CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Okay, we will now begin the official recording of this call.
	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group call on Monday, the 19th of November, 2018 at 19:00 UTC.
	On the call today, on the English channel, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sebastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz on audio only, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Jonathan Zuck, Alfredo Calderon, John Laprise, Alan Greenberg, Vanda Scartezini, Ali Almeshal, Javier Rua-Jovet, Yrjo Lansipuro, Ricardo Holmquist, and Marita Moll.
	On the Spanish channel, we have Humberto Carrasco and we currently do not have anybody on the French channel.
	We have received apologies from Bastiaan Goslings, Satish Babu, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu; and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.
	Our interpreters for today on the Spanish channel are Claudia and David. On French, Claire and Jacques.
	And if I could please remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. And with this, I turn it over to you, Maureen. Thank you.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Claudia. Welcome, everybody, to this meeting and one that we certainly hope will be the final one for getting everything together for this activity.

Before I pass it on to Cheryl to go through the various sections, I would just like to sort of acknowledge the work that Cheryl and Evin and Heidi and Alan have actually put in to the document. We've all made our comments and I really do appreciate that those comments have been sort of listened to. I think we've got a really good document on hand now and so I'll let … John Laprise, I hope you've got sound coming soon.

I'd really like us all to be looking at that document while Cheryl's going through it so if you've got any questions or queries, please raise them. But be mindful of the fact that we do need to get this okayed by the ALAC hopefully at our next meeting. So we'd like to put this out to all the ALAC members before the ALAC meeting because if we delay it for the next meeting, it's not going to make our deadline.

So please, I hope you've been through those issues, you've got your comments or made your comments already if you needed to. But let's go through it and we'll see what we can come up with. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Maureen, and just reviewing what we were up to last week. It was our intention to be at the stage we are at now. In other words, with a final draft ready for ALAC's endorsement last week, but

we stopped actually partway through the beginning of our discussion on Issue 13 so if you can get yourself, and this is a reconvening of an existing meeting and agenda. So don't think we're starting from the top of the agenda. We're not. We're finishing the meeting we didn't finish last week – almost, but not quite.

So if you take yourself to page 15 on the document and just while people are scrolling to that because we might as well start at the beginning of Issue 13 rather than reading [inaudible] the discussion and debate that was held last week on it and I'll make a couple of preamble statements about this work as well.

I just wanted to note two things. First of all, that not very much text has changed with the exception of on Issue 3. Heidi took specific suggestions from David Olive and other staff input to make sure that what we had written and discussed last week was in better keeping with a likely successful outcome, so for those of you who are tracking changes, you will note some text here in Issue 3 between last week's call and this week's call. I think that's perfectly in keeping with us working within the spirit of the resolution which states that the ALAC will work with ICANN.org to ensure that the budget ramifications and planning are worked out together as we had done that between the two meetings. I just want to draw your attention to that.

The only other thing is, and this is a tad concerning for me, I noticed in an overnight e-mail or a recent e-mail that we had Alfredo put some comments in as suggestions, but in fact, it was done to the wrong document. It was done to the "view only" document, so Alfredo, all I can say is I sincerely hope that the spirit of whatever you intended to be

captured as a comment has, in fact, been captured in this final document. My apologies if it hasn't and I guess if you can put in chat what it was that you were suggesting that came in a little while ago, in my overnight anyway, that hopefully will be able to be polished off today.

In addition to that, I will just make sure that you all know where we need to be at the end of today's call and that is that at the end of today's call, which hopefully will be a short as humanly possible. After we quickly go through Issue 13 and Issue 16, we will go through the document in total to look at the general fit and format and to make sure that no major oversights or omissions have been made.

At that point, this document leaves our hands. The word "final" gets removed from its title. It's obviously sanity checked for any typographical errors or spelling errors, etc. and it should go to the At-Large Advisory Committee at the earliest possible convenience so that, in a perfect world, it can endorse our document at its next call.

So with that issue [inaudible] got to thank you, Alfredo. I'll have a look at these while we're going through, that as well while we're going through the Issue 13.

Issue 13 is one that is particularly close to Maureen's heart and she in fact did the lion's share of modified drafting from the working document text, which is what you've all had contributions towards as well as the particular issue needs and that's the one there was some concern raised that in the absence of Maureen we should not continue on its deliberations.

Those of you tracking changes again will note that there are some changes in text to this and this is changes that, surprisingly enough, Maureen's made since her particular commitment at IGF in Paris have completed. So rest assured Maureen is happy with this text.

So with that, we're looking at the participation in regional events. ARIWG comments have not been changed at all. That is as she [was writ] last week. We know the status of improvement. This is from page 16 now and not yet started, and that staff [inaudible] their activities, if any, in terms of dependencies shown. And again, this text has not changed, with the exception of noting that staff resources will need to be made available to the creation of the travel dashboard.

Who will implement is there and the anticipated resources have been modified since last week's text and you'll see that it's now listing as two to six weeks of staff time plus ongoing management with additional time there being allowed for interaction with IT expertise from ICANN.org. This is one that shows no expected budget implications and then you'll find some very minor modifications to the text on the empowered proposed implementation steps has been done. For example, I think where it said "dashboard", it may have said "travel dashboard". No sorry, it may have said something other than just "dashboard" in the last run.

Is there anybody, metrics known in the target completion of 2019, is there anybody who has any concerns, comments or major omissions they wish to make on number 13 as an issue? I'll take a queue on that while I hopefully can briefly look at outsiders' comments.

Maureen, did you wish to speak to [inaudible] at all?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. No, I was just actually going to write that in the discussion that we had and I'd been able to retrieve what I thought were important issues raised in that particular item. I think that what we've done is just made those steps a little bit more high level and just adapted some of the comments to other issues that were also raised, that had some minor changes to them already as well, so I'm actually okay with that but I notice that Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things. At one point … I'm commenting under activities, the staff resources will need to be made available for the creation of the travel dashboard and the number of two to six weeks and the comment on IT expertise.

I think that those went in when there had been a comment saying this is going to be an interactive dashboard and that word has now been taken out, I believe, of this so I would suggest that we're talking about something closer to the two weeks and the six weeks and it's up to Heidi, but I would think that's not something that she's going to have specifically ask for resources for. And without the interactive, I don't think we need the IT expertise.

So before I go on, I'll ask Heidi, if we're talking two to three weeks of work, which I think is what we're talking about for a wiki page to point

to a variety of resources, is that really going to require you to ask for additional staff?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As we're going to go to Heidi, she did, in fact, wish I'm going to, she's already asked if Maureen and myself could join with [Laura] and a couple of others just to dot the Is and cross the Ts on that. So Heidi, did you want to speak first? In other words, Alan, leaving that in there at this stage is no down side because it may indeed come to pass. But [inaudible] paraphrase [inaudible]?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, that is exactly what I was going to say. Thank you. We'll have a call later this week just to ensure that we are on the right track with all of that and see where we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so that's my point number one. Point number two is I'm not sure that the post-implementation activities belong under the implementation steps. I would try to fold them in under the ARIWG comments as opposed to putting them there because putting them there almost makes them things that we're saying are going to be deliverables to the Board. So I would consider that. That's my only other comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Can I ask is there any objection to quite literally cutting from one cell and moving it to the other cell as Alan suggested? And post-implementation steps, it seems they're simple enough [inaudible] and a good flow if there's no objections?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's probably slightly more complicated because right now there's a title in the ARIWG comments post-implementation steps, potential next steps following implementation, and then calling this post-implementation activities. They're going to have to be merged together or at least the nomenclature changed. Effectively, it's a cut and paste, but it's got to be cleaned up a little bit so it flows.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm quite confident we can trust Evin to not make a total dog's breakfast of that, but I promise we will double-check and you've got edit and access rights to this document, Alan, so you'll get a notification when Evin makes those changes and you can also dot the Is and cross the Ts on that [chart] [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: But I'm not going to make changes without the knowledge of the group. That's all I'm saying.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I'm saying is the group happy with it? Not hearing any objections, let's make that so. So Evin, if you can take that as an action item to do.

No Maureen, it won't be lost. We promise. And besides, I happen to know Evin's already captured this document as another file copy so she's probably got so many archived copies of this document in so many different versions, she can probably fill a fair amount of the hard disk space with it. I'm sure you do. I've seen how many you've taken.

All right, just to go back to my question then. Is there any problem that anyone has with 13 or can we take that as read? Yay! Then let us now move to Issue 16, which is metrics and this is where we almost got to last week.

There should be no surprises on the metrics text. The metrics text has been subject to very little modification since you've all had commenting access to it.

The only thing that is still pending is in the status of improvement field. We still have text which I've now highlighted in lots of gaudy colors I use. I'll make it horrible red and I even highlighted in yellow so people can't possibly miss it. We need the link to the working group Wiki to be put in there and we'll also make sure, Maureen, you might wish to just make sure staff have an action item to work with you and I and I think Joanna put herself forward to be dealing with metrics on this. But we need to note on that Wiki page that the reconvening of the metrics working group is occurring and set up a first call just so that link goes to something that is alive rather than static and dead as it is at the moment. But we've got until December to do that. So that link needs to be put in.

As we go down, the activities are, as previously written, just a minor text modification where it says [various] metrics working group in the document, we've made sure it's reconvened. The Metrics Working Group throughout, please note that whilst we have unknown budget ramifications, we've [inaudible] any budget ramifications of this because it may take something to be implemented in a technology point of view or some tool to be utilized, that that will come in under the 2021 budget cycle and beyond.

And just to check that you are all comfortable with the three proposed implementation steps there, that the metrics group will propose performance metrics for the ALAC members. And it should be a comma – "ALAC members, liaisons and appointments beyond those specific in the rules of procedure, regional leadership, ALSes, ALS representatives, and individual members of RALOs" – remembering [inaudible] of metrics for some of those. Things like "be engaged", "demonstrably be engaged", whatever. It's going to be quite a long hand and you also would have At-Large deeply engaged with the development of all of those as well.

The second part is each of the items in the implementation plan is expected to provide appropriate metrics and with that [inaudible] the metrics, each of the issues being implemented in with the metrics issue and so we'll make sure that those measurables are reported on within the ALAC improvement work space.

And finally, that based on the new OrganiGram, that each of the three streams that ALAC will be working with the organization of policy and outreach and engagement will also be asked to establish goals with

measurable objectives. And if I have anything to do with it, hopefully it will be a SMART system, which I know many of you in North America are comfortable with but most of us in Asia are also.

And then the final two sections are the metrics of the metrics, surprisingly enough, that we need to achieve a significant level of support for the proposed metrics of the At-Large Community, looking forward to having that done by June or July 2019. We need to establish an ALAC At-Large metric project plan because some of these things will need to be brought in in stages. You cannot suddenly impose metrics on people, for example, who have stepped up to roles in the absence of those metrics being created, let alone them being aware of them.

So [inaudible] is also a socialization of all of these metrics, so they're going to be required throughout At-Large. And you've got your how long it takes there as well.

For those of you who like splashes of color, you will see a [inaudible] chart which a huge [inaudible] to Evin for managing to finally work out what it is Maureen wanted to see here and getting it done moments before the meeting started. This is listing all of the issues and putting a simple timeline [inaudible] together for the [inaudible] effectiveness committee to be aware of it.

That is the end of the eight prioritized issues that we are starting to implement and I would like to take you back up now to page ten because it is, in fact, page ten that our [inaudible]'s comments [inaudible] were related to, or I'm hoping it's page ten. And that is he asked a question about what is the difference between the ALT and the

ALT-pluses. The argument is just have an ALT, ALAC Leadership Team, as it is defined here in Issue 4, as listed is that the ALAC Leadership Team, the ALT, is a defined team and entity that is identified and described in the current ALAC Rules of Procedure.

The ALT-Plus does not show that classification, but you will note in who will implement the recommendation, the term, as I see it – and this is where your question comes from, Alfredo, and hopefully we can fix this now – we've said the At-Large Leadership Team, ALT-Plus, has its [inaudible]. We're moving the plus in brackets from that and using the word At-Large Leadership Team, ALT, and then the word "plus" liaisons and other forms of ALAC Chairs and ICANN staff, but before we say "and ICANN staff" say "[needs] of the three core activities". And then I think that Maureen, have I covered that correctly then?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, just writing that the ALT is the ALAC Leadership Team, the ALT-Plus is the At-Large Leadership Team which incorporates the regional chairs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. You can't redefine an ALT outside of what it's defined as in the Rules of Procedure. You can embellish it which is what you've done.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So if we state in the "who will implement" what the embellishment is, then I think we've answered our [inaudible] question. Then let's go to Olivier and then Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Just coming back to the metrics and the action item for staff to organize a Metrics Working Group call, I think we need to be quite clear that this is not the At-large Summit Metrics Working Group. Or are you looking at the same group dealing with both? I would have thought they would be different.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, I'm definitely [inaudible]. Originally – and the working document may still have reference to this – we all envisaged that this within the implementation of these metrics, that the metrics for at least the selection process of supported travelers, they did fall under this but the timing is wrong and the different decisions they made within that at-risk work. So there's still the sense they're different. Yes, there's a nexus but they're definitely two entirely different things, so language that may exist in the working document, still referring to ATLAS, is not in this data implementation plan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, so in which case, when we make the call for organization of the metrics working group, we need to make sure that we don't confuse people on this. That's all. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine, but we also would expect that there would be a good cross-over of people in both.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, definitely. But you know the questions we're going to get. It will be like, "So which working group is that?" and "What metrics are we talking about?" etc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Definitely do not underestimate the ability of our people to maximize confusion. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Since we're talking about metrics, I'll start on that one. I agree it is two different groups completely with two different intents right now. Now, if we had finished the global metrics work, the ATLAS metrics one may be really simple. But we aren't and we have to do it right now as a catch-up activity because we have no choice because of the timing.

I made a small change in the metrics section which you may or may not have noticed, just pointing out that we want to capture of metrics not only for ALS representatives, but ALS members. Those are one of the groups that we're trying to capitalize on. That's why we're keeping ALSes because they have members. So the group is larger.

I really think the proposed implementation steps have to emphasize the difficulty of what we're looking to do, and if we are successful – that is

we get a lot of people – either we're going to have to find some magic way to develop tools to gauge involvement and since we're not just counting e-mail messages or presents at a meeting. It's not trivial. It's not clear that we'll have any automated ways. That may well be people intensive and staff intensive, so to the extent that we are very successful, there may be a staff cost to being successful and I think we need to weave that into the discussion a little bit because it's not at all clear right now. It sounds like it's a cut and dry activity that we know how to do. We just have to actually get around to doing it. And I don't think that's true at all. So that's on metrics.

What was the other one we were looking at? Oh, the ALT one. That's a relatively simple one. The ALT and the Rules of Procedure, the ALT are the five people. There's no question about that. The rules of procedure call for the chair to be able to add to the ALT advisors.

I had one set of advisors. Maureen has a much larger set of advisors, so she's naming that super-set group "The Alt-Plus" and that's fine, but just pointing out that in terms of the rules of procedure, they are technically advisors. How she uses them, how she assigns responsibilities to them is purely a chair's decision. So just pointing out the nomenclature. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And I heard I was trying to speak clear enough language to indicate that that's what we needed to make clear and that with that minor change in the "who will implement the

recommendation, we've probably covered that without using the term, "ALT-Plus" which seems to be the cause of the confusion.

Just going back to the metrics, I'm happy to probably I'll just have a look at it when I finish this up except the minor modification to the texting metrics. I'm not particularly concerned about, however, making the changes to beef up what we're saying with if we are successful, then we may have another problem and that is the resulting of it because I believe that's covered well enough in our warning that we have no idea what budget implications may be at this stage. But in the 2020-2021 budget, we will undoubtedly be knowing where we stand and what we need to do. And I think your point would be perfectly well-made at that point because I think it's not enough to have it listed [lightly] now. You've still got your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I do. My concern is I don't know if we—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Who's groaning? Does someone need medical assistance?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. Hopefully they weren't groaning over what I was saying, but we'll see. My concern is I don't really know. We struggle over this a lot and we have come up with potential suggestions that we know don't work.

This may well be an area we want to go out and try to find some external people who may have experience and how do we track activities of large groups of individuals and that's why I think we may want to put in just a little bit about the complexity because that may give us a handle to be able to do that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Alan, if you can propose extraordinarily concise next to that end, then Maureen will consider it, no doubt, as an addition.

ALAN GREENBERG: Everything I write is exceedingly concise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Extremely concise so it's probably not worth putting in. But let's cross that bridge when we come to it and note to the ARIWG that there may be a minor sentence change in keeping with Alan's proposal should Maureen feel highly motivated to add it.

So with that, I wanted to pop that up now to one and the reason I didn't mention some minor edit in text for one is because I knew we were going to run it from the top again.

Just before we do, let me take you a little bit further back up to the introduction. Just to make sure you're all aware of some additional changes that have happened in the introduction and executive summary section that between now and last week's meeting, we had intended to have the overview chart.

We mentioned it at last week's meeting. It has now been added and I trust you will find the paraphrasing of the issues into plain language, a reasonable enough thing to do and the reordering of the order of priority during the document we had originally talked about the resourcing, then the complexity and risk, and then the prioritization in the chart on pages one and two, we said that the Organization Effectiveness Committee was probably going to be interested in the priority and [list those in] how we managed to establish that priority, so we've literally removed the order.

You'll also find an even prettier [inaudible] chart than the other one which shows in very simplistic terms that we've got continuous improvement high priority recommendations and move into low priority recommendations that we're dealing with here.

In the introduction section, the resolution which was to be inserted has been inserted in full and then we get to Section 1, and in Section 1, there has been some additional text changes that Jonathan has done and I believe, Jonathan, that is primarily in the implementation. Did you wish to speak to that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not necessarily. I think all I did was basically update the pros under every comment because that had tended to be like a conversation field in the spreadsheet and wasn't really ready to be cut and pasted directly into the final document so it's in a form that is more easily consumable and more directly related to the document that we're trying to create. So there's nothing new there, there's no new information. It's just a

better prose to be used directly in the final document than it was before because it was like a conversation field initially.

CHERL LANGDON-ORR: And thank you for that, Jonathan. I believe that that is certainly clear and concise from my perspective. Does anyone wish to speak to it or ask any questions of Jonathan, focusing specifically on the proposed implementation steps, please?

Not hearing anyone, not seeing any hands up. Let's scroll down. Issue 2, nothing has happened [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note you still have initials for who's going to be doing things. I thought we said we're not going to do that. So it needs to be cleaned up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent catch, indeed. In fact, that is a whole thing that needs to be removed because it's not even that with a reminder. See if you can find anymore of those. Thank you. Oh, Jonathan. Thanks Jonathan. Well, no. You see, the problem is we're not going to use names. You just need to develop communications or say something about communication or just put a capital C in their names to vote. Evin's doing live editing.

We're going to remove Jonathan Zuck and just put up a capital C, whatever works makes to make that a sentence. Alan is the expert on sentence structure, not me.

Okay, so then moving to two, reminding you that this is one of the two-phase, one's initial and long-term phase and the [inaudible] chart, the colored chart. You'll see at the end of page 20 again does recognize these two sections and you may need to remind yourselves that some of these have longer texts and some of them have shorter texts. Those of you like me who are interested in how much white space is on a page in a document will just have to put up with people who like all that white at the bottom of page seven [inaudible] table doesn't work properly. I'll just have to put up with that little frustration.

The proposed implementation steps for two and as we agreed last week, no changes are being made there. And if anyone has a … Ah, I caught one. We were using the hash tag next to #16 under metrics. Any comments on that? Alan, yes? I could use another [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that's an old hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Just as we go down … Sorry, Evin, can you just check where we first used the term ARI, capital? This may be the first place we used the term ARI under how long it will take to implement this plan. Whilst I have every confidence that the Organization Effectiveness Committee understands what ARI means—

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe I introduced in the Executive Summary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so if it's in the Exec Summary, then that's fine. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure, but I believe that's where it first showed up. But yeah, it is in the second paragraph of the Executive Summary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, so I don't have to worry about it putting it in full there. That's great. I just didn't want to miss that opportunity.

                        So if we don't have any on number two, let's quickly go to number three. Here, Heidi, did you wish to speak to the minor text changes that happened during last week's call and this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Cheryl, I didn't hear that. Item 3?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, please. You've made some minor changes between last week's call and this if you want to speak to it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Just very minor changes to emphasize that the extra, the full-time equivalent staff would be working on policy At-Large including engagement. For ICANN, it would be primarily policy development

support activities. That is the extent of those very minor changes. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Then moving from three on to four, we just discussed that to some extent but are there any other comments on the definition and understanding of what the leadership team does and does not do?

This is where we first mention the OrganiGram and I would like to propose that we attach the OrganiGram as an appendix to this document. Is there anyone who feels that is or is not a good idea? Or can I just ask, does anyone feel it isn't a good idea?

Thank you. [inaudible] thinks it's a good idea. All right. If you object strongly, let us know. If not, we'll take an AI to attach the OrganiGram as an appendix to this document.

Moving down now to our next priority issue which is number seven, the At-Large Working Group. This is one we went through in torturous detail at last week's call and I believe no change has been made to any of that text. Someone can correct me if I'm wrong.

Issue 9 has, again, we discussed at considerable length last time, the need to increase awareness in staff training on using social media. What we have done is, I believe, take away too much of the detail. Pardon me. Not necessarily looked at whether it was going to be online or modular training, but we did stick with our best guesstimate of probably somewhere between $3,000 and $5,000 to do that and possibly as an ADR.

And, yes, John is keen to go. I think we're already listing that one as your working group starting the objectives and an objectives work, but the resourcing being critical for the actual training itself.

Thirteen, we have covered in excruciating detail both last week and again in today's call. Sixteen, we just completed so I would like to take you out. Pardon me. Where would you like to see what the rest of the document looks like? Beyond those eight prioritized, we've decided to return to more sections in this document.

That is the listing in section two those issues that were raised which are not part of the ALI, which do have the attention of ALAC and At-Large. They are listed there in a very short form view, no different to the first 18. In other words, there was some removal of selves from the working document, removal of people's names and calling down all discussed pros into something that is more succinct and that you'll find all of those including Issue 5, Issue 8, Issue 10 and 11, I believe all listed there.

We then have a new section, another section, Section 3 starting on page 29 which lists the three issues which are not going to have any immediate ongoing activities on the ALAC side in our current review and implementation planning. But that is not meaning that they are not important. It just means it's not part of this work and we've agreed Issue 12 and Issue 14 and Issue 15. And they are being treated in exactly the same way as in section two. They are pushing for a completion date to show that we are not ignoring issues raised by a review process and recognized by the ALAC and At-Large.

The only additional thing now on this document will be an appendix for the OrganiGrams. I will then general sanity checks for typographical errors and adding a link that is noted in metric 16 and checking for [spills], etc. and [inaudible] of Alan's sentence, I think Evin has probably already done the changing of where we have the post-implementation work and [inaudible] it up as described as an action item. Is there anything anyone else wants to say about this document now before we move to make it a subject to final [inaudible] completed document to go to the ALAC? Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is not a substantive comment, but the boxes at the left, sometimes they're completely shaded, sometimes they're completely unshaded, sometimes just the lines with text are shaded. I don't even know how to do that, so I don't know how to undo it, but someone needs to fix it.   By the way, I'm curious how do you shade only the lines that have text?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I won't admit to how much time I spent trying to fix that, too. I had no idea how it occurred and my care factor is relatively low on how to fix it. Maybe it's something only Evin, as the owner of the document, can do. I don't know but I also don't care if it stays in. That much I can live with I decided. But yes, it is curious. It is annoying. I don't understand how it happened, but it's there and if we can't get rid of it, personally, I can live with it.

ALAN GREENBERG:	And if anyone can get rid of it, tell me how you do it if you want it.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Exactly. Anyway—
ALAN GREENBERG:	To Evin or whoever fixed up the boxes so the widths or both columns are uniform throughout the document, thank you. That must have been a tedious job.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	It was and I did it.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Not a problem. Okay, so other than Alan and my curiosity, hopefully someone will work out how that happened. Don't worry about it if we can't fix it, but curiosity.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Maureen just made a very valid comment. It may be when you export it to Word, it all either disappears or is easier to fix.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's possible too. Now that said, I am, as Alan knows, really very saucy about pagination and why it's there so I don't suggest that we capture a PDF from this document and then we send that PDF to the ALAC for review and then we allow it the luxury of sitting around to make whatever word differences may happen because that often happens with exports to match rather than—

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, on purely mechanics, I would suggest exporting to Word and then making a PDF of that than fixing the same document that we've looked at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As long as she gets a [inaudible] of pagination as this is, certainly.

ALAN GREENBERG: The alternative is making the Word document from the PDF and that ends up being more problematic. Just trying to save time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Interesting enough, you can't save the PDF [inaudible] document as well. Yes, thank you.

We also have until the 28th to fiddle around with that. This we need to get in PDF form to the ALAC as early as possible so that they can all read it and consider it so Maureen has some chance of getting them to

approve it at the meeting, and that's got to be the first priority. The rest of the logistics, I'm happy to let Evin sort out any way she wants.

Anyway, that noted on that. Is there anyone who has now got a problem, noting we do have a couple of changes that have happened today that we need to accept? Would this document be considered final by this working group before I ask for any objections? However, I want to remind you, remember this is simply the lodgment of our six-month post-resolution, [inaudible] implementation plan. It has to include budget implications as well, budget planning as well.

All of the important work and words that is in your working document are not lost nor are they being ignored. We will need to match them, so edits, deletions or changes that have been made to thinking in the original document, in this document are matched so we will need to rationalize that. Evin's got copies of everything. And we will obviously have a lot more embellishment work to do as we go through the actual implementation of each of these eight issues. So with that, noting the purpose of this document, is there anyone who objects to handing this off subject to final tidy and [inaudible] to the ALAC as early as possible?

Thank you, Javier. I appreciate your support. If there are no objections, then our job on this document and only this document can be deemed complete. We want to make sure that when the ALAC gets their copy, each of us on the ARIWG Group also get a copy so we can send it to ourselves with exactly what the ALAC will be considering and endorsing.

I want to recognize the huge amount of work that you've all done with being able to create this synopsis, and this is only a synopsis document,

from the working document that you've all created. It's been a terrific [inaudible].

Remind you all that from now on we are committed to [inaudible] monthly reportings and that when you take a small break, about ten days, and a deep rest, you'll all need to start looking at the issues that you're in charge of or leads on and start thinking about when your issue is being implemented and what preparatory work needs to be done to make it so as well as probably as a group, and this may be something for a December meeting, Maureen, would be a discussion on a future templating for reporting.

It might be an idea for us to think now before we get into 2019 and the work really starts. If we can agree on some sort of template for our ongoing reporting, both from our Wiki page but also as a hand-in to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and I would suggest that some advice or working with MSSI on that would go a long way, so perhaps Maureen might need to meet with her staff and leadership on that as well.

So with that, Maureen, I'm going to hand this off to you and see whether or not there's anything you want to do before you wrap this call. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Very much appreciated.[inaudible]. I really appreciated everyone's contributions to this major feat. I think that for one of our first activities for the new season, I think we can be pretty proud of having put it together in such a timey way and that we

can all say that we've contributed to it and it's been a really great team effort. I thank you very much.

So the document will go out very shortly and we will to the ALAC so they can consider it and so that we can get something formalized at the ALAC meeting and start moving this forward so we can start with the real work.

And as you can see in the OrganiGram, the first six months is going to be quite a busy time and there's going to be people assigned to various tasks so that we can make things happen more effectively and efficiently, and moving forward, it's looking good.

And I just wanted to comment on the OrganiGram. Alberto did make mention of the fact that it's got names attached to it, which it really is an important part of it and that particular document has been to just about every RALO meeting and as well as to Göran and his team as well the Board Chair and some of his members as well. So I think that this is a formal document. It's going to the Board so it's official. I think that we don't need to worry too much about that.

And yes, as Cheryl mentioned, we couldn't have done it without the work that's been going on behind the scenes too with Heidi and Evin and the rest of the team that contributed. So thank you very much and we can close another meeting this morning with a time and we will see. I got the LACRALO meeting shortly, but we will see you at the ALAC meeting, if not before. Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Meeting closed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, all. Bye-bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining this call. The meeting is now adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]