Saturday lunchtime, I'm assuming that we're going to have some sort of break, because we did have an hour and a half break on the Sunday in Buenos Aries, which just ended up being a working group meeting during that time, we didn't have any other time.

We could also do a lunch. Again, it would be [inaudible] and you will only get an hour in.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can I see a show of hands, or whatever from the other ALT members and liaisons, to what extent do you believe it is really essential

that we have a meeting prior to the start of the ALAC meeting? Am I the only one who thinks that's important?

Apparently. Holly thinks it's important. Maureen, Olivier, Cheryl. Okay, I think we have to see if we can move heaven and earth to arrange that we get in early. Everyone there is going to be approved for at least a Friday arrival. The only question is, are there going to be people who, because of plane schedules, cannot readily make that Friday morning.

And I would ask all of you to look at, you know, what options you're likely to have, and is there going to be difficulty? And do we have to try to get special blessing for people to arrive on Thursday, if necessary. So I ask each of you to do your homework. Yes Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So just keep in mind, Alan, that you are going to be, on the 16th, there is a CCWG meeting. And then there is also going to be that AC SO [CROSSTALK] RALO chairs meeting. So Friday is not going to be an optimal time. [CROSSTALK]

CHERL LANGDON-ORR:

...Alan's not reading the chat, he's not reading [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:

The CCWG is meeting, so that fixes some people. But you're write, the CCWG is meeting. So...

HEIDI ULLRICH: And I can try to get you all a nice breakfast. It's the ALT that Saturday, 8 to 9:30, and then the strategy session starts at 9:30.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let's keep on talking about this. Sorry. My thoughts on Friday were, I forgot completely about the CCWG. Let's keep on talking offline and see what we can arrange. The Saturday morning breakfast is really far from optimal, but it really maybe our only choice.

But yeah, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, it's Gisella again. Just to go on with the, if [inaudible] everyone put [inaudible] on that with the ALAC dinner, would you like one on the Saturday evening and the following Friday evening? Keep it open. It's just, if we want a private, A, if we want a private room and B, the logistics of herding the whole ALAC to a dinner, I need to find a [inaudible] shuttle, and taxies, etc. involved, it's going to be a large group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we all likely to be in the same hotel?

Do we have any idea?

GISELLA GRUBER: They're going to try and put the groups in the same hotels, but until I've seen the hotel allocation, I wouldn't put my [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: And it may not be possible. The people who are arriving for the Friday session may have to be in one hotel, and the others in another one. You know, this has happened before.

Let's talk on the list on this. I don't think... My inclination is to say the ALT should not go off on a private dinner on Saturday, but I think that would be somewhat awkward. My other inclination is to try to find, you know, not necessarily a private room for the ALAC to meet, but some place that's relaxed and, I won't say a fun place, but just somewhere where people can unwind a bit after the first day.

But let's continue this on the list. I don't have any really strong feelings, and I guess I would like to get input from other people.

Julie is asking Friday night. Which Friday night Julie? The first one or the last one?

First one. First one the chairs... I and the RALO chairs are already committed.

Anything else we need to discuss Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, that's all from me, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Sorry, this hasn't been a particularly satisfying meeting. There is an awful lot of things we're putting off, but I'm not

quite sure the, there is a lot of options at this point. Any other business?

If not, then I call the meeting to an end. Olivier, you said your busy right after this, so we need to get together some time, my morning, your afternoon, and try to put that statement to bed.

Then I call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for coming. And for those of you who have been in CCWG meetings all day, or all night for some people, get some rest, one way or another.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh yeah, because our working day is not starting or anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've given up earning money anyway, so just like many of the rest of us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actually Alan, I've got a dinner party to organize for tonight. So I'm going to be cooking my tits off all day.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, but that's fun stuff. Take care all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]