

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Duties and Metrics Drafting Team call on Thursday the 7th of February at 19:00 UTC. We have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yaovi Atohoun, Darlene Thompson, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Eduardo Diaz. I hope I haven't left anyone off the participants' list. Apologies from Carlton Samuels, Cintra Sooknanan and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

From staff today we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could also please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, and also staff will be taking the main action items, so if you would be so kind as to state them clearly. And the transcript will be available within the next two to three days. Thank you, over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. Alright, what I would propose to do is first go through the items that are either redlined or otherwise highlighted in the document, and get them out of the way. And then go around the room so to speak and identify any other changes that people may have thought about. And in between that we'll do the code of conduct little section that I sent around last night. If that's okay, I see no hands, no one yelling and screaming, so we can start going through it.

Section 1.3 was just removing this sentence that wasn't necessary because this particular section is for ALAC members as such. We did say that we were going to define "statement of interest" under "meetings

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.

and administrations” and I don’t believe that got done, so I will make a note to do that. The next item is on 2.6, and this is one that was triggered by somebody asking at a previous meeting, and I don’t remember which meeting, that when we say “Chair” so we mean ALAC Chair or do we mean the Chair of a meeting. And the Chair is one of the things that can be delegated, and this one just makes clear that when the Chair position is delegated everything associated with it is delegated unless that thing is specifically identified with ALAC Chair.

The only thing that I believe is currently in that category is the ability of the Chair on a tie vote to cast the second vote. And in my mind, that’s the kind of thing that we gave to the ALAC Chair because the ALAC Chair has deemed to have or confidence because he or she was elected ALAC Chair. And it’s not necessarily something we want to give to a substitute. There may well be other things that as we go over the document that fall into that category. This was just making explicitly clear that when the Chair position is delegated, the Chair of a meeting, that all of the other bells and whistles go with it.

2.9.1 was somebody’s catch, I think it was Rinalia, that we don’t need to say “has the authority,” the whole section implies “has the authority.” 2.9.8, and I’m not paying attention to the screen, so if someone raises a hand, please would someone let me know. The “taking intakes” was just a correction in tense. And at the end, it ended with “do not meet”...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Didn’t really end, did it?

ALAN GREENBERG: No it didn't, it just was like that. And it's been like that since the very first version and nobody has ever noticed. Rinalia did notice.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's good that Rinalia reads these things.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is really nice to have someone, someone again, someone who's English is not their first language reading these things carefully. And I think that was the intent, so I added "unsatisfactory or does not meet expectations."

DARLENE THOMPSON: Um, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes go ahead. Olivier has his hand up.

DARLENE THOMPSON: We're talking about members and appointees do not meet expectations, are unsatisfactory as a participation – what are those phrases...so "do not meet" is actually correct, is it not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, you're going to tell me it was correct now?

DARLENE THOMPSON: Yeah. “Members do not meet expectations,” so that “do not meet” is correct. If a member does not meet expectations, but members “do not meet expectations.”

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh no. Sorry. The problem was it just said “do not meet.” The rest of the phrase was gone.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Sorry, I didn’t catch that. Okay, I’ll shut up now, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So it could mean “do not meet” or “does not meet,” it still didn’t have any object. I think what is there now [parsons], and we have Olivier with his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, it’s Olivier for the transcript. I’m just going to play Devil’s Advocate and ask what is participation that is unsatisfactory and what are contributions that do not meet expectations?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if I were Chair, I would want to keep those vague and not lock yourself in to a specific list of things where someone could say “I’m doing all of those, you cannot take any action against me.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a bit like art; you know it when you see it.

ALAN GREENBERG: As the current Chair, do you have another opinion?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't. Alan, I'm just playing Devil's Advocate because this is going to go through the ALAC and I think that someone might ask the question, so one needs to look at the answer for this. And I think you're quite correct that this is something that doesn't – the expectations and so on are not just a set of tick boxes. However, we do have some minimum participation things and metrics and I wonder whether any pointer to that should be included in this sentence or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. I think that's implicit because there are whole sections on expectations. I mean look, if we're going to have some Chair go off wild in the future and start reprimanding everyone and sundry for bad performance, the ALAC is going to have to take action. So I think we're presuming there is some level of good sense, and we always have the Ombudsman.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, sounds good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like Alan will be able to answer the question when it comes up in the ALAC as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to be there that day. Darlene?

DARLENE THOMPSON: I guess I'm with Olivier on this, I think there should be at least a pointer to the expectations. I'm not so worried about the Chair going wingnut and axing people because they missed one meeting or something like that. I'm more worried about non-participation of the ALAC members, which I've seen rampant. So I do think it needs to be clearer and specific pointers, or else you're going to have people saying "oh I did it as best as I could," you know, without meeting those expectations. Where are those expectations? Not everybody's first language is English, so I do think we need to be a little bit more specific.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, but let's be honest. As best as they could may not be good enough.

DARLENE THOMPSON: That's exactly what I mean. So therefore we need to point them to what the expectations are, so that they can't just say that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I'll put an "as per" and point to the other sections that talk about expectations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it's just a link to the other sections Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine.

DARLENE THOMPSON: That would make me happy, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next, 3.1 was to get around the awkward position that we say the ALAC Leadership Team helps the Chair but the Chair is part of the ALAC Leadership Team. And I think Cheryl suggested saying "members of," which doesn't mean all the members but some of the members covers that. It still may not be grammatically perfect but I think it was Dev who said "good enough."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I think he did say that.

ALAN GREENBERG: 5.1...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on; I can't get to there for some reason. Oh it's okay, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry Alan, it's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm working from paper so I can write notes, so that's why I'm not always looking up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You don't see my hand go up on your paper?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's just not good enough is it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have technically un-capable paper, what can I say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a question here. I missed the call which defined the fantastic term "ALAC Leadership Team," the ALT, how long did you spend trying to find this acronym? Because I'm sorry, (inaudible) but I don't know of anything better than this, but it's just...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I answer that Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, some of us, myself specifically, desperately thought that the term Executive Committee was well understood, but no, it was hard fought and lost my dear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not – it's Olivier for the transcript. I'm not advocating using Executive Committee. I have actually done some homework looking at what an Executive Committee is, and of course strictly speaking, if one wants to be absolutely anal about this, yes I did say that word, then one would of course say the Executive Committee has executive powers, ooh.
So obviously, since it does not have executive powers then it needs to have ALT power, or no power rather and just be ALT]. But it just doesn't flow. I don't know if we can think of anything that sounds better than this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It took forever to come up with ALT. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is, and I can try to find it, a large number of alternatives we looked at. I'm just trying to figure out where it is right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There were so many alternatives that you went for the ALT one, the alternative one.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. If life was that simple it would be fine, but it wasn't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We needed to say that it was ALAC, so that's the A part. And it was the Leadership Team aspect. And I know Tijani – Cheryl for the record – Tijani was very, very strong on this point, as was some of the – Dev's not on the call is he – some of the LAC members who were on the call at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there were strong objections, strong enough that we were having trouble moving forward. The options that we looked at were the descriptive being management or leadership and the noun being group or team. And we looked at all four combinations and permutations of them, and ALAC Leadership Team is the one that we came up with, with the concept that it's not really management, but leading and we seem to like "teams" as a bunch of people to do things.

The discussion was far longer than that and spans some (inaudible). If you feel strongly and have another suggestion I'm willing to give it a go, but I think we're going to keep on calling it eth ExCom anyway no matter what the words say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Alan, Cheryl here, just on that. The number of other places in ICANN where even “working groups” within the SOs refer to a small group of ‘leaders’ as an ExCo is so common, but I’ve lost that argument; I’m not going to go back again.

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s right. And we can always revise it. We’re going to have a document which supports a global edit. So Olivier, if you want to, at some point, make a suggestion that you think you can sell, feel free. We can fix it at the last moment, we can change it at the last moment easily.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we have it before, between the 10th and 14th of the month though?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Well we can always change it again later. But feel free to come up with something that you think you can sell, but recognize there were many people who really fought against ExCo even though it was usable and flows off the tongue well. And some people were definitely offended by it. Plus we have the history for those who remember, but luckily not many people.

Okay, I’d like to go ahead right now, but Olivier, feel free to come up with something else, propose something else. Alright 5.1, this was a section that we spent a good half hour on last time, and I believe this is what we decided. That we talked about a variety of things, including what the person believes are the interests; because, as was pointed out

in many cases, there is not going to be an opportunity for the person to go back and check on the something.

But we did not want to use those words, so we ended up with “represent the interests of the ALAC and the At-Large community,” and the ALAC of course is supposed to be representing the interest of the At-Large community, so it’s to some extent redundant. But I think that is what we decided. Does anyone have strong feelings that this is not what we want to go with? At one point we had text which said “the interest of the ALAC and the interest of the At-Large community”; I couldn’t see any difference so I left out the extra words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, I think that represents what we said, but I’d be interested to hear just another pass through from this group today.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, my hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly has her hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: I actually like this because I think ALAC and the At-Large community are actually different and I’m glad that we’ve accommodated both. And I think that this actually reads well, so I like it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah I do recall that in many cases, and we have some email threads on our current mailing list which indicated the ALAC itself is divided and certainly the At-Large community is divided, so one could not necessarily represent all of the interest at one time of any of those.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes I agree. I agree, but I think this actually captures the main thing we were trying to say really well as far as...

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's the best we can do right now, we may learn from it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree. Cheryl here, I agree, but most importantly, and Holly this is something you need to remember as well, if that changes, then so does some of the text in the DSDT part. Because at the moment I've written across, as I said I would, and I've used this type of language. So we need to make sure if anything changes it needs to be changed there as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay next section, 7, the first four paragraphs. If you remember we had a very long discussion – sorry yes, go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry Alan, it's Olivier for the transcript.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Back to 5.1, what happens when the ALAC has to appoint individuals to a committee but that individual is not allowed to represent the interest of the ALAC specifically, but has to act as an individual on that committee?

ALAN GREENBERG: “Or to meet other specific obligations.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is that what keeps this because in the first part of the sentence it says “to represent the interests of the ALAC and the At-Large community”...

[crosstalk]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...upon individuals for one of three things – either represent the interest, act on behalf of the ALAC, or to meet the other indications.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would put “and/or’s” in all of those.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps that would be more explicit, yes. Because here it is, it feels, it reads as though these are three things that it needs to do or that it can

do, and the “or” sometimes just works as acts on behalf of the ALAC. Got it, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah I don’t think we’re going to cover the words. I’m not sure there’s any group where they’re explicitly not allowed to represent the ALAC other than the Board position and that’s not covered in this list. Even SSAC, I don’t think anything prohibits them acting representing the organization that originally named them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, whilst I do act in SSAC in an individual capacity, what they are called on to bring in is not only their own expertise but an indication of what the opinion of that person is of the best interest of the At-Large community.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have the escape hatch of the “or,” so I don’t think that we have a worry here. If it’s really necessary there’s language in a few places, “or other requirements as the ALAC shall determine,” and we could put one of those in here, but I think it’s covered by the current “or to meet other specific obligations” unless someone feels strongly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And this is a very important one, this point is hugely important. Cheryl, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: And are you saying we need to change it more or leave it alone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No I like the “and/or” and I think that’s enough, but it is essential that it is as strong as it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want to explicitly put “and/or”s? I’m inclined not to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would prefer not to but we can always do it if needs be.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m happy to leave it as it is. And it looks like we beat Olivier down because he’s taken his hand down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Poor boy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let’s go on to 7.1, this is a more difficult one. We spent a very significant amount of time and took out the issue of we need to be good boys and girls because ICANN is paying us lots of money to come, and therefore we need to produce value for money. And it was taken out because it’s not a rule. Rinalia pointed out, I think it was Rinalia pointed out, that 7.1, 7.2 and 7.4 also are not rules, but are rationales. I don’t think we can lose them. I don’t think we can afford to lose them. I felt that way about the funding issue as well.

And in looking back, our whole section, a good part of the DSDT section, section A is not a rule, it's background. If you look at Article one, Section one of the ICANN Bylaws, it's not a rule; it's preambles, background. And I think we should take 7.1, 7.2, the first part of 7.3 which was eliminated, and 7.4 and put them into a preamble. We could number it, in which case we have exactly what we have now. We could just have a paragraph without numbering, in which case some people may feel more comfortable about it. But I think we need to keep much of that, and I believe, put back what was lost in 7.3.

But if people are offended, I mean if you look at the ICANN Bylaws, that whole first section is numbered just like everything else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl here. The formula I'm not too fussed about, but Alan, if an action item could be on you in conjunction with Holly to put that into that scratchpad page that's now up with the surviving bits of the sandbox from the DSDT, I think you'll find it will work even as a set of non-numbered sub-points, and I'm sure you'll find an appropriate spot for those. There are some bits that allude to expectations in that preamble section.

I would not die in a ditch about the travel myself, but certainly I'd support the rest of them going across to there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah well if we're going to put the rest in we can put that one in because it's in the same ilk. Now I was thinking of, when I said

preamble I mean preamble to section seven. I wasn't thinking of moving the moat altogether.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh no I was thinking preamble for the whole document. I meant right up the front where the definitions, in the definition section that's not just definitions, there are roles, responsibilities, purposes, things like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay you don't think it fits better here in the section on performance and metrics though?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well if you're going to remove it, it's just that we don't have – sorry, Cheryl again – we don't have preambles for other sections, but we certainly could if you want to rewrite it that way. I was thinking you meant in the beginning whole document preamble space.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah no I was using the document preamble as an example of we are not tied to the fact that every line in this is a rule. May I suggest let me put it as preamble here when we pull all the documents together, we can always move it at that point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, you know I'm looking at this and I believe we're talking about form, even if you leave that as a 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and so forth, even if they are statements, what will happen in a practical term is that you probably will never say "according to rule 7.1 this is what we should do"...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh yes you'll say that a lot.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so it [doesn't matter] if it's there as a preamble. It doesn't hurt. That's my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yeah I have no problem removing the numbers; I have no problem leaving the numbers there. 7.3 probably should have been separated into a statement and then a rule, so Tijani was right in that those two sentences do not need to be in the same section. But let me try something, and when we pull the whole document together we can either put numbers back or move the whole thing somewhere else, if that's okay with the group. Eduardo still has his hand up, is that a new one or an old one.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh no, I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay 7.5.1, that was just a cosmetic thing from Rinalia that it's really a sub-point of it and we don't normally have sub-points when there's only one so I just rolled it into the 7.5.1. 7.7 was the changing made to "is empowered to," which...7.9 was the one where we had the "extent possible" which was left over from part of the sentence that was deleted. It said "to the extent possible in a sensitive and discreet manner," I believe it said.

When we removed the "sensitive and discreet manner" the "to extent possible" didn't fit anymore, so the decision was to move it up to where it is now. Rinalia in her comments, and I don't think she had seen the "sensitive and discreet," but when reading it she suggested adding "sensitivity and consideration." And I have no problem with that but if people are offended by it then it can go. Thoughts, hands...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with Eduardo; I'm okay either way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay then, it's there let's leave it until someone objects. 7.13 I used the "is empowered to" to replace a "may" again. So I just changed the sentence structure to make it fit. And that is all that we had, other than the code of conduct section. So perhaps we can pull that up, Gisella.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, Heidi has a question in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: It looks like “throughout the At-Large community” or “throughout the globally diverse At-Large community.”

ALAN GREENBERG: What section are we talking about?

HOLLY RAICHE: I’m not sure. I was going to...

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we’re talking about the one where we just added the word “sensitivity.” “Cultural differences throughout the At-Large community” and Heidi is saying “throughout the globally diverse”...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi, Alan, while I’m filibustering in a way till Gisella can put the other one out. But just “through cultural differences throughout At-Large,” perhaps “throughout the At-Large community” or “the globally diverse At-large community.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I like the “globally diverse At-Large community,” Heidi. That’s good words.

HEIDI ULLRICH: (Inaudible), Cheryl. Okay, let’s see if Gisella...

ALAN GREENBERG: “throughout the globally diverse At-Large community,” very good. Thank you Heidi, you’ve earned your pay today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Can you please restate what you would like Gisella to post?]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it’s the email, the code of conduct email or whatever form you have it in.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella do you have that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She was all organized before. There we go.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Eduardo has his hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hello Eduardo, what would you like to say? Eduardo.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let's take a look at what's going on, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo is typing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh he dropped, okay. We'll get him back in just a moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Isn't it funny how you often drop with your hand up? I can't understand the system there, it so often happens. It happens a lot to Yaovi too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yaovi often drops after he says three words. I think his phone doesn't like to be used a lot.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but it's often your hand is up or you're interacting. Like you stay on the call when you're shushing, but when you actually want to interact that's when you drop.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Yaovi has his hand up, we should let him talk or drop.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I am back. I'm back. I dropped.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Yaovi started speaking. Let's deal with Yaovi first and then we'll go back to you Eduardo. Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you, Yaovi speaking. Did we finish or do we still have some comments and some (inaudible) in the group now or after we (inaudible) would it be possible to pass?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm having trouble understanding Yaovi, did anyone else catch that. we can hear you but your voice is very muffled; I couldn't make out what you were saying.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Oh okay. (Inaudible) comments so, or my questions... Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay. I don't have a (inaudible) with (inaudible) but I think we want to [ensure that] I think when we talk about formal meetings. So my comment is about defining a formal ALAC meeting, something like that. Because (inaudible) which to [know what is] a formal ALAC meeting. That is the comment I had about this, I think 1.4 if you have (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know – it's a good point. The question is should we use the word "formal" or do we simply need ALAC meetings, which are defined. My inclination is to keep it because the ALAC does meet at times when it is not passing motions and things like that. I think we expect people to be there anyway. I think we'll drop formal here. Anyone object to that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's okay.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Ah, I [was].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay thank you. Anything else Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I have another point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: In the 2.4 I think something was missing, like it was referring to [an instruction] (inaudible). So I don't know if this is (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, subject to provisions of section 6.2 and you're telling me...

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Exactly, we should mention the [exception] in 2.4. (Inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I don't know if that number 6.2 is right, but if not I'll make sure it's correct. I'll go back to earlier versions and verify.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay. So for now that is all I have. I can come back later if I have (inaudible). Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay thank you. Eduardo, your turn.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes this is Eduardo for the record. This is in relation to 7.13, where it says – and this is a question – when we say “the ALAC is empowered to publish the adjunct document support” when we say it's empowered to

publish does that mean that it's also empowered to change it without changing these [rules]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes I think so.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean we could add "from time to time," but I think "empowered to publish" means republish as necessary. We're just using that word because we don't want to have to create this document prior to approving the rules of procedure. It's going to be a pretty messy process and we simply don't want to hold up the rules of procedure for this document.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else before we go on to the code of conduct? Okay, then let us do that, and we are looking here specifically at the Chair's responsibilities. Now Olivier did have a – no I'm sorry. Yes, the Chair's responsibilities, which fits in our section. And Olivier did have a suggestion, which really perhaps fits in the other section, per perhaps fits under the specifics of what ALAC members and others must do. But

you wanted a more specific list of infractions. Olivier, are you still with us?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am with you, yes. It's Olivier for the transcript. We're looking at the code of conduct are we? At the moment that's what's on the screen. So what's on screen here says "ALAC code of conduct" there are three clauses there and then there is – I don't quite understand this document, please take me through it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well the original section 22 essentially had a list of some things that were philosophy, a list of things you must do and must not do, and two clauses at the end talking about remediation. So I've taken the remediation part and put them into the list of things the Chair does. And I am suggesting that the work method that is "you should behave respectfully to people, you should not be disruptive," those kind of things I'm suggesting go into work methods.

Because they're wider than what does an ALAC member, it talks about what is appropriate use of communications. The original document was very specific saying "you cannot use an ALAC list if it's not official ICANN business." Well we tend to be more wider than that, so I didn't want to list very specific things, and I used the term "largely in support of ALAC activities, policy and administration." So that's how we got where it is. We decided many, many moons ago to take out the very specific language that was in rule 22. I guess we can pull that – if you think that's

necessary we can go and find the rule 22 and put it up. I'm not quite sure what you would like to see done, so I'm giving you the floor...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, it's Olivier for the transcript record. There is another document, I don't know whether you're referring to this, but there is an ICANN code of conduct that is out there somewhere as well indeed. I believe that we should point to that as well. That certainly provides us with more fodder. One particular concern I have is with regards to postings on mailing lists, where I do have to regularly, from time to time send a quiet little email to some people who tend to take on debates rather personally sometimes and go a little further than they should.

And I wonder whether there might be, I note here "At-Large meetings and At-Large electronic communications largely in support of ALAC activities related to policy administration," but there certainly is this level of respect that is required to be kept and certainly one thing, the ad hominem attack is something which might need to be spelled out specifically because it is the thing that hurts the most and that creates the least amount of friendliness in our community.

And it certainly seems to freeze some people when something like that happens, it turns people away, so it's very detrimental.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I was trying to cover it with "must behave in a professional manner and treat all ICANN participants and staff with respect." Now you're saying that people may have different views of what those words mean and we need to spell it out in more detail.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a fear that this might be the case Alan; it's Olivier for the transcript. Because sometimes, I've even gone down to arguing with someone that they've actually misbehaved, and they absolutely believed that they did not misbehave, strangely enough. So we do have to look at the differences in culture and I guess in some cultures points are put across in a stronger way than others and so on.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also have an internet culture that things done in email and online you do not have to have the same reserve that you would have in person, and that's a very much apparent culture on a large part of the internet. And sadly that's life.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just because – Alan, it's Olivier. Just because the internet is full of unbred savages is not something that we should bring and accept. I'm kidding on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No I don't think that too...I've got my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we've agreed, and I support that we do, include the link to the excessive Ombudsman's guidelines on respect and conduct.

ALAN GREENBERG: okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If that is going in this space, would it not be appropriate and reasonable to give an example, as Olivier is suggesting. Because I, from very similar experience to him, do remember that using the ad hominem etc is particularly important because there are people who maintain what they were doing was simply robust debate. And whilst other people are easily insulted and literally thinking about legal action in reply, it does help if you've made an example, which is "including but not limited to," behavior that could be considered to be an ad hominem attack on another individual.

I just think if we're going to have that other sentence in, and it does in the Ombudsman proposal, sorry the code of conduct, it does talk very clearly on respect and mutual respect and all those sorts of things, if you were to give the example of unacceptable behavior such as Olivier is requesting, it then allows a Chair to just refer specifically to that to say that that Chair is deeming this as such and therefore it is unacceptable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so I've put in the chat I cut out some of the sins from the existing rule 22. So if we put in, as a second sentence to one, "examples of

inappropriate behavior include but are not limited to” and a selection of those – that addressed the issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, especially if in the same sentence we also have the beginning that says “the expected standard of behavior,” then Heidi’s got that link already. So you give them the high level “here is a code of conduct that ICANN works with” and specifically in our world, “unacceptable behavior includes but is not limited to.” Does that work for you Olivier? I know, thanks Holly I’m glad that works for you, but it’s a real challenge with the Chair. And what is acceptable in a highly conflict debate situation and what is acceptable in a number of countries that we’re trying to bring on board is vastly different. So I’m really...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep. Cheryl and Alan, it’s Olivier for the transcript. Thank you. You must have seen my green check mark whilst you were going through the list, and I absolutely agree. And I would say you might think well why does the Chair really need to have that under their foot. One of the reasons is that there comes a time when the messages might actually be removed from the record due to the liableness nature. And at that point it really helps the Chair to be able to point at a specific line and say “that’s broken; that posting is going out.”

And that also saves the Chair and ICANN a lot of headache with regards to any counter threat to sue if the posting is taken out. We’ve not reached that level, but there have been instances where we were very close to this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. With regard to that, that was explicitly mentioned in point two of the Chair's responsibilities. I'm inclined, by the way it's not this groups section, but I'm inclined to put something in saying – and I don't know how to word it and I would really like some suggestions – Chair's decisions are final, subject of course to the rules saying you can always use the Ombudsman. Do we want to put that in or do we want to leave that silent.

HOLLY RAICHE: I've got my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. If we use words like "the discretion of the Chair," that automatically says basically he's got power to do, he or she has power to do [what they want]. Maybe that's the way I'm seeing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: So use "the sole discretion" expression?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep.

ALAN GREENBERG: But not say “final,” okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, “sole discretion” essentially means...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no I understand that. I think they are functionally equivalent but it’s a politer way of saying it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay whatever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I will try to work that in somewhere. Of course everyone will look at it and let me know if I’m wrong. Eduardo, are you okay on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, he’s suggesting silent and I’m tending towards silent myself, but let’s see how the words work out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah he said silent before we came up with the suggestion of “sole discretion”; that’s why I’m asking him. That’s why I’m asking does he still prefer silence or is “sole discretion” acceptable?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo, “sole discretion” will be okay too.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Alright Cheryl, again, Chairs and past Chairs or other people who have exercised similar offices before, they're opinions are always important once we get some words cast out. Okay? And by the way, for the record, what I found particularly offensive in the existing rule 22 was itemizing and assigning numbers to each of the sins; putting them in a single sentence strung together with commas makes it somewhat less offensive. So I am not unhappy with that.

What else do we do? I surprisingly did not get any emails about typos and things like that; I guess they're going to come soon because I can't believe there aren't any. We are almost at the hour; we have another 30 something minutes to go. Is there anything else that anyone feels we need to do at this point? The next step is again to do a pass and implement the things that we talked about today, and then merge it into a part of a single document for further work.

I think it would be reasonable once we merge it into a single document, and that should not take much time, we have the MADT meeting tomorrow, and between Cheryl's work and what Heidi can do, I would think we could have a unified document pretty much ready by Monday. And I would say we go out for ALAC input while we're doing the cleanup. Does that sound okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl here. I would like to encourage the ALAC to make comments and engage during the cleanup; I think that's a really good idea. But I just don't know how you want to handle people in the ALAC going back to

things that they may have lost the argument on with the drafting teams. I guess I want to turn that to Olivier as a question. Do you want to send out something to the ALAC on an announce, it should be ALAC and the wider community I would have thought.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, may I interrupt for a moment? I would just suggest the ALAC prior to our cleanup. And once it is cleaned up then ALAC and the wider community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Cheryl here. That was the intervention I was making. The wider community later, I'm just wondering if Olivier needs to do a bit of a preamble on this invitation and request to the ALAC that makes it clear that these words are a result of wide drafting team input, they have been broadly discussed. Just to remind the members of the ALAC who have been disengaged, uninterested and/or have lost a particular point that this is not an opportunity to rewrite the whole thing. This is – do you know what I mean? Just sort of put it in context.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure any words will have that affect but I certainly support the concept.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And what does Olivier think? Can he even come up with such words that basically suggest that they've had an opportunity to put up and shut up for a very long time? Here's a following opportunity but we're

really looking for huge oversights, omissions of such extreme importance.

ALAN GREENBERG: As a good Chair he's going to ask us to draft it, of course.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep. You've got two hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Thank you, Yaovi first and then Olivier.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. Can I go back to the DSDT document?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have the DSDT document in front of me so I'm not sure we can, but what is it you want to talk about?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Oh okay. We asked (inaudible), somewhere we are talking about the ALAC members must be given an opportunity to attend to the ALAC why they should. Why this issue? So it is [centered in] 10.5.1, so we have in the current [version, one issue]. We are talking about the ALAC members, so it should be [one issue]. 10.7.5.1.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hold on, I'm looking for it. ALAC member must be given an opportunity to explain to ALAC why they should not be removed.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: It should be (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, it should be should or...?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: No it should be they or the?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, oh.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: We are talking about the ALAC member and then to explain to the ALAC why they should...

ALAN GREENBERG: That's one of those "he/she's" that we put a plural in. The tense is wrong, but the alternative is he/she. I'll see if I can reword it to avoid the he/she or something else. Thank you for catching that.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay. Okay, and that point exactly is not very clear for me, like in 6.2. We are talking about the (inaudible) and we are saying if the Chair would put a member of the ALAC in the next year following his or her

appointment. So they may not next year, maybe there's something to look at there. Because in the next section 6.3 it is very clear that the people we are talking about joined near the end of the term. So that is very clear, we are talking second year of the term. That is clear, but the previous text, 6.2, when we are saying in the year following his or her appointment. So the notion of [year] may not be very clear, so I just want you to make that...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah Yaovi, I think it should be "if the Chair will be" or "will still be a member" and I think that will make it clearer.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

No my comment that I'm talking about is the year following. So if the person is elected and after the [GA] like in October or November, it should say the year following his appointment if it is the next year or the second term. So if you look at 6.2 and 6.3 you will see that maybe the 6.2 (inaudible), we are talking about second year, that is very clear, of the term, simply of the term. That is very clear. But in the 6.2 we are talking about in the year following his or her appointment, so that one for me is not very clear.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I think second year of the term was left over from when it was a two-year term and that may need to be fixed. So I understand the point you're getting at. I'll make sure that the whole section six, with regard to the Chair, reads properly; it may not right now.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Yaovi. And Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan, it's Olivier for the transcript record. With regards to the process of where we go forward from here, there has been a suggestion that I think the first thing that would happen would be a cleanup of this with typos and everything else. Sending it to the ALAC prior to doing any kind of cleanup is probably asking for trouble and actually only getting feedback regarding typos and not proper feedback.

Now some people might disagree and say "Yes it's great. Get the ALAC to just work on the typos and then we'll have all of what we want sent through." That's not the right way of really having this properly reviewed. So a cleanup first, then sending to the ALAC. And then there was a suggestion that there could be a single issue ALAC call to review the ROPs.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that is correct. And I believe we had explicitly said earlier that we were going to be soliciting input from the community funneled through ALAC members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes I think that's an excellent...

ALAN GREENBERG: We said that in Toronto.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well then that sounds like a good process forward. And of course, we might get some points reopened and so on. Of course with regards to the text to send to ALAC members for the invitation and so on, I shall delegate this to well, staff is always great at writing this. Heidi I guess you're able to write something that is particularly diplomatic on this.

But in any case, if we have a single issue call, then we can always push back if there is anything that puts everything back in question and says "Well, 1.1 I don't agree with any of these rules." At that point one can always say "hang on, this is the fruit from a lot of work from a lot of people."

ALAN GREENBERG: And remember, the ALAC has seen drafts which are very close to what's coming out now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A good thing, yes Alan. It's Olivier for the transcript. The good thing is the ALAC has been kept up to date with this. I have, with Heidi, we've made sure that there are regular updates at all of our ALAC calls, and Cheryl has been absolutely great at being able to keep the ALAC advised about what was going on here. So I don't think that anyone would be

able to come back and say “hang on, I have no clue about what you guys were doing but I don’t agree with it.” And if they do, they will just have to be told off and told...

ALAN GREENBERG: Somebody already passed on that. Cheryl, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not only do I have a question but “there is a rule that deals specifically with the types of people like you” and point them to that very rule. Sorry. I couldn’t help mentioning that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No that’s great. Actually I just wanted to make one – Cheryl for the record – I just wanted to make a very simple point, but I think it needs to be on the record of this call as we’re planning here. That that special ALAC call, that single purpose ALAC call, I would like very much Olivier if you would extend the invitation to attend that call, not only to your ALAC, but to allow the regional reps and rank and file who’ve been involved in the drafting teams to attend it as observers. Therefore they can be called on by you to contribute to debate and discussion should the need arise.

But you’ve had an enormous amount of community input in the creation of this, which I think is a credit to the ALAC. And knowing that we may have members of the community going “well hang on, is this the ALAC making rules for the ALAC.” This has been an exercise which is the very opposite of that, and I think if you make sure that your single

purpose call also is very inclusive of at least all of your drafting team members and work group members, that's another way of counterming this incorrect assumption.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier. Does the third action item capture what you just said?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me look.

[crosstalk]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah that's fine, that's fine. I just wanted to make sure because if it's an ALAC special purpose call members of the drafting teams may feel "I'm not an ALAC member, therefore I don't need to go," and I think they should.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So extend the invitation to all the members of the various ROP drafting teams. So should the invitation in your view also be extended to Chairs or RALOs?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may as well you know. If you extend that invitation they are welcome to attend as observers and be possibly called on to contribute to; because what you don't want is to make sure that this is a call

specifically for the ALAC, but I just think having it open and having them there would be better useful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep.

ALAN GREENBERG: The bottom line is we need to make sure the ALAC people have an opportunity to speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're the primary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. If someone within their region has a bone to pick, as it were, whether it's Chair or someone else, if they can't get an ALAC person to support them enough to bring the issue up, then it's not going to win in any vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes. It is correct. And it's Olivier for the transcript. We might have to remind participants during that call of course, but as we all know, ALAC calls and all At-Large calls are open to everyone, so everyone can attend if they wish to. But invitations will go specifically to those people on the ALAC and on the RALO Leaderships.

ALAN GREENBERG: But the Chair determines speaking rights.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Your contributions may be called upon, your contributions and experiences may be called upon, it would be appreciated if you could find the time to attend.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else folks, or are we going to actually leave early? When Gisella asked me how long I said we better to do it an hour and a half just in case, but I was hoping we'd do it in an hour, so we're a little bit over that now. Yes, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah sorry Alan. Just the next action item in that series of action items is for the ALAC to then vote on that text after the single issue call?

ALAN GREENBERG: Once any modifications are made, the intent is to go out to a vote at or near the end of February.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We could always do it on the Ides of March, ooh sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're going to be quite ready by then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I couldn't help myself. The whole et tu, Brute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, Eduardo has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes it's Eduardo for the record. For the cleanup, you say that it's ready by Monday. I remember at the previous call there were a group of people that we're going to do this cleanup, so let's say this document is ready for Monday, how much time do we have for the cleanup? Do we have a week, two days, four days?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Four days between the 10th and the 14th I thought it was.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl as usual is a bit optimistic, but that's our target.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have to keep trying Alan. Cheryl here, I have to keep trying. It's in my job description.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know. I did say the end of February date was realistic. I'm starting to believe it slipped because we ended up adding an extra week and a half or so with these meetings which we hadn't originally scheduled.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. May I put into the action item "as soon as possible thereafter?"

ALAN GREENBERG: You can certainly do that. you can even say the target is the 15th of March.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I still like the Ides of March. I think that's got a lot going for it, I really do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question, or just a reminder.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can do all of those.

HOLLY RAICHE: The definitions team, I've already gone through the terms and made a comment or two about the terminology that goes in front, I've also had another little look. I don't think we need a glossary, but as I said in the comments, I think we need at least two or three days to go through the final document. This is sort of we're now back in definitions and structures as that final pass through. So I don't know if that adds two or three days to what your schedule is or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure, we may. But I would suggest that when we start the cleanup we are going to focus on sections B, C and D. And so you in parallel, with us starting us – the global us because you're part of the cleanup group also – but in parallel with focusing on the text, there's also an opportunity to be reorganizing. So we can all promise not to look at section A at the first day. It's going to be an iterative process. Right now, to be honest, it is mind boggling how we're going to funnel

the input from the various people who are doing this into a single document so that we don't lose track of things.

And I have a thought on that, and I'll be putting something out on the mailing list, but. Do we want to – by the way, the people I think who volunteered to do this are Cheryl, me, Eduardo, Maureen, Yaovi and Holly and I think Tijani, I'm not sure. Do we want a separate mailing list of that or are we just going to use...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Was Yrjo involved in that? I thought he said he was as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: He may have been, I'm not sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes I think he was, yes Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. Do you need a separate mailing list or can you just copy that list of people and the information that they need and give the details to all the list, that way everyone is informed? I mean it's up to you but.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was actually going to suggest, instead of a mailing list just use the 10 names in a tube and not agonize over it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. A mailing list if going to be created for about four days running, I don't think it's really...

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah it's not worth it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm going to suggest, I was talking to various people about how do we physically do this, and all of the suggestions ended up being "Well, go to Google docs" or use some brand new tool we've never looked at before, and I don't have the stomach for reinventing things right now. I did have one suggestion, which I thought was a marvelous suggestion. You'll recall that I said if you trade things back between Word and Open Office a few times with people making changes on both sides, before you go very far the document tends to self-destruct and things start happening that you can't fix.

So, I thought that maybe we could use RTF format, which is standard. But apparently RTF does not support tracked changes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. I'm not sure how much is going to be tracked change work when we're going through. I think once we discuss a given format and have an agreement, so style wise, I actually see it, Holly you'll be very familiar with this, that we actually give someone the pen on the call and that it's their job to capture the group's candid opinion and then put it out, rather than individuals doing track changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well I support that 100%. I mean I don't mind people taking a document and with track changes making changes, but I wouldn't want that to be the master document. I think you almost have to move them over by hand, or there's tools to merge documents and things like that, but I really don't want to have multiple people typing. I was on another working group call today and Marika sent around a draft report, a draft PDP report. I opened it up and it said "warning, Word has determined that there are dangerous things in here. We are opening it up in read only mode because it may destroy your computer otherwise."

We think it's because Marika has a Mac and has a new version of Word don't do it, we're not sure yet. If that happens between Mac's and PC's I don't think we want to add to our troubles. So sometimes replicating hand work makes it easier. In any case I'll make a proposal. If anyone violently disagrees with it you know where to find me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Warning, don't bite the apple.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're going to wipe out Apple Computers at this point. I don't think so.

[crosstalk]

ALAN GREENBERG: For those who like tilting at windmills go for it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. We just need to make sure, I'm more concerned about the end point being as compatible as possible, and that's very much where we're relying on Dev and his team. But this polishing team is a small enough group that providing you do remember that people like Dev and I do use Open Office and not other proprietary copy things it's going to be okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl it's going to be up to you to verify that what is coming near the end is usable by you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It'll be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: And my concern is to keep the document clean enough so that when we make one minor change near the end the whole formatting doesn't change.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No I agree totally. And I'm happy with sort of sticking in that more of the RTF style. And to be honest, that file toilet really needs to just be in the hands of one person...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep, and I am volunteering.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: to the agreed style. Exactly right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Darleen has her hand up.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Thank you. It's been up for a while.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hadn't noticed and you didn't harrumph out loud.

DARLENE THOMPSON: I did but people were talking and I couldn't get a word in edgewise. Darlene Thompson for the transcript record. I agree with having only one person as pen holder, I think that's a great idea. But if somehow we could still do track changes, because I do like to see what was there originally and what it's being changed to. So RTF still may not work for that, but because I think even if it is one pen holder I think it would be still good to see the changes that are being made.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you've been watching what I've been doing for most of these versions, when I say "here's a new version" I have a clean one plus a [delta] from the previous one, and I would expect to keep on doing that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah it is important and I think the main thing is too Darlene, Cheryl here for the record, at this point we don't actually, with the polishing, there shouldn't be changes to text because it's the agreed text from the drafting team, other than a clear typo, spelling or grammatical error, right. What it will be doing is looking at format and omission and "Oops, this is duplicated" type stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean once we get closer to the end, I presume a number of us will go back to the current rules and read them. And is there anything there which we omitted without a conscious decision that we don't want it anymore. So there are going to be things that we say "oh my god we never mentioned that," and so be it. We'll have to cover them. That's the only way to do it. I thank you all. This is going to be a challenging next couple of weeks for those who didn't already have a full schedule.

And I look forward to seeing many of you on the MADT call tomorrow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Talk to some of you on the morrow. Thanks Alan and thanks everyone. It is light at the end of the tunnel and I do not believe it is an oncoming train. That was Cheryl.

[End of Transcript]