

Gisella Gruber:

Welcome to everyone. I'll just do a quick roll call, welcome to everyone. On today's Metrics Subcommittee call on Monday the 11th of June we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Andrew Molivurae, Adetokunbo Abiola, Alan Greenberg, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Hadja Outtara, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cintra Sooknanan, Darlene Thompson and on the Spanish channel we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Jose Arce and Sylvia Herlein Leite. Apologies noted today from Adam Peake and possibly from Maureen Hilyard if she's not able to join us, and we also have Holly Raiche on the call, my apologies.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call; if I did please state your names now. Also if I could please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking, this is for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Cheryl and thank you very much Gisella. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond here and I'm just going to start the meeting whilst Cheryl is finding a way to access the Adobe Connect room in which apparently she is unable to do at the moment. The first part of the call, of the agenda is to look at the summary minutes of our last call on the 28th of May 2012. And I invite all of you who are in the Adobe

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.

Connect room to click on one of the two links which Gisella has put in the chat, the one for the summary minutes of the 28th of May and I will read through those. In fact, actually they're quite long, so I'm probably not going to read through those.

Cheryl I gather you haven't been able to look at these, I'll just invite any one on the call who has reviewed them, whether there is anything that they would like to add to this. I don't see anyone waving their hands around. I think they're a little long to go through the whole length of them. I gather that they are correct. What we do have to do though is to then look at the Action Items. And on the same line, Gisella has put the actual link to the Action Items.

And on that page there is one Action Item and that's for SC is to use the term mandatory and desirable.

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, we have an echo on the line. It's Gisella. If you could please just make that sure that if you are on the audio bridge please do mute your speakerphone.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. So, SC is to use the term mandatory and desirable.

Alan Greenberg: Could someone define SC? This is Alan speaking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: SC – subcommittee.

Alan Greenberg: Ah, I guessed right. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So subcommittee is to use the term mandatory and desirable. Cheryl does this ring a bell to you?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes it does and it's a standing item of what we're to do, what we established and agreed to at the last call, which was something (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl I can hear you speaking but I can't hear what you're saying, you're too faint.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl is some distance away; I think she might have been dropped. But we can still hear her in the background.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay is that better?

Alan Greenberg: Oh much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's a lot better, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What you were actually hearing was the phone picking me up not my headset so I've now disconnected the phone, which is why you were lucky to hear me at all. Okay, this is Cheryl and hopefully able to be heard and understood through the AC room now. Yes, that's simply a standing note to ensure and to make sure that our records, whenever we take down any notes about it, any particular metrics terms, that line there.

We have somewhat prescriptive tendencies in the wording of some of our rules and what we established from the last call was that we would be using those particular terms there, which is the advisory type as opposed to thou shalt and [we all shall].

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you for this explanation Cheryl, it's Olivier here. And that's the only Action Item there is listed on the page of the Action Items from the 28th of May 2012. So the next part of the call is I gather something that I can give back to you then Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is and thank you very much for that Olivier, this is Cheryl for the transcript record. I trust that if Matt has now emailed Holly she might have better luck getting into the room as well. She's not joined us yet, but you can eventually get in. Perhaps IT fixed it. Well maybe they've fixed it in Melbourne before they have in Sydney.

Holly Raiche: We're not that far away.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So she may also (inaudible). You wouldn't have thought so.

Holly Raiche: I will just [list it].

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier is telling me I'm cutting out, is that a problem for everyone?

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Holly Raiche: Oh here I go!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay well I'm looking at the (inaudible), okay, I'll get back in the speaker. As I'm trying to explain I have fluctuating yellow and green on the internet, so this is going to be a call fraught with technical problems, but we will simply have to bear up to it. With Olivier there at least I know that we can continue on. Okay today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure is going to include us having what it is that we need to do very much along the lines that we did last time, looking at rules five – we've already looked at the earlier rules, but starting with Rule five, six,

seven, I think it's eight, eleven and a few others that are listed in the page on the Wiki that you'll be able to see and that I won't be able to see because my internet will only allow me to do two things at once here [in Australia].

And we're going to take, for those of you who are in the Rules of Procedure Work Group as well as the Metrics Work group, a very similar approach to what we have done (inaudible), that is we're going to look at first of all the first part. Do we need to change or not, and if so, is this a big change or little change. In other is this a must do or a could do. And then we will cluster them together as appropriate. And we will, as Metrics break into some sub-teams for drafting.

So whilst we might agree that we want to have something along the lines of a particular level of engagement measured by the number of teleconferences attended, that might be what we agree in this call. We might, I would suggest do better than rather than spend most of our time debating whether it should be 9 or 11 out of 12, if 12 is the number we have per year for example, we would do better to let a small ad hoc drafting team come up with a set of proposals or perhaps simply one proposal. They might be unified in their consensus that it has to be two-thirds of whatever the total number is.

Whatever it is they then present to us we can then chew over as a draft in a subsequent meeting. So that's the proposal for you as a way forward for today's call. Is there anyone who has an issue, a problem or does not understand that approach? And someone else will have to tell me if there is anything happening in the Adobe Connect room. Yaovi, go ahead. Is Yaovi's hand up or was that intervention accidental?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl it's Olivier. Yaovi has just connected. He was in the chat. So, back to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, we are going to be fraught with challenges I'm afraid. Never mind. So is that clear to everybody? This way we don't get down into the weeds of does it need to be 9 or 11 out of 12, or 12 out of 12? We first of all establish that there does need to a measure. Alright, so if everybody is okay with that, let's look first at the Rule #5 into the liaison world and we did [so], and I believe we've gone so far is to agree and Olivier or someone, if you could just make sure you do let me know if any hand is raised because I will not be able to see that with this desktop here today .

When we're talking here about the criteria for liaisons, we will be treating all Liaisons, those that are Bylaw mandated to for example the GNSO and the ccNSO, as well as liaisons to an ALAC liaison appointed to a particular work group. And some of our informal – yes you're back Yaovi, thank you – some of our informal liaisons as well. But obviously there may be differentiation points. So we'll look at some high level in general set of metrics that are borne out of this particular Rule.

But first let's look at what the current Rule says, recognizing that what will be said in the new rules of procedure will be a set of high level principles, generally applicable to all members of the ALAC and their liaisons, regardless of in what capacity those liaisons serve. And then there will be some specific rules or requirements applicable. For

example, it would be expected that a liaison to a work group attend the work group meetings. So we'll get into the particulars at a lower level of Rule.

Our job as metrics is to work out what the expectations are of these positions. So let's begin first of all with Rule five and look at what metrics, remember we're metrics, we think should be applied assuming that the rules will have criteria established such as the nature of the person, the position of the person in At-Large or the ALAC or both, and character type situations. So we don't need to say that they should be of good character or that sort of thing.

The current Rule talks about liaisons do not need to be members of the At-Large Advisory Committee. It does state that the common interest statement needs to be filed. It does state that no two different liaison positions can be served at the same time. It does state that there is certain other rules, such as the Rule of recall; that is relevant. It does state that they have a particular duty in the performance of their role. And it may be that that we need to start looking at.

It starts about how we have diligent expectations. Of course my measure of diligence and someone else's measure of diligence may be different. We need to discuss that. It's describing some of the activities in their role in terms of communication and advocacy. And it goes on to talk about reporting requirements, and also the concept of asking for specific instructions on matters that are going to be discussed. And I think Alan will have some insight that he can share to us on that particular latter part of that Rule because there are some things where there is just an ability to get ALACs specific instructions on and there are

sometimes when you simply cannot afford that luxury and you need to be very confident in what you're saying in the name of the ALAC.

So, that's what the current rules say. The new rules will be somewhat similar, but let's look at what metrics we can tease out before that, opening the floor for any particular proposals. I would like to see that we look at them as section. That if we can, let's talk in general principles first, recognizing that these are metrics that would be applicable probably not only for all liaisons but all the ALAC as well to a certain extent in terms of their diligence and communication etc.

So if someone can see if anyone has got their hands raised and just let me know. Terrific Alan, jump on in.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, a more general question, as is clear from the agenda and from the way we're talking, right now we have section 21, which has some specific targets and also has the remedy embedded in it. And then we have scattered throughout the rest of the document things which either overlap, duplicate or perhaps are unique in terms of expectations. So for instance in five, we have 5.6 which says to participate diligently in the meetings and activities of the body he/she is liaison to. There is a corresponding entry in 21. Is our target to try to put them all into one place or scatter them around and have them mutually exclusive or, I think my preference but I haven't thought it through clearly, is to put the generic things in the text description in the body and then in 21 or whatever it is, try to quantify a little bit more.

Right now five is listed as qualification criteria – well is participation once you're appointed a qualification criteria, I don't think so. So I'd like to try to get some, whatever comes out of this, some order so it makes sense, although I'm not quite sure what that is. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay Alan, obviously I didn't make myself clear – Cheryl for the transcript record – that the Rules of Procedure Work Group are planning on having very much what you described in the latter. In other words, there will be high level text under, it might be a topic such as ALAC member and appointment (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg:

You're cutting out Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

ALAC member and appointment engagement. Or it might just be ALAC member engagement and all of those very general things text wise would (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg:

We lost you after the word "would."

Gisella Gruber:

Cheryl, Gisella here. I'm not sure if everyone has the same problem but we can't hear you.

Cheryl we can call you on your mobile.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or Olivier can take over the call.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay it's Olivier here for the transcript. I'm not sure if you can hear us Cheryl but we have lost you. I've understood that you've said that Olivier...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely. Then I'll just ask (inaudible).

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, so Cheryl, we are going to call you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you can hear me (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl you're breaking up and you seem to be significantly delayed sometimes. You're gone now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's rather strange. Okay so it's Olivier here for the transcript record. I'm not quite sure what Cheryl was saying since she cut off a number of times, so I'm afraid not being able to read her mind I will not be able to answer the question that was raised.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier it's Alan speaking. I think what she was saying is that my third option I think that is we have very generic words within the body and they then refer to the nominal section 21 or whatever it is to flesh it out in more detail.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm back on the phone bridge, I do apologize.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So Cheryl you're back but you still haven't put your hand up in the Adobe Room? Holly has put her hand up in the Adobe Room. Now her hand is not up anymore.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine but also I'm getting as much delay and feedback and dropping as I think even now on my mobile phone as you were getting with me from the other way, so we'll see how it goes. Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Yeah just I'd like to emphasize what Alan said. I think in terms of metrics if it's worthwhile us concentrating on the actual metrics and hoping that the Rules of Procedure come up with something that is general. In other words are duplicating what the Rules of Procedure are doing in terms of coming up with general rules and should we be

concentrating on Rule 21. Or, I'm just worried that we will be duplicating the work of the Rules of Procedure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, I don't know if you're speaking, it's Alan, I have my hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Alan, I wasn't speaking at all. I couldn't hear that over that noise.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I think Holly has actually hit the methodology right on the head. I think we should focus not so much what is in the other rules, although we need to look at them to make sure we're not missing anything, but I think we should be focusing on the specific metrics which may be detailed or may be generic, and presume that they will get reflected back into the other sections by the Rules of Procedure Group, and not try to craft the individual ones.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely Alan.

Alan Greenberg: So I think going through five as we are now or whatever, we just almost need to make a very short checklist of what are the things in five

currently that are now of the form of expectations and performance. And then use that as a checklist to make sure when we're crafting the new 21 that we're not missing something important.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly. Cheryl for the record. And if you could have heard me at all, I was hoping that that's what I was trying to encourage you to all do, and that is to look at details et al, but look through any of these rules and say "okay we need a measure of communication. We need some way of measuring diligence. We need measures..." and be very general (inaudible). And particularly because we don't know whether we're going to end up with a Rule 21 at all. We may not end up with, we might only end up with six rules.

Alan Greenberg: I know. 21 is a placeholder for wherever we end up putting there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly. But then I think we all [are under the opinion] that what we are having is a layered approach where you have general standards of performance or behavior and indeed character. So that was typical for all those who serve in the name of ALAC, be they ALAC appointments, ALAC liaisons or members of the ALAC. And there are specifics that we would need to be detailing in each of these levels. Do we all agree on that?

Alan Greenberg: I certainly do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright, unless someone can tell me that someone is disagreeing on the Adobe Connect, let's take that which is building exactly on what Holly was proposing and apply it. So (inaudible) then, which is why I was reading out the rules in person and not reading out the rules in a 5.1, 5.2 step 7B order, I was trying to merely take the high points for the transcript record of what we were [looking for here] and what we were looking at. And at what do we have here that we need to measure. Would someone like to put forward that short list? Olivier you've potentially got your hand up. Go ahead, Yaovi.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl it's Olivier here. I'm sorry I'm jumping in but I think when you hear Yaovi say his name it's the times when he's actually the times when he's actually coming on to the call and falling off of the call, and each time he's saying "Yaovi" and every time you have said "go ahead Yaovi." So Yaovi is actually in the Adobe Connect so he is able to put his hand up if he wishes to speak and at the moment his hand I not up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why thank you for that Olivier and I'm more than happy to let you let everyone know when anyone has their hand up. In fact if you'd like to manage the speaking order that would be good. And if someone jumps in they're going to have it make it very clear that they're jumping in then because that would [be a tad] like a Pavlovian dog who was trained by the Chairman to recognize anyone when they're identifying themselves by voice.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hands up from Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I volunteer to actually start talking about the subject instead of talking about how poorly the communications on this call is working.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well you can certainly take it in that direction Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. If you're looking at Rule 5, which is the first one, there are a number of items which I think will end up going into the generic "everyone must" and we don't need to repeat it in every section. Using the appropriate nouns this one currently says "all liaisons have the duty of performing their rules with diligence and loyalty to the committee" – I by the way hate that word "loyalty," I think it's inappropriate – "are bound to meet minimum participation requirements," again this is referring to that, "to participate diligently in the meetings and activities of the body he/she is liaison to," that's a liaison specific one, "to communicate and advocate the positions of the ALAC to such body and to report to the ALAC the current and upcoming events and activities of the body" and so on and so forth. And to "when possible ask the ALAC for advance instructions."

So all of those are really detailing how we expect someone to carry out the job and implicitly are referring to performance targets if they don't do it. So I think we almost need to have someone go away and write a strawman of how this kind of thing should work so that we don't end up replicating the same words in multiple sections. On the call right now on the fly I can't come up with that answer, but I think that's probably what we need to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. Is there anyone else with their hand up?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Holly has her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Alan, just a follow-up. Instead of using terms like "diligence" and "loyalty" and so forth, a general Rule would just say "this is what you do" and then are placeholder 21 would say "this is what it means" and we don't use those kind of generic rules that don't have any content to them but actually the content is delivered elsewhere, if we actually want to divide things up that way. Does that make sense?

Alan Greenberg: Actually I think it's the opposite of that. I think the fact that you're supposed to be, to the extent possible, and that's a big if, representing

the organization and not your own views if you are a liaison, I think belongs in the liaison descriptions. How one measures it, if indeed one can, belongs in the generic Rule 21. I was commenting on the word “loyalty” itself which I think is an inappropriate one in this context.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So Alan I heard you call for what I think was more drafting to look at the more general principle type metrics that we had – oh for heaven’s sake why would my phone (inaudible).

[background conversation]

Gisella Gruber: Cheryl we’ve called you because (inaudible) we have difficulties...

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl if we have three connections going maybe one of them will work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah well now I am tethered to a basically wall-mounted phone in the middle of a kitchen hotel room.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry but...

[crosstalk]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hope you can all hear how happy I am with this logistical set up very clearly. Go ahead Alan, I think you were calling to have a DT, a small little drafting team put together.

Alan Greenberg: Well I was suggesting that's what needs to be done. When is our next meeting? Are we meeting again before Prague?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, in Prague. And it would be nice to have draft on the table in Prague.

Alan Greenberg: Then I will do something and if one or two people want to work with me I'm happy to do that. I don't want it so large that it requires teleconferences, but I would be willing with Holly seems interested if there's someone else to try to put together an outline essentially of how we do this without trying to replicate things so it makes some level of sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific, that will be excellent.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I'll meet that target, but that is what I think we should try to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But you are talking straw poll here – this is Cheryl for the record.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's something for us to probably take up and you're going – the mandate says that this group of two if not three people will be looking at the high level principles that go across all those who operate in the name of the ALAC, regardless of whether they're ALAC members or otherwise, correct?

Alan Greenberg: And the sections that are unique to each of them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the sections that are unique.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah in other words try to put some structure to the stuff that will go in each section.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah that sounds fine.

Alan Greenberg: So then we can make sure we put some flesh to the more appropriate in the Rule 21. And some of them are not going to be able to be more specific than the generic I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright well let's now work first of all, during this call, because obviously we've ended up with several small drafting things, but if you think you can do it more effectively as a whole then that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think it's a big job.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Can we spend some of the rest of this call, if everyone else agrees, looking at the things that we believe are critical in terms of measures. Not necessarily identifying what the level or measure of a go or no go will be, but for thinking first of all for everyone who acts in the name of ALAC, in other words whether they are a member of the ALAC, an appointment of the ALAC or a liaison of the ALAC to another part of ICANN Bylaw mandated, formal or informal that's a big lump there, what are the things we would like to measure and have as public viable and verifiable information to show the world at-large the people we represent.

And if anyone's looking at ICANN what function we, the ALAC and At-Large perform. What would be the key areas that we would like Alan and Holly focusing on? Anyone's hand up?

Alan Greenberg: I'll put my hand up to ask some questions, this is Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I can hear a voice so I wasn't sure if someone else wanted to speak. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No, no one else today, I'll certainly yield the floor if anyone else wants to. I made some notes on the comments on Rule 21 earlier today, I don't know who's had a chance to look at them. One of the things...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Could we bring those up on the screen? Sorry, normally if I were anywhere near a machine I would be able to type to staff could they bring that Wiki page up on screen for everyone to see Alan, but I'm just going to jump in. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I don't even think we need the page for the discussion. One of the things that doesn't show up anywhere, and I think it's a decision that this group has to make, is to what extent do we want ALAC people, or liaisons for that matter, to be actively participating in other activities. So in other words, I personally feel that every ALAC member, and certainly every liaison, should be participating in activities outside of ALAC and outside of At-Large to some extent. So if you're ccNSO liaison you should be participating in some ccNSO activities, be they a work

group or a particular task force or whatever. The same with GNSO for me and for other ALAC member, everyone should consider as part of their responsibility they have to do something outside of the enclave of At-Large; whether it's GNSO policy work or whether it's something else in some other venue, or working with ICANN Fellows or something, I don't know.

But I personally think it's important that people make contacts and start doing things outside of At-Large, but that's nothing we've ever discussed before. And I think it's this group that should be talking about should we be putting a Rule in like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay, I heard a yes. Was that just an agreement from Carlton or?

Alan Greenberg:

I'm not sure if it was Carlton, but it was someone.

[crosstalk]

Alan Greenberg:

Darlene and Holly have their hands up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: I semi-agree with Alan, but I would even be happy to see a Rule put in that all ALAC members, and perhaps leadership, definitely liaisons should be active in at least one, even the ALAC Working Groups, like leading or co-chairing in that kind of role. Because we've got multiple working groups even amongst the ALAC and I see the same few four or five people taking the leads in every one of them. So if we could even say that even within the ALAC Working Groups that you need to take leadership roles within these groups even within our own At-Large society. I think that would be a huge push forward. That's it. Darlene Thompson speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay Darlene, that's very much I thought picked up somewhere in the expectations in Rule 21, if not it's an informal expectation. Alan, and again normally I would be looking something up on my computer but not being able to reach my computer, I thought we did have an expectation that all ALAC members will be engaged – "engaged," it's not saying just as a Chair but engaged in a leadership role in at least one work group of the ALAC.

Darlene Thompson: Engaged – Darlene Thompson here – it's the engaged part that's hard to quantify. Just being a member and not saying anything, is that engaged? You know, so I think we need to hone that down a bit and I'm not sure how to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well certainly I think we should be saying that all members of work groups are expected to be engaged, but we expect for example you were just suggesting the ALAC are engaged at a level which means they are part of the leadership or not necessarily just a Chair because not everyone can Chair and that's okay. But we have liaisons, we have lots of other roles. So you're saying specifically leadership as well in most...

Darlene Thompson: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I agree with that. I don't think we want to stick by everyone must be a leader, but I think everyone should be participating in some ALAC activity, ALAC/At-Large. And I was suggesting something over and above that, so maybe that's what you want.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, no I thought what you were suggesting is something beyond for example if you're an ALAC member just the ALAC. Or if you are a ccNSO liaison just the ALAC; that you need to be engaged in the wider ICANN community in some, way, shape or form.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Gisella Gruber: Sorry to interrupt Cheryl, Gisella here. We have Holly and Tijani who have their hands up as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Holly – can I ask if you just be very proactive with jumping in when hands come up because as I say I’m now somewhat tethered. Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Okay, just to pick up a point that Dev made, and I think it goes to what we’re looking for in measurements in our placeholder Rule 21, which is things like monthly reports or somehow in which you can demonstrate some kind of participation so that you’re not just sitting in on a call or sitting in on something, you actually have digested in some way what’s going on and participate. So Alan, that’s probably one of the things we might think about in terms of how do you have some kind of metric on terms of a liaison role, or other roles for that matter.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah if I may answer that, I don’t want to not put a target in even if we can’t quantify it.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: So I think first we want to put targets in, make sure we're happy comfortable with them, then try to quantify them and we may or may not be successful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Cheryl. I don't think we need to add the other duties for ALAC members. Don't forget why you are here, why we have this group formed. It's because we have big problems with the organization. So we need first to be sure ALAC members do their original duties. If we do what Alan requested means that we'll ask ALAC members to have the duties to have other activities outside ALAC. If they don't go what you will do?

So I think we have first to solve the problem we are taking and then we can put other things to be preferred to be done by the ALAC members, but not duties.

Alan Greenberg: Point understood.

Gisella Gruber: Sorry to interrupt Tijani, it's Gisella but you are very faint. People are having difficulties hearing you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Are you hearing me?

Gisella Gruber: Yeah could you say it again please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I said that I don't think we should add duties to ALAC members because I don't want you to forget why we are here, why this group is formed. It's because we have big problems with participation. And if we add other duties outside of ALAC and if the ALAC members don't do, what you will do. You will have members saying "we are volunteers." So I think that first you have to fix the problem for which we are here, and then we can add preferred things to be done by the ALAC members, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Tijani. I'm wondering – Cheryl for the transcript record – would this be better than to be listed as desirable or encouraged?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I'd prefer it yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay Alan are you comfortable with that?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I said when I made out what he said the first time that it was noted, that yes, we don't want to set unreasonable expectations and it's

not going to be everyone's target, but what we end up wanting is people who are serving the community and part of the job in ALAC is actually understanding what the rest of ICANN is doing to be able to do that. And that's the target. Yes, we don't want them serving on six other work groups and not doing their ALAC chores too. And Tijani is right, we're here because in the past we have had performance problems where people don't even do the ALAC stuff. So we don't want to set unreasonable targets. If we don't put the right words in the strawman I'm sure Tijani and other people will tell us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Exactly right. Is there any other hand up on this issue?

Alan Greenberg:

We had Darlene still has her hand up, Tijani still has his up, I had mine up and it shouldn't be and Olivier; Olivier and Yaovi, I have their hands up now. I'm assuming Darlene is the old...yeah, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay in that order then.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you; it's Olivier for the transcript. I absolutely agree with what has been discussed just now and I just wanted to add my approval on that. However, I just have a question because this is a metrics working group. Now if we are going to have mandatory requirements for ALAC members, I understand metrics could be designed on that. If on the other hand we have desirable features such as taking part in working

groups, does this have a metric as well or is this just a desirability metric?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier if I may try and respond to that. I think there's a sort of blending of two concepts from what I heard at least. That is that there is already a mandate for ALAC members to be involved in leadership of at least one ALAC work group.

Gisella Gruber: Cheryl, sorry to interrupt. We've lost interpretation.

Alan Greenberg: Gisella have we lost it or they just couldn't hear Tijani.

Gisella Gruber: No they're disconnected. If you just give me one second to check if they're actually back online.

Female: Excuse me, this is one of the interpreters. We are connected on the English line and we are trying out the Spanish line. We dropped a minute ago, but we are connected again.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you. Can you just reconfirm that you are interpreting?

Female: Okay sure.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you.

Female: We are now ready to proceed with interpretation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Okay so what I'm hearing Olivier is two slightly different things. For example, the outline was I was just giving was that we already have and we appear to want to maintain a mandate for ALAC members to be involved in a leadership role for at least one of the ALAC work groups. So that should actually be able to be measured. For example, do they attend and do they attend how many thereof?

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl it's Alan. Cheryl didn't you just say before that we don't want to enforce leadership roles on people?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, there's a difference between leadership and being the Chair.

Alan Greenberg: Okay fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Leadership can be all sorts of things, certainly not only being a Chair. I didn't want to lead in, not to lead a work group, but in a leadership role of a work group that's a nice lot of wiggle room. So with that clear I think the second part of your point which seems to be fused together was, Olivier, a matter of we're not getting them to do what they're asked to do now and that's the issue. Well part of that comes back to show under our current Rule, reasonably under our current Rule 11 that there is any need for any form of recall.

And before that, for you as Chair, to have a conversation with even just an ALAC member that says "we don't feel as though you are performing and this is why"; you need to have some arguably strong material to work with, and that's where the rules certainly need to outline it, the measure. For example things that Darlene has come up with in the past where just attending a meeting is one thing but being an active participant in a meeting is what's desired. Having your name just marked off on the role at the beginning of the teleconference is not all that is required.

You actually need to contribute to the debate etc. And they are perhaps desirable characteristics which can be qualified if not quantified. Yeah that may mean that you end up with a debate point, if you ever get to a point of recall of someone, where their idea of meaningful contribution, if they're the types of words that we end up using, is "I said/they said" type thing. But that's what discussion and dispute resolution is all about.

And that of course comes eventually down to the fact that if one cannot agree in polite terms that one needs to improve one's game and this is

how one is going to do it, then one is subject to the recall and the recall is to a vote and can be little more than a popularity contest if need be if they want to play that game so be it. Perhaps we should have played that game more frequently in the past.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay Cheryl, thank you. The next person on the list who put their hand up is Yaovi Atohoun.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Yaovi. Alan, can I get you to manage this, I'm about to have all sorts of things happen in this room and I probably won't be able to stand in the middle of the room and open the door at the same time.

Alan Greenberg: No problem, Yaovi? And I put my hand up next.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's Olivier here, Yaovi has said that he sent his contribution and he wasn't quite sure if his microphone was working. I gather scrolling back up that his contribution was "I have a thought. Do we really need a liaison for a group where the leader is also from ALAC? I am not sure that my speaker will work." So his thought was do we really need a liaison for a group where the leader is also from ALAC.

Alan Greenberg: That's a good question. The GNSO has taken the tact that every group needs a liaison regardless of who the Chair is of the group, and it may

be important that the liaison is not the Chair. Because the liaisons responsibility, among other things, is to go back to the parent group and say it's not working. And so in that context the liaisons perhaps should be someone other than the Chair. It's something that I think the ALAC needs to talk about. I'm not sure we need to outline it here because if someone is a liaison then there are certain responsibilities. If it happens to also be the Chair then so be it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And for those people in interpretation that was Alan speaking. And Alan you're next in the list of people who put their hand up.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, it strikes me as we're having this conversation, and I'm not sure if this is something which should go into the rules or simply be used as a discussion piece. But it's sometimes easier to identify what you don't want than what you want. And if we look at the extreme, and sadly the ALAC has had examples, someone who participates simply in the two hours of ALAC meeting a month and one hour of RALO meeting a month, which is three hours or teleconferences, who dials in and doesn't say a word is probably not meeting our expectations.

Someone who doesn't even dial in for the three hours a month is certainly not meeting our expectations. So I think perhaps we want to try to, we may want to try an exercise of doing the reverse of what we're looking for, of identifying scenarios which are not acceptable in our minds and then working from there. I'm not quite sure how well that will work, but it may be easier to identify bad performance rather

than to quantify the good performance which we want to encourage which can come in so many different forms that we may not be able to make a list of them. Thank you. And Olivier has his hand up next.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan. I was going to say that. It's Olivier now for the transcript. One question, you mentioned there looking at the bad, well sort of noting the bad players or noting the things which were not done rather than noting the things which are done, are we looking at a points-based system Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We may but I wasn't really trying to generate those points. I was trying to come up with examples of things that everyone would agree is not sufficient. And that may help us come to closure on describing the other side of it, of what is sufficient.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay Alan thank you. Next is Sergio, Sergio Salinas Porto you have the floor.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you Chair, for the record this is Sergio Salinas Porto. I would like to emphasize something that Alan said. I think we should first focus on certain items or points, that is regarding how we should [score] an ALAC members performance. It is my impression that we should emphasize a minimum standard of performance for that member. A point-based system, I don't think that is possible because point-based systems are

generally based on subjectivity instead of an objective fact-based reality.

I think we should measure the participation or attendance in teleconferences, in voting or votes, in working groups be it contributions or inputs or comments sent through the email exchange list for instance. So these are objective measures that we can use in order to evaluate an ALAC members performance. Now, with this in mind, I think it is timely to point out that the way in which we should evaluate this should be proactive. That is that there will be a minimum level of participation implied that an ALAC member will have to do their best in order to meet that minimum standard and that minimum standard should be enough to show that they are interested in representing their region.

If not, we should implement certain processes that have to do with the warnings for instance sent out to the region. I wrote a comment regarding Rule 21. I think that there are certain things we should do, among them we should send reports on all ALAC members, not only on those that are not meeting the minimum standard. It should be a habit or custom within ALAC to submit reports on the ALAC members performance, on all of them. And I think this means that we should also reward good performance. Having good ALAC members implies that the regions are working well.

So first of all, we should come up with this structure, that is submit these reports, probably quarterly reports, that is three reports on a yearly basis in order to observe the progress of the performance of our ALAC members. Thank you Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Sergio. And Cheryl, for your information there are two more people in the queue. There is Tijani Ben Jemaa and Darlene Thompson. But first, back to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Just to respond to Sergio's point, I think then what we might need to look at Sergio is what was the intention of what used to be called, perhaps before you joined the ALAC, the metrics dashboards. They were not so much reports sent out, but continuing reporting they were a running tally, which then also could be annotated. And they were intended to be reviewed at the face to face meetings, which fits into your, not quite your quarterly but at least that's a three times a year group review opportunity where the regional leaders were involved. We might need to look at that again.

There was quite a lot of pushback of course from some ALAC members who appeared to be not performing at 100% or even 90% or 80% capacity as they felt there was some sort of stigma associated with having less than a particular color or a particular value assigned to them. So we need to be fairly careful about those reporting mechanisms and we need to be sensitive about those reporting mechanisms. But I think most of us would agree that some of those report back to region mechanisms, indeed more importantly to the ALSes and the At-Large membership that we represent is very, very much essential.

Can I ask you Olivier to continue to Chair this call? I'm going to try and just stay on the AC audio unless they want to ring me back on my mobile, so I keep getting call waiting on this line because they're trying to actually send me up my breakfast before I have to leave to go for meetings at the end of this call. So this is the hotel which maintains they don't serve you until you say "come in," so I have the point of either starving or hanging up and answering the phone call next time it comes in. So if I disappear I'll still be on the AC room audio. The next one was Tijani I believe.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct Cheryl, it's Olivier here. Next is Tijani, then Darlene and then there are more people, but first Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani ben Jemaa: Thank you Olivier. Thank you Cheryl. In response to what Alan proposed, I think that as a general matter to do I would prefer that first we have to list the tasks and then we find the minimum performance for each task. And then, put the norm or end date in those minimum requirements of each task to get a general equation for each member. I think that we have to do that to get at the end a different level of performance. And at the end we have to speak about the [treatment]; we have to with each member in each case in each level of the performance. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Tijani. Any feedback to this? I guess Cheryl is probably ordering her breakfast right now, we'll continue. We'll have Darlene next, Darlene Thompson.

Darlene Thompson:

Yeah, I just wanted to encourage everybody to go to the workspace at some point and have a look at what Sergio did say there. I did translate it from Google Translate – I can't do it myself. And he outlined an excellent, I think, set of steps for doing this and he said some of them when he talked there a few minutes ago and I think it's an excellent way of approaching this matter. And his first one was submitting quarterly reports of the actions of the member. And I realize what Cheryl was saying about the stigma attached to these reports and stuff like that, but I know there may be hurt feelings and all but I don't care about the stigma attached.

If you're not performing then everybody should know about it and it should be addressed. "Do you need help? Do you need extra training?" Maybe you had a family member die and you were unable to attend some meetings or have something so that people know what's happening. And if there is nothing happening then it needs to be addressed immediately. So I really like how Sergio put down the points – one, two, three, four, five – about how we could go about doing this and I encourage everybody to look at it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Darlene. Next is – oh! Next is myself. Okay. I was actually going to comment on what Sergio had just told us just now. And one thing which struck me was something he said, I just wanted to make sure that I got this correctly, and Sergio if you could answer that. What I heard appeared to be pointing in the direction of having ALAC members individually give marks to other ALAC members; is that correct? So each

ALAC member would effectively give a score or a note on how well his or her colleagues would be performing? Is that correct?

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Mr. Chair, this is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. I don't know; no doubt it's going to be ALAC colleagues that will be evaluating our performance now. I don't know if it's going to be the ExCom, if it should be the Chair, I mean if they should be in charge of scoring or assigning points and sending the quarterly reports. But somebody from our environment should be in charge of doing so. Maybe we should set up a specific group devoted to metrics and working with code numbers and recording them on a worksheet. But no doubt this is going to be done by ourselves.

So I believe, and I think Darlene understood exactly what I mean; many times a person is going through a very difficult situation and cannot participate for a specific reason. But what matters is that these code figures should be contracted with each members reality, what they are going through. Having said that, I imagine that we, or some of us will have to take up this initiative in order to work the numbers out and work on the initial review. I hope I have answered your question. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay thank you very much Sergio. It's Olivier here for the transcript. That certainly has cleared things. There are two more hands up. There's Alan Greenberg and there's Heidi Ullrich, although I don't know

who was first. Heidi has just taken her hand down, so I guess it's Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you, Alan Greenberg speaking. A couple of comments, and again I'm speaking more as a historian than anything else. The problem that we had with the metrics that Cheryl described from several years ago, and you can still go back and look at those Excel spreadsheets, and the reason we stopped doing them was largely because, I mean there was a turnover in staff and things like that which made it convenient to stop. But the problem was if you read the current Rule 21 it says if you do not meet certain criteria then you must be ejected from the ALAC.

There was no "look at the situation," there was no "consult," basically if you don't meet the criteria the Chair should try to get them to resign and if they don't we eject them. And that was so white and black, or actually red and green that people found it offensive. Some people were offended who didn't do anything, and to be honest, that corresponds to what Darlene was saying was tough. If they weren't doing anything I don't care if they were offended. It also puts some people who are working very hard in a position where for some reason they had not met a criteria and therefore they suddenly showed up as red and if you follow the Rule to the letter we had to kick them out.

So it was convenient to stop doing them because it was generating more unrest and generating more problems than it was fixing. And that's why we're here today to try to come up with a reasonable set of rules. But I think the intent was that once we have the reasonable set of rules that we try to enforce them and that we try to do that on a

regular basis whether that's quarterly or in time for every annual meeting.

In terms of who does it, and there's been a discussion on the chat about this, I think this is one of the things that it comes down the Chair. The Chair may enlist other people depending on the details of the situation. But I really think we're talking about human issues and I don't think we can do that in open forums. I think the Chair has to be willing to accept suggestions from other ALAC members or other people in the community who feel someone is not working adequately and then has to take some action on it one way or another.

I think it's got to be relative, flexible and it shouldn't put on people who don't feel comfortable in confrontational situations, a requirement for them to do it. Thank you.

Darlene Thompson: May I reply to that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan. Yes you may reply to this Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson for the transcript record. Of course we all realize Alan's saying that is because he was red-flagged once – no, I had to give you a hard time Alan. I agree with pretty much everything you said Alan. And that's why I'm encouraging people to read what Sergio put down. After the submitting of the quarterly reports thing he said "once the procedure of the ALAC member isn't reached then they must inform

the President or Secretary of the abnormal performance.” And that way you can check with the person, check in with the person and see what happened. And then if they say well it’s perfectly reasonable why this happened, then life goes on. Take away the red flag and then go on with it.

But yes, I do understand what Alan is saying, but we still need those metrics performance – shh.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes thank you Darlene. I think I’ve seen a number of people saying yes there is worth in this. Definitely several people are agreeing with that. And the point that Alan brought forward is a very valid point in that some people might be against the metrics because they are so final. If they are seen as a final solution without any possibility of discussion or moderated or mediated response, then of course there might be opposition to them. There is a queue again, there is Sergio and then there is Alan. So Sergio Salinas Porto, back to you.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you Chair. This is Sergio Salinas Porto Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Two things and I’ll be brief in the interest of time. First of all, I will not go into detail regarding what Darlene said because she perfectly understood what I meant. But I do not think that ALAC should be in charge of rejecting a member. I think the RALOs should be in charge of that, of rejecting. With that in mind, I want to make this very clear. ALAC cannot eject ALAC members. What ALAC can do is report to the

regions. And I want to make this clear so as not to go any further into issues such as rejections.

We as ALAC members have to report what is going on with one of our colleagues or members, and it is the region the one that should be implementing the tools that the working group will be using that will be indicating the mechanisms so that the region is represented. But it is the region the one that has the possibility of even deciding to keep that same ALAC member. We need to have this clear in mind, if not we understand that we will have some kind of super power within the region. The region has its representatives and it is the regions the one that recalls a representative from ALAC. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg:

Have we lost our Chair?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

No, no, no I'm still here. Alan is next. Thank you Sergio for this point. I was just trying to find out perhaps Cheryl would know the exact points of that or if Alan could respond.

Alan Greenberg:

Yes I certainly will respond. A couple of things, first of all, what people objected to in the old forum was that there were essentially if you did not make a threshold, if you did not make three-quarters of the ALAC meetings or 50% of the ALS votes or whatever it is you essentially you turned red and you needed to be ejected. And that was the black and white. I think a better way might well be, if we're going to use an Excel

spreadsheet for instance, if you shade the cells for an attendance as green and not attending as red or pink or something like that, and then anyone can look at it and get a feeling for yes someone attends most of the meetings or no they don't attend most of the meetings.

The value judgment is a lot easier to make if a computer has not made the decision to eject or reject, and that was the concern that we had in the previous one. It was the computer that was saying you did not meet the criteria you're out. And that was problematic and fine, I hope we learned that lesson. In terms of what Sergio is saying about who can eject people, first of all let's remember that a third of the ALAC is not sent by the regions and therefore it is not clear that the regions have the prerogative to say they can continue or not continue. Or for that matter that the regions have the ability to remove a NomCom appointee if they don't like them. The ALAC does have different composition.

Second of all, and I'm not making a statement on what we should do but I'm making a statement on what we are allowed to do. If you look at the Bylaws several groups, including the Board, including some members of the GNSO can be removed unilaterally by action of that group regardless of who sent them. So it is in line with ICANN rules that says we the At-Large need to decide who has the prerogative to remove someone. Now I'm not saying it's good or bad, I'm just saying that's a decision that has to be made and it's one of the discussions that should be taken.

But that's not a metrics discussion and it shouldn't be discussed in this meeting. It's a rules of procedure issue. Here we're trying to come up

with what are the metrics, what are the limits that we want from a good performer and how do we recognize the bad ones to the extent we can. We are not here to be discussing the process by which we take action if someone is deemed to be not a good performer. So I think we need to focus on what we're here to discuss or we're never going to make headway. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier now and yes, you're absolutely correct. We're discussing the metrics, not the actual procedure by which to appoint or take out a member. Next is Darlene Thompson.

Darlene Thompson:

Darlene Thompson for the record. Yeah, you're right, we shouldn't be discussing this. But just to address what Sergio did say, right now in Rule 21.4 it says for "ordinary ALAC members," and these are the elected ones, "in the case of failure to meet the requirements the Chair will privately encourage the member to resign. If this doesn't happen by 14 days from the communication the Chair will formally notify the entity responsible for appointing the member," so in this case that would be the RALO, so "the Chair will contact the RALO and the message may be copied to the ALAC list and asked that the appointment" – asked – that the appointment "be immediately reconsidered." But right now it's not set that the ALAC can like fire someone. It does go back to eh region for regional because it's the region that elected them.

So this would be like giving the UN power to fire the American President or something, that doesn't make sense to me. But you're right, this is what this conversation is about. I just wanted to clarify where the Rule is sitting right now anyways. That's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Darlene. It's Olivier now and that of course will be something which I'm sure the Rules of Procedure Working Group will be spending some time on since there are calls that are going to be devoted specifically to this. Cheryl there are no other hands up at the moment, so it really would be up to you to continue the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much and I'm sorry about the acoustics, I'm in the AC room. Is it alright or no?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yep.

Alan Greenberg: A little bit of an echo but we can hear you well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay good. Well hopefully it will hang out for a couple of more minutes on the call. Okay so we're going to have draft text for us to discuss at the face to face meeting in Prague. There will be a system where we not only have remote participation, but I believe, and Heidi just double

check for me that I am correct here, we will have interpretation at that Prague call, is that correct?

Heidi Ullrich: I believe so. Gisella, is the one that's-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, I'm sure she will tell us if that's not the case then. So what we will be doing is fleshing this out in greater detail in our Prague meeting. I think we're going to need to take a fairly serious amount of time on this, but I'd like to try and also use the Prague meeting as an opportunity to make sure the whole of the Rules of Procedure Work Group know what we're on about. So if I may, I'll integrate this review of the draft text etc, etc for metrics, and it doesn't matter the specifics aren't outlined just as long as there's placeholders for the specifics at that stage as a committee of the whole part of the meeting in the Prague agenda.

Then we will break up into sort of breakout sessions. And so those of us who are particularly passionate about the rules of procedure in elections for example can play over there and leave the rest of to perhaps work on some metrics for meetings or whatever. With that said, I'd like to call for any other business. Someone will need to tell me if anyone is waving their hand.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific, thank you Tijani. In which case, thank you for answering Roosevelt's question there both Alan and Olivier. I think what we'll do is convene in the Prague face to face meeting time. What I'd like to do though Alan is if it's all possible as soon as you (inaudible) can we-

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl you're cutting out now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So that we can start...

Alan Greenberg: And she's gone completely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...make sure we get what (inaudible) interact before (inaudible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's for you Alan. She asked you is it possible to have something written on the Wiki before Prague.

Alan Greenberg: If what Cheryl was saying was she would like to see something on the Wiki well before Prague that would be my intent also. I'm not sure that's what she said, but the one or two words I picked up seemed to imply that might be what she was saying. If there's anyone else who wants to work with Holly and me let me know privately then. I've got to drop off the call now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And that was Alan speaking.

Alan Greenberg: That was Alan speaking. Olivier are you in charge now because I have to drop off.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan, yes I believe I probably am in charge. I see that many people are dropping off willingly and also unwillingly.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl was saying that she would like to see something...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I think that Cheryl is going through a time zone at the moment where she is hearing things that we've said about two or three minutes ago. So I have to thank each one of you. If we cannot get Cheryl back, Cheryl are you still here with us? No, it looks like we've lost her altogether. So I think that Alan you've got the right understanding of what Cheryl was trying to say. May I add that if there is anything that Cheryl was going to add that she could please email it over to the list and we will be able to add it to the record of this call here and as an Action Item if this needs to be an Action Item.

I have to thank all of you for being on this challenging call. Certainly the technical issues today have not made it very easy. Gisella apologizes for the audio issues and more often than not these are things which are

totally outside of her hands. So it's a bit unfortunate, but some progress has been made and certainly the points of view of several people have been made and are on record. And I invite all of you to continue now on the mailing list so as to continue the progress before Prague.

And with these words, thank you very much to all of you for attending this call, and see you in Prague. And for those of you who cannot make it in Prague then I hope that you will be able to join remotely during the Prague meeting. Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]