EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the ICANN 59 ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 4. 27th of June, 2017, 9:15 to 10:15, in Ballroom 4.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, folks.

ALAN GREENBERG: If everyone can please take their seat. We're already running a little bit late. This is the session on the At-Large review. It is not a working session as such in that we're not planning to have substantive discussion on the issues, but looking at the process going forward to take the review that has been produced and provide input into the Board Operational Effectiveness Committee, which then goes to the Board.

We've had a preliminary meeting yesterday with MSSI and we think we have a pretty good idea on how we're going to move forward. The one thing I will wave a red flag at is the timeline is far more aggressive than we originally imagined. When we look at the schedule of the Board meetings, the meeting of the Operational Effectiveness Committee, the lead times they need

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.

to get things on to their agendas, we've lost about a month that we thought we had, so this is going to be a pretty aggressive thing. And I'll turn it over to Holly to talk about the details and explain how we think we can actually manage to go forward and do this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. Yesim, can I have the slides, please? Okay. First slide.

To start with, these are the documents that have to go to the Board and we're aiming for the October meeting. Now, the first two items have been done. Obviously, the ITEMS report. They have, as we know, there is a final report. It was completed in April. That will go. The second document that goes to the Board is an actual summary of the public comments. Staff will be or has prepared that. That is another item that goes to the Board.

The third thing that goes to the Board is what we are talking about today. It's called a feasibility assessment and implementation plan. It is our response to the Board. It's not the response that we made to the actual review. This is something separate, although there's a great deal of overlap and, indeed, we have done a lot of the work already.

So, with that, could I have the next slide, please?

Alan said it's a tight timeframe. It really is a tight timeframe. For the next week, ICANN staff's going to take a well-deserved break, but we start in earnest the second week in July and we don't have a lot of time. From July to the third week in August is the actual timeframe we have to develop the document that we have to develop, and that's not a lot of time. Think of it. You've got, what, three weeks, six weeks max, from July to the second week of August, that all of the RALOs will have met. And at the top of every agenda for every RALO, I would hope that you would be putting a response to the review, and I'll go into that in a bit more detail.

But this is your opportunity. If you remember, the RALOs had a separate document that went as a comment to the review, so this is your second chance at a buy-in. Now, what will go to the Board is going to be one document that we'll take into account all of the comments. In particular, all of the RALOs' comments. So, you've got one meeting with which to actually have a look, talk through, and see what you're going to say. And I certainly welcome, everybody welcomes, all of your input.

The third week in August is going to be an APRALO – sorry, an ALAC meeting. At that meeting, most of the time is going to be spent looking at the RALOs and looking at where we have to go, what we have to say in the final response to the Board. So, in fact, that's not a lot of time. By the first week in September,

there should be a final response. It will go to the Operational Effectiveness Committee, and we had learned last night our deadline is the first week in September. That is absolutely the latest and if we can do it earlier, that's terrific. So, you all understand the tight timeframes that we're all operating under to get a really good response.

The final step in the next phase is a presentation to the Board of the ALAC response. And in that, we have to have our response to each of the recommendations and charting a way forward. In fact, when I say the next phase, I keep saying the next phase is going to be worse. Well, the next phase is going to be worse because it means we're going to have to implement everything that we say we're going to do. And I'm not even thinking about that yet.

Next slide, please.

Okay. This is the form that will have to be filled in, and it's called the Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan. This is the third document that goes to the Board.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Jennifer]? Use this mic.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right. Okay. This is the third document that goes to the Board. It contains – and I'll just go through quickly what each section is. There is an executive summary that sets out, in essence, what we're going to do and our response. Now, I'm sure all of you have read in great detail our response. You would realize that we have in our response to the report, we did an executive summary, and a great deal of what is in the executive summary we've already written will be included in this executive summary. But remember, this document is not a response to the ITEMS report so much it is as it is our report to the Board about how we're going forward. So, there's a completely different emphasis. Nevertheless, we've done a lot of the hard yards and all I can say is thank goodness we have.

The next, against each recommendation – and remember, we've got recommendations and then we've got things like implementation stuff. So, if you add it all up, it's actually more than just recommendations, but against each of them, you've got to the following: You first have to say, "Do you agree?" And for those that you agree with, we say, "Yes. Thank goodness. We can move right along." Unfortunately, or fortunately, that's not a lot of them.

The next is we partially agree. And if you will recall in many of circumstances, we said we agree with the issue that you have identified but we don't think your solution is appropriate. We

think there might be another solution. We have to say that again. Again, this is our response, this has been response to the Board. Sorry, our response to the review. So we've done a lot of this work, but this is what we have to say. And we have to have the rationale for saying so.

If we don't agree with any of it, we have to, again, it has to have to say so, and again, why we don't. And for every recommendation where we either agree in part or don't agree, then we have to say, "This is what we suggest instead and these are our proposed solutions." So, against every single number, that's what has to happen.

Next slide, please. We're almost over.

Okay. The other part of the document that we will be sending to the Board is the implementation plan. The implementation plan sets out what we are going to do in response to the review. In other words, there will have been highlighted things that they believe and things we agree with that are issues that can be addressed. This is where we say what we're going to do and how we're going to do it.

In the implementation plan, we start with prioritization. What are the most important things? What are the least important things? And we have to agree on the order. There are also dependencies. In other words, if we are proposing to do some

things, there will be circumstances where we have to do something before we do something else. We need to identify those circumstances and then say before we can do the following, we will have to have done these things and this is the order in which we are going to implement.

At this stage, when we're talking about resources needed, it's very high level. We cannot actually give a great deal of detail. We can identify this is going to cost, in terms of staff time, maybe one day a week for X weeks, certain amount of money for X things, but the best we can do is a guesstimate. Remember, the Board hasn't accepted this, so we don't have the certainty that, in fact, they agree with everything we say we're going to do.

So, we can identify where we think the resources are needed. We have to identify what we think those resources will be, both in time and money, and that goes into our plan and then our proposed timeline. What we're going to do first, second, third fourth, and the approximate time we think it's going to take. So, there has to be a lot of thought and this is the section that we, in fact, have not worked through. So, this is going to take a lot of thought, and it would be really very useful if all of you sat down and thought what is it that we need to do and what kind of resources are we going to do need to do it, and what is really important, what's less important. So this is going to be the, if

EN

you will, this is where your thinking caps really have to go on and we need your input.

Next slide. Yeah.

This is an example of the template and… Just because I can't possibly read it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's a bit faint, isn't it?

HOLLY RAICHE: It's a bit faint.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's got nothing to do with our eyes.

HOLLY RAICHE: This is what it looks like. And if you can't see it, it doesn't mean you're blind. Okay? Now, what Ariel has already done is on the wiki that is associated with the review, for every single recommendation and for all of the implementation stuff, there is one page for this set up. She has simply put in the first bit, which is this is what the review said. The rest of it is blank and the rest of it is our responsibility. So, I will actually, because my eyes are probably as good or bad as everybody else's, actually go

ICANN 59
POLICY FORUM
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

through the recommendations. It starts off with, first of all, what did the independent examiner say? And that is the only space that has been filled in.

Then you've got prioritization. Now, this is something we're going to fill in last because we have not, at this stage, determined the second part of the implementation plan. So, at this stage, probably you can make a suggestion. We'll probably move it a bit around.

The working party comments. For those of you – well, all of you will know that we made extensive comments in our review. And in fact, probably a lot of what we said could fit in there. There may be some additional things. Actually, what is the next thing?

The status of improvement. In fact, I don't think we should – I think the things that we need to look at here, the way that this is filled, the way that this reads, it reads as if all of the work has been done. And we haven't done all of the work, so the most important things that we have to fill in here would be after the first line, which is what was recommended. We have to then indicate whether we accept it or not, and if not, why not? And then what we're going to do about it.

Do all the pages look like this? Yeah, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just jump in? Thank you. And if you want to get in the queue, [inaudible] already, please feel free to do so at any time. We will take questions at the end of the presentation, though. Just with this, one of the things Holly and I would like to encourage you all to do when you have time, and when you have time, hopefully, in the next week before we have to start working on these documents, is just look at these templates pages that have been set up and have been set up for several weeks now, and familiarize yourselves with the sections.

Now, what is going to be happening is appropriate work that we did in our responses to the public comment period, because a lot of what we said in our significant documentation, both that from the ALAC and that from the RALOs, can literally be cut and pasted into this, and that will be happening. Staff is already planning on getting that done and, in fact, we may see some of these pages, at least as samples showing that, even before we leave here. So, we don't have to redo the work we've done, but we do need to reformat and make additional material in this template in our next piece of work. So, with that, hopefully, Holly's got her next step organized again.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I have, and the first is to say process-wise, what we will be doing is having – and we haven't worked it out. Maybe we're

EN

happy to listen. Do we have both a wiki page and Google Docs? And the reason that we set up two different forms for comment before was for some people, it is difficult to deal with Google Docs, and what we want is to make sure that everyone has the ability to participate in making comments.

So, as a team, we just talked about that last night and didn't decide. Did we?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yes, we did. We did. We did. Let me tell you what we decided and it was absolutely democratic. Just happened to be something I agreed with, which is, of course, very democratic [inaudible]. No, quite seriously. We will be running both a Google Doc for people who will find making the comments in that format available, absolutely, but this house of pages in our wiki has to be there as a final product and archival record, so we will maintain it as we go, and general comments are more than welcome on this wiki page.

So, for anyone who doesn't have the ability to work with Google Docs because we realize that not everybody can, you can either work with Holly, myself, or some of our staff as proxy or put the comments on the wiki page directly. But what will happen is most of the work, we'll run it in the Google Docs system, and we will make sure that everything is in that documentation is

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Now we've got some questions. Briefly, you've got the timeline and all of this stuff, all of this stuff I've done is available. The timeline is there. It is very short. Now we want to deal with some comments and we're going to start with Alan and move on from there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. A couple of comments. Number one, just in a bit of history, the template we're using is a modified version of the template that was used in the GNSO review, which was the first review of the modern era, so to speak. It looks like it's pretty applicable, but it's not locked in stone. If we find as we go along that one of the items really doesn't make sense in our case or we're missing something that we really need to say, that's flexible. So, just keep that in mind.

Our overall reaction has been debated ad infinitum. Now, the final recommendations are not exactly the same as the ones in the draft report but they're pretty close. There was almost no disagreement throughout our complete community on the responses. And although some RALOs put in separate

ICANN POLICY FORUM 59
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

comments, it was much more to reiterate issues rather than to disagree. So, we're not expecting a lot of surprises in the content, and because of that, staff will be able to do an awful lot of the work without us actually having to draft the words ourselves. Of course, the final words are ours and we will have ownership of it.

In terms of if we don't disagree with the solution, what do we do instead? There are a couple of issues that were raised in the report, which are longstanding ones, and we have no illusions that we have magic answers. And we're not going to pretend that what we're proposing is necessarily the definitive answer that will solve the problem for all time, but we're going to do our best to identify where we're moving and how we're moving forward.

Holly mentioned dependencies. The two largest dependencies are not ones of recommendations dependent on each other, but are availability of volunteer resources that we are not in a position to simply buy. And a good number of the items, interestingly enough, really are going to require dollars from ICANN, which we're also not in a position to guarantee. But in some cases, the implementation is going to be really simple. If ICANN says we don't have the money, done, we don't have to do any of the implementation. And if you remember, there were a lot of things that said the CROPP program is really good but they

were using 30 trips per year and we only have five, so it's not quite a done deal.

Lastly, the window is really, really narrow between the time that we expect to be able to have a draft of some of these documents to the time we have to finalize it. We are not going to have an opportunity to nitpick every word and sentence and adjust everything in a stylistic way. It's really important to get the content there, though, to make sure that we are presenting a good case to the Board. Thank you.

And more important, we're looking for real comments. So don't agonize too much over the details, but if you think we're saying something that's wrong, we need to hear that early, and I emphasize early.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a final plea, too. We have not thought through, at all, the second bit, which is the implementation, which is what we're going to do, what order are we going to do it, and what kind of resources are we going to need. So, that's where we need the new thought. That's where we need the input. So, it'll be really nice if you're thinking through not only what is your response to the review because, basically, we've all spent a lot of time doing it. And that's, perhaps, less important than actually saying, well, what are we going to do about the review and about the

recommendations? That's the important bit and we actually need to hear from all of you. I'm dead serious about that.

Now, we've got two cards up. Sebastien and – we've got Sebastien, Seun, Andrei, Andrei, sorry, and in the room. Ricardo in the AC room. Okay, those are four.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, he – I was going to say [inaudible] just to be clear, Ricardo is next [inaudible] of the rank, and then the order follows. And while you're contemplating what Holly has just asked you about in terms of prioritization, also consider if there is an advantage to us phasing some of the implementation on some of these things, bundling some of these things together, and saying these need to be done sooner, these need to be done midterm out, these are longer term. That might also be something we can start thinking about. So over to Ricardo.

Use a mic that's – these, the cameras track to where the mic is, so if you take the seat, that'll be terrific.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you. Just a comment in the if I read this in the screen, I didn't found easily if we agree or not. I guess, I think that if we add a second line there prior to high, low, medium, and we say agree, not agree, partially agree, so that the Board can read it

easily, it will be better. In this way, I find out that we agreed with everything and that if I read this from outside, I say we agree with everything and we have a priority for this, but not the if we disagree. Just that. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that. We'll certainly take that onboard. And remember, too, that when we framed our response to the public comment, at the top of each of those sections was our response to the recommendation and our rationale. So, when the material gets transferred across, that will help us capture that, as well. So, we will just form a new field and put that in that field so it reads in the order you're suggesting. Thank you. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Let me speak in French, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ready to roll. This is not your first rodeos, people. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank you. I would like to go back to the beginning of the presentation. In the Northern Hemisphere, it's going to be our summer vacation. We're all having other activities. We have tons of other ICANN work to do. And I don't

understand how we can accept to be treated this way with such short timeframe. It's just not possible. The only ones that are going to have the time and the knowledge to do so are going to be able to intervene and participate. And if it were me, I would say that in the report, it says that the users should be taken care of, that and there are no working group. What should we do? Not have a working group and answer to that? Really, there are times when we have to be strong and say this schedule is not acceptable. We cannot work with that schedule. We need time to work well so that the voice of end users is being heard. The ALSes, we talk about in the report, we have to talk to them. They have to be involved for the implementation aspect of it, or else it's a contradiction of what we want to do and the way we want to work in this report, which is [inaudible] tells us what to do.

So, I have another drastic solution. We put it in the garbage, this report, and we do our own implementation of what I think and we think is useful for At-Large. We would waste less time and we would be more efficient. I'm sorry to be so blunt, but sometimes enough is enough. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll respond to two parts of what you said. In regard to the latter, let's put it in the garbage and start over again because we can

do it better. Boy, do I agree. I don't think we really have that option.

Well, in terms of the timing, the call is really ours. We made a strong statement and request. Luckily, I don't carry the report with me but I can't say strong enough that I support that concept. I really do not think it's a practical one given the bureaucracy around us, and it's our bureaucracy, which we've created.

In terms of the timeline, we have the option of saying we want to do it a lot slower, but we've also said very strongly we want this addressed by this Board and this Operational Effectiveness Committee, which among other things, we know is moderately sympathetic to us, and the next one might not be. So, it's our decision whether we try to do it in the timeframe to meet the deadline of this Board or not. And certainly, my position was we have gotten lots and lots of input into the recommendations and, implicitly, the implementation of them, so I think we already have the fodder, the basic information, which to work with without feeling that we are working counter to what the ALSes have already said. But, yes, we could decide to delay this. I wouldn't support that, but we could.

HOLLY RAICHE: Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. Two comments. On the templates, I think the one on the wiki is quite more detailed than the one that is projected, so it may be good to make use of that.

On the second point is I wanted to ask, would it not be, given the fact that we do not agree with some of the recommendations, would it not be prudent to hear from the Board what they agree with instead of first preparing implementation on what they will not agree with on the long run? Would we not be wasting our time? Especially if we propose implementation and it's not approved. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that question, Seun, because it is a very important process point that I think we all need to understand. The mechanisms by which the independent and external reviews of the component parts of ICANN is a formulaic one managed by the Operational Effectiveness Committee, and the Operational Effectiveness Committee is whom we are currently trying to interface with. It is their job with staff papers to then, after they form opinions, bring the matters to the Board. In preparation for that, the Operational Effectiveness Committee meets and they have the independent examiner available for questions. And

they have probably Alan, Holly, and myself, but the organizing committee of the review team available for Q&A.

So, what we're doing now is at this near-end preparatory phase, it's extraordinarily unlikely that what the Operational Effectiveness Committee recommends to the Board would then be overturned by the Board. That would be very, very unusual. So, this is one of the reasons we're so keen to try and work with this Operational Effectiveness Committee, where the members of the Operational Effectiveness Committee have shared the journey with us.

HOLLY RAICHE: God, you're polite. Alan, before Andrei, Alan comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very quick response. The only other review that's gone all the way through under the current regime, current rules, is the GNSO. The GNSO accepted some of the recommendations, categorically rejected some of them, including one of the more substantive and, perhaps, important ones. And it was, to be blunt, rubber-stamped by the OEC. I'm optimistic we will see similar results but, of course, can't guarantee it.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to back up, Alan, I watched the faces of some of the members of the Board at some of the presentations, and I gather from some of the raised eyebrows possibly we have some sympathy, which we won't go there. Andrei, go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you. I have a technical question. It's pretty much clear with this in this presentation and we've been living with this for many months and I don't think that there is a time press, actually, because everything which we have to write there, we know. I mean, it's just, I mean, come on, it's just [inaudible] just type it in. That's it.

Technical question. How do we proceed with that? I mean, like everybody add to the same page or who holds the band? How it will be done technically?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, okay. First, absolutely agree with you. We've done most of the hard yards. The thing that we haven't thought through is some of the implementation stuff. That's going to take some thought and that's why, basically, we'd like the RALOs to talk. In terms of how do we do it, this is what Cheryl talked about, which is we have a Google Docs that worked really well for the review itself, but there are some people for whom that's really difficult,

in which case, we'll have a wiki. So, and also, there were people who had difficulty with both. They e-mailed me, and everything that they e-mailed to me I then put in. So people have literally three ways of inputting. Probably Google Docs is preferable but some people can't. That's fine. So, and then what we'll do that final week is to go through what everybody said and condense it down so that everybody can agree. And then what we'll probably do, there will be an ALAC meeting the week of, I think it's the 23rd, 24th, where we can then review and find – August, where we can finalize the start, the report that goes forward. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have a well-established process that we use for statements, where we draft something and people make comments and then whoever is the penholder revises it, factoring in those comments and things. So I don't think it's going to be a super one in that there's a lot more text, but it's basically what we've done before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if I may, just on that technicality, we'll make sure the permissions are set that if you have the link, you have the edit right. And the people who will be given that link is those on the list, which is ALAC, regional leads, and the members of the

Review Working Party, so that's your primary drafting team. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Shall we do it open for everyone? I mean, ALAC members, all the At-Large members, or shall we organize it by region as we did for the statement?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. That's a very good question. This work product actually belongs to the Review Working Party with ALAC endorsement. The Review Working Party is structured to have membership from all of the RALOs, so I think we can consolidate working primarily with those members of the Review Working Party as conduit. For example, I would expect the members, if possible, if not Holly, Alan, or I, Leon, or someone, one of us mooring. The people who did that pen-holding the first time around will make ourselves available to assist, but I think the job should really be owned by the member of the working party who comes from that region. And they'd be the ones who would raise it as an agenda item and discuss it at the meetings that Holly referred to at the beginning of August, and do that.

The advantage of having the wiki, of course, is that if you can log in, you can comment, and so I would allow and encourage that

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 59
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

when I was talking, for example, to APRALO, I would be saying to all of the ALSes and the individual members and the members of the ALSes, "If you want to get engaged, get onto the Wiki page, put your comments in," so we can capture that grassroots that way. But because this is actually the product of a work team, which is regionally balanced, I'm really keen to make sure that they act as the interlocker on these activities. And back to Alberto, but before we do, Alberto, would you mind if Aida had just a very brief intervention? If we can go to you, please, Aida.

AIDA NOBLIA: Well, since this is our wintertime, winter season in our country, when we see all this stuff about the recommendations, well, I believe it's quite interesting. And I took the time because we are in winter, I took the time to read recommendation number 2 because I was really concerned about recommendation number 2. I belong to one of the ALSes and as you said that the wiki page was a means for contributed. What I contribute and what I did was to write a comment. Can you hear me? Okay, great.

So, what I did was this. I put my comment on recommendation number 2, and I think I had two or three comments based on what we said before, and I added some information. So since we have 16 recommendations and these recommendations have different items, perhaps, we should [this] reviewed or, perhaps,

people with great knowledge of these recommendations. I mean, I know or I understand certain recommendations, but I don't have that amount of knowledge on other recommendations. So, perhaps, we can get some comments on that other recommendation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And what you raised is the importance of using both the wiki page but also in the comments and notes in the Google Docs, get a dialogue going early on and develop some discussion and debate, and you might all agree in your comments to take a particular direction or move to a particular style of prioritization or outcome of how we react to the recommendation. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Cheryl. Just a brief and small suggestion for the RALO leaderships. The leaders should make it clear the timeline for this activity because we are receiving comments outside the established time. So could you please state the end, the time for these comments to be provided? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, yeah. Excellent. That's why I put something up on the – that was the first slide and I think we just circulate the first slide and say this is the timeframe we've got. And that's why I said in

terms of all of the RALO meetings, that's why I would like this on every RALO meeting's agenda. But thank you for your comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, we hope with staff support we will have the draft of the response ready before the end of July, and you will then have the first three weeks in August to work on it. That's about the timeframe. Comments can be made ahead of time but that's when we expect to have the text.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm unsure. Is it Harold or Dev who's next? Harold, please, go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS: Just a brief comment. We are having a meeting in our RALO to consolidate this material and I would like to ask staff to send a Doodle poll during this meeting so that we can move forward in the following days because, otherwise, the Doodle poll would be sent during the three days that we will have next week and we need to start working at once. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Harold, can I ask? Are you talking about a Doodle poll for convening a meeting of the Review Working Party?

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes, that's right. We are asking for the Doodle poll to be sent this week so that we can be ahead of time and have a week to rest. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I didn't see you, but were you before or after Dev. Oh, to that point, yes, go ahead, please, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: I would like to reply to Harold. I would like to remind that interpretation services will not be available until 10th of July, so if I send out a Doodle this week, I'm not sure if it will be fine for everyone to look at their schedules because it will be two weeks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's not a problem because we're not trying to Doodle for an early date. We're trying to send the Doodle for a date out early.

ALAN GREENBERG: The meeting will be later after that window. He just wants the Doodle sent out early.

YESIM NAZLAR: I know. My concern was just if people will be available to look at their calendars and schedule two weeks in advance. That was my concern.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, they're going to have to. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. So, good presentation. I like the wiki layout and so on. Just a question on how the implementation detail. You mentioned the Google Doc that will also be used to capture comments and capture the writing of towards the final response. So, is it that the… Is there going to be some sort of reconciliation exercise where whatever is on the wiki is going to go to the Google Doc? And my question is then would it, it might make the most sense to have also the link to the appropriate Google Doc. If it's one, to have it on the wiki page as a reference so you can see what is happening in the Google Doc, what is happening on the wiki, and address your comments to suit.

And a further suggestion would also be to just at the top of every recommendation page, just have a box with the actual ITEMS final report, the ALAC response, the RALO response, just for ease of reference. When you go to the page, you can just quickly open them up, so that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: A lot of that's already done, but to be honest, we had the meeting with MSSI yesterday at 7:00 PM. We haven't fully thought the exact details through but we understand that we want both wiki and Google Docs, and somehow, we have to coordinate them in that timeframe. To pretend that we actually know exactly how we're going to do that, I won't lie to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can I just say what's on the wiki already is for every page Ariel has already put the recommendation. So, there is already on the wiki the recommendation is headed up. So, and what we have to do is then probably there's going to be a lot of cut and paste, like we've already said yes, no, maybe, whatever, and we've already articulated a lot of the reasons. We haven't done that second step yet but there is a lot of material and the outline is there. It's a matter of then Google Docs and doing the rest of the stuff that we've agreed we should.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And, Dev, what you've suggested is very useful because whether we run as sections or whatever, having those embedded links, we've made the note, we'll make it that way because it is just easier, as you say, so thank you very much for that suggestion.

Ariel. Go ahead. You're a woman who is going to make some of the magic happen.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Cheryl. Yesim, you can click on the parent page above recommendation number 1. It's just right above that. You can see I already put the Google Doc on that page and using a macro, so any changes to the Google Doc will be reflected on this page. You can just scroll down a little bit so that we can keep everything in sync. But as a participant stated, we will give access to the Google Doc to the specific people, the working group, Working Party people, the ALAC Leadership, and RALO Leadership and [liaison]. But for the wiki everybody can comment, but still, we have this in sync, so it's linked.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Last call for any comments. I'm not seeing any, in which case, we might actually get this train back on the track on time. Therefore, I am unaware of anything else we need to do in today's meeting unless fellow leadership team to my right, which we're all going no. That's fine. In that case, we all know what we need to do. We can do a little preparatory work ourselves by familiarizing ourselves with what's on the wiki now. Rest assured that the work that was done for the public comments will be [bored] across and put in.

Also, Alan, for example, has put together an excellent next step document. We will also take text across from that as draft and see your comment. So, when you get a – if you a member of the Review Working Party, you will be getting a Doodle for – we will probably set three but hope to run two meetings. We'll see how we go. I'd rather have them in your calendar and then not have to need them all. And that will come out, thank you Harold, as soon as is practical and possible. And when you get your links to these docs, that's when your individual pieces of homework start. And that goes to not just the working party, not just the Review Team Working Party, but the wider leadership in ALAC.

And then, ladies and gentlemen, I'm looking forward to us actually getting this done in a highly efficient way because we've done all the hard yards already. Thank you, interpreters. Thank you, staff. And back to Alan to have his meeting back.

ALAN GREENBERG: And thank you, Cheryl and Holly. This meeting is effectively over in a moment, but I do remind you that we are meeting with the GAC in Ballroom 1 at 10:30, which is about 18 minutes from now. So, see you all there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]