Gisella Gruber:	We can start the recording now. Welcome to everyone on today's Rule of Procedures Working Group call on Monday the 18th of June. On today's call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, Yaovi Atohoun, Eduardo Diaz, Darlene Thompson, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crepin-Leblond; yes welcome. On the Spanish channel we have Jose Arce and Natalia Enciso will be joining us shortly.
	We have apologies today from Sergio Salinas Porto, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sala… Sorry, that's Carlton joining, apologies from Andrew, Sylvia Herlein Leite, Fatimata Seye Sylla. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and Matt Ashtiani and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I can please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, and also for our interpreters today who are David and Veronica on the Spanish channel. If you are on the audio bridge and the Adobe Connect room, if I can please ask you to please mute your speakers when on the call. And also if you're not speaking to please mute your microphone, this will give us a better line today. Thank you, over to you Cheryl.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you very much Gisella and welcome everyone; I must say I'm looking forward to meeting up with so many of you when we get to (inaudible) Prague. But the very first thing, and I do apologize for being a little after, nearly ten past the hour, but we will power on and get as much as we can done in today's call because we have the opportunity to meet face-to-face in Prague. Speaking of our meeting in Prague, is

where our first Action Item from the last meeting on the 28th of last month from the discussion about if we could use the break out rooms [system]. Staff did look at that and we've come up with a more cost effective and we hope alternate mechanism that we will be running so that we will be able to have full and engaged remote participation while we do our get together and face-to-face meeting in Prague.

Heidi is not on the line yet, is that the case Gisella? Heidi is having audio problems this morning so I'll ask Gisella to just confirm that as I understand it what we will be actually doing during our break out sessions in our face-to-face meeting is running four or possibly five, depending on how we manage it all Adobe Connect rooms. For those of you who will be in the room will be gathering the different corners of the room with (inaudible), etc., and we will open up a complete Adobe Connect room just for the purposes of the discussion in the section of the Rules of Procedures that the subgroups will be discussing to be looked at. Gisella have I got that correct and are we actually technically set for all of that now?

Or can anyone else from staff speak concerning that?

Gisella Gruber: Sorry Cheryl, Gisella here. I was speaking on a muted microphone. Can you please, there's someone on the bridge who has a very loud background noise and the interpreters are struggling to interpret Cheryl. I think it may possibly be Carlton, just from the previous time he spoke.

Carlton Samuels: I really don't have anything on.

Gisella Gruber:	No that's fine, if you could just please mute your microphones when you're not speaking. Also Cheryl, with regards to the break out rooms, we found the solution last time of giving four different Adobe Connect rooms, which we will be using for the break out session. Heidi please do correct me if I'm mistaken here. We are however looking into the option of having break out rooms. Staff will need to be trained on that in Prague just prior to being able to use them with the community, but we have got a response for you.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Oh excellent. So it looks like we actually have a [dollar] each way. We will definitely be having – Cheryl for the transcript record, I apologize – we will definitely be having an ability for remote participation, even in the break out session of our meeting, which is excellent. And I think not only would staff need to be trained for the break out room, but some of your key workgroup leaders might need a bit of in-servicing as well. But we'll [see as we go].
	The second Action Item was also I think on Alan to gather documentation and links from the ExCom previous meetings, which was in fact reflecting any resolutions and the meeting notes from any discussions that affect the Rules of Procedure from earlier on and that includes specifically the mandate and creation of the (Inaudible). I believe that was done, but we'll just double check on that; Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	Yes that was done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. And we have that all into, now I'm not sure which of the pages that's in.

Alan Greenberg: I don't know where it went. I know I sent it in to staff and I think copied to you or maybe the whole group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes thank you Alan, Cheryl here, I certainly saw it. I'm just unsure where it ended up. Heidi can we make sure someone finds exactly where that got posted so we have that as a ready resource as we'll need it in Prague? Well that's it for Action Items. If anyone would care to take a quick look at the notes taken from the last meeting, I think you'll find that they are accurate and extensive. But is there any particular point that anyone wants to raise now about our last meeting, this is the opportunity to do that.

And out of that you will note that the section on section one, what we're now breaking up into sections which will be [half a] section. We've got a sub-team formed and what we should have now is a little bit of time to have a look at what happened in that sub-team. And I think that's something – I'm just going back to the Adobe Connect room now. Any comments on any notes taken from the last meeting. If not, do we have Heidi on the audio now, is she…

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ooh that's a very bad line Heidi, Cheryl here.

Heidi Ullrich: Can you hear us better, is that better?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that's much better, thank you Heidi. Excellent. Okay we were going to power on without you, and if Matt at some point through the call just perhaps let us know where the material that Alan did send from his Action Item through, that would be appreciated as well.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes we're looking into that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. Now unfortunately as I've shifted back the Adobe Connect room I have a black screen. I do hope everyone else doesn't have a black screen while I work through my technical difficulties. I notice Sala was an apology for today, Gisella – who else, perhaps Alan or someone from the drafting team for section one would like to speak to what when I last looked at the Adobe Connect room was the note [taken] from that group deliberation. Alan, perhaps over to you?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, I'm not in front of my computer right now, so I'm not quite sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I do apologize Alan, me with a blank screen I was just grasping at straws and looking for what I thought was the best likelihood for someone who would speak up on that.

Alan Greenberg: I will be there in two minutes but I'm not right now.

Holly Raiche: I'm happy to talk.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please do so, thank you.

Holly Raiche: Okay look I think I may throw…

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, please state your name.

Matt Ashtiani: Who is speaking?

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche for the record.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Holly Raiche: I've had a really good look finally. I just downloaded the whole set of rules and thought "Ooh what fun." I would like to make a lot of changes. First of all, well what I tried to get on to yesterday and [see it], so I'll make a lot of changes. But my first question, and it really goes throughout, we use the terms "member" but in fact if you look at ALAC rules the member is the organization. So I think we really have to be careful about how we define member because it's the organization and if we have an individual we should refer to individuals.

                        But when it comes to Rule One, and I tried to actually redraft it and sort it out, I realized we've got to be talking about either the organization as the member and their individuals, or something else, we've go to work through what we actually mean. And then…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Holly – sorry, Cheryl here. As I'm entering back in, I just want to make really clear now that the particular rules we're working on are the ALAC Rules of Procedure.

Holly Raiche: That's what I'm looking at.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. And of course there are no organizational members of the ALAC at all. ALSes are At-Large structures that are accredited to be part

of the At-Large. The ALAC is the 15 person Advisory Committee on the Bylaw. So whilst we have used terms in the rules such as delegate and/or member, I think that is, unless you can come up with a better word that we are talking specifically as individuals who are either appointed by the Regional At-Large Organizations, and they can be either individual members of those RALOs or representatives of the ALSes. Or they are individuals appointed by the NomCom. We need to make sure that we're focusing on the right terminology and I think we actually preferred the term "member" over "delegate" when in our earlier discussion.

Holly Raiche: Yep, yep, I'd be happy with that.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan speaking. Holly, what gave you the impression that we were talking about organizations? Is there something there…?

Holly Raiche: Okay no, no, no. This is a conversation we'll have in Prague. Let's not waste time, okay. Simply because no, no it's going to waste time, it's going to waste time. I'm just going to work through the language and make sure it's all consistent.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, in any case, as Cheryl said, we were talking definitely about individuals, even if an ALAC member is a member of an ALS, which many

of the RALO selected ones may be, they are appointed as individuals and not as representatives of their ALSes.

Holly Raiche: Yep, I just think we can clean that language up to make that really clear, okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I have no problem with cleaning up language.

Holly Raiche: Yep okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's good. Holly what we've decided at our previous meeting – Cheryl for the transcript record – is that we will be bundling the areas of the new Rules of Procedure in sort of four layers. One which will be the "about" layer; the next one which will be the "operational" layer and then there will be sort of two parts of another layer, one which will be looking at the administerial in general and elections in particular. So we had a drafting team put together at our last call, a few were going to look at the "about" section, what we're not referring to as section one. Alan, are you in front of your computer yet?

Alan Greenberg: I am indeed.

EN

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Terrific. As one of the people, and Holly I think it would be extremely valuable if you would focus on being involved in that particular drafting team when we do have face-to-face work in Prague. You're very good at writing rules, you've written a number of rules.
Alan Greenberg:	I've done it a few times.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	I'm facing a black screen that says "sorry application Adobe Connect is not responding." Alan if you're in front of your screen I would very much value you speaking briefly to what we're up to with the deliberations with the drafting team, knowing that there is time for us to dive in deeper when we get to Prague.
Alan Greenberg:	Is this in respect to Rule One which is on the screen right now or a more general...?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	No I think Rule One and in general while I reboot computers and do my best to get back connected. Thank you.
Alan Greenberg:	Alright. I believe the problem we have right now is that the current rules were written a long time ago, perhaps from perspective different than ours today, so although we are going to work from the current rules as a base, what we end up may be something that structurally is quite

different. So I don't think we should be focusing at the first level with crafting the actual replacement rule of Rule One or Rule Two or Rule Three, but trying to identify what it is we want to say in the context of the specific rule, and then we will come up with a way of organizing, which may be similar to what we have now or may be structurally quite different.

So the kinds of decisions we've made right now are kinds of recommendations although we have focused on the section numbers in the current rules, people shouldn't get hung up by that as the final outcome. So for instance, in case of Rule One we've clearly identified that we want to delete the concept of "delegate" which is confusing at best and misleading at worst, and replace it with "members" because we are talking about members of a committee. And the same is true for the other sections. If you look at sections on officers or elections things are scattered over various different places and in some cases there are rules that are repeated in other cases there are conflicting rules.

And in other cases there are references to rules that don't exist. The best one I like, I've always been very fond of is the fact that it says "the procedures for selecting other liaisons other than the GNSO will be the same for that as selecting the GNSO liaison," which we don't have.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we've never – Cheryl here – exactly right Alan, the fact that we've never articulated what the rules are.

Alan Greenberg:	But the rule formally says we will use the exact same procedures and these are rules which normally go into, in my mind, far too much depth and here it points to the detailed procedure which doesn't exist. So I don't think we want to get hung up right now about the exact structure of the rules. Clearly it has to be cleaned up and that may end up resulting in something very different. But we want to go through it and try to identify what are the things we need to keep, what are the things that are missing and much towards the end of the process, I think it will become clear to us what a reasonable structure it is. And then I don't think it will be a lot of trouble to write. Did I cover enough time?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Yeah Alan, I'm back in the Adobe Connect room. Cheryl for the record, thank you Alan.
Alan Greenberg:	And we've got two hands up in case you can't see them.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	I cannot see them so who is the first hand?
Alan Greenberg:	Okay Holly first and Yaovi next.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you.

Holly Raiche:	Yeah, one question. Alan you wrote about the Executive Committee, where would mention of that go? Because I tried to structurally figure it out, does that go in the first section of "about" in the description?
Alan Greenberg:	No. I think that falls clearly under what I just said of I don't know where it goes. It may fit under the section on officers; it may fit under the section on "about." I'm not sure. I'm not sure it's important enough to put in the first section, but clearly it has to be put somewhere.
Holly Raiche:	Okay because I was going to suggest Rule One, once we kind of straightened it out, does talk about what the delegates are. If the Executive Committee does have particular powers, which apparently it does, it can act in an emergency, I think we need to put it in and then say that the reason that it's there is that it is comprised of so and so and in an emergency it can do X.
Alan Greenberg:	Oh there's no question that the reference to eh Executive Committee of how it's created and what it does has to be there. I'm just not convinced at this point that it's important to understand today where it's going to be in the rules.
Holly Raiche:	Okay.

EN

Alan Greenberg:	I just think it's putting the cart before the horse because that tends to tie us to the existing structure which I know is faulted in a number of ways.
Holly Raiche:	Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Cheryl here for the transcript record. I think this is a very good grounding discussion, but we did have a drafting team that was put together to look at and cherry-pick from all of the rules, literally all of the existing rules. And look at any of those rules that needed to be gathered together into what I think we need to think of now as Section One, the "about," the structural part, the structure and function of the At-Large advisory Committee, which would have definitional text. It would have from whence we have come text, in other words reference to the Bylaws. And it would have then no doubt appropriate space for a little more structure and function information such as Executive Committee etc.

There would of course be cross-reference to the other parts of the rules. For example when one was talking about having representation of the At-Large Advisory Committee, as opposed to representation on the At-Large Advisory Committee. We may in this section, Section One, the "about" part, want to also at least mention the liaisons and appointments that the ALAC makes. We may not need to go into detail about them, but we probably want to have that bundled in there as well.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, it's Alan speaking. I know we talked about this but I didn't think we struck a drafting team to work on it. I may be wrong on that, but I don't believe we did.

Holly Raiche: You and I were going to do it mate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought we did and if not we certainly need to. So let's make that the first point of business for today. If we also think about now what other layers, think about dividing our group up as we move through today's call, into what will be the four break out groups in Prague. So we're sort of carving up the Rules of Procedure into sections, at least in draft form at this point. But I know Yaovi has his hand up, please go ahead Yaovi.

Yaovi Atohoun: Thank you. Yaovi speaking. Just a comment, it's like during the last call we have, for people in the Adobe we have a Rule [1.2 "Activities]. I think this word is confusing people sometimes. So I don't know if you can remove this one from Adobe so we have in Adobe what we are going to be talking about. This is just a comment I want to say. I don't know if I'm clear. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Yaovi. Cheryl here for the transcript record. Yes you're perfectly clear and you're echoing my thoughts exactly. Can we get rid

absolutely, positively and forever off our screen for now, the page which looks at Rule One here – the delegate's workspace. What we now need to do perhaps is bring up the page that will be a reference for our drafting team. If we bring up the page now for the different sections that we might be carving ourselves into and we'll start allocating people into these drafting teams.

I think as an observation it would be that Alan and, fine Holly I'm just picking up on that point, Alan and Holly would be looking at this first section, the structure section. And I'd certainly be interested to call for other people who remembering that we will be cutting ourselves up into four, and those of you who are wanting to participate in the face-to-face meeting effectively in Prague will need to clone should you spread yourself too thinly.

Yes you can be in more than one group, and some people might want to spread themselves virtually over several. But if I could first of all, call for perhaps at least one other, if not two other people to join Holly and Alan in this first structure piece?

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl I have my hand up, it's Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan, just before I go to you I would be very keen to have at least someone from each of the regions if possible. So if I can call on someone in the LACRALO region to also put themselves forward to this section, and indeed from EURALO and AFRALO that would be very good. Thank you Jacqueline, Jacqueline has popped her hand up for this

	section one. I think it's important that we do try and get a regional balance across here. Alan, over to you.
Alan Greenberg:	Yeah thank you. First of all just a note that I do intend to work to participate in all the workgroups given that I've been closely involved in the creation, not the creation but the last major revision of the rules four or five years ago. And have been involved in a lot of the problems caused by the current rules, I certainly intend to be vocal in all of them; I clearly can't lead all of them. Just for reference can you tell us when the meeting is in Prague, can someone tell us?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Certainly. Well actually I'm now having a mental blank. Heidi, (inaudible), is that right?
Heidi Ullrich:	Yes I believe it's Wednesday four to six, 16:00 to 18:00; we're just double checking.
Alan Greenberg:	Unfortunate that I believe that I'm in a GNSO meeting at that point but okay.
Gisella Gruber:	Gisella here, correct.

Alan Greenberg: Alright, I'll work through that somehow.

Heidi Ullrich: Alan, just to let you know that there will be the adobe connect break out room, so if you are able to multitask you could do both.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah but I can't be listening to what other, to a meeting while I'm on the stage of the GNSO. That's bad form. I shouldn't, not I can't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unfortunately we didn't have a lot of flexibility with the time.

Alan Greenberg: I understand. I said we'll work through it, let's not worry about it now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here for the record, believe me Alan I'm supposed to be in the ccNSO room too. So I'm actually having to apologize for the Council meeting so I can run this section. It's inconvenient for all the liaisons I can assure you.

Alan Greenberg: That's okay. I'm trying to book something else for Wednesday also, so knowing that it's then will help me. I won't triple book that time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, alright then. We have Holly, we have Alan, Holly you'll work out what time the remote participation will be for you I'm sure.

Holly Raiche: I'll be in Prague.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh are you in Prague? I didn't realize you were in Prague, excellent.

Holly Raiche: Well I'm not now, but I will be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good, even better. I don't know why I didn't realize that you were in Prague. I do apologize – Cheryl being humble for a moment for the transcript record though it doesn't happen often, for the transcript or otherwise. Okay, so we have Jacqueline, we have Alan, we have Holly, someone from Africa and someone from Europe? Rudi were you interacting – you're coming to Prague Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi here for the transcript. I'm not sure I will be in Prague. I'm still figuring out to find a hotel to stay because there was an error in the bookings, it's quite difficult to obtain a hotel room in Prague now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can imagine.

Rudi Vansnick: Anyway I will follow remotely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay thank you Rudi. It would be good to have a little more in person. Okay Eduardo is the structure you're most passionate part or do you want to look at other aspects of the rule. Remember what we're doing here is just definition of ALAC and structure. We also need to look at duties and metrics, remembering that metrics material we'll be seeing from the other sub-team.   Then we have process, which will be meetings and all the administerial that goes with meetings, and the elections, selections and the (inaudible).   Thank you.   Eduardo has popped his hand up for process.

So if we're looking at the page in the Adobe Connect room, and if I can encourage you all now to look at in that middle section where it says "Rules of Procedure drafting team" and we have in fact prepared workspaces under each of the following topics: definition and structure of the ALAC; duties of…

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me it's Alan, can we have the URL of that page? I'd like to bookmark it for future reference.

Heidi Ullrich: Alan which page, this is Heidi.

Alan Greenberg:	Of the one that's in the Cheryl.pdf window right now. It says "please use the above workspace" but the above is off the screen.
Matt Ashtiani:	Alan I've already placed that hyperlink into the text, I'll redo it one more time.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you Matt. Okay, I do want to deal with them first of all as a quick overview so everyone knows what they're putting their hand up for. And staff can we just note, remember I keep mentioning in our planning meeting – this is Cheryl for the record – that we might actually need five rooms running because I thought meetings, elections, selections would need to be two separate parts. So we may still need to play with the logistics at Prague.

The break out rooms and indeed our drafting teams need to be segregated as follows: into a section one which is definition and structure of the ALAC; into section two, which will be the one to define the duties of the ALAC and of those representing the ALAC, and the metrics will feed into that group; into section three, which is all about process and there are two parts to process – meetings, which is all the administration, conduct, who does what etc, etc, how they're held, when they're held etc, and also the elections, selections and appointments.

So we have four discreet pieces of work that will be done and we'll also be meeting as break out in Prague. Process, which is an overarching one, we may not have the administration set up for [assisting] but we

do need to make sure that there is that [brief entry] that makes sure that the meetings and elections, selections and appointments are not standalone, but are joined together under the section three, process.

Each of those pages and that's what you're looking at on the screen, we have a workspace set up for each and every one of those. Would it be appropriate now, I'm seeing people put their hands up for a number of them, would it be appropriate now as we prepare for Prague if we agree with that structure and that will fit with what the metrics team is also doing, if we now go section by section, and knowing all the topics in front of you, if we can at least allocate from those of us who are on this call, our names.

And Matt, if you can quite literally open up the first drafting team workspace, I think there we have a list of, or a place to list names, if memory serves correctly. Let me just make sure that it's [popped up] in a minute to do its job.

Matt Ashtiani: Sure Cheryl, it will be there in one second.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. So while Matt's bringing that up – this is Cheryl for the record – we know that in this next section we will be putting Alan's name down, Holly's name down, Jacqueline's name down. We certainly would want at least one from each of the regions where possible. I've got an awful lot of NARALO sitting in the definition and structure space. Can we try and make sure that we have people brought forth from also the Europe and African regions please?

Holly Raiche: Cheryl, I've got (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, please go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche for the record. I'm just looking at really high level stuff in one. I am puzzled as to why the UN General Assembly rules are mentioned and why the ICANN Bylaws are not mentioned. Are we still following the UN Rules of Procedure or not? I'm just-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Holly, Cheryl for the record, I can answer that very quickly for you. The current Rules of Procedure, which we are I'd like to think as autopsying and collecting into jars whatever little bits might fill it in beautiful, based on the UN GA. Which is why there is…

Holly Raiche: Okay but there is a rule that says we follow them and I'm just puzzled why we don't mention ICANN…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because we do. Current Rules of Procedure are unashamedly modified UN GA rules. So anything that is not specifically tailored to talk about and be reference to ALAC falls back to UN GA. That is actually a fault in many of our Bylaws. The Bylaws will be reference in the Section One.

Because we often found a clash between people's understanding of the Rules of Procedure as they are under UN GA which was just to see it filled, and forgetting that there is in fact the separate structure rules beyond that, which of course will be the Bylaw foundation ones.

So this is our opportunity to fix that. So I'd like to think that all reference to anything UN GA is absolutely and irretrievably deleted from any future rules that are for the ALAC. And that will also mean that this bizarre and peculiar terminology, such as the word "rapporteur" disappears. Neither the Executive Committee or the ALAC have a rapporteur as an executive role exists in UN GA rules of a rapporteur. We can get rid of all of that and make it just a model [in name] or toss and salvage what may or may not be redeemable.

So we've got, at the moment, we've got Jacqueline from LACRALO, we have Alan, Eduardo and Darlene from NARALO. We have Holly from APRALO. Heidi I note that, sorry whoever is taking the notes on the page might be Matt, Rudi indicated he would be interested in being in, which will give us at least one EURALO, in Section One.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes I have him. Cheryl this is Heidi.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. It just wasn't updated on the screen. I'm crying out to Africa – ah Yaovi, excellent. Perfect. Thank you Yaovi, you've made me feel much more relaxed now. I can take a deep breath. Now admittedly these are a rough list and we recognize that some people will be across several of these, but at least we've got one, I'd like to see more than

one in cases like this, but at least one in the definition and structure. So with that list at least something is together.

Matt Ashtiani: Cheryl? I'm going to put the updated list on the screen. Can everyone please confirm that they've been captured?

Holly Raiche: I have been, thanks Matt.

Matt Ashtiani: I think we – and the screen has just gone blank. It's Alan speaking. I think you asked me to lead it but I'm not sure. Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan I would very much like you to lead, but if that causes you enormous challenge for…

Alan Greenberg: No I'm happy to lead it, I may not be participating in the room in Prague, I may or may not. But I'm happy to lead the group regardless. If I'm not there I'll obviously have a deputy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. I would declare now that Olivier and I will be across all of these groups. Therefore either Olivier or I would deputize for you on that during the Prague meeting. If you're comfortable working with either of us.

Alan Greenberg: No I don't like either of you. I don't think I want to work with you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was a joke for the transcript record. And even if it wasn't, that was a joke.

Alan Greenberg: Right, does it matter if it was a joke or not?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No it doesn't but we need it for the transcript record Alan. Okay, I believe that is the list. Can everyone just confirm? I'll read it for the record. We have Yaovi – AFRALO, Eduardo – LACRALO…

Alan Greenberg: On my screen all I have is the affiliations, the names are off to the left invisible. There they are. Thank you. Sorry Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: From the top again, this is Cheryl for the record. I have Yaovi – AFRALO; Eduardo – NARALO; Alan – NARALO; Jacqueline – LACRALO; Holly – APRALO; Darlene – NARALO; Cintra – LACRALO; Rudi – EURALO. I will be across so I give a spot to APRALO. Olivier will be across so that will help EURALO. But perhaps Yaovi if you could implore someone from your region to consider also contributing to this group it would be a very

good thing indeed. Okay that one's done. Thank you. More people can join, but we add least need to build a skeleton.

Can we now move to the next (inaudible) and exciting section, which is all about duties. Matt will make all the magic happen and all of you can start thinking who wants to put their hand up for this next part.   Is there anyone with their hand up in the Adobe Connect room, recognizing that I don't see them on my system at the moment?

Alan Greenberg: My hand is up, it's Alan. And Holly's is also.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan and then Holly, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No Holly was first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. What a gentleman you are. Just a question, you mentioned in passing that you'd like to do away with the term rapporteur, however there was a function that was being undertaken. So if we label this individual X does X actually have a function?

Alan Greenberg: I'll address that Cheryl, having been a rapporteur.

Holly Raiche: Did you do anything Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I did indeed. Sorry, Holly is that the end of your intervention?

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. To answer that question, the first task of any rapporteur or the people that appoint them was to define what it meant that year; it has varied from year to year. It was a title that we were stuck with. It made no sense other than to confuse people significantly because it had none of the meanings that most people attributed to it. To someone's credit, and it might have been Cheryl's, someone found a dictionary definition in some obscure place that almost made some sense. But we have since forgotten that.

So it was a title that got carried over from the UN rules, it should never have been there. There were no specific tasks associated with it that had any perseverance past the one year appointment, so it's nothing to worry about. My own intervention, the reason I put my hand up was yes I volunteer for this group. And I'll make the same blanket statement that Cheryl did. I would preferably like to be put on all the groups. Thank you. My hand is now down, Carlton's is up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Go ahead Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. This is Carlton for the record. I am putting in for duties and metrics group as well as the process group. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific, thank you Carlton. And that will be very important. We're looking at duties and metrics, and remembering that we also get specific input from our metrics team. Alright? So don't confuse the two. The metrics team will be looking at the measures that will be plugged into this section. What the rules part need to look at is for example, what will happen with in the measuring of those metrics, if one for example, is unable to or fails to comply. So in this section, in duties and metrics, this is where we will be defining what our expectations are of the members of the ALAC. And in whatever role they play, be it Chair through to member, the NomCom appointee or RALO appointee, if there's any differences in those expectations then this section is where that would be outlined and annotated.

It is also where the expectations and the measures that the metrics team will plug in for us, what the consequences of any measuring are also outlined not only the members of the ALAC, the 15 people appointed but also for those who represent them. In other words, the Bylaw mandated liaisons with the SOs and in the future to the ACs we hope, as well as other little "L" or lower-case "L" liaisons, such as those we put into workgroups or study groups or drafting teams in the policy

development, in other parts of ICANN. Or those we appoint to our own internal structures, our own workgroups or our own drafting teams or our own taskforces.

So it may in fact include what our expectation is of the Chair of a workgroup. Now we may just, for example, decide to refer to other existing rules in the organization. Such as adoption of some, if not all of the GNSO and ccNSO policy development rules. But that's to be decided by this group. At this stage then – first of all is anyone's hand up for clarification?

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes go ahead Heidi.

Alan Greenberg: Carlton and Eduardo have their hands up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, is that the order? Go ahead Carlton. You might be muted Carlton.

Alan Greenberg: Carlton's hand is now down, Eduardo's is up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, go ahead Eduardo. You might be muted Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now we can, yes. Please go ahead.

Eduardo Diaz: Oh. I was talking to myself. I was going to suggest that in these workspaces, that we're defining these teams, what you just said Cheryl about the expectation and responsibilities of what this group has. We should put some kind of introductory paragraph in the workspace just to put everybody into context as to what these teams are doing. Because it helps so there is no question about what they're supposed to do. It's just a suggestion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Eduardo, this is Cheryl for the transcript record. We'll take that as an Action Item and that will magically appear between now and Prague. Or more to the point between now and our meeting in Prague since it may actually happen at Prague, the way some of our lives are running at the moment. That will come very much from our agreement at this meeting, but we will certainly do that. I think that is a very good thing. We have the how to define what the duties and metrics drafting team sentence, the executive summary and what the expectation will be for that section will exist on the top, so that's terrific.

Now looking at our members of this we currently have Alan from NARALO, we have Eduardo from NARALO, we have Darlene from NARALO, we have Rudi from EURALO, we have Cintra from LACRALO, Olivier from EURALO, we have me from APRALO but we seem to have a lack of Africa and we could certainly do with some more names. Olivier, are you on the call and able to just manage the list and the collection of names for just a moment or two? You have been muted Olivier? Okay, in the absence of Olivier responding to me, let me answer Yaovi to begin with, this is Cheryl, yes you can certainly join more than two groups, but during the face-to-face meeting in Prague you will have to select your priorities. And there will be people like Alan, Olivier and I and probably others who will want to be across all of them. But that contribution will meet the virtual in the other rooms or in the other spaces.

Heidi, Olivier has been dropped from the call. While we get him back may I ask, may I implore you to just manage the call for the next couple of minutes? If you finish populating duties and metrics obviously we need to move on to the two sections of process. But I have to step away for a moment because I have a 52 kilo dog that is demanding to go outside. And one does not keep saying no to a 52 kilo dog for very long. So I'll be muting, I'll be listening, but I'll be dealing with domestic duties for just a few moments. Thanks Heidi.

I just unmuted. I'm hearing absolutely nothing. What's…?

Holly Raiche: We're waiting for you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Well as I just finished saying, I need to deal with the domestic duty. I asked Heidi to manage the call. So if Heidi is not able to manage the call you'll all just listen to the background noise of me putting dogs in and out.
Matt Ashtiani:	This is Matt. I'm happy to help right now. I think Heidi just stepped out to go get something to eat at the moment and then she wasn't here for the past minute. But I've been taking notes so while Cheryl's gone I'd just like to confirm with everyone whether or not I've accurately captured anyone. And if I've left you off please just let me know. For the first group that I have it is the definition and structure drafting team. I have Yaovi, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Jacqueline Morris, Holly Raiche, Darlene Thompson, Cintra Sooknanan and Rudi Vansnick. Again if I've left you off or you would not like to join that team please just let me know.

For the next one that I have is the duties and metrics working group. I have Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, Darlene Thompson, Rudi Vansnick, Cintra Sooknanan, Carlton Samuels, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Oliver Crepin-Leblond and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. For the next one, which is the process drafting with the sub-team being meetings, I have Cintra Sooknanan, Alan Greenberg, Darlene Thompson, Eduardo Diaz, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Carlton Samuels.

For the last team, which is elections, selections and appointments I currently have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg and Carlton Samuels. I know that was quite a bit of talking so if you would like to look at the page yourself to ensure that your

name was captured, I'm going to put a link into the chat. So while I think everyone is looking at that link just let me know via Skype or in the chat room if you'd like to be added to the group. I will see if Olivier's been reconnected.

Alan Greenberg: Gisella says he's back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, this is Cheryl. Thank you Olivier. Cheryl here, I'd like to go back on mute while I let the dog back in again in a moment. If we could, thank you Matt for running through on those. If we can just do a little more populating on the two sub-teams under process that would be good, again aiming for regional balance. But Olivier it would be also useful to get the workgroup, I think they've got in their minds fairly firmly what we're writing in on, as Eduardo pointed out, on the header space on the workspace for each of these drafting teams. We're pretty right on section one. I think the duties and metrics, because we have the metrics workgroup and the duties are fairly well-discussed, I think we're okay there.

But it would be good to lead the group through what their expectations are under process in those two subsections, and also the scope of those rules. And now I'm going to go back on mute if you're okay to manage the call for a couple of moments Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl. It's Olivier here.

Alan Greenberg: We can hear you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay thank you. Thank you Matt. Well I was looking at the Wiki page for the duties and metrics drafting team and I note also that Carlton has put down that he's also volunteering for this group. I'm not sure whether you've captured this Matt.

Matt Ashtiani: Yes I have.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay fantastic. And I'm afraid I haven't received the other link which you said you – oh here we go. It's just coming up now. I'm afraid I have to juggle between Adobe on one side and phone on the other with each one cutting off alternatively as I move from one to the other so it's…I understand how hard it is for some of our colleagues to join when they are colleagues from countries where the telecommunication system is sometimes a little bit unstable, should I say.

                               I think that these [themes] as Cheryl mentioned are quite complete. I would personally be a little happier if we had a couple of more people perhaps in the metrics and the other one, the last one which I forgot.

Holly Raiche: Meetings and process.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier, it's Alan. Can I make a comment on that?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I really don't think it's an issue. I think it's important that we have someone from each region at least watching the email and alerting the rest of the people in their region if there are issues they want to weigh in on. The reality is that in any of these sections the drafting is going to be done by one or two people and the onus is on the rest of the people in that workgroup to weigh in and say whether this is acceptable or not and what needs to be changed.

So I don't really think we need huge numbers of people, we just need to make sure that each region is represented and that that person, if there's only one, is going to do their job diligently. Large working groups, we're not going to divide the work among 14 people in a working group. I think pragmatism is going to weigh out here and we're looking at a small number of people who will be diligent and do their job properly. And I think we need to worry about that more than getting 15 people on each group with three from each region. That may be just my perspective, but I feel really that that's what's going to end up resulting in a good set of rules that is people have looked at it and have made sure that it makes sense from their regions perspective.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier for the transcript. The only concern that I have is that I see the same names in all of the different groups. So as long as the workload doesn't get too much for them then I guess it's okay. The reason why I thought a few more names, specifically from some regions might be helpful, would be that if one person is particularly involved in one of the drafting teams and might be taking the lead in one of the drafting teams, that person doesn't need to then furnish so much work in the other drafting teams as well.
	And now of course, if we all feel okay about this then I'm happy with it as well. But I do think that we might wish for some regions perhaps to also look at alternates as well, if there is and if we can search in our regions someone who might be interested they could also alleviate the workload. Holly?
Holly Raiche:	Holly Raiche for the transcript. Just a question, from what Cheryl said there are two steps. One is actually to have an overview of the structure, so there's an idea without having wordsmith stuff of what goes where and essentially what we're trying to say. And the second step is the sort of minutiae of getting the rules right. Am I correct in saying what we're aiming for in Prague is really just the former, which is to get the structure right and to get a really clear idea of what goes where with some details as to content? But in terms of wording, we're not aiming to complete that at Prague?
Alan Greenberg:	It's Alan and I have a thought on that whenever it's my turn.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier do you want to respond to that or do you want to go straight to Alan?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I only caught part of it so if Alan can respond-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright Alan if you'd like to say your intervention and then we will…

Alan Greenberg: My intervention is relatively strong. If the intent is that we sit around a table in Prague and try to wordsmith rules, I'm not coming. I think that's about the poorest use of time of a group of people that we can imagine. I think we want to come out of Prague, it would have been nice to go into Prague with this but at best we'll come out of Prague with a general agreement on what should be there and what the intent of the rules should be. If we can come out with that, and there's going to be some perturbation, some variation of that because not everyone is going to be in Prague and be able to participate and there are some of us who want to participate in multiple groups, but if we can come out with a general idea then it's not all that hard to draft them afterwards.

But if we're intending to start drafting rules and nit-picking about sentence structure at a meeting with a bunch of people around a table, I think that's about a poor a use of the time as could possibly imagine. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Not that I don't have a strong opinion, but I'll just leave it at that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Holly, Cheryl for the transcript record, is that general design for what we'll be doing in our break out sessions clear to you?

Holly Raiche: Yes it is and under the strict guidance of Alan I promise not to put pen to paper in any kind of detailed form whatsoever.

Alan Greenberg: Well I don't mind one person writing. Excuse me. I don't mind one person writing, but if 15 people try to write the sentence it's not good use of time. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay Alan. Thank you for that intervention. And more importantly thank you very much for your question Holly because it's going to save us a lot in the introduction to our work in the Prague meeting. We will be creating the skeleton in Prague. We will be agreeing on how this beast is going to look and what the general formulations and what things are going to be put in to create the specifics in Prague. You will have flip charts. You will have a dedicated Adobe Connect room and I

would suggest the use of the White Board there would be very useful. You'll have remote participants and you'll have not only our own membership, but of course as with all ALAC related meetings, unless there is an extremely good reason to make them closed, this workshop will be open so any man and their dog can come in and contribute.

And I'd be very happy to see that happen, especially if we could get the four-footed friends to be involved seeing as how I'm surrounded by four-footed friends on a cold and windy night here in Sydney. I think the sum total, just as a side piece of trivia for you all, having let my 52 kilo dog back in and out, out and in more to the point, I know have a sum total of let me see, 30, somebody can do the math. I've got a 42 and 52 and 48 kilo dog on the bed. Yes that is three dogs. And yes I am still in bed but it's more comfortable here. And there's no room for me.

Alan Greenberg: And that's not counting the snakes in the ceiling.

Holly Raiche: Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I don't normally take them to bed Alan, true. Okay so what we will be doing is literally leaving Prague with a clear understanding in each of the drafting teams as to what they expect from those who have decided or agreed to hold the pen. And there's going to be a number of rules, a number of subsections in each of these sections. And it may be that we have a number of pen holders. So there will plenty of room for the

pedants to dot the I's and cross the T's and to parse and analyze the sentences. But that will be done on the Wiki in a post-Prague world.

So you'll be looking at flip charts. You'll be looking at Adobe Connect rooms, use of White Boards and we will be expecting everyone to come out with a clear understanding of what they will be seeing in their section. We will, in our Prague meeting, be coming back together just for the last 10 or 15 minutes of the forum. Because what we want to make sure is that no particular design team has gone off in a tangent that is not fitting and meshing. We want to have rules that synthesize well when we bring them all back together to be the whole. So we will make sure that we have that look, feel and structure. Is there anyone's hand up before I take…

Alan Greenberg: Alan's hand is up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: One follow on to what you just said about the coming together at the end to make sure that we neither have holes nor overlaps, significant ones. But I think it's important to say that even though we're going to come out of that meeting with a single understanding of what we believe the draft will look like in terms of content when the drafting gets done, there is going to have to be an iteration after that where once we have a draft we will look at it again. And there are those of us, and I'm

one of them but I'm not unique, that it's very, very hard to critique vague things. When you actually have text in front of you it's easy to see the things that you disagree with or the place where there's holes or overlaps.

So let's not have any belief that because we have this face-to-face meeting and are attempting to get a single unified view for each subgroup that that's necessarily what's going to be in that final document. Because that next iteration is going to be perhaps the more important one of "now that we've written everything down does it make any sense." Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. I would hope that the capabilities and the skillset of this working group would ensure that that would in fact be the case and the modus operandi of working on the Wiki's, particularly with the text development, I think will help there as well where we have the ability for people to quite literally say "I interpret what is written this way. Is that how everyone else reads it." Particularly because we're looking at a document that is going to need to be easily understood in clear and simple language and able to be translated.

Alan Greenberg: You got it. Just a bit of history – the current version that we're working with, minus some changes that have been made in specific sections over the years, Cheryl and I ended up being the two people who took responsibility for it. And I don't know if I can speak on behalf of Cheryl, but what we ended up with at the end was something that was semi-

acceptable and we were both far too tired to do one more iteration. And therefore that's what stood. I think this time we're aiming a little bit higher than that and our level of critique should be higher than that to make sure that what we come up with does meet with what Cheryl just said of it has to make sense, it has to be translatable, it has to be understandable. We gave up most of those things because we were just too tired and what we were starting with was too obscure. But this time our target is a bit better and I'm sure we'll meet it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm absolutely confident we will meet it Alan. It's Cheryl for the transcript record. It is good to know who to blame Holly, and I have to take an even deeper responsibility because I was part of the six person team right back at the very beginning when we clawed, and I do mean clawed, our way through the huge volume of UN GA rules (inaudible) of what may in fact be even maybe applicable for use in the wonderful world of ALAC and indeed the regions and At-Large. What we were trying to do was to make sure we had covered off things that worked across far too many [mistresses]. This time we will get it right.

So yes, mea culpa I think we can say. Just for the record I should point out, and correct me if I'm overstating the number here Matt, but I think we are up to something like version 12 or 13. I don't think it's 14. We're certainly beyond version 11 of the rules and procedures.

Alan Greenberg: No I think 11 is correct. I think 11 was the addition of the Board member selection, I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So just to put context in as we come towards the close of our call here today, and as we get to the nitty gritty planning for our Prague meeting. We've been plugging up the holes and the leaks and the obvious errors in the original set of rules. But none of us, including those of us who can be put to bended knee and sword to throat perhaps and be blamed for them, are wedded to having any of them the way they are writ at the moment. We have an opportunity to get it right and get ALAC 3.0, because that's what we're up to now is the third iteration of what the ALAC is and what it does.

We now have, we're in a post-implementation of ALAC improvements point in our world. We are at the first time when ALAC has a specific and operational role, not just an advisory role in the world of ICANN with the new gTLDs objection process. And we are stepping forward into a brave new world. And I think this is a very exciting time for ALAC and the At-Large community and we need a vehicle which we can rely on, which is easy enough for us all to operate, and which we all don't have to go to in-service training to understand.

Far too few of us have a good knowledge of what the rules we operate under are. And in the not too distant future, and by then I will put a self-imposed timeline that the plan would be to have in the Toronto meeting, the ALAC improved, endorsed, and have legal counsel from ICANN sign off already to be in place and announced at the Toronto meeting. So this is a short but I think long enough period of time to get this done and we will have a new set of ALAC members, or a continuing set of ALAC members operating under rules that they will be able to in

fact sign off on and say that they are clearly understood and are intending to be accountable to.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, Olivier has his hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. Just before I go to Olivier, looking at the clock, we'll be stopping at half of the hour but I do want to make sure we can call for any planning and logistics discussions and also any other business. So if you have any other business, start thinking of it now while I move to Olivier. Go ahead Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl. It's Olivier for the transcript. I just want to come back to what Alan has said earlier about giving a final read out to make sure the whole set of rules actually makes sense and also is translatable. Obviously we also have to give a final read with regards to the languages themselves. So both in Spanish and in French, and I guess any other language that the rules will be translated to. One needs to make sure that not only they make sense but that they also adhere to the original English version of them. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Olivier, important point actually that we would want this tested, proof tested to at least the UN languages that I would suggest the UN languages and those that are of significance to the At-Large community as measured by the RALOs. So for example Portuguese would get on

the short list there, at least from my understanding and knowledge as well. We also have to of course put this to ICANN legal. So when we're writing this we need to recognize that we have a couple of audiences that have to be sold on the end product, our own community and the ALAC themselves, but also ICANN legal. And I think we have enough legally trained and barrister employed or deployed or qualified people in our working group.

In fact, looking down the list, it's almost 50/50 which is kind of scary. We need to make sure that those who like to work in the world of legal language, which usually is somewhat more convoluted and complicated than plain and simple language requirements would prefer to do, are also satisfied. So let's make sure we keep our eye on satisfying both of those audiences. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask Heidi if there's anything she would like to share a bit of the specifics about our workshop now. Heidi if you could just refresh us on the confirmation of the time, I believe we're in the room that we're all living in for most of the week anyway, and any other logistics before I call for any other business and close the call?

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you Cheryl, this is Heidi for the record. I can confirm that the At-Large Rules of Procedure and the ALAC Metrics Subcommittee meetings are being held Wednesday the 27th of June from 16:00 to 18:00 in the Roma meeting room. And I will put the link into the Adobe Connect, just scroll to the bottom.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Can I ask Heidi how we're going to promulgate the address of the separate break out room Adobe Connect links, will that be in the formal ICANN agenda as well as the ALAC?
Heidi Ullrich:	This is Heidi for the record. I believe that we will at tehm to the At-Large meeting page that I'm going to now put into the Adobe Connect. Once we receive the main Roma meeting Adobe Connect link we will put that on the agenda page and then we will also put the break out rooms as well. And I think that Gisella is going to be handling that, Gisella and Nathalie.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you very much. I know it's going to be a challenging logistics for staff on that particular two-hour session. But I think it will be well worth our effort if we get it right. Anything else Heidi?
Heidi Ullrich:	No Cheryl, this is Heidi. Everything else is fine. Thanks everyone for signing up.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Now I am aware that we've had a number of apologies for today's call – this is Cheryl for the transcript record. So can I make a final AI, Matt I'll signal to you, if you could send out the links to this master page and then the subpages such as you are going to share in the Adobe Connect now to the list, and just ask everybody to add themselves or respond to the list or directly to you to add themselves to any of the sub-teams.

Can we make sure that the Metrics Subcommittee is copied to that and mention to Metrics that they will be meeting at the break out room in the topic of Metrics with additional people just from the Rules of Procedure.

So we're not going to be purists about who sits at the Metrics table in the Prague meeting. I in fact don't want to be too purist about who sits where at the Prague meeting in the break out rooms, but I would like to see a fairly well and evenly distributed regional representation across all of our break out discussions. So if for example I observe far too many of one region clustered around one particular topic, I may tap some people on the shoulder and ask them to shift across so that we do get the greatest input to the greatest spread.

I'm now going to call for any other business; is there any other business? If someone could let me know if someone raises their hand I'd appreciate it.

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl no one is raising their hands, this is Heidi.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well it sounds like we're ready to close off the call. I'd like to thank all of you for attending today. I look forward to working with you in what I think will be a dynamic and hopefully fairly exciting and indeed productive workshop in Prague. I will implore upon you all to please be prompt in your arrival. I know we are all incredibly busy, especially in the middle of our week, but if you cannot make it let staff know by

Skype or something else that you will not be there because we won't want to hold up starting proceedings hoping that someone will turn up.

Safe travels to you all. For those who will be with us virtually, we look forward to seeing you in Prague in the Adobe Connect room. And I look forward to leaving at 18:00 hours on Wednesday with a firm and well-articulated skeleton created for the Rules of Procedure for the At-large Advisory Committee. Thank you one and all, thank you staff. Thank you David, thank you Veronica and safe travels. Bye for now.

[End of Transcript]