
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. A very warm welcome to the first ALT call in 2018. Wishing you all a very happy, healthy, and prosperous new year.

On this first call of the year we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Seun Ojedeji, Bartlett Morgan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Sebastian Bachollet.

Apologies noted from Bastiaan Goslings, Julie Hammer, and Yrjö Länsipuro.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdoğan, Claudia Ruiz; and myself, Gisella Gruber.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Sorry for being late. We have a somewhat packed agenda today and I'm afraid we may end up going over time, but I'll do my best to try to make sure that doesn't happen. The first substantive on the agenda ... Well, first of all, any other business or any other comments on the agenda? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we'll assume the agenda is accepted as presented and the first item is review of action items and the ALT meeting of the 22nd of November. It has my name on it, but I don't review action items. Heidi?

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. I hope all of you had happy holidays and all the best for 2018. It will be an exciting year.

For the action items, we do have a few open ones. There are several regarding policy statements, which I believe are going to be covered during the next section. I'll [inaudible] on those. I did find [inaudible]. Just to remind APRALO and LACRALO Chairs about the call for volunteers for the WT5 liaison, which I think that one has been completed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Honestly, we have not formally taken any action. At this point, I can't even remember if we made decisions. I thought we did.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let's take a look for that and [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's an AASC and I think we made decisions on that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, reading that, I think so, too. But let me double check. The next one is Alan to review the CROP Review Team membership criteria and evaluate the potential to name an ad hoc Chair for the review team, taking Cheryl's opinion into consideration.

ALAN GREENBERG: That has not been done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible] are all related to public comments. So that will be in the next section. I'll get back to you on the work track 5.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next item is, in fact, policy discussions. There's a lot of comments open. There are a number that are open and we are still looking at input on them, and a few that essentially – I believe we do not even have someone drafting them. So let's go through this one by one and see where we are on each one. Ariel, if you could introduce each one, one by one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan and Ariel, sorry for the interruption. Just to let everyone know that we are going to have a transition, or basically in the last pages of the transition with Ariel moving to the GNSO and Evin taking over the policy device activities. So from now on, we're going to have Evin moving things forward with Ariel basically just helping her [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I turn it over to whoever is going to speak at this point.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay. Thank you, Alan, Heidi, and Ariel. Please feel free to pipe in. Thank you very much, Ariel. She's been great at helping me to get a

grasp of what's going on. We've been moving things along. There's some updates.

First, statements approved by the ALAC. The ICANN reserve funds, public comments on rationale and target level was approved last month, and enhancing accountability recommendations for diversity was ratified just this week. We have statements in process being drafted actually now open for comments. Today we received two drafts. The first being recommendations to improve ICANN's office of ombudsman and recommendations on ICANN jurisdiction being the second. Both of those closed on the 14th of January. So a kind reminder to everyone to please work on the draft before this Friday, the 12th at 23:59 UTC. I don't know if you want to pause to discuss or if I should go forward on the next one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, let's go one by one. First of all, the ombudsman. To the extent that people have looked at what is there, and also obviously input from Sebastian. Where do we stand? Are we in a good position? Are we in a bad position? Do we change our decision to comment on it? Where do we stand? What should we do?

I must admit I have not had the chance to look at what has been presented. Anyone care to comment? Ombudsman is the one on the question right now.

"I can't talk, but I made a comment." Sebastian, are we at least in a position – [inaudible] comfortable we'll be able to do something we can stand behind.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can. Very faintly, but please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry. I will be home in ten minutes and it will be easier. I made a comment on the comment to propose. I am a little bit surprised that I am not sure that the one who made comments have really read the documents. I'm sorry about that in saying that it seems like that.

We need to be sure that what we are saying is if we disagree with the proposal, it's okay. But, at least we need to be in line and explaining why we disagree. The fact that the comments from recommendation eight is saying that we want to give back to the board the control of the ombudsman is contradictory to all the work that was done by the ombud subgroup. I have no problem [inaudible] disagree with that, but we need to be sure that it's what we want.

Therefore, I think that the comments need to be reworked before any vote on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sebastian, can I ask you? I presume you said something like that in your comment. Is that correct?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I tried to explain, yes, definitely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Did everyone catch that or do you want me to repeat it? No one says they want to repeat it. I assume everyone heard Sebastien then.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'd like to stay in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you want to get in the queue. Fine. Go ahead, then.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien, for the comment you put in the chat. As the person who drafted the initial statement, I [inaudible] something that [inaudible] statement and the reports. I responded to your comment, even though [inaudible] should remove that part about [inaudible]. But, if you think there are parts of the statement that should not be echoed because I saw that you only commented on recommendation eight, then it would be good to hear that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sebastien, if you in fact have comments on other parts of it other than recommendation eight, specifically if you're supporting the other things that are being said or you think that they have some merit, then please be clear because we are rather short on time on this, as we

all know. I will take a look at it also and comment, but my time at this point is somewhat short today.

Any other comments on ombudsman? Alright, Evin, next one.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. The next one was jurisdiction. I'm not sure if you wanted to go over that one. A draft was received today and that closes soon as well, on the 14th.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And who was that draft done by?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Bastiaan, Tatiana, Erik, and [Stanley].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Anyone else who did not right it have a chance to look at it yet? Clearly, we cannot make everyone in ALAC and At-Large do it, but I would appreciate if everyone on the ALT take the time to at least glance at these things and add, if nothing else, a very short comment saying looks reasonable or identify the parts that you have a problem with. That goes for our liaisons also, assuming you can find the time. I know some of you are rather busy. Liaisons and other advisors, of course. Next one, Evin?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Next one is recommendations to improve ICANN staff accountability. That's open for comment as well. I believe Maureen is involved with this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, any comments?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I have taken into account the comments that have been made. There haven't been that much, but Bastiaan and [Ricardo] did contribute and I have included their comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, you're not in a position where you have significant pushback that you disagree with at this point?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Again, I will look at these before the end of the day and make whatever comments I have. Next one, Evin?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. It's competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team – [new sections to] draft report of recommendations. That's been open for vote and it will close this week for votes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I hope we're happy with it because it's too late to change it now. Next, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: New public comment request to which ALAC needs to make decisions. There are two. One proposed incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy. The second is operating standards for ICANN specific reviews. There are a number of upcoming public comment requests listed for January and February. But those two are the ones that are open now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Proposed changes to the meeting strategy closes February 1st. What is that? We're talking about again the length of the meetings. Has anyone looked at this? We have hands up. Sorry, I don't know if the hands up are on this or something previous, but we'll go through them in order. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello. Hi, everyone. I've got a new phone and it doesn't seem to be happy with me being on conference calls. I wanted to comment on the previous thing and actually on all the previous statements that have been made there. The one on the competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team. There's been a discussion in the Internet DNS health indicators – sorry DNS marketplace help – about the whole thing of domain parking. It's one of these very touchy issues that seems

to be always [inaudible] contended as to some are basically saying that the whole domain parking should not be monitored.

The CCT Review Team has come up with a point which we say quite openly that we support, which is that some domain parking might be used for malware.

I think we need to follow-up on some of this stuff. I was looking at one of the previous statements that we made and that's the one which was to do with the ICANN reserve fund, public comment and rationale and target level.

I wonder whether in order for us to be able to continue the tracking we shouldn't also link to the staff report on the public comments that we have received because that's what I was reading when it came down to the ICANN reserve fund to see whether our concerns were captured properly by the staff report. I was going to suggest these two things. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. Olivier, I'm not quite sure what you are suggesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm suggesting that we also have on our policy work page a link to the follow-up staff report so we can track whether our input has actually been inputted in there. I'm now starting to look at the difference between chugging something over the wall and hoping that it gets taken up and actually tracking back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent point. I would suggest as we go forward with the At-Large review, assuming we ever go forward with the At-Large review, that we consider that as one of our actions related to the policy work.

Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is much better.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. I am now and I hope it will be okay. It was just to say about the meeting strategy. I didn't know that [inaudible] somebody to make a comment, but I suggest first draft now a few days ago. If you want to take that into account, you are free to do so. If you don't, we can resume my comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Sebastien. You do have a bit of an involvement with the prior process. Just a little bit. Does anyone else have any interest in working on this? Given that we all are subjected to ICANN meeting strategy and ICANN meetings I would think that there might be some input and interest in this topic. Do we have anyone else interested in doing anything or saying anything about it? Just a little bit of interest.

Bartlett says he is. Then, please, feel free to make whatever comments you want and we can decide as we go along whether we replace Sebastien's first version or augment it or replace it completely. Anyone else interested? Sebastien, I assume that's an old hand.

I may well look at this. I also have a little bit of thoughts about ICANN's meeting strategy. We'll see if I get to it.

Next one is the specific reviews. I suspect this is one the ALAC as such will not participate in, but I and a number of other people who have been involved in reviews may well submit private comments. Does anyone have any strong belief that the ALAC as such should submit comments on this? The only person I think might have such a belief, but I don't know if she does or not, is Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl can respond to that if you like, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Could Cheryl please respond to that, if I like?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Look, I think there is so much on the [inaudible] so early in the working here for a new ALAC that it may be challenging despite the fact that this has been out in fact for public comment since our last public meeting and we ran cross-community working groups on it, but never mind. Never mind, indeed.

It might be a challenge for the ALAC to create a meaningful comment on it. I would love to see an ALAC comment on it, but I often live in hope and die in despair. But, yes, I'd certainly like to think that people like you and Olivier and others who have either been involved in or have watched closely various review teams would like to at least make some sort of comments in an individual capacity. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. One of my concerns is that I'm not sure we're all going to say the same thing, and therefore that results in a potential problem if we are disagreeing with each other for a single ALAC position. I don't know if that's going to happen, but I wouldn't be surprised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, if I can just respond. At this late stage – and this has now been extended to February. It would've actually been closing I think the beginning of next week, if memory serves. Put it in the too little, too late pile. But, there you go. These things happen.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Indeed. Things are regularly happening. Evin, back to you. Anything else we want to talk about right now? We should be spending some significant time looking at the ones upcoming. I don't know – let's look at them very quickly.

Spec 12, that may well be something we want to comment on. It certainly impacts things we've said in the past. Registry agreements in general we do not comment on unless someone has something that's

exceedingly pressing. Privacy proxy services we might have. Script changes we don't tend to comment on. Budget we will be commenting on. I think we need to start thinking about that one pretty quickly.

I seem to see several things replicated in this list. It looks like the whole list has been replicated twice.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to make you feel good about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This was a test to see if I'd recognize that I've done these already once.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sorry. If I could [inaudible]. A few of them had different staff as point of contact. I'll double check, though, but I think the duplication was intentional. I will double check, though.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, it was intentional and I did pass the test.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Maybe. Yes, I will check if it's accurate or if it's my mistake. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Evin. Sebastien, is that a new hand?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Alan, because as we talk about what will come, I think it could be also very important to review the summary of the comments of the reserve fund to see where we are with that, as it could have some consequences both on the next ICANN budget, but also on the work done by the cross-community working group on [inaudible]. They just published the staff summary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and that goes along with what Olivier said. We should be doing that on a regular basis, not just because this one has particular interest. Anything that we have commented on, we should do at least some level of review to see how those comments were acted on. There is a process now by which if we believe that a staff summary does not adequately reflect our comments we can complain. So, if only for that reason we should be looking at anything that we do comments on to see whether they were adequately reflected or not. I suspect that something that we might want to do with staff doing the first pass.

Heidi, if we can talk about that, whether that violates some rule of staff critiquing staff or not. If it can be an action item for Heidi and I to talk about that, as a first pass. Anything further on policy? We are just on time at this point.

Updates from liaisons? Normally, liaison reports are written ... Is that Olivier speaking? Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry about this, Alan. I wanted to comment on the point just before you launch on the liaison reports.

ALAN GREENBERG: Surely. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's not a case of staff critiquing the summary that is being done. It's a case of basically ticking a box and saying whether all of our points have been taken into account by the staff doing the summary. So, if we make five points in a statement and only four of these five points are listed in the table of input points that have been made, it's not critiquing. It's just pointing out that one of the points hasn't been put there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, to be clear, what I said is Heidi and I will talk about whether that would be considered staff critiquing staff or not. I don't believe it is, which is why I suggested it. Staff may have a different position. That was the only impact of what we will discuss. Sorry. I'm particularly sensitive to this because of another issue I was working on recently, not related to At-Large where some very strong statements were made about the concept of staff and being involved in any review of what staff does.

Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Alan. Going on to just an update of the ccNSO liaison thing. I actually suggested to Katrina that we perhaps make a change, that we attempt a change for the joint meeting we were planning for [Sunday]. [inaudible] meeting time. I think that last time there was also a conflict with [auction proceeds] meeting. I just thought that we missed out on quite a lot of discussion that actually happened [inaudible] the second meeting was just a summary of it. I thought a little bit that we missed a lot. I'd rather not have that change again.

But, I do note that the ccNSO has actually included a lot of the stuff that we were actually thinking of including into our program is actually included into their member's day and tech day program itself. I will make sure that the [inaudible] made aware of when those sessions are and hope that they will make an effort to attend so that we can have some input into their discussions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We'll be talking further about the meeting scheduling in a little while. Cheryl, I see your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Very briefly. Just that we haven't had a meeting since the final meeting of the GNSO on the 21st of December last year. I just want to, particularly for new members of the ALT, to mention if they're reviewing any of the minutes which should be lodged now I believe. Basically, it was primarily it was administrative and [inaudible] discussions on aspects of WHOIS and rights protection mechanisms.

There was one vote that did go through and that was the adoption of a charter for the GNSO standing committee on budget and operations on an interim basis. The way that's written, I just wanted to make sure that the ALT understands what that actually ... It says what it is, but it's not that the GNSO has never had committees formed and work done in the past on budget and operations – they indeed have. Not quite so formally of course as the ccNSO history on our own. But this is now a formal standing committee.

So, if people [read] it, they would've thought, "Good heavens, what has the GNSO been doing?" I just wanted to put that defense in that in fact if this is a new formalization as a standing committee with a clear charter, at least on an interim basis, not that the GNSO hasn't been doing this sort of work before. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, on the long term, the GNSO did not generally comment on budgets. That has ramped up over the last number of years.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. But this is now a formal step, which of course most of us have already taken over a longer time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments from liaisons? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, the next item is the At-Large review and where we are right now. We finally had this mapping delivered to us at the end of December. The mapping, you may recall, was a document that was requested by the

OEC. The OEC was not in a position to recommend to the board that we be directed to implement the recommendations. In fact, of the 16 recommendations in the At-Large review, we rejected eight of them and we accepted eight conditionally or with caveats. None of them were accepted simply saying yes. That puts the OEC and the board in a rather awkward position of not really easily being able to say what it is that they're recommending we do as a result of the review.

The OEC requested that MMSI do a mapping of the issues identified with what it is we said we would do about them and requested MMSI create such a mapping. MMSI did that, but in the process identified a very large number of gaps that they found. The mapping was sent to the working party leadership and that is myself, Cheryl, and Holly. Our universal response was basically a gasp because among the questions being asked were a huge number of questions that were, in many cases, unanswerable. In some cases, unanswerable by us. They included things like in the discussion of should auction funds be used to fund the ALAC, can we please tell them exactly what At-Large costs, what is the budget we currently have right now which of course we don't know because ICANN has never given us anywhere near that kind of information.

On the issue of the ALT, can we explain the difference between the ALAC, the ALT, and the ALAC Chair for those who might be confused? How does the ALAC – the presence of the ALT stop newcomers from getting involved in ALAC. They were just questions that would take an inordinate amount of time if we tried to answer them and do not seem to be related to addressing the issue at hand at all.

At this point, I am trying to come up with, not answers to the questions, but just my reaction to the questions and I should be finished with that in a day or so. We'll then distribute it ... Well, first off, send it to Holly and to Cheryl, but then to the At-Large working party for discussion about how we go forward. It's clear we cannot answer all the questions. It is equally clear to me, in any case, that answering them will not help us go forward. What can we propose as a way that we can actually get this review over with and start implementing something that will help At-Large? Gasp is about the only word I could use. It is a 21-page report they did with many, many questions per page.

So, that's where we stand right now. We'll have something to send out within hopefully a small number of days for a larger discussion on where we proceed at this point. Cheryl, please go ahead. Cannot hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The tablet [inaudible] my audio. My phone is disconnected. Sorry. Can you hear me or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It disconnected partway through what you were saying, so I'm now trying to use the silly buddy AC. Anyway, just to reiterate in my own words, just to assure you all what I said was not [inaudible] GISC. Gasp is not the way I responded and I can assure you [Alan] was close as I've

ever seen him to [inaudible] his resignation and telling the world what he thought about certain parts of ICANN [inaudible] MMSI.

There is a vast difference between a gap analysis between two documents and a mapping exercise. I have no idea who did this work within MMSI or why they thought that was answering the questions that they were tasked with answering for at least the last organization effectiveness committee that let me assure all of you in the leadership team – Alan in particular, but the rest of us as well in the review team, leadership – wasn't very hard to rectify some of these issues because if we were to actually need to respond to all of these supposed [GAC] questions, as [inaudible] most of them would be impossible and it would take another 18 months. In other words, we simply need to reboot. Not acceptable. We'll [inaudible] it out and we'll get back to you as soon as possible. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. One of the things that was bothering me is I did not feel comfortable receiving this document and not redistributing it, but I felt less comfortable with everyone else looking at it and trying to then understand how we go forward without some sort of analysis to say what they were asking for was completely unreasonable, in my mind anyway. That's where we are right now. I'll take any other comments and move on. Seeing none, hearing none, we'll go on to item number seven, which I believe is ICANN 61. Who will handle this one? Is it Gisella, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. It's going to be Gisella. Make sure she's there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see her microphone is making sounds.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: There you are, Gisella. Okay, thank you. Alan, just before, could you please respond to my question in the chat about [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: What is the estimate for when the mapping exercise might be ready to be sent back to the OEC? I don't know. I hope it'll be ready to be sent to the working party in the next day or so, or day or two or three. No later than the beginning of next week. How long the working party takes to say come up with ... What I have been asked informally is if this mapping exercise is not the be-all and end-all which is going to give the OEC something to do, what do we suggest? Now, they don't have to listen to us, but I think we have an obligation to make a suggestion for how to move forward. I may have a suggestion by the time I finish the review of the document. I may not. So, I'm not going to predict. I would like to think by the end of January we should have it back to the OEC, but I'm not going to guarantee that at this point. Maybe even sooner than that.

Cheryl said, "It is confusing and not, in my view, even fit for purpose to meet the needs identified to the OEC." Thank you, Cheryl.

Can we go on to ICANN 61 now, please?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. According to the agenda, the first agenda item for ICANN 61 is the At-Large supported travelers, which I'll hand back to you because we're still waiting for a follow-up on the additional travelers.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're working on it as quickly as we can. There are a number of issues that are still up in the air.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. Then I'll wait to hear back from you. Thank you, Alan. I'll take that offline just to see when we are likely to get the names through so that I can get constituency travel know as we're running late on submissions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. I'll go on to the meeting scheduling and block scheduling. I did sincerely hope that we would be at a more advanced stage that we are at on the 11th of January with ICANN 61 starting on

the 10th of March for the official meeting date. To be very honest, the block schedule has not yet been finalized, so it is all very much up in the air, but I'll run you through with what we've got for the moment.

The version that we've got up on the screen in the Adobe Connect is Version 3.1. The final version is due to come up tomorrow, Friday the 12th of January, but there is still discussion on the list and I hope that we'll see something coming out of it by the end of tomorrow. When the final block schedule does come through, then I'll be able to forward something a little bit more accurate to you.

Alan, your hand is raised, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the cross-community sessions. There are four cross-community sessions proposed. One is on the open data initiative, which I think is a great idea, and in fact have suggested that the At-Large participate in that, although I don't believe we've had anyone actively say they are willing to help organize it. I did send out a message on that a while ago.

The next one is – and I'm going to read the title: "To whom geo names belong, the trajectories of dot-patagonia, dot-africa, and dot-amazon." Given that there is a cross-community – or not cross-community working group, a GNSO sub PDP group – looking at geo names, given that they are talking about the trajectories, which in my mind says how did these things evolve, and two of the three are not finished yet. One is before the courts and the other is before the ICANN board to decide what the next step is and we do not even know whether these will be

completed or how they'll be completed by the meeting. I think it would be inappropriate at several levels to hold this discussion. It will certainly not help the work track five discussion. It will have people pontificating on things which have not finished yet, and in fact may be ongoing at that very point. I just do not think that is a particularly wise meeting to have

The third one is GDPR, which I think is quite appropriate in talking about the models which should be announced by then.

The last is a "case study of SSR2" which is talking about the board's halting of the SSR2 review and what is now in the hands of the AC/SO Chairs to somehow restart it. Given that we're not clear what the status will be at the time of the March meeting, given that they are saying this will be a panel discussion among the people involved excluding SSR2, and therefore that means people from the board and the Chairs, none of whom at this point are in a position to confirm that they will speak about this because we don't know what the current status will be. I think that one is particularly ill-advised also.

I personally have recommended that both of those not be held. It remains to be seen what's going to happen. Back to you, Gisella. Just wanted to talk about those at this point. Back to you, Gisella. You're muted.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry, Alan. Yes, I was talking to myself again. Until these cross-community sessions get finalized, everything will still very much be up in the air. As it stands now, we have, as I said, the expected block schedule

will be up by tomorrow. We have four cross-community sessions of 90 minutes each. There may possibly be three. The topics are placed, but as Alan said, likely to change.

We have the ALAC and regional leaders working sessions. Our group so far, the ALAC and the board is scheduled on Tuesday from 17:00 to 18:00. We have requested a change to Tuesday morning.

The ALAC and GAC has been penciled in on Tuesday from 13:30 to 14:30. The ALAC and ccNSO on Sunday from 17:00 to 18:00. As Maureen pointed out, this does clash with the CCWG auction proceeds. The ALAC and SSAC is yet to be confirmed at a time on Saturday or Sunday.

With regards to the RALOs, the NARALO would like to hold their monthly meetings. We're going to try and keep that if possible at 15:00 local which will coincide with the regular monthly call time.

The LACRALO will no doubt hold, even if it's an informal meeting, an ICANN 62 prep meeting. There will be a joint AFRALO, AfrICANN meeting as well as the At-Large regional leaders meeting. I did forget to put on this slide under the RALOs, [inaudible] of the LACRALO general assembly or mediation. That will be held on Wednesday and Thursday all day.

With regards to the working groups, we're just confirming with the outreach and engagement and technology taskforce that they do wish to meet, but they usually meet at all the meetings.

The At-Large Capacity Building group has been confirmed. The Accessibility will be meeting as well, as it was decided last year that they would be meeting at Meeting A and B.

I've added the At-Large improvements work group. Alan, would you like to say anything to the At-Large improvements working group?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. I hope I then will have some better idea where these things are going, whether we will have anything to discuss or not. Probably not officially in implementing it. On the other hand, we know there is some work that we are going to do even though we don't know quite how it's going to be ordered to be done, so to speak.

So, I think we may well have some work to do on that. The real challenge is can we do any work ahead of time on things like communication with ALSes, individual member motivation and metrics to have a substantive discussion at the meeting? That's a real question. Can we do anything in the next month and a half or so to have a useful discussion that is a document presented ahead of time, and then discuss? I'm not quite sure that's going to happen.

At this point, we're likely to schedule a meeting, but that may change as we go forward. Heidi says if it happens, it's an ALAC working session. It probably will be a meeting of the whole. I don't think there's any merit. Unless I'm very surprised and things move very quickly, I don't think we're going to be in a position to discuss the formal At-Large improvements working group, but there may be topics within it that we can discuss, and I think that will probably be a meeting of the whole.

GISELLA GRUBER: Perfect. Thanks. [inaudible] telephone just disconnected. We will dial out to you. Thank you.

With regards to the At-Large improvement, my apologies if I misunderstood. I thought that we still needed to keep a slot for that, but that helps me if we don't need an extra working group.

Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. That may change as we move forward, but if it does, we'll accommodate.

GISELLA GRUBER: Perfect. Thank you, Alan. The Academy, I've just got an italic as it is a cross-community, but we at this stage [inaudible] will be scheduling it on the ICANN 61 main schedule.

Then, before going on to the social events, we have the ALT meeting on Friday the 16th of March. Location and exact timing to be confirmed as soon as we get confirmation on where the meeting will be held. For now, I'll be sending out a calendar invitation just to block the Friday morning. Then I'll also be contacting you to find out whether your flights are leaving on the Friday or whether the Friday night is required. But, at this stage, from what people responded to, Alan, most people will be able to meet on the Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Gisella. It's a matter of good faith. We have been allowed to schedule this meeting with the understanding that if people have to stay over to the Saturday because of flight availability, then so be it. We will be granted extra hotel days. But, to the extent that we can avoid it, without making the trip completely unreasonable for people, then that is something that we're going to be trying to do.

One other issue that just came up this morning. There will be an auction proceeds meeting, a public consultation meeting, that it was not clear when it is going to be. It is going to be at this point Thursday morning, probably first session, which unfortunately conflicts with when we were planning to start our wrap-up meetings. We have a significant number of ALAC people involved in that discussion. That's something we're going to have to work on. That only came up an hour or so ago, so we're not quite resolved today.

Gisella, back to you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. Just on that last point, I've already tentatively put the wrap-up part one at the end of Wednesday and then wrap-up part two on the Thursday after the CCWG auction proceeds again, which is not ideal. But, if the CCWG auction proceeds meeting does go ahead on the Thursday morning, then we're just going to have to try and do our best to have our wrap-up on two different days.

With regards to social events, so far on the Saturday, Sunday, Tuesday and Wednesday, this block schedule has allowed for community networking. On the Saturday, we're going to try and have an ALT dinner. All details to be concerned. There again, I'll be sending you a calendar invitation to block the dates and time. We've only discussed this a couple of days ago.

On the Sunday, we have just the community networking. Monday evening gala to be confirmed. Tuesday evening possibly the NARALO 10th anniversary. The Wednesday evening [GEMS] and Thursday evening closing cocktail. That's all I have for now.

I did also want to point out that I had a look at the GNSO schedule, and again they've asked not to take anything set in stone as things are likely to change. I have noticed that on the Saturday during the day they have got the NPOC outreach event and I don't have any details on that. I know that last time we weren't aware of what outreach was being done by the GNSO, but I thought I'd just contact the GNSO secretariat team and see what the NPOC is organizing on that day.

If you don't mind, I'm not going to share the Excel spreadsheet that I usually do with everyone, just because at this point before we reach tomorrow evening, everything is still very much in draft format. So as soon as we have something a little bit more set in stone, then I would like to share what we've put together so far. Thank you.

Alan, you have your hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Can you tell us what community networking means? Does this mean there is an event planned where we can go get a drink and peanuts or does this mean they are allowing us to schedule something should we wish between 6:30 and 8:00 in the evening. I don't quite know what it means other than we're not booked, but we might be if someone comes up with something.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, you might be muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: She may have just disappeared.

GISELLA GRUBER: [inaudible] a timeslot where the communities can hold cocktails ...

ALAN GREENBERG: And we've lost Gisella.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella? Let me just see what's going on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we got enough that we know the answer.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. My phone wasn't playing ball and neither was the Adobe Connect. Hopefully, you can hear me again.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we can now, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. So, just to finish on that point, the community network, nothing is planned like for the policy forum where we actually do get drinks and peanuts. This is just a time allocated in the schedule for the various communities to hold their various cocktails. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, in other words, it says we're not supposed to other meetings against it, I guess.

GISELLA GRUBER: Well, Alan, we're not supposed to schedule meetings after 18:30 in any case because of the implications with technical staff, etc. But, yes, you can organize cocktails. You can't organize meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm just trying to understand. So, there is no difference functionally between putting that item in and leaving it off altogether.

GISELLA GRUBER: Absolutely correct, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just wanted to make sure I understood.

GISELLA GRUBER: It's just a head's up on maybe you can go looking around and see where there is a free cocktail going on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understand. And be kicked out of it because you're not invited, as I was last time. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Two points. One is that, Gisella, I'm not sure you mentioned the scheduling the Board/ALAC meeting, but we did speak about it yesterday with Alan and I just wanted to update Alan as well as the others that currently it is scheduled for 17:00 on the Tuesday, which is not at all an opportune time. We have been in touch with board ops and they are working on now switching it back to the regular morning time. We should be able to confirm that shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was on the slide. We've got to read all the words.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Just listen to Gisella. The second point is that there will be a LACRALO Assembly Part 2. It's going to be a smaller group than the one that was held earlier or last year. We're expecting around 10-12 people. That will be held on the Wednesday and Thursday during Puerto Rico meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, you want to describe what LACRALO assembly means to those who weren't around earlier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. It's a process that is ongoing. It's dealing with the challenges that LACRALO has. We dealt with some of the more urgent issues last year in January. It definitely helped, but now what they are working on is we'll bring the mediators again and they'll be looking at the new Bylaws and all of that entails, including the voting and other issues. We're working with the same mediators. It will be a smaller affair, but just wanted to let you know that will be there during that Wednesday and Thursday. We have confirmed this with the RALOs, the LACRALO leadership, and they have confirmed that that timing will fit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, where are we on the current new rules of procedure or whatever they're called.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm going to hand that over to Silvia for that. Just briefly on where we are.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Yes, there is a working group working on the Rules of Procedure and [inaudible] Sergio. It's the Governance Working Group. They have produced about three or four topics. They have drafted [four] topics. Hopefully by Puerto Rico, there will be a [inaudible] elections on the type of [inaudible] and acceptance of individual members that was agreed by LACRALO after the date.

So, there are a couple of issues that I already agreed on and I think two or three more issues will be also discussed. That's the progress so far. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything else? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. You might have seen my questions on the mailing list of SO/AC [inaudible] etc. list on putting together this agenda regarding the cross-community working group on Internet governance. You will have noticed that the response we were given was a little fluffy in that we have to find out from each one of the SOs and ACs what for each slot they might have or what their agenda would be like. I have no idea how to proceed with that. I will follow-up on the mailing list, but I would be interested in hearing from the ALAC as to what potential slots this working group could make use of.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you know Gisella's Skype address.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I will ask, thank you. Gisella, I can consider her has been asked. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, your hand is up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will put it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Last call for comments on ICANN 61. Done. At-Large budget requests, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you very much. Could we please put either agenda back up or the fiscal year 19 additional budget request page up? I'm going to put that in the screen, into the chat. So, just to very quickly highlight the deadline for the RALOs and At-Large to submit requests to staff and to the FBSC is tomorrow, the 12th.

Currently, we do not have that many, which might be a good thing, given budget issues. I wanted to highlight some of the ones that we do have. Alan, please flag if there are other ones from the ALAC that you still expect to be submitted. Most of the ALAC ones are repeats from the

past, so I'm not going to go into the details. The first is access for RALOs for funding of local engagement activities. This is the \$2000 per RALO. That has been used by I think the majority of the RALOs this year, which is new. The fiscal year 17 it wasn't really used, so I'm hoping that will be approved.

Then, the ALAC leadership team, the ALT Strategy Sessions, those are the sessions on the day after the close of the ICANN meeting. That is pretty much going to be moving forward I would suspect.

Then, we have again the IGF Global Engagement and Capacity Building. That has been submitted by the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. I have not seen the actual request yet. I've just seen [inaudible] very similar to what was submitted last year. Then we also have, again, a repeat of the global indigenous peoples' ambassador program for the fellowships that's been put through by Lars and Judith for the most part. It is similar, but pretty much a doubling of what the current request is, what the current project is. Rather than two and one – actually it's more than that. They're looking for four ambassadors and two mentors for two meetings. It's a pretty significant increase.

Then, from the RALOs, we only have actually two and both are from NARALO. One is for a Spanish language – basically [inaudible] in Spanish. On that one, you may recall that in the past we've had a significant bucket of funds for use by all SOs and ACs, some type of promotional items, etc., that [inaudible] communication department has. This year we're not 100% sure whether that is going to go ahead, so a request like this might be useful. I will try and find out a little bit more about this. It might mean that other RALOs need to do that as well.

The final RALO request that I've seen so far is the NARALO team participation in the global IGF. Again, that is sort of a connection to the global IGF one. What's a little worrying is that I have not seen other RALOs coming in with that IGF request, which I think really helps get that funding this past year. So, those of you who could perhaps reach out to your RALOs to see if we can get something in by tomorrow for the IGF, that might be useful.

Also, Olivier, I've seen some discussion about a EURALO request, but I have not seen any kind of template coming yet. So, if you could perhaps work with [Walid] on that, that would be useful. That's all. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. On the outreach and engagement capacity building at the IGF, there is a – I've seen the request. Everything is being built on Google docs at the moment. That one I believe is either Glenn or Maureen will do a cut-and-paste and then send that request probably tomorrow. We'd be collecting feedback on it.

On the EURALO front, we currently have two requests also on Google docs. One is a request for workshop at the next IGF. Location to be confirmed, obviously, and it's a workshop on IOT. The other request is one that we are building on for the individual users, support for individual users and development for individual users in EURALO. That's also being built on a Google doc at the moment. We might have a third

one that would ask for funding for pre-event in Barcelona. That's the three of them that we're likely to see from EURALO. As I said, they're all on Google docs, so we'll be able to do a cut-and-paste and send them by tomorrow. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. Any further comments? Then we'll move on.

The next item is the ICANN Leadership Program. A quick update. I sent out a message yesterday to the effect. It would appear at this point that we might have two RALOs that do not have a candidate that is both in a leadership position, which is a requirement, and already funded to go to the ICANN meeting which is also a requirement because the leadership provides the additional days but does not provide air travel or attendance at the ICANN meeting.

I got back a number of messages – and I'm not sure whether they went to the list or directly to me – pointing out that several other regions had more than one candidate that they would like to see going. Nobody objected to my comment that we reallocate to different regions to use all of our five slots.

Heidi, you were going to verify that there is no requirement that they each go to a different region. Are you in a position to verify that?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

My recollection is that ... [Sandra] has been stressing it is up to the SOs and ACs to decide. So there is no limitation on it being it has to be one

per RALO. I'm quite sure about that. I would just move forward at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was also a question of whether NomCom delegates are considered leadership and therefore eligible.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's a leadership and I believe that in the past we've had some NomCom delegates. I have to double check that. But, again, that's definitely a leadership position and that's definitely one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. A couple of things. First, on the regional balance. Let's proceed forward, but I do cringe because our whole point of getting five was based on the fact that we had five regions. So someone might turn around and say, "Wait a minute, you're now abusing this ability to have five." But, I guess it's a special case scenario,

so we do that, but I hope that this is not going to be a regular occurrence.

Secondly, on the NomCom, yes it is leadership but you do have to remember that the NomCom is not funded to be there the whole week. As I understand, from my NomCom friends, they will only be arriving towards the middle of the ICANN week, and therefore the leadership training taking place at the beginning, before the actual full ICANN week, how are they going to get funded between the leadership training and their NomCom time? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is one of the considerations, Olivier. That's understood. My question was are they eligible at all to go? The answer we've had from Heidi is yes. Therefore the question is if that person were to be selected, then how would they be funded for the interim number of days?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I've been in touch with Joette and she's confirmed that the delegates are arriving on the 9th, so that's a perfect segue, because

again, the leadership program is the 7th through the 9th. So there would not be any overlap.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. So you're saying this week their delegates are arriving for the whole week?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's what Joette has just said to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is marvelous. That used to be the case for many years until people started deciding that NomCom delegates didn't really need any contact with ICANN. I'm glad to see rationale minds have taken over again.

In any case, Olivier, one of the options is, is the person willing to self-fund for a couple of days? It sounds like that is not a requirement.

Heidi, is that a new hand now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I wanted to just [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. At this point, we have a few more options and hopefully we can make some decisions very quickly. In fact, we may have more options than we have slots for at this point. We'll do our best to work through that.

The next issue is a personnel issue which has to be held in camera, so we need only ALAC ALT members and formal liaisons to other ACs/SOs. I don't know who is on the phone bridge. Is there anyone else on the phone bridge that should not be on the call? I see Sebastien is on the Adobe Connect and is no longer on Adobe Connect. No, his hand is up. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I may have misunderstood that you say ALT and ALAC member, but I guess you wanted just to say ALT members. Therefore, I will leave. But I didn't get – okay, no worries. I'll ask one question if you allow me before.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to know if you or if we will have in the ALAC discussion where we are on SSR2 and therefore where we are with the other reviews. I know that you touched it because it's maybe one of the topics of cross-community session in the next ICANN meeting, but if not, can you tell us where we are on that if possible? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Sorry. That should have been added to the agenda, and it was my mistake that it wasn't. So, yes. At this point, there have been a number of issues identified. Number one, it is not clear whether the SSR Review

Team has all of the skills it needs, and sufficient people who are active. That is made worse by the fact that we know that several people have either resigned or will be resigning very shortly. There's the question of reinforcement of people on the review team.

I, in fact, have an interesting candidate who has expressed the interest of being on the review team and I'll be bringing this up in the near future. I want to pass it by the AASC first because they are the formal selection committee.

Skills is one thing. There has been some concern expressed both by the board and by members of the review team on leadership. One of the three co-Chairs that resigned quite a while ago, there has been some concern expressed in a number of different ways about the current leadership. There has been expressed concern about the lack of adequate MSSl support.

The last question is the board originally had major concerns, as did the SSAC I believe on whether the scope that the review team had passed on to the board was in fact agreed to by the SSAC, by the SSR review team.

The documents used words like decided by majority consensus. Now, majority is not in ICANN's normal terminology deemed to be consensus. It's quite different. One of the questions is: is indeed the current scope actually supported by the full review team? We're trying to work on all of those angles and see how we can, as quickly as possible, get them addressed so the review team can restart again. There had been a meeting scheduled for the end of January in Brussels. There was a drop

dead date by the middle of December by which if we couldn't confirm the meeting was on, then it had to be canceled, and it was canceled. We are hoping that the group will be restated preferably before the ICANN meeting and probably would meet in a plenary session sometime after the ICANN meeting, but that's all somewhat vague right now. There's another meeting next Monday of the Chairs and I may have a clearer position at that point.

In terms of the other review teams, the ATRT, according to the Bylaws must be convened no later than the beginning of April I believe, which is five years after the last one was convened. I'm optimistic that that will be on target, but I wouldn't presume it's going to be much earlier than that. Certainly I think it will not be convened until the operating standards are approved.

Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Just very briefly. [inaudible] back to, of course, a lone public comment on the operational standards. This is of course one of the rationales for improving and formalizing the operational standards for these reviews because things like [inaudible] would have been clearly delineated in advance. So whether that encourages people to put in their comments, I don't know, but I just wanted to link it back to why we're doing the other work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

One of the questions in the operating standards raised by the SSR issue is should the scope be defined by another group, a drafting team as it were, prior to the review team being convened and having its scope handed to it on a platter? That has some pluses and minuses. It avoids the problem we're in now. It does say that the scope will be defined by the people who don't have to do the work. That always I find is a somewhat dangerous situation. Plus, in other review teams, the scope evolves to some extent based on what you find. It's not clear we wanted to cast in concrete ahead of time. But, that's one of the major questions in the operating standards.

And if the operating standards end up saying that the detailed scope must be defined before the review team convenes, clearly the review team will not convene in April and we will not meet the Bylaw requirement because if we're pulled together a drafting team and it goes through whatever process it happens, that's not going to happen beginning of April.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. You made important points there, but of course people like me would come back and say there is scope and there is detailed scope and there are ways to make sure that you have a large [inaudible] of suitably electrified fencing that is predictable without being unreasonable to the operation and effectiveness of any review team, and of course harking back to the very first review team, it had a very specific fixed narrow and annoyingly [inaudible] scope.

ALAN GREENBERG:

One of the points become clear in the SSR review – at least clear to me. That’s not necessarily accepted by everyone – is the issue of scope is not so much the topic, but what the review team believes it is supposed to be doing. In my mind, for instance, a review team is supposed to be making recommendations so that our overall security, stability, and resiliency is high.

One of the questions that was raised is the issue of whether ICANN’s firewalls are appropriately configured. That I think is a completely reasonable thing for the review team to consider, but I don’t believe the review team should be looking at the firewalls. If the review team feels there may be a requirement to fix firewalls, then the review team should be saying that we should consult with an expert group, an external security expert, to analyze the firewalls and make sure they’re properly configured – not to have an SSR review team who may or may not be the right people to do that work.

There’s a big difference between fixing the problems and identifying problems and making recommendations so they can be fixed with actually fixing them yourself.

I suspect that a significant part of what is being called the scope issue with the SSR review team is not the scope, but is to what level of detail are they supposed to be working on the item. Are they looking for solutions or making recommendations at the board level? It’s not clear if scope was really the right word in the way we’re using it right now.

Sebastien, does that come closer to addressing your questions?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan, and sorry for having you taking another topic for five minutes. I would like to thank you for allowing me to participate in this meeting, and I want you to have a good meeting in camera. Take care, bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can we have confirmation that there's no one on the phone lines and—

GISELLA GRUBER: The recording has started. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. The ALT met to discuss a personnel matter and obviously we do not discuss those kinds of things in public sessions. The matter has not been resolved, but is continuing and will be further discussed as we go forward.

Any other business? Heidi, you had one item.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Just wanted to let everyone know that the policy staff will be having their annual workshop the week of the 22nd, so responses during that time will be a little slower than usual. However, we'll all be on the ALAC call the evening of the 22nd or I guess the morning of the 23rd for some. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Heidi. Any further comments before we adjourn? It's been a meeting that has gone almost 20 minutes over. My apologies for starting a bit late. Thank you for a very productive meeting. If there are no other comments, the meeting is over.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Goodnight, Seun. Goodnight to you and your family. Thank you very much. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for joining today's meeting and hope to speak to you all soon. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]