OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	So let's get going. So good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. This is (inaudible) for the final review of the revised rules and procedures on the 19th of March 2013. The time is 20:08 UTC and we have a nice number of people who are on the call; great to see you all. I'm not going to just speak forever. I think the best thing is to just start with a roll call and then I'll have to hand over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr and to Alan Greenberg. So (inaudible), if you could please start with the roll call.
Female:	Thank you, (inaudible). On the English channel we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, (Ron Sherwood), Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Gordon Chilket), (Robert) (inaudible), (Alan Skews), (Garth Brewn), (Geordie) (inaudible), (inaudible), (Edwardo Diez) and (Sandra) (inaudible). We don't have anyone currently on the French channel.

And on the Spanish channel, we have (inaudible), (Natalia) (inaudible) and (inaudible).

(Oncology) is noted from Holly Raiche, (Ranallia Abdul Rahem) and Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. Also (Evan Lavavich) has also just joined the call.

On our Spanish channel, as interpreters, we have (Veronica) and (David) and on the French channel we have (Claire) and (Camillo). And if I could also please remind you all to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes and also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel and to speak at a reasonable speed as you

---

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.

will be discussing a document. And if you do read anything, please remember that it is being interpreted.

I hope I haven't left anyone off the attendance list. If I have, please speak up now. And if not, over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, (inaudible). It's Olivier for the transcript and I'll make this quick and pass the baton over directly to Cheryl and to Alan. You have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript report. And interestingly enough, (inaudible), so I'm not sure how disturbing it's going to be for everyone else. If it an issue for the interpreters, please do let me know.

All that said, I will, therefore, try and minimize my verbal introduction for today (inaudible) and give you a very brief introduction before I'll, therefore, hand over to Alan to take you through the proposed ALAC rules and procedure, a draft version, 64 – (inaudible) is not a typo – 64 versions and these (inaudible) changed versions have been worked on by your work group, your work group dialect.

You would care to note that for the purpose of this call and for the record, was a regionally balanced and diverse group, which included ALAC's member representation from all of your regions and the regional leadership and (inaudible) (ALS) members from all of your regions.

They have logged, and I do mean literally logged, more than 500 man or person hours, which I would prefer it to be called, on the pieces of rule change and review.

There is an untold amount of additional work that was not logged in formal meetings that was done by the (inaudible) and, in particular, by a couple of your ALAC members who took significant lead in the process. And here I would like to specifically call out and go down on virtual bended kneed to thank Alan Greenberg, who's done nothing short of a heroic amount of work, particularly in the final phase of the (inaudible) documentation directly for your review and we trust adoption.

Any comments that have come into the Wiki page that we are aware of, unless they've in in the last few moments, have been nothing but supportive and complimentary. But there is and was a call for any regional input and opinion to be brought to this meeting and to be shared by the ALAC representatives from (inaudible) region.

And one thing we would like to do is ask upfront, Alan, if that's good with you, if there is any such opinion or comment that needs to be tabled at this time. So if anyone has brought with them for tabling at this meeting a particular comment or editorial, suggestion or question from the regions and (ALS)s, could they please let that known now? I'm not sure who that is, but please go ahead.

I believe I heard a yes. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Is there someone wishing to table a comment, (advice or) question on behalf of your regions or (ALS)s?

That may have been an (errant) noise then. Please make it known in the chat room if, in fact, you do wish to raise a point. I believe at the moment everyone should be able to have individual (thinking) of their (supplements) at their (inaudible) individual (scrolls of the drop ins). Can

everyone check to see that they are able to scroll through the (inaudible)?

If scrolling is OK, then what I'm going to do now is – (inaudible) – is hand over to Alan Greenberg and he will take us through the high points and highlights of this documentation. But he will also make particular point of a single piece (inaudible) addition which will be a proposed fix to (inaudible) into Paragraph 11.2 as a nuance in 11.2.2. Over to you and thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. A little bit about the history and process that we've gone through; it was in the cover note that announced this meeting, but I'm going to repeat it now because I think it's worthy of making sure everyone understands it.

The rules of procedure working group very quickly divided into four subgroups and there was overlap in the people, so they weren't mutually exclusive groups and they correspond to the four sections that you see in the final rules of procedure.

Within each of those sections, the process that was generally followed was essentially a wide ranging and sometimes structured, sometimes unstructured discussion of the aspects that that group was responsible for.

And that took – I don't know – a few months. And the calls at that point I believe were every two weeks in general. The process was interesting in that people started off in some cases with very diverse positions. And as we talked through the pros and cons of the various issues, there was an awful lot of closure and an awful lot of merger, not necessarily to any

one person's position but to some common point where everyone felt comfortable.

The process then went into a drafting process within each of the four sections. And Cheryl noted this is very 64. That's version 64 of the consolidated document. Each of the four sections went through – I can't tell you how many different versions. In some cases it was only four or five; in other cases it was 20 or 30 versions as we went through each particular section.

And although we had reviewed all of the substantive issues in the first part of the process, we then, as things were drafted, went over them pretty well line by line. Obviously in some sections there was less interest and it wasn't in any great detail. In other ones it was in very great detail. And sometimes a good half hour to hour might have been spent on one paragraph.

I think I can say with assurance – and if anyone who was involved in the process disagrees, I wouldn't mind if they speak up – that on virtually every issue, even when there was significant disagreement to start with, everyone felt comfortable with what we ended up with. And I'm talking about not with the overall document but on a line-by-line basis.

So I'm comfortable that this does reflect at least significant part of ALAC. And at large that participated in the process and certainly for people within any of the four working groups, there is virtual unanimity or close to it that what we've ended up with is something that matches what people want to feel with ALAC.

The vast majority of the document, in fact, is a reorganization and reformulation of the original rules of procedure. There are differences and I'll note some of them as we go along.

Before I go into a quick bit of review – and I'm not going to try to take too much time. It's a long document. Are there any particular questions about the process we went through before we look at specifics?

Hearing no voices, seeing no hands raised – we have a hand from (Evan).

(EVAN LAVAVICH):   Hi, there, Can everyone hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

(EVAN LAVAVICH):   Alan, I was just wondering, as you're going along, you could point out – you mentioned that there was a broad consensus met amongst everyone in the group. Are there any parts of the document where you couldn't get consensus and it was a preponderance of opinion or would you say the entire document as it sits now has a very broad consensus from the group that was working on it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can say with some assurance that of – each of the four sections were worked by different groups, although there was overlap. There was a number of people, four or five of us, that were on all of the groups, so participated in most meetings of all of the groups.

So within each group, I do not – I'm not aware of anyone who said I don't agree but I'll grudgingly file a minority opinion. I think at pretty much every point we came down something people felt comfortable with.

EN

So I can say that with a pretty good sense of assurance. I can't think of a single thing where people ended up saying I don't agree but everyone else disagrees.

I certainly didn't – there are sections that if I had written it alone I wouldn't have written that way. But I ended up feeling comfortable that what we have is certainly livable.

So it's certainly in many cases it's not what each individual would have written if they were on their own but we ended up with something everyone, I believe, felt comfortable with.

We then went into a drafting, an overall document drafting process and although the individual work groups have all seen it and there were no comments from them, the in depth final review of these documents – and when I say in depth I mean word for word – was done by about a half a dozen people, which included the pen holders of the original sections.

And those pen holders were Holly, and earlier in the process, me, (Eduardo), Maureen Hilyard, (Yuria) and (inaudible). Pardon me?

Female: And (Yelvi).

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I did say that. Maybe it didn't come through. Plus (Ranalia) and (Tijani) who took part in – who sort of participated in the overall review. And at this point, there are no outstanding items that someone said I don't want it and I'm going to (inaudible).

Along the way, we did have some where people said I'm going to bring it up when it gets to the ALAC because I really don't like that but we – I

believe we've eliminated all of those by changes to make people feel more comfortable.

So at this point, I know of no one who is saying I do not agree, no one who is an active member of any of the working groups or the review team. (Tijani)?

(TIJANI):   Thank you, Alan. (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, (Tijani).

FEMALE: Alan, Alan? Sorry to interrupt but the interpreters were unable to hear what (Tijani) was saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we still here?

FEMALE: Yes, sorry, Alan. The interpreters were not able to interpret (Tijani), so the Spanish channel will need a short summary, please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: (Tijani), let me – I had a great deal of difficulty hearing you, also. Let me summarize what I think you said and you can confirm it if I have it right.

You said that there were certainly points – and I don't disagree with this – where one person may have disagreed with all the rest on some point of substance but ended up accepting it because they felt that was something they could live with and that there was an overwhelming consensus of the rest of the people that it should go forward like that.

And I know you had a number of those points. I certainly had a number of those points. But I think they were all things that in the end people accepted as OK.

However, I think you ended up saying that you had a few points that you would like to have reviewed by the overall ALAC. I think that's the way you ended but I'm not sure. Is that correct?

(TIJANI): Yes, (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: It would really be useful if you could put those in writing so we could see them and not just try to listen to you on the phone. So if that's something you could do and we could look at them during this call, that would be very useful. I would have hoped that we had had them going into this call. Are there any other questions before we go through this then? No questions.

If we – as we look at it, the introduction is just that, an introduction. The definitions and terms are important in that it has two functions. One is a convenient place to look back and when there's an acronym that was defined somewhere else in the document and used later on, they are all selected in the fine terms.

So it's a quick place to come back when you find a set of initials you don't remember anymore, a quick place to go back to see what they are.

There are also terms that are used. And an example is appointee, chair, consensus, motion that are standard words in the language but have a very specific meaning within this document.

They're all capitalized. And when you're reading the document, if you come to a capitalized term, that means it has a specific meaning and you might want to refer to the defined terms to see what that is.

The defined meaning is always identified exactly when the first time it's mentioned in the document but you can always refer back to the table.

I'm not going to keep an eye on the screen, so if anyone puts a hand up, please, staff or Cheryl, just call out and let me – call my attention to it, please.

FEMALE: (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: (Tijani).

(TIJANI): Thank you, Alan. So in the introduction are you (inaudible) organization. We have a very big problem because when – on the (inaudible). So and (inaudible) where you explain how the organization (inaudible). How are they (inaudible)? Are they (inaudible)? (Inaudible) something that I don't want to (inaudible) now. You need to make (inaudible).

Right now we don't have agreement about this. So (as it is here) (inaudible). So this a point that I want to clarify (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Which sentence are you talking about (Tijani)?

(TIJANI): (1.1).

ALAN GREENBERG: No, which sentence would you –

(TIJANI): Moment, I will (inaudible) –

(KEITH LEGUNE): Alan, sorry. It's (Keith Legune). Just want to let you know that there's no Spanish interpretation at this stage with (Tijani) speaking. They are unable to hear him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, (inaudible).

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl here. (Tijani) had referenced we do also have a very significant echo back on the line (inaudible) could help you track that down. I mean, if it is (Tijani)'s line while it's open then that's not a problem. But if not, we should try and fix that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: (Tijani), may I – (Tijani) was saying that there's a reference to individual users in Section 1 and it sounds like an individual user can be part of At Large, the At Large community without going through any process.

Part of the problem may be that the first sentence, which says At Large is the home of internet users within ALAC, is not –

(TIJANI): No, (inaudible). I will review. The ALAC community (inaudible) is made up of (inaudible) organizations.

ALAN GREENBERG: And you're saying individual should be modified to make it clear that a process must – they must go through a process.

(TIJANI): Yes, yes, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine, noted.

((CROSSTALK))

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Cheryl here. I would call on the ALAC to have extreme caution in modification of the sentence if they desire their rule to have some longevity because it is a specific requirement of the last ALAC review that all of the region find a way that individual can be directly related in their regional business.

And what (Tijani) is saying is true, there is only the one region that has done that to date. But it is a mandate for all the regions to do so. So if

modifying this sentence, please be very certain that you do not create or propose how each of the regions (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It can be – I mean, it's still a very good thing there has to be a process. But it can be (inaudible) and that is also OK. Thank you.

(TIJANI):   (Inaudible). I am proposing to (inaudible) can be part of the (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do so.

(TIJANI):   Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. (Tijani), I understand that. I'm just saying how that happens will and should and can vary from (inaudible) to (inaudible), so do not be limiting in what you change it to.

ALAN GREENBERG: (Evan)?

(EVAN LAVAVICH):   Thanks, Alan. Actually, I was going to speak. Cheryl said most of what I was going to say. I actually wanted to speak against making a significant modification to that line.

It is within each (realm) to determine how people are defined to be individuals participating in At Large. So frankly, I – on one hand, yes, (Tijani), it is vague. On the other hand, that's probably good because that enables the (Ralos) to determine and each in their own way on how individuals can participate.

Not every (Ralo) is going to pick the same way to enfranchise to individuals who are not part of (ALS)s. That's OK. I think being too constrained in what we're doing here puts a damper on that and, as

Cheryl said, goes against an explicit mandate to incorporate individual users into the operation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Give me the ability to try to craft something and if anyone objects, I'll be doing this very quickly, you'll have an opportunity to comment. May we go forward? (Tijani), you still –

(TIJANI):   Yes, yes, yes. The second point is on the table and defined terms. You defined, for example, the (inaudible) but you didn't define the (inaudible), for example, which is not (inaudible) the same thing for everyone.

So I think everything that you (put in) the room that is not well defined in the room (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem with that. I wish you had made this comment earlier. Thank you.

(TIJANI):   I am sorry, Alan. You are right but you do not know in which situation I am.

ALAN GREENBERG: I appreciate that. Any – (Tijani), is your hand still up?

(TIJANI):   No, I will remove it.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, seeing no more hands, the next section defines the At Large Advisory committee as clearly as possible. Much of it is a direct quotation out of the rules – out of the ICANN bylaws. It defines the – goes on in Section 3.5 to define the – what we are now calling the ALAC Leadership Team, what used to be called the Executive Committee or the (ExCom).

The (ExCom) has not changed in substance from what it is right now except it's better defined than it was before. It, again, still has no explicit powers in its own right.

The Chair does have a variety of explicit powers and the chair may delegate those to the (ExCom) or to individual members.

We are defining a new term in 3.8 called work teams. The work team is a generic term, which may be a subcommittee, a standing committee, a working group, any of the various terms and this is just something to group them all together so we can have one set of rules that apply to them.

Section B is talking essentially about individuals who take – who plays within the ALAC or in conjunction with the ALAC. And it tries to group together what the requirements are for being – for filling one of these rules and then the responsibilities that one has if you take on that role.

Section 4 is ALAC members. Section 5 is the Chair. And it goes into a fair amount of detail there because the Chair has a wide variety of obligations and responsibilities.

Section 5.12 is something that was listed separately under I think Code of Conduct in the last rules and it's actions that the Chair can take in very extraordinary situations where there's some remedial action has to be taken because of what I'll generically call improper behavior.

There are no new functions added here from what we had before but they're stated in a somewhat clearer way and the exact process to be followed is a little bit clearer because in some cases we're talking about things like mailing lists, which are, in fact, processes that are owned by

ICANN, not the ALAC Chair and ICANN staff and legal and IT have to potentially get involved in some of those.

There is 5.14 which is a succession process that is should the Chair be unavailable and not have identified someone else to take his or her place, whether it's sickness, family problems, being run over by a truck, none of which we wish on Olivier, should any of these happen, there's a process by which we can make sure that there is continuity until such time as the ALAC can replace the chair, if that is, indeed, necessary or until such time as the Chair is back.

And I see Olivier has a smiley face. We wish only the best for you, Olivier.

There is a section about responsibility of the ALAC Leadership Team. And I think the most – perhaps the most important part is that we're expecting a significant increased workload over an (out normal) ALAC member if someone were member of the ALAC Leadership Team.

We have two categories, three categories of ALAC Leadership Team members. There are – there's the Chair, one or two Vice Chairs and whether there's one or two is up to each Chair to decide how many Vice Chairs they want, he or she wants and other ordinary – the other ALAC Leadership Team members who don't bare a specific title.

And the work load is generally expected to be highest for the Chair, next to the Vice Chair or Chairs and somewhat lower for the other members. And that's important because when you're trying to convince people to take on these roles, you have to adjust the workload to some extent based on their particular circumstances.

There is a section on appointees and appointees may be someone who takes on the formal liaison role in cases where that title is used or it could be someone who is appointed to some other group in a non-liaison role that is – that term is not used. They are almost the same in many cases.

We go into a fair amount of detail of trying to put into word some very difficult concepts and that is that the person needs to be, to the extent possible, representing the ALAC or speaking on behalf of the ALAC or understanding what the ALAC would do if the ALAC had an opportunity to make a decision.

In many cases in these roles, there is not an opportunity to go back to the ALAC at every moment and in some cases there's confidentiality issues where you cannot go back at all.

And there is a certain amount of care that must be taken in choosing people and the rules try to flesh that out and try to set some guidelines for how that can be done.

The terms are basically – that's Section 8 now. All terms in general are one year. The Chair, if you remember under the ALAC review, was designed to be a two-year term now. We found a way to finesse it. I think it came from (Tijani).

Instead of having a different situation with a lot of exceptions – because you might appoint a Chair to be there for two years but they may not be available in the second year, they may not be on the ALAC even.

So we found a way of doing it, which worked out much better. That is the Chair services for one year and is automatically renewed in first-

second year if certain situations are followed – certain situations are valid.

Performance metrics and remediation, this is essentially saying that ALAC members have a certain – ALAC members and appointees have a certain set of obligations that they have to follow and if people are not meeting those obligations, if people are not contributing in a reasonable way, then there are a number of actions that the ALAC can take going all the way through in the extreme case to removal of an ALAC member or recall of a Leadership Team person or recall of a Chair or removing the – unappointing someone if they were appointed.

And there is a reference to what we're calling adjunct documents. There are about four or five adjunct documents. These are documents which functionally form part of the rules of procedure but are created separately and will given an opportunity to be able to be changed more easily as time goes on if changes are needed.

Some of the adjunct documents are going to be needed immediately. Some of them, the wording allows them to be created at a later date. And in fact, the motion that will be put before the ALAC to adopt these will, in fact, be to adopt the rules of procedure once all of the necessary adjunct documents are available and approved by the ALAC.

So all of these documents do have to be approved by the ALAC but the order in which that is done may be different. And of course, the resolution will spell that out in more detail, saying which documents are still in process.

Any questions before we go on to Section C? Seeing nothing –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, there's been a couple – Cheryl here – there's been a couple of points raised in chat and I'm certainly doing my best to respond to them in the chat but you might want towards the end to do a review. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want me to – do you want to raise the ones here that need discussion? No, I'm trying to keep my eye on hands up but I'm not looking at the chat at all.

The next section, Section C essentially is all about the processes that the ALAC uses to conduct its business. The first section, Section 10, talks about ALAC meetings and, although there are four kinds of meetings defined, to a large extent they all devolve into regular meetings under some conditions, so you don't really need to worry about them.

But these – the urgent meetings, special meetings, allow meetings to be called at short notice by the Chair or by other people on the ALAC should they decide a meeting is necessary even if the Chair doesn't think one's necessary.

But in general, we work on the assumption that our Chair is doing a good job but there are escape hatches if that turns out to not be the case.

Section 10.3 talks about the various rules and the ICANN bylaws overrule anything. The rules of procedure that we're talking about comes next.

ALAC may make specific decisions which alter something in the rules or in the adjunct documents and so forth. We refer to the (Roberts) Rules

of Order as a fall back should something become complex and we want to see how authorities look at it.

I don't believe we ever had to do this in the past or maybe once or twice and I don't expect it to happen very often in the future but they are there so that we have a sequence of things that we can follow.

We formalized the concepts of agenda, which we've never done before and say they are required for meetings or, at least, preferably. Again, the language we use tends to not be too rigid because we know that situations will occur where we're going to have to be flexible.

Quorum is an issue that took an immense amount of discussion. The standard quorum, 50% of sitting ALAC members, is a simple one. And by the way, the expression sitting ALAC members is used when we want to make it really clear that we're not talking about the people in the room but the people who are officially current members.

The discussion centered around not that part of quorum but the quorum associated with a vote. And we are introducing a new concept here that is with a few unusual exception for a vote to be considered valid it must have participation votes cast, including extensions, from all five – all regions that are represented in the ALAC.

So if everyone from a specific region chooses not to participate, then in general a vote is not valid but there are some exceptions and it goes on to an other rule that we'll talk about when we come to voting.

Speaker rights are – 10.6 – are basically what we have now. That is meetings are open. We do our best to make sure that they are documented and transcripts and things like that and that, in general,

ALAC members have speaking rights over others but we try to make sure everyone can be heard.

Motions are – there's nothing particularly unique about motions. The – in our previous rules we had something called motions and resolutions. No one ever knew what the difference was but we had two different words and this one we only have one word.

We've introduced the concept of a point of order. A point of order allows you to stop the meeting to fix something. It may be because rules aren't being followed. It may be because the projector isn't working or it may be because someone doesn't really know where we are in the agenda and they need clarification.

Procedural motions are things that we rarely have in our meetings but are necessary should we want to be more formal about it or should someone believe that the meeting should be taking a different direction than it is right now.

We talk about records of the meeting. This is Section 10.10. Up until now they were not mentioned. We are now essentially mandating that we need some level of minutes or records of the meeting. We are no prescriptive as what they're called or exactly what they have in them but we do have a minimum number of things that are in them, including a record of what decisions were taken, who participated in the vote and the opportunity for people to insert into the notes a reason for why they may have voted the way they did.

And a relatively flexible but, nevertheless, important rule about these meetings must be – the records must be available on a timely manner.

Under Section 11, we're looking at decision of the ALAC. We are revisiting a statement that has been in the ALAC rules since Day 1 but has not been used rigorously and that is try to make decisions by consensus instead of formal voting.

The formal – the vote – the process is not very different in that in many cases you simply call for those who are abstaining or those who are voting no and the rest are voting yes.

But we've assigned numbers to consensus right now and we're essentially saying that there's something to be deemed a consensus decision. At least 80% of those participating in the decision have to agree.

So consensus is not just something which is less formal than voting but, more important, it indicates a stronger belief of the ALAC than voting does because voting in most cases requires a 50% of the ALAC whereas consensus is a much stronger decision and that's emphasized to some extent.

A new innovation that we have now, which we've never done before, is for the situation where we have formal votes. Unless we are in an exceptional situation where the decision must be acted on immediately – and we do have occasional things like that when a statement must be submitted and we have a tight deadline or something like that.

But if we're not in that kind of situation, then any vote will stay open for a small number of days to allow ALAC members who may not be physically present on the teleconference or present in the room to participate.

That essentially says that for any ALAC decision that is important, we can make sure that everyone has an opportunity even if they're not on the teleconference, even if they were – couldn't travel to the city where we're holding the meeting.

And I think that's a very substantive difference and hopefully will allow us to make sure that almost all votes or decisions of the ALAC have participation by virtually all ALAC members.

There are a few cases where a formal vote must be taken and they're decided – they're mentioned there.

There was a significant discussion over how to handle extensions. The current rule allows essentially subtract out extensions and then looks at how people voted and were there more yes's than no's or whatever the question was. And there was a strong consensus that we keep that process, that we still allow extensions not to count as no's.

There are exceptions and, in some cases, a vote requires an absolute majority or super majority of the sitting ALAC. But in most cases, we still have the flexibility of allowing extensions to be extensions and not effectively no.

The section that I added and a comment earlier this week or last week, I guess, is part of this. The vast majority of formal votes at the ALAC require a simply majority of those voting and a majority of those voting who didn't abstain.

However, there are situations and it was brought to mind by the process we just went through of deciding on objections for the new TLVs. And for something like that, you really don't want a vote to pass and be a

decision of the ALAC without an overwhelming majority of the ALAC or at least without a majority of the ALAC deciding on the issue.

And, therefore, I am suggesting that we add an escape hatch which says the ALAC for a specific vote may require a higher threshold than is normally necessary and that simply says that if we choose to do that in a particular case, it's because we're trying to emphasize that this is a decision which a significant number of ALAC members believe is the right way to go.

Some of you may recall a decision ALAC made a number of months ago on the – on supporting the recommendation of the Red Cross IOC Drafting Team where the decision was actually made because of the number of people who were on the call, minus the significant number who chose to abstain.

There were only about six or seven people I think who were participating in the vote and it won but it won by I think a four to three count, which said four people made a decision on behalf of ALAC. And although that can – that may be a reasonable way to go on some roads, there are others where we really do not want it to be that loose.

Next substantive change we've made is introducing the concept of proxies. Proxies like the concept of holding a vote over for several days, allows someone who knows they will not be at a meeting to cast a vote either on anything that comes up at that meeting or on specific things that are known ahead of time.

And they can cast – they can give their vote to another ALAC member with a number of provisos and they can either specify that the ALAC

member vote in a specific way or they can leave the – how the ALAC member votes to the discretion of that other point.

But again, it's an opportunity for someone who cannot be at a meeting to make sure that their region is still represented in the decision process.

One use of the proxy, which did generate a lot of discussion, is what happens if a person has a personal conflict and they feel they should not personally take part in the vote?

And ultimately the group decided that - one or two people feeling a little uncomfortable with it, but not a lot – that they could give their proxy to another person who is not conflicted and, again, making sure that every region is equally represented in decision of the ALAC. And a region shouldn't lose a vote because an individual happens to have a personal conflict.

Now, I'll point out in all of my history with ALAC, I can only remember one case where that ever happened. So it's certainly not a common situation.

How are we doing on time? The hour is just about up and we're not quite finished yet, so I'll try to go a little bit further.

Section 12 is amendment of the rules and it basically follows the previous one that is saying the super majority is needed, two-thirds of the ALAC.

ALAC work methods, we're talking about email, Wiki use, any other technology that may come up, although we mention some, there are provisions there that the ALAC can decide to use some new one.

But we were very careful that we're not mandating specific technologies which may not work in certain parts of the world and we know we have to be very careful about that.

The code of conduct is a paired down version of what was in the original document. That is, we took out some of the various specific and directed statements but left in the overall tone.

13.5 is a section of language and it essentially puts in to the rules what we are doing right now and codes what came out of the ALAC review in terms of language requirements for the ALAC and for other appointees.

Section – oh, I see there's a – Section 14 has an error in it. There is a hyperlink that is incorrect. That has to be fixed. Amazing no one noticed it before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I didn't notice it. None of the reviewers noticed it. That's a curious one in that we realized late in the process the bylaws say that the process for approving (ALS)s and decertifying (ALS)s is within our rules of procedure and it never has been. It's always been another document that was not linked to the rules. This links it to the rules. But we're just satisfying the mandate.

Section D is on selections, elections and appointments. It tries to put in place a set of rules which, number one, satisfy the bylaws. So, for

instance, the Chair election has to be an election, it is more flexible on the other appointees and on the other positions including the ALAC Leadership Team.

And, in general, in the past bunch of years, we've tended to have acclimation and not elections. But it doesn't code what has to be done if there is any contention for these things.

And we have never had rules which explain how we make sure that the other four members of the ALAC Leadership Team do not come from the same region as the Chair because that is a regionally balance group and these sets of rules, in fact, do cover that.

I don't think there's anything particularly controversial in selection of appointments. We do have provisions now that say the ALAC, if someone is in a position and they are still available and the ALAC is happy with them, the ALAC does not have to go out to a formal call and that is effectively how we've done things for a number of the positions before and the (SSAC) position is specifically one of those that we have done that.

And again, this puts into the rules the ability to do that should the ALAC choose.

The procedures for making this selection for Seat 15 are to a large extent unchanged from the previous set of rules with a couple of exceptions.

The largest single exception is there was an inconsistent set of rules about electors and who could be an elector and the electors in this set of rules are the 15 ALAC members and the five Chairs of the (Ralos).

But there were situations where if the – if one of those electors was a candidate, they may or may not be able to vote for themselves or they may or may not be able to be replaced by the (Ralo) and we now have a consistent set of rules which says in all cases a candidate cannot vote for themselves but their region will still be fully represented.

And the last change in there I think is one that says that (Ralo) Chairs may be directed by their (Ralo) how to vote and we put into the rules something which we had in the process last time but it didn't make it into the rules of procedure but it was something that was well understood.

And that is the decision to direct a Chair vote must be made by a formal decision of the (Ralo) and the direct how they are to be voted should be made by a formal decision.

In other words, it can't be made by two people in a back room and claimed to be a (Ralo) decision.

I don't think there is anything else and we have several sections on if we, for some reason, believe that some position that we have put someone in should be undone, that is remove an ALAC appointment, remove an ALAC member or remove a member of the ALAC Leadership Team.

There are processes to be followed. They are all very onerous. They require a significant majority of the ALAC to do in most cases, not likely to ever be done but it was felt that there should be rules in place.

And that's the end of it. Cheryl, do you want to highlight any of the things that came up during the chat that I – that you want me to address?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl (inaudible). I would like to do that. But before that, if I could just get you to introduce to the ALAC the proposal made in (Point) 11.2.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry. I didn't hear any discussion on that, my error.

ALAN GREENBERG: When I was talking about 11.2, that section, I made –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't recall that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I didn't read the text, sorry. But I did discuss it. That was when I discussed situations like the (GTLD) objection process where we want to make sure that we have a larger vote. And the actual word – yes, the actual wording I proposed is ALAC may decide that for a specific vote additional threshold be required for a vote to be successful.

                        But in no cases shall the threshold be lower than the normal threshold specified in Paragraph 11.2.1.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's important that (Chair gets the record) for everyone to note that that will be, assuming you all agree, a new (inserted text) into what we've got in front of you. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's been a couple of things discussed in the chat. I think they mostly have been dealt with. The one currently going on is the AA in AGM in (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG:	There was a feel, a belief in the work group that talked about meetings and administration that we needed a name for the ALAC meeting that is held during an AGM, that is the ALAC meeting that is held in conjunction with the turnover in appointments.
	And the term (AGM) is an essentially defined term in the bylaws, so we couldn't use that and we played with a number of different variations of the ALAC AGM, which is what we ended up with, the Annual AALAC General Meeting, AAGM, and this is what we ended up with.
	What is the substance of the concern? Anyone? Is anyone still here? (Evan), your hand is up. Would you like to speak?
(EVAN LUVAVICH):	Yes, thanks, because – this is (Evan) for the record and I was the person who first raised it in the chat.
	I think it's just a little confusing to a person that was going through it. There I was reading Section 16 and looking at this reference to the AAGM, went back up to the definitions in Section 2, didn't find anything and then had to go and dig deep into (inaudible) defined in 2.2. So I'm going to suggest perhaps – it's not in the defined – oh, it is? Never mind, sorry.
ALAN GREENBERG:	(inaudible) where I think it's defined.
(EVAN LUVAVICH):	Sorry, I missed it. This cold is worse than I thought. Never mind.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Anything else? Cheryl, anything else to summarize? It's a huge chat that I don't think I can scroll through easily. Can I get dialed back? Cheryl is not on. Is there anyone else who was watching the chat

and thinks there's anything of merit that should be talked about? Olivier? Anybody?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. It's Olivier for the transcript. I've looked at the chat. No, there wasn't anything to do directly with the text on there. So there was a note with regards to (Roberts) Rules of Procedure but I guess we do have to have some fall back into a book that will be able to answer all the questions that we have.

Ultimately, having had (Robert) in many languages these days, I think that's a good fall back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, my personal feeling is we could remove that line and no one would ever notice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: (inaudible) as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: (Sandra) asked who is (Robert)? (Robert) was an ex-colonel or something in the US Army who decided to run for his local town council, if I remember correctly, and was amazed to find out that nobody knew the rules under which the council meeting was to be run. So he wrote some rules and they have taken on a life of their own over the last 150 years or so.

It's a set of rules that are used widely in English-speaking countries and through translation in a large number of other countries as well and it was the only ones that we could find that had such universal – not universal usage but wide usage and, in fact, there were even some variations available in other languages.

But as I – from my personal point of view, we could have not included that and I don't think we would have missed it. We did include it because the previous rules referred to the United Nations General Assembly rules as our fall back set of rules and those applied even less.

Anything else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Alan, just letting you know I am finally back on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good, thank you. We just talked about (Robert)'s rules. (Sandra) asked who was (Robert).

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, no, I listened on the (AC room) thankfully but it was very annoying. It seems to be exactly every 60 minutes after I've been dialed out to it hangs up, which is an interesting concept of managing calls in Australia.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier or Cheryl, are there other items in the chat that we should be highlighting, or anyone else? (Evan), your hand is still up or –

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Hello, this is (Evan).

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Yes, that's a new one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Now, earlier on – can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you, (Evan).

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Anyway, there was mentioned – there was mention made earlier on that the preference for decision making is by consensus. I don't know if this is new or not. I don't recall it being in the previous version but I want to thank you for putting it in there.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was in the pervious.

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   - and it – because that (inaudible) has been very effective in avoiding – in trying to avoid confrontational votes when possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, (Evan), it was in the previous version. It was not defined what it meant and it was – it is being studiously avoided perhaps because it wasn't defined. But it was always there. We just didn't know what it meant. Hopefully now we'll know what it means.

(EVAN LUVAVICH):   Thank you for doing this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can't claim that was mine but you're welcome. Anyone else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. Alan, I'm pretty happy with what's happened in chat. I think it was probably – we just need to make sure we go through, we capture that, which I know staff can capture it for us and, in particular, (Evan)'s points such as the noisiness, the (inaudible) double check on.

I just wondered if (Tijani) has been dialed back to, whether we – I would very much like to tidy up and complete any other points that he might wish to raise. So if (Tijani) has been dialed back to, I wondered if he had any specific text points he wanted to raise beyond those that he did earlier on in the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I noticed (Wolf) had something about Point 18 but I don't know what the substance is, so perhaps we can also have him –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I will (inaudible) and there is nothing wrong with a little (inaudible) from time to time. But we probably won't be saluting things (inaudible). Thank you for that observation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Go ahead, (Tijani).

(TIJANI): Yes, Cheryl and Alan. I have a lot of points to raise but I will send email because I am mistaken. I didn't discuss those points before because I have special conditions, personal conditions. I have a lot of problems this time. That's why I am really late in everything.

So I would send an email. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (Tijani), if I may. (Tijani), if I may, I would actually like to offer you the time to raise the most important or as many of those points as you can now because this is the one opportunity you have to whole (list) of ALAC to make opinion and react to those points. It would be a valuable use of your time and ours if we did that now.

(TIJANI): Yes, if you want, we can go to the five-point text and this paragraph you said when the Chair wants to (inaudible) to someone as to Chair a meeting, the delegated Chair has all the rights of the – for managing the meeting except those that are specifically designed for the Chair.

And this is not good formulation because for managing a meeting there is nothing which he is specifically designed for the person of the Chair. So I don't – it is a confusion without any results. I have checked all the

responsibilities of the Chair and I didn't find one which is (typical) to the Chair as a person for managing a meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point you to one that I'm aware of. There may be others. The one that I'm aware of is – and let me take a moment to find it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While Alan is finding that – this is Cheryl, (Tijani) – for example, the matters that would be to do with a discipline, et cetera, those points where we specifically task the Chair with having an intervention with a (inaudible). That's the sort of thing that would not be transferred over to a lower-case Chair of a meeting. They would be (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, the specific one, (Tijani), that was added for our rule. There may be other ones also. I don't remember offhand is 11.2.3.4 and that is a situation where if a vote is taken and it is a tie, one of the actions that the Chair can take, but only the ALAC Chair, is to cast an additional vote to break the tie. That was given to the ALAC Chair because the ALAC Chair was elected by the ALAC for that role and it was believed by the working group that came up with this that someone who is sitting in for the Chari on an interim basis, which could be any ALAC member, should not be given the ability to break a tie by casting a second vote themselves. That was an example.

(TIJANI):   So in this case, I suggest to add only at the end of the paragraph because the meaning is a little bit confusing. So if you add only it would be more clear that that is a restriction for some things or the ALAC Chair only.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which section was that?

(TIJANI):   5.6.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will take a look at that and see if I can fix the wording.

(TIJANI):   In Paragraph 5.12.4, there is – yes, you spoke about the action that relates the code of conduct. And I have seen the code of conduct. It is a paragraph in this rule of procedures. So perhaps we have to mention the number of the rule, the reference number. But (inaudible). Pardon?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're right. There should have been a paragraph pointer there.

(TIJANI):   Yes, because when you speak about a code of conduct, everyone will think about a document, another document and –

ALAN GREENBERG: (Tijani)? You'll notice in 5.12.1 it does have the paragraph number. It just got omitted from this one.

(TIJANI):   That's good. Yes, 5.13, I don't think that this paragraph should be there and yet it is repeated in 9.8. So I (inaudible) in 9.8 and not repeat it. We can mention, we can make a mention of paragraph 9.8 but not repeat the same paragraph in both places.

ALAN GREENBERG: (Tijani), let me explain to you and to all how that came about. Originally, 9.8 had the full description of the ombudsman and because this section, 5.12, we're talking about actions of the Chair, which someone might complain about, they wanted a pointer to 9.8.

We had that. When we had the legal review, the – we were advised that we should not use anything to describe the ombudsman other than the formal bylaw definition of what the ombudsman does. And, therefore, we ended up with two versions of it.

I have no problem taking out one of them.

((CROSSTALK))

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Alan. I also have no problem leaving them both in because they actually serve slightly different purpose.

ALAN GREENBERG: May we have this discussion on email or in the Wiki, so either way – you want it out, Cheryl wants it in. I don't really care what's decide but let's not waste time on this call about it. If you have suggested wording for this one where you think you can point to another one, then, please, again, propose it.

(TIJANI):   Yes. Next point is 5.14. In this paragraph we speak about in case the Chair is not able to carry out the duty obligation of the office, including delegating responsibilities to another member.

    Another ALAC member will be deemed to be the Chair. Who is defined as another member?

ALAN GREENBERG: The process below defines it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (Tijani), Cheryl here. That is what the rest of the rule through 14.1 to 14.4 describes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Its deemed because it's not an election. Remember, the Chair has to be elected. So here we have a situation where we can't elect it, so the word deemed covers that.

(TIJANI):   But I have a big concern about 5.14.4 because you say that there is no agreement in the other cases, the last case, if there is and (inaudible) case is members of the ALAC can be the Chair and there is not agreement.

If there is several candidates, there will be an (inaudible) election and I don't agree with that because we may have a member of ALAC who would never – we never would – were not aware of things and with candidate to be Chair.

And if it is under selection, it can be selected.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (Tijani), Cheryl here. (inaudible) has bee put forward. They would have to have been nominated. Another ALAC member would have had to either nominated them to the position or support their nomination to the position, which does make your scenario extremely unlikely.

14.4, 5.14.4, goes to when more than one person, in other words, we do not have – find mutual agreement – is standing for this deemed role. And in which case, we simply randomly select out of those that are duly nominated or put forward, I should say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, in fact, there is no nomination process. If we want, I can put it in, yes. If you believe there needs to be a nomination process for that, then I would suggest that any ALAC member to be eligible has to have some support and I'll try to come up with some words for that exact (inaudible).

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Alan, If you use terms like propose as opposed to nominate, that would be better. Thank. (Tijani), your next point.

(TIJANI):   I will stop here and perhaps I will read more. I didn't have time to read everything but those are only the first things I kept from the text and there will be more (inaudible) an email very soon.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Please, and perhaps we can have a one-on-one Skype chat or several of us to try to resolve them because we really need to get this approved and the timing is tight on this point.
(TIJANI):	I understand. I apologize.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	(Tijani), thank you for that and might I suggest to the ALAC that unless Alan and (Tijani) agree that such text issues raised by (Tijani) need to be emailed to the working group and hopefully also to (inaudible), but if he doesn't have time to do, staff could be sure that it gets copied to the group.

But unless they deem it substantial, like simply short of (inaudible), and either agree or otherwise to maek the change, this is far, far, too late in the game for what is really decorative discussions to go on.

If they are substantive discussions, if they are significant omissions or errors, then yes, by all means, Alan needs to catch them and needs to make the change in the text.

But I would caution you all, ALAC, not to try and make the perfect here. You have what is an exceptionally good document, Yes, there may be some minor imperfections. You well and should be able to review and polish those out in a simpler process in the not-too-distant future.

Do not, please – I implore you – hold up for any length of time over more than 36 to 48 hours your moving on to the next step and moving back to (inaudible) next step that only the Olivier on the agenda will be looking in a moment.

Just before we do go to that part of the agenda, I think it is appropriate to ask if there are any other questions or comments coming from, first of all ALAC members, and filing ALAC members or any member of the community on this call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, before we do that. Yes, before we do that, a couple of quick comments. I have asked that a small amount of time be allocated in the next ALAC meeting, should there be any last-minute things that we need discussion.

But clearly our ALAC meetings are already overloaded and we don't want to do anything substantive in that case.

And I'll reiterate something you said but I'll say it in different words. These rules of procedure are pretty clean. There are, no doubt, things we have forgotten or gotten wrong.

And hopefully they're clean enough, unlike the last steps, that if the ALAC a month later decides we really need to change a few things to clean it up, it's not going to be something we have to put off for five years like we did this time.

Changes to these, like changes to the ICANN bylaws can be made on a regular basis when we have some need, even if it's a small need.

So with that in mind, yes, anyone else with any comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. Cheryl here for the record and, yes, I think it is important that this major overhaul has set the ALAC up for more easily reviewed and certainly addressable rules of procedure.

Opening first of all to any ALAC member and then to any member of the community who wishes to ask a question at this point. I don't see hands.

ALAN GREENBERG: While we're waiting for hands, I'll point out that although (Tijani) is very late with these comments, (Tijani) has been one of our more diligent workers working on all four review teams, I believe, and has done an awful lot of commenting until recently he's been side tracked. So (Tijani), I thank you for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is in no way a criticism of the contribution made of anyone. It is simply a drawing up while in (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: No hands up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do we have any hands in the room because I'm unable to see them? If you're able to raise your hand (inaudible), please make yourself known. I'm hearing nothing and seeing nothing, in which case I will move to the next section of the agenda, which is over to you, Olivier, with our next steps.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's Olivier for the transcript and the call. We've now reached the next steps phase, which technically is going to be, as Cheryl mentioned earlier, a short period for more comments in writing as soon as possible to Alan, to Cheryl, basically thinking about rewriting the whole thing from scratch.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, to the Wiki. Everyone should see them. No private conversations if we can avoid them.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Alan. And if somebody could actually put the Wiki location on the chat so that all of the people who are here don't need to scramble for it, that would be really helpful.
	And so with all those in the Wiki, Alan, how many days did we say? 48 hours? Three days?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Our meeting where we want – the ALAC meeting is next Tuesday and we want to start the vote immediately after that. So within the next day or two, not much more.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Alan, so within the next couple of days.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	This is Cheryl, 24 to 48, no longer.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Cheryl, so that we have – Alan will have plenty of time to do the edits and to present this over to the ALAC meeting next week.
ALAN GREENBERG:	To do the edits and if there's disagreements, to resolve the disagreements.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Well, that's up to you at that point. I believe that – so the ALAC meeting will take place next week. What I suggest then after that is to launch an ALAC vote to rectify these rules of procedures immediately after the ALAC meeting next week, which will, therefore, not require everyone to be on the call.
	And on top of that, it will make sure that everyone has had a look at them, the rules of procedures, rather than having a vote done (inaudible) as we know votes on ALAC (code) are usually very time consuming.

	And if you turn over to the agenda of that (inaudible), you notice it will be a very full agenda as usual. So that's the next step. Are there any questions or comments?
(TIJANI):	Alan, the link you put is the link for the meeting of today.
ALAN GREEENBERG:	And that is where we ask for comments.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, (Tijani). Cheryl here. That is the place to put the comments. That is the correct place. All context on the text go to that page and no other.

Olivier, if I may steal the meeting back from you. Are you completed with your next steps now? |
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	(inaudible). I just want to (inaudible).
ALAN GREENBERG:	Olivier, I have not a clue what you just said.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yes, unfortunately, (inaudible) Steven Hawking, so perhaps you could repeat that. This is Cheryl.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	This is terrible. Can you hear me?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes, now we can, yes.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	So as I was saying, I would like staff to send a copy of that link over to the ALAC list so that everyone is aware that comments should only go on the Wiki on that page because the last thing we want is for comments to go in other places and to be lost or forgotten and for people to turn up at the call next week to say, oh, I put my comments but I didn't put it on that page.

So let's make sure everyone on ALAC is aware. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, as a means of explanation, we had said the comments should be made before today, so today's agenda page was the right place to put them.

Since we are extending, however, we don't want to move to a second page and have two different places. That's why we're keeping today's agenda page.

((CROSSTALK))

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Thank you very much. I am aware that we only have three minutes of our time and I've used as much time as we could and should take of our interpreters for this call.

I would like to specifically thank (Veronica), (David), (Claire) and (Camillo) for their work on today's call. Note that the recordings of this call will be available in short order as will some transcripts as soon as possible and should allow all of the ALAC and, indeed, the community to avail themselves of information in the languages of English, Espanol and French.

To that end, I would suggest, Olivier, that if you would allow me to close this meeting, I would with great pleasure thank each and every one of you both on this call and to those who have contributed what can only be described as a heroic and utterly highly successful effort in a major outpour of the At Large Advisor Group Committee rules of procedure.

Thank you one and all. Thank you, staff, and I (believe) this call has ended. Bye for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all.

[End of Transcript]