
BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (12 of 13)

Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 12:15 to 13:15 CEST

ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

MAUREEN HILYARD: ... Of the ATLAS-3 activity. But I think one of the key things that we've come out of the discussion that we've just had is that it is really important that we relate the ATLAS activity to the review implementation that we are currently undertaking. So, we've just got to make sure that matches up because it's something that the board has actually ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Made the funding contingent on.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. The funding is actually contingent on that particular activity, so it's probably a little bit more important than we probably thought of before. So, what we're going to be doing, therefore, is probably not what was originally planned, but we're going to go through ... Alan is doing an introduction and then Gisella when she comes back, looking at a block schedule that's actually being designed for what we're going to do and have a look at ... There's going to be a process of looking at the key working groups, logistics – what are they? Logistics is Gisella anyway. The delegates working group, which is going to be looking at the criteria, all that stuff related to the actual participants. What are the

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.

other ones? Programming which is Olivier and Eduardo. There was one more which I'll think of as we continue on.

So, what we will be doing very shortly is calling for members for that, but we'll have a mailing group which will probably be a generic one, an inclusive one, so if anyone has got any questions or queries, they can e-mail on that list.

So, I'll let Alan start.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. As the agenda said, let's identify the criteria. I think it would be premature to have that discussion before having another discussion of why are we doing this? You can't figure out the detailed criteria until you understand what are we trying to achieve. I think we'll then go from that to a methodology for identifying people as opposed to just the criteria because I don't think it's going to be as simple as criteria that we can tick off boxes for.

Maureen mentioned that, at some level, the funding for ATLAS is contingent on the relationship with the At-Large Review. I think that's irrelevant, to be quite honest. Cheryl doesn't agree me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Of course.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But, perhaps, when I give you the reason, you'll understand why.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm listening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. When we started talking about this ATLAS, it became obvious that, number one, we were not going to do what we had done before of bringing one person per ALS for a number of reasons. Number one, we're not going to get enough funding for it no matter how much we dream.

Number two, I think it's been demonstrated quite clearly that the representatives who come on behalf of some ALSes and who have been attending our meetings off and on for 12 years are not necessarily going to be the heavy workers. And our target is, as part of the At-Large Review, the main items that the reviewers identified as an issue, the main one that we agreed as an issue, is we need more people to be active. This is an opportunity to start putting that in action.

So, yes, what we are going to be doing is going to be a significant attempt, a significant part of implementing the At-Large Review. But the motivation is not to implement the At-Large Review. It's to get our community in a way that can be more effective. And that just happens to coincide this year with the At-Large Review.

So, how are we going to pick people? Well, we have had two travel slots of the last several meetings where we said these are policy – people who are active in policy. And we have filled them by looking at what people are actively doing and we are filled these slots. The people at

this meeting are Justine and Jonathan and I don't think anyone is going to argue that these people are active.

But, if we total the number of people who are not actively funded already come to ICANN meetings and who are very active, we're not going to need a lot of hands to count them and certainly it's not going to be 60 people.

So, what we are looking for are people with potential to be good and we're not going to hit it 100%. Some of them won't be. But, we want a high probability that the people we bring to indoctrinate – and I use that word carefully – to educate a little bit, to try to convince them their time is worthwhile spending on these kind of things, those are the people we're looking for, to try to identify them. And I don't know what the criteria is and, based on the applications we get for the travel slots, we tend to get 30 and 40 applications for travel slots. We explicitly say you must be active in GNSO working groups or At-Large active working groups, and I can't count the number of people who say, "I occasionally attend a RALO meeting, a monthly RALO meeting," or, "I haven't attended the monthly RALO meeting but I plan to." And how they imagine that this satisfies those criteria, I'm not quite sure.

Now, those might be really good people with potential, so they may be good candidates for this. But I'm just showing that how people answer surveys and put [inaudible] applications is not definitive.

So, what we're looking for is 60 people we can bring so that, going forward, we have a significant number more people who are likely to be

involved in our various activities and who will have benefitted from the exposure to the ICANN meeting and to the ICANN people.

So, that's the rationale of what we're doing, and now I'm going to turn it over to you to talk about the methodology for what are we going to do to try to identify those people. And out of that I suppose will come some criteria, but first of all, when you look at the scheduling which will be coming in a minute, we don't have a lot of time. And I'm talking days and weeks to establish what are the questions we ask in the applications to start the process, because of the lead time it's going to take to get input in to require them to take some ICANNLearn courses and to start arranging things in enough time to travel. Visas in Canada are going to be problematic. As a Canadian, I don't say that with pride, but it's a reality. We have a lot of things to do and not a lot of time, even though the meeting is a year out.

I just wanted to say that first. I think it's really important that everyone understands what it is we're trying to achieve and then we can start looking at the details. So, I thank you. I've got a video interview in a few minutes, so I'm going to finish my lunch and scoot out. Good luck.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are there any questions or queries? I mean, this is just looking at purpose. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: This may solicit a lot of boos, but if we establish that the primary purpose of ATLAS is a recruiting tool for active policy participants,

should we be asking the question whether or not is it in fact the most effective tool for that purpose? I mean, is it a training environment? Is it a prize that you win if you become active prior? What is it that makes this special for that purpose I guess is the question I would ask.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's too late to be used as a prize if you become active. There's not a way anyone can demonstrate they have become active over a reasonable period of time in the time we have left. So, it can't be that.

Is it other things? It's a whole bunch of different things. Is it the most effective way? Lord knows. We know just talking to people and sending them e-mail is not effective and we're hoping that we can put together a program which will be effective. Is it the most effective way? Interesting discussion. I'm not sure it's one we have an opportunity to have right now. At the end of ATLAS, I think we should have a really good post-mortem. First of all, at the end of that, [inaudible] then a year later when we see how successful we were, I think that's a really good discussion to have.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Alberto and then Cheryl, Holly.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is a small detail but I believe it is important. Can we have visa issues for Canada impacting on the time that we need to allot to inform people or to pick up the candidates?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I'm projecting too much. I'll try and tone it back down so Alberto is not deafened.

Just to respond to Jonathan to some extent, one of the sets of terms that I've heard in conversation even as predominately I think between Olivier who tenders his apologies, of course, for this meeting. We should not that formally. Oh, he's still here! Here we are. I'm quoting you and you're right here. You can speak for yourself now.

But to develop thought leaders and change agents that will be working, actually, in edge communities. Now this may end up transferring a few of these people into actual future leaders as well. That would be a nice bonus. But to pick up on Alan's point of recognizing potential as well as current performance, with the discussion about using ICANNLearn and similar models to what you've seen in the new fellowship style where to even be considered as a delegate, you need to have done this, this, this, and this. I think that takes it away from the risk of it just being we're just trying to pad out numbers that look like we're more engaged in policy than we actually are. So, I'm not too concerned about that.

To your question, Alberto, the next speaking slot in Maureen's agenda is actually going to staff and "logistics" is being managed by staff because it has to happen so darn early in this bizarre process. That would include the questions on visas and any assistance that can be provided for visa. But, as Alan said, Canada is almost as difficult to get into as Australia, so we can just apologize for that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Sorry. This is also sort of an answer to Jonathan. I think probably there's multi-purposes, I think. First of all, getting everybody together and getting people's faces in each other's faces is really important and having people listen to and participate in the meeting and then actually get interested in is probably some of the important steps in getting involvement.

Although a policy is prime, I think some of the other things people have developed expertise in, some of the capacity building stuff, is also important.

So, I think if I were going to say why ATLAS, I think there's probably multi-purposes. Yes, priority [inaudible]. Policy is up there as priority, but I think it achieves some other important objectives as well. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. I'm not sure what question we're answering here. Are we trying to determine where's the market that we're going to look for these people, where are the places we're going to look for these people? I have a couple of ideas on that, but I'm not really sure if that's where we are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Not there yet.

MARITA MOLL: Not there yet. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'd just invite us to look outside the box here. In other words, if we decided to make this into a virtual conference and had a bunch of hubs, etc., that allow for greater participation or something like that, then we'd be getting out of this 60 number that seems to be so contentious. It might be a better use of the money than all the travel support. I don't know. That's what I'm getting at. It feels like we're retrofitting something that was designed for one purpose into a new purpose and I'm incredulous a little bit. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't really think it's changing the purpose. We're just ... We have realized after having done two of these – and they were very different, by the way. They have the same name, but they were very, very different and [inaudible] community. I think what we are describing as the aim now is always what we have described as the aim, but the methodology of doing it we thought that targeting the people we targeted before were the right group.

Now, with the clear understanding that these people re not the formal representatives, voting representatives, are not necessarily the right people and when you add in the fact that we now have individual users, individual unaffiliated people, in all of the regions who may be good candidates and are not the representative from an ALS, we're looking at a different way of doing it.

The overall intention was always to get people familiar with ICANN and let's see the results of that.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Maureen. Firstly, the number 60 might actually have to be 70 or 75 given visa and other drop outs that might happen. We want 60 people on the ground, we may have to have a waiting list.

Secondly, when you have 70 people or 75 people to be selected, the first 15-20 on the basis of performance should be easy. But the next 50 is going to be very hard because it's going to be a fuzzy area and I like Holly's comment about policy-plus-plus. Policy being the most important thing, plus other factors as well. That's a very good suggestion I think.

Finally, I am assuming that we are not going to open it up completely, meaning we are sticking to our At-Large community individual members plus ALSes. All of you opening up completely because if that is so, it's going to be a bit of a problem of alignment, that you open up beyond the existing community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would've thought we're looking at our existing community but that's more just ALSes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

[inaudible] individual members.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. I apologize. I was just addressing Satish. I'll be leaving really soon, so I'll stop being annoying.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The debate that we're having now is extremely important. We have to be very careful with two things. Firstly, why did we talk about ATLAS? Why did we [inaudible] in ATLAS? What can be the evolution of ATLAS to improve it? And how can we make sure that At-Large doesn't explode?

Let me explain that. We're looking for individual members and [ALSes] would have no reason to be At-Large anymore. We build a structure around the ALSes. This is the center of our organization. The ALSes. Even if many people push for individual members, why not? But I'd rather they worked in an ALS, those individual members, and make sure that the ALSes work well and function well instead of being their own representative in the structure so that they participate in the debate.

So, let's be very careful about it. I agree with Satish. We have to look inside our organization. We already have enough trouble selecting among all ALSes that we do have, so from 200 to 60 is going to be difficult. 200 [inaudible] all the individual members, that's over 300, to 60. That's going to be difficult.

One fundamental point is that we need a meeting at the worldwide level of all the actors that do participate in the debate for the future of ICANN, so that end users have a stronger voice at ICANN. It's now when

we have to train people. It's good to give them some training elements. Fine. But, we shouldn't forget people outside of the system. It's time now to debate, to have a debate among those people, and not only among those 30 people in this room at the regional level as well. It's difficult to organize, but we're going to have, at the worldwide level, a meeting just like there is a high-level meeting of governments that happened here four times. For the third time, we're going to put together our worldwide meeting at that high level with a high level of thinking and participation. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

I'm having a little trouble figuring out. We're going to stay with our own community to attract people to come to this event despite the fact that they have not, until now, gotten engaged in the policy issues. They don't appear to be interested in what we're looking for. Is that what we're looking for? Are we looking a little bit outside of our own envelope where there are people who are studying Internet governance and things who would have a natural interest in this? Can't promise they'll stick around, but bring in some new blood.

I'm not sure which way this is going or supposed to go. I understand Sebastien is saying stick with our own ALSes. I don't know how other people feel. Maybe it can be a little bit of both. Maybe we can have some really new people who are actually engaged in working in this area but haven't actually done it in this particular context.

MAUREEN HILYARD: John?

JOHN LAPRISE: With respect to Sebastien’s comments, I largely agree, although on the matter of ALSes versus individuals, I disagree. I think that we should open up for both. I think just because someone is not in an ALS should not disqualify them. Sorry? Okay.

In terms of opening it up beyond At-Large, I really do believe that the people who are invited to come to ATLAS have to have shown some interest and/or commitment to At-Large. Even if they’re not members, they still have to have shown some degree of participation within the work we do. I don’t think it’s quite a problem, necessarily, if we don’t have the people currently in the organization. But as we’ve discussed in times past, in a given ALS, it may be the case that only a handful of people are actually aware of the ALS’s involvement with ICANN and maybe it’s just a question of messaging beyond that handful within a larger ALS. There may already be people within the community who don’t [inaudible] community and we just have to reach out to them and open up that.

So, on that score, maybe it’s a question of messaging to the ALSes to get them to solicit their membership more broadly to participate in ATLAS. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sergio’s card isn’t up. It’s Sebastien [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's Sebastien. Is that you? Okay. Alrighty.

ALBERTO SOTO: I think we're losing some time here, some significant time. I'll give you a participation example. During an IGF, I can't really remember whether it was in Panama or somewhere in Latin America, I was approached by someone who said, "I want to participate in your RALO." And I said, "Well, that's great. Give me your information." Then, someone from the same country comes again with me and I know that person because that person is a member of our RALO, and those two people were members of the ALS and they didn't even know they were in LACRALO. That's the level of participation we are facing. It really is amazing.

We have had other examples of people who have not participated in the last five or six years at least in one RALO meeting. That's another very annoying example.

So, I am in favor of individual users attending because I am a member of many working groups – I don't really know how many groups – but I am at least six, seven, eight, or nine and to my surprise, many of the active members are individual users and these are ALS members who are involved in those groups and they don't even show their apology – I can't even think of the word in Spanish – for not being able to attend. Then, they say, "I am part of this or that working group," and they never really participated.

MAUREEN HILYARD: New hand?

MARITA MOLL: With respect to the suggestion that we look inside our groups, I don't know, I look inside my group but I don't know. There's a lot of people there who are going to jump up and down and say, "Yes, all of a sudden, I'm going to get involved."

But, I'll tell you that I've spent quite a bit of time in the last couple of days speaking to some of the young people who are around here under the NextGen. They're floating around. They're looking for a place to land. They're looking at At-Large. They're looking at NCUC. These are the kinds of people I think that we should be enticing, trying to give them, okay, maybe a surprise. Let's invite them, see if they would come because these are the kind of people who already know quite a bit about it and are looking for a place to call home in this organization.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Maureen. I am a little bit confused because I see that we said that we will not talk now about criteria and we are discussing criteria. So, I don't know where we are. I have only one request, clear request, that the criteria should be clearly [inaudible] and explained so that we will stick to it during the selection.

And second point. I want it to be clear, done under the light and not underground. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to respond to that. When we get through the agenda, if we ever get through the agenda – and right now I’m doubting that – there is logistics to look at first. Then, the delegates where criteria amongst other things will be discussed is a new work group to be formed as of 15th of November and this work will begin. [inaudible] work other than this thrill-packed and exciting discussion that we’re having here at the moment has gone into it.

So, there is no under the rock needing to be looked into. Can we perhaps just clarify that? Despite all fear, loathing, and paranoia, nobody is missing out on the startup of anything but the logistics. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Whose was that? Was it Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. I am completely open to inviting fellows, NextGen, and other people into At-Large. That’s what we must do. However, travel funding is a [inaudible] and it could be the wrong kind of incentive, even for the right kind of people. So, we have to be very cautious with using travel funds as an enticement to attract people. Otherwise, they are most welcome to join. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Do you have your hand up?

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Just listening to this, it seems that a goal here clearly has to be to build At-Large and to build that At-Large Structures, or alternatively, individual membership. So, inviting people who are not interested necessarily enough to join At-Large as such beforehand and just are kind of being invited on spec seems a little bit too early in the process of recruiting them. If there aren't any people in an At-Large Structure who are interested in ICANN – I understand many At-Large Structures are multi-purpose. I'm the President of ISOC New York and we have many people who are interested in community networking and other things besides ICANN. But, if they are At-Large Structures that are as such built for this purpose, then clearly they should be interested in ICANN policy.

But ultimately what we need to do is to really make it clear that ATLAS is part of the larger At-Large effort and that coming in just kind of for ATLAS is just kind of smacks of ... Not having tourism and of not getting them ... Not selling what it is that we have overall, because if the only thing that gets them interested is a chance to travel to Montreal, which I love – my father's hometown – but if that's what it is, then ... What didn't them earlier before they had the chance to travel?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, Marita. This will have to be the last before we go to Gisella.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. I'm just going to say that we can't look inside the box and look for something that's different in there that's going to come up because we

don't have it already. We have to go outside of the box a little bit to change the pattern here.

I wasn't trying to suggest that any of the people ... There are people here who are really serious about learning about and contributing to Internet governance and they're not just coming here just for travel fees.

I think more to the point, you've got more of that in some of our organizations than you do in these young people who are coming here really with a determined interest.

So, I don't want to push this point much further, but I think we can't just keep on looking in the same place for something different.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Perfect. Thank you very much for this discussion. It was actually an intention of mine to actually have that sort of dialogue and I really do appreciate it. In fact, when we finally get around to creating our working groups, like a lot of the discussion that we've actually had today will actually be incorporated into those working groups, so I thank you for that.

But, if we can have Gisella, she's going to go over some of the logistics stuff that's going to be involved.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It might have been two on the agenda.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Maureen, for giving me the floor. I just wanted to come and reassure everyone that why this work was done initially on the scheduling which you have in the Adobe Connect room and up here on the screen and why we've put [initial] group together was that we were asked to provide meetings team with an estimate number of meetings – sessions, sorry – in Montreal to make sure that what we're planning fits in with the current contract that ICANN has with the Montreal venue, meaning that if we start using additional meeting rooms or have additional requirements including interpretation, as we will have interpretation for all of these sessions at the plenary sessions, we would then be using the funds which are allocated to At-Large-3 which was not the aim of the game.

We were trying to get all the sessions to fit in with the current contracted space in Montreal, hence the smaller group who have already done ATLAS, the two previous ATLAS's being put together and doing a little bit of brainstorming of how to most effectively use this space which we have been given.

So, what is up here on the screen is definitely not the final version of what we will be doing in Montreal for a very simple reason, is that the block schedule has not yet been released.

The way the block schedule works is that it is released by meetings team, and on the block schedule, we have the main meetings that we need to take into consideration as well as the important high-interest topics or cross-community sessions which, on this chart, I've put a

strike through meaning that during those times our ALAC room will, as always, be available to us with interpretation, but depending on the high-interest or cross-community session topic, we may or we may not have all ATLAS-3 participants attending that HIT, which is high-interest topic, or CC cross-community session.

So, the idea is to have the first two days purely on ALAC work. We will no doubt be working straight through the lunch as well to have two full ALAC and Regional Leaders working sessions like we have here. Then, the rest of the time will be for the ATLAS-3, the plenaries and the breakout sessions.

The plenaries will be in a big room where will have interpretation and the breakout sessions we've been trying to juggle with the meeting space and we will have one room for sure which will be the main room with interpretation. We have requested a secondary room with interpretation and then the other two rooms won't have interpretation. Again, looking from a costing perspective.

As I've said, and I can't reiterate it enough, this is not the final schedule, so please don't take it as such, but we had to come up with something and we had to agree with meetings team that we will work together very closely to make it happen and not to infringe on the budget that we've got and not to have any additional space needed at any time.

Then, the last session is I've put the ALAC Wrap-Up session, which if you look at the initial block schedule, is meant to be on the Thursday afternoon. But, we were then notified that, for instance, at this meeting that there was ICANN 20th Celebration, so that kind of put, as we say, a

[spinner] in the wheels, so there will always be adjustments that need to be made and we will do our very best to get the scheduling started as soon as possible.

For those who aren't aware, the topics for the HIT and cross-community sessions, this is something that the SO, AC, SG, C, and RALO leaders are all part of submitting topics that we get from bottom-up and then the topics are voted, and depending on the outcome of that vote, there will be either three or four cross-community sessions. I don't have that information at this time. So, again, that is likely to change.

With regards to travel, Olivier did mention this earlier. We have a date which is the 5th of July by which we have to submit the travel database. We have now been asked to submit 120 days in advance of a meeting, and this goes for Kobe as well, as we've mentioned earlier this week – earlier this meeting, not week, as we're only Tuesday. But we have to submit by the 9th of November. So, we have to work like a wedding planner. We have to work back from that date. It's extremely important.

And to Satish's comment, yes, we will have an additional B-list, as we can call it here, like for a wedding, the B-list. But, we do that currently for the ... It's similar to what we're doing for our additional At-Large funded travel slots. We have a B-list, which is also then put in order of priority, and as we lose people on the main list, we will absolutely go towards those people.

But, as we've already mentioned, Montreal will be challenging with visas. Yesim and I will be working very closely with Constituency Travel. It will be on a weekly basis as we're getting closer to the meeting. But,

once we've submitted our invest to the travel team, they will then be immediately dealing with everyone case by case on who needs to have their visa applications in first. Some countries don't allow for visa applications 90 days before traveling. I don't have the final on what the requirements are for Montreal, but Constituency Travel are well aware that we have to play this one very carefully to allow as many travelers as possible to attend.

So, I hope that covers the main points for the logistics. If you have any questions, please ask now. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Marita, is that a new card? Marita? Well, thank you very much. Thanks for that, Gisella. I think what we're going to be ... Next steps. We're going to have some Wiki spaces. Heidi, can you tell everybody about when those Wiki spaces are going to be started up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Gisella may be able to.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. I'll take that one. Wiki spaces, I'm sure you're all dying to see the Wiki space. But until we had the conversations here in Barcelona, all we could do was mirror what we've had for ATLAS-1 and ATLAS-2 and

ATLAS-3 is not mirroring neither ATLAS-1 nor ATLAS-2. So, we'll open this up. We've just got to tweak the logo as well. We'll open up the Wiki space and show you some shiny new machine as soon as we have all of the information to put on it, so there's nothing secret on there. There's nothing that we're hiding. It's just no point to put something that is going to be picked on when we don't even have the information to start it.

So, after ICANN 63 Barcelona, we'll be putting our thinking caps on and just try and make this as user-friendly as possible so that everyone can navigate pre-ATLAS, on the ground, and then post-ATLAS and then there will be all the sub-pages, and of course we always welcome any input to make it as user-friendly as possible. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And, of course, with those Wiki spaces we'll actually [inaudible] working groups, so that there will be a call coming up – how long do you think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: November 15th.

MAUREEN HILYARD: November 15. Okay. Straight after the end of the implementation planning session that we've got. That's the deadline that we've got for the implementation plan, so that's our next project. So, we'll put out the call then and then we'll assign the tasks for each of those working groups and move on from there.

Honestly, we've got to get this implementation thing out of the way first. It's really important that we do that. In fact, if we can get it out earlier, that will be even better. But that's our goal, November 15th. Then we'll move on from there. Anything else from anyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want to tell them what the different groups are?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay. Well, planning delegates, and that's the group that's going to be choosing the criteria and [inaudible] which is staff and?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's support and social. Long distance here. There we go. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, pretending to be Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. In ancillary was the potential for sponsorship. You already mentioned, for example, Microsoft may be interested, etc. Obviously, if we can find – and obviously, more importantly working with the local ALS, which is a point Sebastien has made on several occasions, and I for one certainly agree with him – on that. I just thought I'd put that in there. It's all right. It's got to happen occasionally, Sebastien. It's okay.

But working with the local ALS on the ground, plus other contacts that, for example, people like Olivier may have. We may be able to get a sponsored lunch, a sponsored something, whatever. That's not a working group worthy of everybody's attention, but it's a working group that does need to still exist.

And along with that, because what is likely to be sponsored, is something that is probably social, so it will be a lunch, a dinner, cocktail event or whatever. They're batched in.

So ancillary will be not "an everything else" bag, but at this stage at least, a bag that includes sponsorship and the social aspects. I think that's it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Okay. I think I've covered most of what we would ... Oh, okay. This is a response, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it's a response. No, it's not a response, but I am very happy to be agreed with Cheryl for once.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Muah!

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My point was even if we agree with the locals, it's to know where they will fit better and maybe we need to have them in different groups. For example, I want to reiterate the discussion I had with the chair of the ISOC Quebec chapter was that he had some acquisition with the [Francophone] Minister in Quebec and they may [inaudible] to help us to have more, to bring more people from [Francophone] Africa, for example, of [Francophone] country [inaudible].

Therefore, it's both – I don't know where to fit better, in the same time [inaudible] help also with the logistics on-site and so on and so forth. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are there any other questions or queries? Okay. Well, I hope you've taken your plates and everything back to where they're supposed to go and I hope you enjoyed your lunch and don't get indigestion or anything. But enjoy the rest of your day. This meeting is closed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But we reconvene later.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, the next time that we convene will be in the GAC room next door. That's at 14:30. That's going to be the joint session – 14:15, sorry. But also for the RALO chairs, please remember that you do have a [fica] with Goran in 30 minutes – I'm sorry, in 10 minutes. So, maybe we can just meet right here at the back of the room and we'll take you up to the room. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: So, that ends this session. We do have another session in here at half past, so if I could kindly ask all those not staying on for the next meeting to leave the room. There is still some catering, I believe, which is going to be packed away now. So, if you'd like to grab anything, please do that now. It is going.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]