
GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team Mid-Monthly call on Wednesday, 13 April, at 12:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sandra Hoferichter, Holly Raiche, León Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ron Sherwood, Julie Hammer. Apologies noted from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First substantive item is At-Large policy. Who do we have who will be doing that today? Do we have anyone who will be doing that today?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I've just been informed that Ariel is not yet on the call, so, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want to delay it until later?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we could do that. That would be useful.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, very good. The next item is update on CCWG. If Leon is on, if he can give a brief review of where we are, and specifically anything the ALAC and At-Large should be doing.

Now I will make the comment that we tacitly decided we are not as a community going to comment on the bylaws. There just didn't seem to be the bandwidth to do that kind of thing, and it wasn't the kind of issue that we wanted to call out at this process. Now once it goes out for public comment, however, I think we do have to do something. But then that process will be starting in a couple of days. I've been working on the assumption that individuals, to the extent they have had the bandwidth and the capacity, have been looking at bylaws or sections of bylaws. But the public comment, obviously, will be something that we have to pass judgment on.

So, Leon, over to you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. As Alan just said, we have been working on translating the documented recommendations into bylaws. This is an exercise that has been carried out mainly by both the CCWG lawyers and ICANN legal. With those draft bylaws, what we have done is to circulate them to the wider group, and the wider group has had a look at those draft bylaws and raised the many questions or concerns that they might have. We've been, of course, trying to address these issues, concerns, and questions, and not in a way that we reopen any issues, but mainly trying to guide both our lawyers and ICANN legal to duly reflect what the recommendations tried to convey in the document.

As Alan said, I think that the bandwidth for us at least to have a detailed look at the draft bylaws is very limited, but I definitely agree with him that when it comes to the public comment period, we should definitely at least make some comments. I don't see anything that serious for the ALAC at this stage, although I haven't, of course, had the chance to do a detailed review of all of the draft bylaws. But I don't remember anything at least that is too serious for the ALAC at this stage. However, of course, I will keep you posted if I notice anything that would be relevant to the ALAC.

As for the CCWG at Helsinki, we of course will be holding different meetings trying to advance the work on Work Stream 2. We haven't confirmed that we will be having an extra day of meetings for the CCWG. Chances are that we will be, in fact, having a day of meetings the day before the meeting starts. As for travel support for this meeting, we have been confirmed that those people that are already being supported for travel and that, of course, are part of the CCWG would have support for that extra day. But those who have no travel support for the meeting or are not planning to attend the meeting would not be supported because of belonging to the CCWG. So they would have to participate in the remote participation.

I guess that would be a brief and concise update on the CCWG, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, Leon, that's not quite what I heard, I think Thomas, say the other day. He seemed to say that we had confirmation that we could meet and that the room was available. Where does the uncertainty come in.

He made what I thought was a very strong, very definite statement during that meeting.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Well, we do have the room available and we have confirmation that we would be supported if we decided to carry out that extra day of CCWG meetings. But the truth is that we haven't actually decided how we would carry out that day, so that is why I say that it's not set in stone. I mean, as I said, chances are very high that we would be holding this extra day of meetings, but since we haven't planned the schedule for that day, that's why I say that it's not set in stone.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. That's certainly not the way I read the words, and I won't speak to other people. I also heard a slight variation in terms of travel support. I heard a request from the Board to not extend travel support to those who were otherwise funded, but it didn't sound as absolute as it has in the past. It's as if the chairs have some discretion should they choose. I don't really want to discuss that. I'm just noting that that's the way he said the words, in any case.

Any questions from anyone else on the CCWG? Clearly, we're going to have to come up with some sort of methodology, and I'm not quite sure how we do that, to make comments on the bylaws. Really, that involves at least a number of people within the At-Large support group having gone over them with a fine-toothed comb and saying, "Yes, we think that they meet the requirements" or "we found certain things." I just noticed something in an e-mail today where apparently it's a wrong

acronym, but there may well be things that still haven't been caught despite the process.

Leon, can we assume there will be a real redline between the current bylaws and the new bylaws? That wasn't sent out originally. Then Bernie created a fake one, and then someone sent out the lawyers' redline. So will there actually be a redline distributed for the public comment period?

LEON SANCHEZ:

We have asked the lawyers to produce this document, although since the time is really short, we have given priority to actually finishing the bylaws rather than to have the redline document. Another concern, of course, about producing this redline document is cost. So we would be doing our best to have this document, but in my mind it is, of course, important to have a redline document but it's not essential to actually be able to assess the new version of the bylaws and actually produce any comments to them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I guess I was assuming that they were working from a redline document, but let's not discuss that any further right now.

Any other comments on CCWG before we go back to item number 3 and ALAC policy? No comments? Then I'll turn it over to Ariel for an update on where we are on that. We have a fair number that are in drafting, and I want to make sure that we're meeting our schedule as we go through it. So, Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Alan. Apologies for joining late. We have one statement that is being drafted. It's the one on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. That's [launched] by Tijani Ben Jemaa. Public comment closes April 30. It would be better if we have a first draft ASAP on that.

Then also we know that Olivier Crépin-Leblond has led the drafting of this white paper on the GA and the Summit. We know that Alan [usually] works with Olivier and Heidi to update that draft. We know that next week we will have a call and actually review the draft. So, hopefully, that is going to be ready, close to a final stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, can we have an update on the statement? Is Tijani with us?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we do hear you now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. You are asking about an update about geographic regions?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Of finance and budget.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Finance and budget is not yet started for me because I finished the [geographic] region. It is on the wiki for now day. The deadline will be 15, so that people comment on it and they will deliver the final version. Regarding the finance and budget, I didn't do anything. You know very good how things went for the CCWG. I didn't comment at the beginning of the comments of people because I couldn't read everything and be sure what I had to change, what I had to do. That's why I come in the comments very late, and this prevented me to start the budget and finance statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I think you had said you were going to put at least some bullet points up of the things that you believed need commenting on. What's the timing for that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I said I wanted to do that on 10 of this month. I didn't do. I hope I will do it very quickly because we are really pressed by the time. The two plans are very long. They need very good attention, so I hope I will be able to deliver very quickly. Let's say, perhaps next week...perhaps.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess we need at least some bullet points really quickly so other people can at least look at those and comment on them. Ariel, can you work with Tijani to at least get some tentative dates in, even if we have to change them on the schedule? Because right now, everything is “to be” – “TBC,” whatever the “C” is – “to be considered,” I guess.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay? Thank you. I’ll go back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. There is another statement that’s going to the internal commenting progress. That’s the statement under Final Rapport Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The internal commenting period will go on until the end of this week, April 15. Just a reminder for Tijani, by April 18, next Monday, please try to have the final draft ready so that we can start the ratification logs on that statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: The last one that is in progress is on the statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. That’s

going to the ALAC ratification vote and will close April 15, so that's on schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Nothing new recently?

ARIEL LIANG: No, nothing new recently. Oh, sorry. I forgot to mention. There's one more. It's a public comment on the Draft Report: New gTLD Program Safeguards to Mitigate DNS Abuse. Julie Hammer just replied to Alan, you, and Olivier about her review of that public comment. I don't think she has a firm idea of why the ALAC should submit a statement or not, so she would like to get some input. Oh, Julie has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I saw that e-mail, but I haven't actually had a chance to look at it yet. Julie, what's your gut feel? Is this something that has been well done and we may want to say, "Well done," or do you think there are really things that we need to substantively comment on?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

JULIE HAMMER:

Ah, good. I don't think we want to say, "Well done." I found it quite a sort of a puzzling paper. It's something where at the beginning of the new gTLD process I think staff must have gone out and asked, "How do we go about this in a way that will prevent abuse?" and a number of entities came back (like the Anti-Phishing Working Group, the SSAC, and various other groups) and said, "Well, you could do this. You could that. You could do the other thing," and from that [list] they came up with nine things that they called "safeguards" that could perhaps prevent or mitigate abuse in the new gTLD space.

So staff seem to have produced this paper, and it talks about those nine safeguards that were implemented to, I think, the best of their ability prior to the issuing of the new gTLDs. But they then go on to discuss, "Well, if we're trying to measure how effective these safeguards are, how would we measure them?" and they have a bit of discussion about that in each one. You could debate in some of them whether the measures that they're suggesting are effective or not.

Then they go on to say, "Well, the only way that you can probably test out this stuff is to propose some hypotheses and then test some data that you might be able to measure against those hypotheses." The hypotheses are fairly simple, like the three hypotheses. "Well, if the DNS abuse rate increased, then the safeguards have been ineffective. Or if it decreases, they've been effective."

I just found the whole paper to be just quite vague and not quite sure what it's intended to achieve. It's proposed to be a background information paper to assist the CCT Review Team go about its work and

for the CCT Review Team to recommend research along the lines of testing those hypotheses if they think that's a good idea.

I have to say, I just found the paper quite confusing and a bit vague in ways. I'm not sure that's a comment I necessarily would want to make publicly, but I also don't really think I'd want to come out and say, "Oh, well done. This is a great paper." So my inclination is just to remain silent on it. It's intended for the CCT Review Team. If they can find something useful in it, that would be great. But I must say, it's fairly esoteric.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If all they're doing is recommending more studies which will not be complete by the time we start a new round, it's not going to be very useful.

JULIE HAMMER:

No. I'm sorry if that's all a bit unsatisfactory review, but I really went over and over it and I thought, "I can't think of anything useful to say on this."

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Olivier is also listed as one of the people who will look at it. Is Olivier on the call?

JULIE HAMMER:

No, he was an apology.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes. Very correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I didn't hear what that was. That got muffled.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan. Yes, Olivier is an apology. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Alright. Because he was going to look at that also. I don't know if he did or not. Let's go back to that offline. If you can do an action item that we'll check with Olivier on that, please.

Any other comments on public comment before we go on to the next item?

Okay, the next item, I'm just raising a red flag that I'm starting to become a little bit concerned that the whole concept of individual members within RALOs seems to have fallen between the cracks, largely for good reasons, but there has been not a lot of action that I've seen within most of the RALOs. I guess I'd first of all ask Cheryl, how are we doing within the ALS Criteria working group, the subsection on individual members? Is Cheryl here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I just have to come off mute. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just struggling [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I can't hear you, Cheryl. You're not audible from my side.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, is this better? Is that better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's try.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I can. Not loud, but I can hear you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, okay. Alright, well, I'll [eat] the microphone even more closely. I really haven't got anything to respond to your question. I think [inaudible] it all since the last time we looked at it.

Have I been dropped?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Cheryl. We can hear you, but you're very soft. Not your normal forceful voice.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think [inaudible] trying to be quiet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have we lost Alan then?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, are you there? Gisella?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, can you hear Cheryl?

ALAN GREENBERG: I heard a sound, but I couldn't make out what the words were.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, try again, Cheryl?

ALAN GREENBERG: If someone else did, if they could repeat it perhaps?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, did you want to just try again?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will do my best considering that I haven't got anything to say. It seems like an awful lot of words to say I don't have very much to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. That I got. The focus really wasn't on Cheryl's group, but to go around, do we have any chance of actually doing anything? There seems to be so much resistance within some of the RALOs to even considering it and trying a pilot program that I'm really worried we have to do something that's a little bit more forceful than anything we've done to date. And I guess I'd like some comments from the specific RALOs, and the ones that seem to be the most resistant from what I've received is AFRALO and LACRALO. EURALO does have this group; I don't know how successful it is. Actually, Tijani has his hand up, so please, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. In AFRALO, we had already discussed this point. We are reviewing our operating principles, and one of the points that had been discussed was individual membership. This point was discussed largely. The result was that people accepted not easily to have individual members, but they refused that they have any kind of decision making possibility at the moment. What I managed to have is to make our principles say that this is only for one year, and we will review the principle the year after so that if we find that it is possible, we find a way to give them a voice, to give them a say in our decision making, it will be better.

I have another comment about the individual memberships. I feel that, Alan, you make it as something very important that we [inaudible] have to adopt it. I am not sure in my point of view this is something like this. We try to have individual members, assuming that those members are useful for the group. This is according to each region and each [inaudible]. I make my best to have this adopted in AFRALO, but I am not sure we'll manage to get it and I don't see the harm in it. We may push people to integrate ALSes or to form an ALS, and we [inaudible] that also. I agree with you that we have to perhaps try to make it happen, but I am not sure it is something crucial for us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I notice a queue. I'll just point out, it was one of the recommendations out of the first review and is clearly going to be something the second review will be focusing on if only because of that but also because I suspect we have plenty of evidence when we're looking at ALSes which are not functioning that, in at least some cases, those ALSes are really a vehicle for a single person or perhaps two people. So those two motivations are why I've been bringing it up.

Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to say that for APRALO, for example, I guess a little like Tijani mentioned, we are actually reviewing the individual membership statement that we currently have in our Rules of Procedure, but we've not had any members actually approach us and individuals approach us about any urgent decision making, but it's because you've raised it. We will bring it up at our next meeting to start some discussion amongst the ALS members who actually attend to get their views on individual members as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright, can you hear me a little bit better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, as you said, it is a recommendation and is one of the few things that has not been completed out of the first review. We do need to be “more forceful.” There’s very little evidence to those RALOs – and AFRALO is at least finding a way forward, so we’re really only talking about LACRALO – there’s very little evidence from the other RALOs that having this capability on the book is an issue. The world has not stopped, and there hasn’t been outright overturning of the democratic processes in the regions that have picked up a methodology.

Of course, what APRALO is trying to do, as Maureen just said, is find a way that we can ensure that how any important decision making happens, happens fairly and effectively. Yes, we probably do need to be more forceful about it. And with the upcoming review getting started, I think it’s probably a motivator. We’ve got one RALO, by the look of it, that now is the recalcitrant. We just need to work with it. Each of these RALOs have had a lot of other things they’ve been focusing on. It just hasn’t been the most important thing, so, yes, we need to do something and help it happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I guess it’s a little bit worse than that in my mind because even NARALO, which has had from the beginning and it’s not a controversial issue, has done nothing. If you listen to the leadership, outreach is

finding ALSes; outreach is not finding individual members. The only individual members we have are the ones who wandered in by accident, essentially. We get an average of one a year and lose one a year. That's the rate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. And so, in a way, it's kind of a non-event. But certainly at APRALO, from an outreach perspective, where we have opportunity for an At-Large Structure to be created having one or two people [inaudible] an individual member and being active and interested with our processes until such time as that happens, we see that as a benefit, not as a negative.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess my larger concern is even when the words are there, the action isn't, and I don't know how to motivate people that individual users may be a way to contribute. I will point out, I'm an individual user. Some of them do actually do something, so just for the record.

Alright, I'm not going to beat that one to death right now, but I just wanted to raise the issue and remind people that somehow we have to do something or it's going to become perhaps more embarrassing.

Next item is At-Large Working Groups. That we tried to kick off at a meeting a while ago, and Maureen volunteered to put together the document for the ALAC to consider in terms of what working groups do we change, what working groups do we kill or re-motivate as it were, perhaps rename? The staff was working on a document. It finally came

out yesterday, and I found a number of problems with it so we seem to be stalled on that.

But let me just reiterate it is I think we need to do. We need to identify the working groups that are not fully functioning and well. We know the ones that are working well. We know the ones that are staffed. They have chairs. They actively have meetings, and they've accomplishing something. Then we have a bunch of them that seem to have not met for a year or two years or whatever. The chair has long gone. Half of the people listed as members of the working committee have not been seen in a year or two. Those we have to either do something about or kill.

I will get the document the staff is working on to be revised and pass that on to Maureen. Maureen, I hope you're still willing to do that. What we're asking from you, Maureen, is simply a personal position – which can be completely wrong, but it's a starting point in a discussion – for what does the ALAC do with each of the working groups that are not operating perfectly and humming along.

So that's where we sit right now. It seems to have been delayed a month or so, for reasons I'm not quite sure. But regardless, I think we need to get it and put it on the agenda for the next ALAC meeting. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, I've been waiting for Heidi to get back to me, and I know that there are other things that have been happening. But, yes, I would be very happy to do as you ask. And I agree, let's look in at what's working and what isn't and what we can do about it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We also need to recognize that some of these have been passive because of the considerable human bandwidth taken up by other things. So let's make sure that we watch our timing here. There is still a number of people who are extraordinarily occupied with what limited time they have in other ways. In some of the RALOs, for example, they themselves are busy doing lots and lots of reviews. Just let's be very careful that we watch our babies being in our bathwater if we toss some of these things out. Some of them will be clear, as you can see on the list. There is a need to address this, but whether or not some of it is as time critical as may be seen, I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I don't think it's particularly onerous. It's just that we've been talking about it for a long time and it keeps on coming back on every meeting. We did an abortive start at it – I've lost track now whether it's in Dublin or Marrakech – and then we're criticized that we didn't do it properly. The vast majority of our working groups are actually working. There's just a number that we just need to do the clean-up. I don't think it's a lot of work; we just need to focus on it, and this was what I hoped was a painless way of doing it. We'll self-esteem whether that proves out or not. Anything else on that?

Next item is RALOs Elections, Selections, and Appointments. This was a 0-minute item just to alert everyone to the fact that this process is starting in each of the RALOs. There was supposed to be a pointer to the page, which is not in the agenda. If we could put that in the chat at least or maybe circulate it to the ALT agenda so people could look at the pages. And just be aware of what's going on within your region is the only highlight of this one.

Alright, next is ICANN 56, Helsinki, and I will turn it over to Gisella. Is Gisella with us?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. I'm here. Sorry. Mute/unmute; mute/unmute. Thank you, Alan. I sent around earlier on a document I've just been updating from the latest information that I found on the meeting page. I know that the SOs and ACs had a call and that you may actually have some more information, Heidi, to share information with us. I'm putting the links to the page there.

What I've done initially is just changed all the times, updated our Meeting B that the new meeting strategy working group had initially set up and added whatever has been added to the main schedule.

Basically, what I'd like to get out of today's meeting is just if we can have a look at the document, maybe highlight any places where we think that we're going to have to change what the new meeting strategy worked on, and also maybe discuss the outreach. Now I know that we need to get an outreach call set up for next week to work on the outreach in Helsinki, so basically a little bit of a brainstorming.

I'm just going to display the document that I've been working on and that you've all got in your inboxes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

While you're doing that, Gisella, let me update people on where we in terms of the changes. You'll remember in Marrakech there was a decision to hold a small ad hoc group to look at how we cooperate among the ACs and SOs and have some common sessions. The decision was made to – I think...I haven't quite actually seen a decision yet – to set aside every afternoon I think from 3:00-5:00 or 3:00-6:00 with some sort of communitywide discussion focused on particular topics. There has been a solicitation of topics.

I really don't understand how these are going to be handled and what the intent is. The topics have ranged from everything from the public interest to issues that are relevant to particular PDPs that are going on, both past and present ones – privacy proxy, new round of gTLDs and specific parts of them – and it's not clear to me whether these are going to be working PDP sessions with the whole community or if they're going to be public forum type sessions. I just haven't gotten my head around exactly what it is they're planning, and I'm not sure anyone does at this point.

So we have some sort of things that will be going on every afternoon that are blocked out of our schedule. What I suggested to Gisella is to take the rest of our meeting, the things that we were trying to do, and try to find places to put them. So essentially, juggle the building blocks to fit into this new overall time schedule which, instead of having what I

think was Thursday set aside for intra-community work, it's now every afternoon.

So, Gisella, back to you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

With regards to juggling the building blocks, we're going to be meeting with a smaller group like we have done in the past to set up the At-Large schedule. There will be Leon, Alan, Beran, Heidi, and myself.

As I've said, I haven't actually touched the At-Large schedule as it is now because I've just taken all this information off the meeting page [further] to the call that you had [inaudible]. Tanzania has made some changes, so what you see in front of you all on your e-mail is what I've been able to collate. I think that if we can just maybe run through the days and just agree on the outlines of what we would like to be doing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can try. Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes. Again, it is very vague because I've put in the afternoon sessions which will be these topic sessions, which seem to be Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and on Monday, I still have the days mainly for outreach.

Now with our start in the day, the coffee and welcome, we've [inaudible] having any parallel meetings to that. So what I'm going to

have is you can see there's an additional column there which will be the proposed schedule for the ALAC which I'll be working on with the smaller group. I've left in yellow what the working group actually put into this Meeting B.

The outreach activities, while I was on holiday, I heard that Sebastien would be working on that. [inaudible] has asked for an outreach subcommittee meeting next week to discuss the outreach in Helsinki and what we can eventually do, bearing in mind that there is little to no budget for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Gisella, you said you have the ALAC schedule and left in what the new meeting working group came up with. I only see one column called ALAC.

GISELLA GRUBER: The second one is a blank column which is "Proposed ALAC" which I haven't touched yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay. It's the empty column. Okay, thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. The building blocks start today.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understand.

GISELLA GRUBER:

I've taken all the information that I've found on the main meeting page and I've also added in pink the social events that I've heard of so far which Yrjö has kindly shared with us.

So if we start on the Monday morning, there's a Coffee and Welcome, David Olive. That's about as far as it goes, but how that's going to take shape probably just in one main meeting room I'm not quite sure. Then the outreach activities from what I'm seeing in the main room, the outreach activities for the Fellows/NextGen is basically going to be the whole day. We also have for the Board what has been put in there is Board participation in the policy development work in the different SOs and ACs. So the main question is, are we still going to be doing outreach all day on Monday?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I thought our tentative decision was that we would do something similar to Marrakech. That is, we would do a half day with selected people going out and the rest doing something in parallel. I thought that was the last we said.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead. Cannot hear you yet.

GISELLA GRUBER: Tijani? Let me just check with Adigo. Thank you. Tijani, can you hear us?
No, Tijani is unmuted. Tijani?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're speaking, please type. We cannot hear you.

GISELLA GRUBER: He's showing connected and unmuted.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's dropped.

GISELLA GRUBER: We will dial out to him again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, Gisella, let's go on.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, what I'll do then is I will do the parallel activities on Monday afternoon with outreach...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi did ask, are we doing outreach Monday or Tuesday?

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, there is a topic session on Tuesday afternoon, however this is going to take shape. So maybe the outreach, we could keep it on Monday as per initial plan because that's what the NextGen and Fellows seem to be doing as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl says, remember, we'll know more when the outreach committee meets.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. So we go on to Tuesday which again for the main sessions is Cross Community Collaboration and Networking Area. Then in the afternoon, we've got the first session of these topic sessions. We've got Topic Session 1 – and sorry the borders didn't come up – and Topic Session 2 basically running from 15:15 through to 18:00. Again, I'm not sure if we want to be scheduling any ALAC policy work against those.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. The intent at this point is these are communitywide. Now when the topics get announced, we may well see something that we have absolutely no interest in and we may decide to do something against it. But at this point, I think we have to keep them empty.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, are you back?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, yes, I am here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I am a little bit confused because I see that the first day of working is Sunday. Why Sunday is not normally the first day; Monday is the first day and that's why the CCWG will meet on Sunday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where do you see Sunday?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I see it on the call that I am here, on display. The first day is Sunday.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: On the screen that I see – are you talking about on Adobe Connect?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Adobe Connect, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes, sorry. Gisella, your dark heading with the black line says Monday, just in the upper left it says Sunday.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, sorry. If I may there, Alan, this is a draft document. The Sunday is just to point out that there may be a CCWG meeting, and to that I'll add the SO/AC/SC/RALO meeting as well, etc. So that's just to say the official starting day is Monday. It's just for logistical purposes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The Sunday is CCWG. Unlike me, you have to read both sides of the line.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, okay. Okay, now it's okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead, Gisella, then. Tijani, did you have more?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no. It's okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, go ahead. And, Cheryl is now saying that we can confirm the CCWG will meet in Sunday, so that's an update from what Leon gave 10-15 minutes ago. Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, thank you very much, Alan, Leon, and Cheryl, for the update. I'll now put that in. Again, for logistical purposes for the planning of any ad hoc meetings, knowing who will actually be there on the Sunday or possibly even on the Saturday and at what time.

Going on the Monday evening, sorry, just to come back to that, Yrjö has kindly let us know that there is a reception of the City of Helsinki at the City Hall which is likely to take place because the pink are the social events.

Going back to Tuesday, as we've said, we will not schedule any meetings against the topic sessions until we know what the topic sessions are. Then we can eventually slot in a few working groups as the schedule develops. In the evening, the DNS Women's may be one of the evenings now as opposed to a breakfast. Vanda is looking at a Tuesday or Wednesday evening. ISOC Finland is hosting a get together for the ISOC-ers, which won't be an official ISOC/ICANN meeting. We're looking at a possible jamming session after that like we had in Marrakech just as a social event.

Going on to the schedule for Wednesday, the initial New Meeting Strategy working group has the ALAC with the Board. Now my understanding is that the groups won't be meeting with the Board, but the Board will be brought into our groups and we can possibly invite Board members into our meetings, depending on the subject. We've got, again, the whole afternoon for Topic Session 3 and Topic Session 4. I'm hoping that the topics will be released ASAP because this will help us definitely in our planning. Again, what's in yellow, the ALAC Policy Discussion Wrap Up, definitely won't be there. We're going to moving the blocks around very shortly. In the evening, DNS Forum. Are we having a Regional Showcase? That is yet to be discussed with Olivier and Wolf, and the EURALO are meeting on Tuesday at 18:00 UTC for their monthly meeting. I'm sure this will be discussed. There might be some form of possibly more a EURALO networking event which we've had in the past, which worked very well. Just for your information, the CCs might be having an event.

Thursday, our last day, we've got the morning which will be a joint meeting to discuss PDP working groups. I've crossed all other meetings out as it stands now because nothing will be scheduled against that, and then, again, Topic Session 5 and 6.

So as it stands now, every afternoon from 14:45 when the coffee break is, or at least 15:15 to be more accurate to 18:00, we can't schedule any meetings. The number of working groups are going to have to be reduced as, again as Alan mentioned, once the topics are released, we can possibly schedule some working groups against these topic sessions, but it will be maybe a little bit last minute. We don't know when the topics are going to be released. So again, we're going to have to

probably prioritize the working groups, and how we're going to do that, we'll have to decide because we don't have that much meeting time. I'm not sure whether we can start at 8:00 AM. I'm still waiting on confirmation for that because the 8:00-9:00 AM slots could work for working groups or for even ALAC meetings.

Any comments? Tijani, you have your hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. No, I'm not sure if that's a new hand or not. I've asked Tijani. Gisella, what's the origin of this session on Thursday from 9:15-10:30? This is the first I've heard about this.

GISELLA GRUBER: That is on the link that I put in for the meeting schedule planning. I see that it was a change that was made by Tanzania as it is in yellow. So that's also the first I've heard of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I'm not quite sure what happens in an hour and a quarter session, give that there are at least two and possibly three absolutely critical PDPs that are going on at that time.

Alright, you'll notice that on Thursday afternoon, we have hot topic sessions, which we're not supposed to schedule against, and that ALT Wrap Up. At this point, I will be requesting that the ALT meet Friday morning. That implies a change in travel for ALT members. Most likely, it would be a closed meeting because we are asking for not necessarily a

meeting room with full facilities, but we will take a hotel suite or something.

What I would like to do at that meeting is do a postmortem of the meeting that has happened so far and do some planning. I think it's really essential that we look at the meeting as the starting point for the next three or four months and try to put together some sort of plan for just what are we going to do. I find as it stands right now we're all exhausted at the end of the meeting. We go home. Nothing happens for a week or two, and then suddenly the whole world goes crazy because we suddenly realize there are things to be done. I really think that we need to do some planning and talking about it.

There may be an opportunity also there for talking to Steve and to David. I think we're going to have to decide that. It's pretty clear we will not get a formal meeting room that we can simply have an open meeting in and certainly no remote participation, so we're looking at perhaps another venue and that may change the agenda somewhat because of that but that's where we stand right now in any case.

Any thoughts on that? Does that sound like something we should be doing, or should we just scrap it altogether? I've certainly been very frustrated in the last couple of meetings with these very abbreviated meetings where, yes, we do end up meeting with Steve or David, but we really don't have any time to do any talking among the ALT. And I certainly have found that somewhat limiting. I welcome input from anyone else. Is this a good direction we're going in, or is it something I shouldn't do? Tijani, go ahead. Tijani, can't hear you. I hear beeps.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ah, okay. Thank you. I 100% agree with you, and I think this kind of planning or kind of schedule is something very good for our work, so I agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Whether we'll get approval, I don't know. I did mention this to Nick Tomasso in Marrakech. His initial reaction was, "We really can't do anything outside of meeting times." I said, "I don't want a meeting room. I don't want remote participation. I don't want simultaneous translation. I want an opportunity to talk." I said a suite or something like that would be just fine, and he said, "That shouldn't be a problem." So whether the real answer will be that simple or not, I don't know, but it wasn't an absolute turn-down, which is what I was initially expecting.

Leon says, what if there are no flights that day? Clearly, if we finish in time to get a flight out that day, then you can. But the meeting schedule would imply an extra travel day. Certainly for me, I don't think I could leave Helsinki halfway through the day and not have to have a layover somewhere along the way.

Alright, any other comments on schedule?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: We usually have an ALT dinner. Before, we usually have a little get together to kick off the meeting. Bearing in mind that the CCWG is meeting on Sunday, the SO/AC/SG/RALO leaders are going to have a dinner on Sunday evening as far as I know, how would you like to kick off the week. Would you like a breakfast on Monday, for instance, before we start the official 9:15 kick off? Cheryl has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, look, you probably are going to be able to do a breakfast meeting on Monday, but I must say we will need to look very carefully at the B Meeting being so exceptional in its new nature, the Women and DNS breakfast which is, of course, what I like to make sure most people are at if they're female as opposed to having competing meetings put in on the Monday morning. We're told that we simply are not going to be able to, despite the fact that we have people to host it, if we're going to

do something, it can't be facilitated. We won't be able to have anything onsite. If we do anything, it will have to be, you know, go find a bar somewhere in Helsinki and do as you bloody well like without bothering meetings people.

So Monday morning is something that would be open, but I would hate to see it become, "Oh, well then, we always meet on Monday morning as an ALT to kick off" because other traditions do work for particularly the longer meetings. I'm still pretty uncomfortable with trying to make this meeting a situation, a normal one. I think if it's going to be made to work as a policy-focused meeting, we really just have to put some of our more traditional work aside and focus on policy bits. To that end, as long as it then doesn't become a "what we do in the other meetings on a Monday morning" then, yes, I guess it would be truncated in [inaudible] system we could do a start of the day once.

The question, of course, will be where. It may very well be that it's going to have to be in one of the hotels. And, yes, they're all within walking distance, but time is still going to need to be taken to get from wherever the hotel is. Of course, you would need to make sure that your constituency travel had us all in at least location, not spread around the whole place. Imagine Dublin, for example, which logistically is very similar to the set up in Helsinki. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. With regards to hotels, I blew a gasket because of the hotel assignment in Marrakech, and I have asked for input from constituency travel before hotel assignments are made to make sure

that they don't do things which they assume are right but are not right. I make reference to things like Julie being put into a hotel way different from everyone else because that's where SSAC is, and yet the vast majority of her meetings were not SSAC. So I have asked for that. Whether it will happen or not, I don't know. Joseph seemed amenable to it, so we'll see what happens on that.

In terms of an ALT meeting at the beginning of the meeting, I'm assuming we will not have an opportunity. If we do end up having the ability to schedule a breakfast, we will, but at this point I'm not assuming that we will have an ALT meeting, so we're probably going to have to schedule a teleconference for shortly before people start traveling to try to handle that. We're just going to have to be flexible and see how that goes. As Cheryl said, this is not a normal meeting, and we're not going to be able to everything that we have in the past.

I'm assuming that there will be no meetings with other groups. As an example, we're talking about the standard meetings we have with GSE and a few other groups. If there are any joint meetings between ALAC and anyone – whether it's SSAC, ccNSO, whatever – it will be because we have specific things that we believe we need to discuss as opposed to just we do it every time we meet. Otherwise, we're going to end up having no time left for any discussions. So that's the general theme but, of course, if there are things that need to be discussed with other groups, then we should try to highlight them as soon as possible.

Any further comment on the meeting schedules? Gisella, is there anything else you need to address?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, no, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We are a little bit over time, but we'll see what we can do. The white paper is the next item on the agenda. This is the proposal to do multi-year planning and advance planning for the GAs and Summit. I did some redrafting of the paper. We were at the point where I think Olivier felt he needed another set of eyes, and I redrafted a little bit of it. I kept a lot of it the same. I moved annexes out to pointer so the document doesn't look quite as threatening, even though the same amount of information is there.

We've reduced the large table to a timeline. I'm not convinced we still want the timeline, but I think that's something I'd like some input on. I believe the timeline is important. It gives a feel for what we have done in the past and what we're trying to do in the future, but other people may have a different view on that.

I sent that out last night. That was a copy that had just had some edits done to it and not proofread, so I'm sure there were problems with it. Has anyone had a chance to look at it. I know some of you have had a day before this meeting. For others, it's early in the day. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I do like the thrust of it. There's some language I really would change, and there are some edits. I think it does need a bit of a going

over, but I think the main thrust is okay. My vote would be to retain the timeline. I think that does illustrate what we're saying.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. If you can send in – don't worry about typos at this point. We'll have another pass for that. But if there's language that you really don't like, then please if you could identify that as quickly as possible. We are going to be scheduling a meeting with the ALAC to discuss this in-depth. I think that meeting will likely now be next Monday or Tuesday, so we really don't have an awful lot of time left to get this version out for them to read and be ready to discuss ahead of time. So we're on a pretty tight schedule on this.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'll try.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else have any comments on it? Anyone else have a chance to look at it? I would appreciate it if before the end of your day, whenever your day is, if you could look at it. And again, don't worry about typos and stuff, but to be blunt, is this something we think a Board member is going to actually read? That's the target. The structure of it has changed a fair amount. I'm not sure we're going to call it a "white paper" anymore because it's really a proposal at this point. But look at it and put yourself in the seat of a Board member. Are you going to be able to read it? Are you going to take the time? Does it flow well, and is there a convincing argument there or not? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just wondering straight off the top with the title, based on the discussions that we've been having with [DTO] and strategic planning as well as budget and [allocations] discussions for PTI and other things, the nomenclature is very important. I think some of the Board members will be hypersensitive to terms like "multi-year budget planning." I think we need to look at, right off the top, the title.

We all know what we're meaning to say, but I suspect that we might have people balk with the response that the ICANN Board allocates an annual budget. So what we're really talking about here is planning and strategic design for predictable [inaudible] commitments, etc. It might be worthwhile having, Alan, Olivier and you and I even have a quiet word with Xavier to see what is the better language. He is, for example, constantly trying to reeducate people about what a budget means as opposed to what a strategic plan is. I think what we're trying to do is get a commitment to a strategic plan with a predictability for the allocation of funds over time. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, Cheryl. The nomenclature in the document has changed, and you're right, I didn't go back and change the title. But the nomenclature has changed, essentially saying this has to be integrated into the planning process, the strategic and operational planning process, with implications on the budget, obviously, but not budget. But you're right, I didn't change the title, and that's very correct. I also

realized I didn't change the heading which says this is Version 1.1, even though it is. So there's some clean-up to be done there. Thank you.

Any other comments on it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, I just wanted to make sure that you knew – you asked, would a Board member read it? I suspect that some wouldn't read more than the title if it wasn't changed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Noted. The title not being changed was a slip-up. As I said, if you go through the text, you will see some different language than was there before but perhaps still not sufficient but there's a movement in the right direction.

Any other comments on this item. I'm sorry we didn't have Olivier with us today, but he has other commitments.

Alright, the next item is the ALAC meeting, just a standard one. If there are any things that you believe need to be on the agenda that we need to cover, please highlight it with me and/or Heidi, or both of us actually preferably. If anyone has any comments right now, I'll open it. Otherwise, we will go on to the next item.

The next two items are in camera.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead. Tijani? Yes, I see Tijani's hand and Heidi. So, Heidi, you're speaking already. Go ahead, and then we'll have Tijani.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Just a point that there was an action item from Marrakech that Rinalia was to be invited to the next ALAC meeting, so I will do that. But you may wish to think about what you would like to discuss with her and let her know that in advance.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean be invited to have an opportunity to speak as opposed to simply be invited?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Well, either/or.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I don't remember the context of the action item. Do you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will take a look at that. Did you wish her just to be listening, or did you...?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I'm asking. I don't remember the context of the action item. She's always invited to be there, to talk or listen as she wishes. It sounds like we had an action item for her to have an agenda item, but I'm not 100% sure of that. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. I hear you very distorted. I don't know what happened. I hope you hear me well. Do you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you. I can anyway.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I will send you two agenda items to be added to the 26th ALAC meeting. As you asked, you said send them to you, I will send them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Send them to me and Heidi, please, or you can actually tell us if you know what they are now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. One of them is the [DMVC] report. I will send it very shortly, and I want it to be considered in the meeting of the 26th because we are a little bit late now. We need to start the process in Helsinki. So if we don't go on now and update the Rules of Procedure, we will not have the chance to have our new election with the new procedure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Tijani, did you already send that to me and I missed it? Has the report come out from the [DMVC]?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then, I have missed it, and that's my fault. We'll work on that before the meeting then. Thank you. What is your other item?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The other item would be the CROPP Review Team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just Tijani's talk of making sure we get on to the work of the Rules of Procedure, etc., that's really important and it may be that action item

regarding Rinalia is the opportunity at the ALAC meeting to have a Board member allocated a small piece of the agenda to formally report rather than be more [active]. That's something we used to do, and then it sort of drifted away. Perhaps it's time to think about it coming back, particularly when we would have a number of people coming into the electorate, because they're not changing that much of the Rules of Procedure, that may have very little knowledge about what our Board member occupying Seat 15 does. They're not the sort of people who, for example, would be trawling over the output of every Board meeting and things like that. There has been the extraordinary Board meeting that she has put out to the list that perhaps we should be giving our opportunity in the agenda. If it's a null item, then that's easy. Remove it and nothing happens that month. But I wondered if it might have been the actual meaning of the AI.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, noted. Could well be. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. The action item states that I am to invite Rinalia Abdul Rahim to the next telephonic ALAC meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we don't know the context, but Cheryl may be right. It may be worthwhile trying to check the transcript around that section, assuming we have transcripts, to see what we were talking about at the time.

If we can now go, the next two items are in camera. If we can have staff stop the recording, confirm there is no one on the call who is not part of the ALAC Leadership Team or...

GISELLA GRUBER: We're recording again. Please, if you could just wait a couple of seconds, I'll just confirm that we have the recording started again. Thank you. the recording has started again. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The ALAC Leadership Team met in camera to talk about two issues. One was a finance and budget issue where we may have to make some decisions once the results come out and just needed to be able to discuss in private a number of the options as we go forward. There is no decision made on going forward on anything at that point.

The second one was a decision, or at least a discussion, on who might use the extra two travel slots if we get them. We do not formally have them yet. We have narrowed the possibilities down but have not made a final decision on that either.

If we can go on to Any Other Business, have one item, and I don't know if anyone else does. Does anyone else have an Any Other Business item? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, the Any Other Business is the Board has said that at the Helsinki meeting they will not be meeting in formal meetings with ACs and SOs. The Board, however, is scheduling nothing – if you believe that – for the four-day week, and they will be participating

in other meetings. They would like to know which sessions do we want them to be at the ALAC for, and which Board members do we want. Given the current situation where with really don't know what we're doing at these sessions, we're in a bit of a quandary. But sometime soon, we're going to start getting desperate requests for "please tell us which Board members you want and when." So as we plan the meeting going forward, keep that in mind. We are going to have to do something about it, and I'm not quite sure how.

Anything else? Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. It seems to me that this may be a serendipitous opportunity then because we should perhaps make a blanket request for our current Seat 15 Board member to be as engaged with the community as possible so that if they're not having as many formal sessions themselves, we should [inaudible] the other Board members at some sessions once that becomes clear. But I think off the bat now, you can say you should expect to see Rinalia pretty much all the time unless she's otherwise occupied. That will also perhaps help the community, and there are new people in our community, try and learn and understand what the demands are and what the skillsets may be and what the requirements would be for an appropriate person to occupy Seat 15 as we move into the next election cycle.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Yes, I had presumed that was one of the outcomes, but thank you for bringing it up. Anyone else? Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan, thank you. Just adding to what Cheryl said, perhaps Rinalia could be asked and involved in the ALAC decision on which Board members should be invited to which policy discussions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good idea. Anything else on this subject? If not, we have not made the deadline of leaving early. We're, in fact, late. But I think it has been a good meeting. I thank you all, and we'll see you online. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Tijani, sorry. Tijani's hand just went up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I would like to bring to your attention that in Helsinki we have to schedule at least on section for the ALAC Board selection members. First, we need to try to select the [BNSPC and the BCET] members. When we are there, we have at least to schedule a meeting for those two committees because we have to start the process there. Otherwise it will be late.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Heidi, can you do an action item that we should, perhaps you, me, Tijani, should get together and start putting together a timeline for this selection. And from that, we can look at what else we have to do between now and before Helsinki. Thank you, Tijani.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I'm happy to help you with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Cheryl, yes, certainly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I had that beginning. Remember, this all started on my watch.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not trying to exclude you, Cheryl, don't worry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. If I can be of any use, I can help.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have nothing else to do. We have to keep you busy. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan? Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Heidi? You really don't want to let me go, do you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I'm just getting awake now. Cheryl, also another work for you along with Holly and the entire At-Large review working party is that at Meeting B will be the first time, and a key time, for the external examiner to be interviewing people. So we really need to have that working party work closely with Larissa and her team to identify the people to be interviewed and then schedule the people to be interviewed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Heidi, we need to know who is going to be there. Let's face it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We need to know who the examiner is also. Has one been picked?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have heard that the due diligence has been completed, and it should be announced shortly. So that was going to be moving ahead very quickly now once it gets going.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let's do that offline, please. I really need to go.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]