
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the At-Large Technology Taskforce call on the 15th of September 2013. On the call today we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Gordon Chillcott. And we have received apologies from Glenn McKnight and Sivasubramanian Muthasamy.

From Staff we have Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much Nathalie. Okay, let's move immediately to a review of the Action Items. An Action Item was for Staff and myself to schedule and set up a call to test the GoMeetNow conferencing tool. This was done so you can cross this off. Working Group to document and research information about tracking conference calls with Google Calendar, Outlook Calendar and so forth and notification systems.

This was also done and is on the Agenda so you can cross that out. Ongoing Action Items – reminder be sent by myself regarding TTF Members to look at content for the ideas of improving the organization of At-Large content. I will say that's partially done. A lot of the stuff is up on the Wiki and that's going to be on later on this call.

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.

Action Item – myself to draft the social strategy document; to update several concepts. This has been done so I’m going to cross that out also. Action Item partially implemented – to create a central repository of videos, pictures captured by At-Large Members. I have an update of this, which is also on the Agenda. Action Item – TTF to evaluate and review tools regarding accessibility. Glenn McKnight on the last call said he would take charge on this. I haven’t heard from him with anything new on this so we’ll leave that as ongoing.

Action Item – Lance Hinds to create a template for structuring information in the technology workspace and to update the one page of material. That’s still ongoing and Lance has sent his apologies for not being on the call today. Action Item – myself to upload the content from the slides, to separate the Wikipedia pages for you all to view on comment. This has been done so you can cross that out.

BILL THANIS: Hello? It’s Bill. How are you?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi Bill. I didn’t see you on the Lucid Room there but it’s good to hear you’re on the call.

BILL THANIS: I haven’t actually gotten in yet, until 11:03 I was debugging my network at home, trying to figure out why I couldn’t get onto the Internet.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, at least you've got the phone bridge sorted out Bill. All right, thanks. We're just going through the Action Items here. Finally, the last two Action Items – TTF Members to look at content of the ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content. Well, I'll leave that in. And finally – Chair to copy the TTF Members comments regarding the previous Action Item on the Wiki. That has also been done so I'll cross that one out.

So quite a few removal of Action Items. Let's see. Anybody with thoughts or comments? In that case let's jump right into the Agenda. Next Item on the Agenda is documenting how At-Large can use the calendar. Well, I've spent some time updating this Item on the Wiki. I'll post the link here. It's also linked in the Agenda.

What I tried to do was to... I put the calendar URL, which is the critical URL for [users? 05:25] for subscribing to calendars. And also on the same Wiki page I am trying out a new feature. If you notice, this is part of Confluence Call Team Calendars. I was able to add the calendar to the Wiki and it's fully embedded as part of the Confluence Page.

Below that I have some text describing what the calendar is and how to subscribe to the At-Large calendar using a calendar application. I went through and did some searching and found links for Google Calendar, iCal, Microsoft Outlook, outlook.com – the web service –, Yahoo Calendar and Mozilla Lightning, which is for Mozilla Thunderbird, which is an email client.

Any initial thoughts? Gordon or Bill?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a question – there was on the ALAC call a request to have Gisella work through a calendar of worldwide Internet governance events that are taking place. I know that she faced some problems with that and I wondered whether you'd had a chance to have a look at that and see how these events could be imported into the At-Large calendar?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you Olivier. I remember that Action Item and I will undertake that, as Gisella is on leave right now. But no, I've not made any particular progress on that Item. I have noticed though that the myICANN system has apparently created all of the calendars on one, within ICANN. It has both the gNSO and the At-Large calendars all on one calendar.

This is where, if you're on myICANN, there's a tab called "Calendar" and from there there's a calendar link to subscribe to all the ICANN events. But in terms of adding... Not from the ASO but from the Regional Internet Registry events; no progress set on that and I'll add that as an Action Item too. I think it's tagged in the ALAC Action Items, but I'll tag it here and the Technology Taskforce.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you wish I can send you the email exchange that I had with Gisella and then you'll be able to know the exact calendar we're facing on this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That would be appreciated. She did send me a link of something one organization was using to have all of these events, but there didn't seem to be an easy way of subscribing to that or merging the information to a Google Calendar. It was an html-type calendar view, for lack of a better word. But thanks for that. All right, any thoughts from Gordon or Bill on the actual Wiki page document?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: On the calendar issue, I think I want to try it a few times before I comment on it. It looks good but... There are a few other things I've been trying recently so I'm going to hold comment until it decides to try and bite me with something.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Let's see... Nobody else is raising their hands on this, in which case we can move onto the next Agenda Item. Hopefully persons would... Well, I'll post it to the list and get some more feedback there on the Technology Taskforce list. In that case, let's move onto the next Agenda Item, which is the view of [10:41] evaluate web conferencing solutions.

I don't think we'll be spending much time on this because we've made some modifications to the criterion, to the web conferencing solutions, so I don't think there's any more major changes to the list as such. So I think now that we've more or less finalized on the criterion we can start

filling in the information from those solutions that we've already evaluated, and for future solutions that we would evaluate.

Gordon, Bill, Olivier, if there's any other criterion now would be the time to say it. If not, we can move onto the next Agenda Item.

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

The results of the last two that I've seen have pointed out that we're running a little bit into a dichotomy between conferencing solutions and collaboration solutions. Some of these tools are very good for collaboration and not terribly good for conferencing. I think the last one was a case in point. Somewhere in the evaluation matrix, that should be pointed out because reasonably good collaboration solutions are going to be a requirement here.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Well, thanks Gordon. I would agree with you. Any ideas how you would incorporate that in the matrix – suitability for conferencing or collaboration? What type of heading would you want to put that under? Or do you want to think about it some more?

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

That requires a bit of thought. I think probably an item in there saying "this is best suited for a collaboration of conferencing tool". That's pretty wishy-washy but I think it's the type of thing that should be pointed out. Lucid for example is excellent for a meeting. I think so anyway. It's been very good. I'm not sure how good it would be for a

collaboration tool, whereas the one we did in our last task was not bad as a collaboration tool but I wouldn't use it for a conference.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think I do understand it. I have to admit I'm not sure exactly what you'd group that type of thinking to put into a matrix like that. Suitability, might be a term?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wonder whether we could have a graduated response on this? In other words, if you go from one to nine, where one is suitability for conferencing and nine is suitability for collaboration? Would one then be able to provide a number where if it's five then it's equally suitable for collaboration and conferencing, and if it goes towards nine then it's further towards collaboration and if it's further towards one it's more of a conferencing?

Would that be a suitable solution? Is it either one or the other? I guess if it's neither suitable for conferencing nor collaboration then it's not a tool we want to have!

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: [laughs] Thanks Olivier. That's an interesting idea; having scale of one to five or one to ten.

BILL THANIS: Can I make one point there? If you do such a scale you may end up finding that most of them will just be clustered around the five mark, because many of them have enough features for both that most of them will be in the neighborhood of four, five or six, which I think really comes down to if we're going to do that we may as well just have three systems: conferencing, collaboration or both.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Bill has a very fair point actually. Yes, whichever. It was just a point.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That's one way to do it; having two more rows saying "suitability for collaboration" or "suitability towards conferencing", and then maybe in those sections you could then elaborate on why this solution was better for collaboration but poor in conferencing – so you have two more rows. A suitability for conferencing and suitability for collaboration. That's two extra rows. And then rank it accordingly there. Any thoughts on that?

Two rows added to the matrix – suitability for conferencing and suitability for collaboration.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Works for me Olivier.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right, I'll add those two rows. All right, anything else? If not we can move along to the next Agenda Item, which is a review of the GoMeetNow. The link is in the Agenda. To summarize what we discovered with GoMeetNow, it was a very short meeting because in a sense there wasn't really that many conferencing features. Windows users had to download a program to install. Linux was not supported and I believe it was Gordon who had to use his tablet, which supported Flash, and he was able to be in the meeting.

And the way GoMeetNow works is on starting the meeting the presenters will share their desktop with all the participants. This means that there's no easy way of setting the Agenda or managing the Agenda, unless the presenter puts the PDF up or a browser tab of the Agenda on their desktop. So ultimately the presenter had to prepare his or her desktop accordingly before the call, very carefully, to show your content on the desktop and to show the GoMeetNow chat client.

The chat client did allow for persons to chat publicly and privately, and you could raise hands. The session itself can be recorded so if you're doing a demonstration of some sort you can record the session. File transfer worked as well. It also had web cam support, which Glenn was using. But there was no real room as such, compared with Adobe Connect or Lucid. So I hope I put all those points in the GoMeetNow page. Anybody with additional thoughts?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I agree with just about everything you've said so far. Going back over my own notes I think we pretty much converge.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. The next Agenda Item was the next steps for the next conferencing solutions for review. Well, so far we've done Blue Jeans, Ready Talk, GoMeetNow... I suppose the next one we should try is MeetingBurner.com. Just speaking from that whole matrix from the comparison of web conferencing solutions. In which case I think we'll try for MeetingBurner next week. The Action Item is I'll work with Staff to set up the meeting for evaluate MeetingBurner next Monday.

Any thoughts on that?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I'm good for the 23rd I think. I'm not sure if you want to change the time but I'm good for this time on the 23rd.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure. All right.

BILL THANIS: I can't say yes or no yet because I may be deep in other conference that day and I'm not going to find out about it until Wednesday.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. For now we'll try to do...

BILL THANIS: My suggestion is that no one else has a problem so schedule it and if I can't make it I can't make it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, so MeetingBurner it is. Great. We'll move onto the next Agenda Item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately I won't be able to make it because I'll be on a flight at that time, which makes it even more difficult.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Well, in which case we'll just do the best we can. Okay, we'll let's move ahead now to the next Agenda Item. We are progressing quickly. Okay, at the At-Large social media strategy, one of the key things was this related Action Item related to this regarding Technology Taskforce and Staff creating a central repository of videos and pictures captured by At-Large Members, that could be used by if possible [curation? 22:53] Working Group for resharing or reusing by At-Large and the suggestions of content.

Glenn in particular has a lot of video content and picture content and this where the discussion came about to create a central repository. I have to say that I've tried to use Drop Box for this and there are probably two downsides. One, you'll probably require accounts for at

least multiple persons, so if you wanted to do this for five RALOs and Staff you'd have to get accounts for each of those RALOs and the Staff, so six accounts.

And I tried to circumvent that by trying to implement something like a public Drop Box where you can go to a web-based link and persons can then upload the content and then all of us will be using one Drop Box account. Unfortunately, when testing with Glenn, there's some sort of limitation that the API limits the type of files that can be publicly uploaded; I think it was something like 15MB or something like that, which is clearly inadequate for video and long audio recordings.

So that doesn't seem to work. I have been looking at box.com and I have to say that it has many of the features of Drop Box and for the business solutions you can create file sizes up to 5GB in size. I'll post the link there in the chat. This is the business plan and it costs US \$15 a month, rather than say \$900 for the Drop Box Team accounts. And also there's another benefit of going with box.com, which is that ICANN already uses box.com for distributing documents and so forth, so it should not be a significant hurdle for ICANN's IT Staff to support.

So one of the recommendations would be to work with Staff to implement the box.com to implement the central repository and from there we can try synching some content and so forth and build up the central repository of video and pictures captured by At-Large. Okay. Any thoughts or questions on that? I should also mention that box.net also allows public uploading as well, so you can give persons a link and

from that link they can upload content, even if they're not a box.com user.

Any thoughts, comments or questions on that?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: You just answered by question. You say it's in use by ICANN already?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, it is. In fact, we need some time to download links... [27:14] box.com link to [download? 27:16] the actual file. So it is being used by ICANN internally for their public-facing stuff. Okay. All right. [27:40] social media post – what I also tried to do was... I'm trying to remember where I put the link... Oh dear. Okay, yes, what I also did was update the social media strategy workspace.

If you recall, one of the objectives that was embedded in updating the strategy was you have to update the template to simplify and enhance the presentation of announcements posted on the ALAC announce mailing list. So if you had gone to the social media strategy workspace you would then see a link for the templates, and I'll post that link there in the chat.

And I basically catalogued six possible templates that we have to work on: the ALAC meeting announcements, the ALAC vote announcements on proposed ALAC statements, the ALAC vote announcements for ALAC voting delegates to the NomCom – I decided to separate that out because typically when there's an announcement for when the ALAC

votes on the voting delegates to the NomCom it's not a [first-class? 29:10] to post type thing, it's a voting preference that is used where all the candidates are ranked and the one that has the most of the first candidate's choice is selected.

I'm probably not explaining it correctly because I probably can't remember all of the details regarding how the voting selection is done. But it just shows that... And often I've noted that whenever the result is announced for the NomCom one, there's always a lot of confusion about it because it's not presented in a clear manner. So that's probably one of the [29:58] we have to work on as well.

Also, ALAC thoughts on ALAC statements or motions and a call for comments on proposed ALAC statements and ICANN [use alerts? 30:15]. So for each of those I created six child pages as well. And from that I point to examples that exist in content and then below you can then have a template where we can try and work up a better template for all of these types of announcements that go out on ALAC Announce.

Any thoughts or observations? Okay. Well, now that I've broken out all of the social media strategy, the links to the various templates, we can now try and take one of the interesting ALAC announcements and see how this can be better structured or better presented. I already have some ideas for how the meeting announcement can be done and so forth. So hopefully we can all work on those templates.

Let's see... Anything else? Okay, so those are the two key things – using box.com for the central repository for video and pictures and the links

for the Wiki pages for the various templates have been uploaded for the different types of announcements that go out on ALAC Announce.

Let's move ahead now to the next Agenda Item – #6, which is ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content. I've also updated the Wiki page for this, so when you all go to this you'll see I've put in a table how At-Large content is generated, organized and distributed and breaking down things like Wiki, email lists, teleconferences, calendars, online voting and so forth, a description and the platform used, and/or the tools that are used.

For example, if you noticed there for example for face-to-face meetings is one point where At-Large content is generated, organized and distributed and that in turn uses the ICANN website via teleconferences and the Wiki. So that's the first part of the page. Then I put down the content created by At-Large Working Group.

So if you go to that link – and I'll post that link in the chat – I then broke that down into two sections; the tools used to organize content created by At-Large Working Group and the issues noted regarding content of At-Large Working Groups. So in the tools section, I wrote down all of the different tools used to organize content created by Working Groups; so there's the Wiki, the calendar, the event time announcer, the email list, the teleconferences and the telephone bridge.

And a lot of this documentation is taken up by the Wiki and under the Wiki section I then break down, okay, the information about the Working Group on the Wiki includes things like the description of the Working Group Members, meetings and events and then each meeting

page under that meeting and event page contains a lot of other information; name of meeting, date of meeting, time of meeting, meeting number, action items... The list goes on.

So this is the idea of what we're doing – we try to document what content is created by various At-Large, what tools are being used to organize it and how we can improve the organization of those tools using the same tool or if there is a need for another tool, if we think it's needed.

A lot of information there, I don't want to recite the whole thing. And what has to happen is, all our documents are for the Working Group. What we then have to do is document it for the RALOs and then document it for ALAC, because the ALAC would have its policy development page and so forth. Any thoughts, observations, comments?

Well, it is a lot of information to review, so I'll repost this to the Technology Taskforce mailing list for persons to comment on and update the Wiki. All right. Great. So let's move ahead to any other business. One of the Items I added here was the evaluation of the machine translation website tool.

It was noted that the ccNSO's – just to remind you what this was – website that they use the Microsoft translator tool on the page where there's a dropdown and they can pick another language other than English and then the page translates into that language using machine translation. The question was which tool we should use on the At-Large

website? And of course there are two popular tools; the Microsoft one, that is on the ccNSO, and there's the Google Translate web plug-in.

So one of the questions was which one would be more appropriate to use. Judging from how both tools work I suspect this is not really a technology issue but more of the quality of how the machine translation works. I don't know if anybody has any observations about that, but what I'll try to do is probably contact a few persons in At-Large and ask them to evaluate the translations using one tool and another tool, and then see how well the content translates.

I would make an observation though from my experiences in LACRALO – although I use Google Translate a lot, I do find however when it comes to translates longer passages of text, the Microsoft tool seems to produce better translations when I translate from Spanish to English. I do not have a bigger plus for Microsoft's tool as it relates to Spanish. Does anybody have any observations in terms of the Microsoft tool versus Google's?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. I have tried the Microsoft tool to translate things to French and I've found that the Google tool works better at capturing the nuances of English and putting it into French. It's surprising that Microsoft's tool works better with Spanish but with French the Google tool was doing better.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks for that. Okay. Obviously it's not a simple choice then because... Well, I think we probably need to ask a few more persons. I'll probably ask someone else in LACRALO to look at the content and tell me what they consider when they translate from English to Spanish and how it works for them. And I'll try and identify someone who speaks French. Gordon?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: One of the questions this brings up is what languages are the target ones for this? For what languages are we going to evaluate these tools?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The key primary languages would be French and Spanish, and then I would say the six UN languages recognized by ICANN, and the six UN languages are English, French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Chinese. The machine translation tools offer a crude translation into other languages that are not formally supported by ICANN. But if I had to give them a priority I would say Spanish and French, as they're the most common languages used by At-Large.

I'm talking not so much in terms of actual numbers but in terms of the number of At-Large structures and their primary languages. Okay? Well, I'll keep this on the Agenda under "any other business" then, as I get more feedback on the tools involved. For Olivier the Google Translate tool works better but for me the Microsoft tool worked better for Spanish, so we'll just have to keep evaluating.

Okay, well, I think we can end this call, unless there's any other business that anybody wishes to raise? Anyone? Actually there is one other thing. I would ask something I forgot to mention and I'll go back to the previous Agenda Item, which was ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content.

One of the things that I realize is that it's very hard for us to try and use the Confluence Wiki to attempt to try and come up with templates of different ways of organizing things. Right now ICANN's Wiki runs Confluence and it's running to 3.4.1, but the latest version of Confluence is version 5.1.3. Okay? Actually, a correction: the At-Large Wiki is on 4.3.1. I misquoted the digits there, whereas the latest version of Confluence is 5.1.3.

There is a plan by ICANN's IT Staff to upgrade to the latest version, but I'm thinking more and more that we need our own separate Wiki installation so we can try out new things. And there's a benefit to that. By installing the latest version in a separate Wiki installation we can try and "break" things, so to speak, without worrying that we're going to affect the large existing content of the Wiki content, as well as the Wiki content that's used by other organizations in ICANN; ccNSO, gNSO especially, and so forth.

So one of the recommendations I'll be sending to Staff would be for a separate Wiki installation of Confluence. This will allow us to beta test news ideas. And by also having the separate Wiki installation, especially with admin access, we can try out and install new plug-ins, for example.

And there's quite a lot of plug-ins out there that I think are interesting. For example there's an email to a Wiki page plug-in, for example.

So one of the challenges in Lucid was the export of the Agenda back to the At-Large Wiki. If you had that plug-in installed it may be much simpler to export in html and then forward it in email to the Wiki page immediately, for example. So there are some ideas you can try a bit more effectively and by having our own Wiki installation of Confluence we can try it and if it doesn't work then no harm done. We can recover and delete and try again.

So are there any observations about that or any concerns about that? One of the recommendations would be to send a request to ICANN At-Large Staff to request a separate installation of the Confluence Wiki for our testing purposes.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: So you're suggesting that we put this Sandbox development, based on the latest available version of Confluence?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, that's correct.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Okay, one caution – actually, two. One is that a we do this, I don't know how often Confluence updates its versions, but we'd need to be careful not to jump too far ahead of the rest of the pack. The other caution I'd

suggest is you kind of manage how many things you're trying at once. I'm working with some other products where it appears that those two cautions were not taken terribly seriously and insanity is beginning to become a result.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, Gordon, thanks for that.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I was being nice about that, by the way.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Regarding the first point, yes, I understand that we may not want to jump too far ahead, but at the same time... You see, for example, there's been quite a few changes from Confluence v.4 and Confluence v.5. There are some features that I'm reading on Confluence v.5 that could really affect how document management is done under Confluence, and that's a challenge that we're facing in the ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content.

So if we had the latest version, v.5, which in terms of features sense, to try out the new features, then we could try these things out and see how they work. And I see Staff are going upgrade us to Confluence v.5 at some point, so it might be that if the features in v.5 are worthwhile, we can then find out – and the bigger plus is my view is that we can try different teams, for example.

Right now we can't really apply a team without changing the entire look of the At-Large website and I don't really want to do something like that because it could break the whole existing content on the At-Large Wiki. So that's my main reason for Sandboxing it. I take your point though.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: One further question: can we keep a close enough connection with ICANN IT so we can get some idea of what their update roadmap is going forward?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: From the communication I've gotten, I don't think they have a rigid time to do the changeover. Right now ICANN's IT Staff have created a separate installation of the Wiki and they're undergoing testing, in terms of migrating the content and so forth and seeing how well it runs before doing any switchovers. So I could try to find out some timelines for when they manage to finish the upgrade. I could try to follow up and get some more ideas of the times for which the upgrades would take place.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: The reason why we probably want a fairly close communication channel there is there may be a sudden delay in their plan to move up to a new version, for example. It would be really interesting to find out why, because more often than not it's because they found something that [52:35] them and we would be [52:39], but it would be nice to get that information.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I understand. As I recall it, from the conversations I had with Staff, is that they were trying to install it very soon and right now it's in a holding pattern as they do this evaluation. And I think they just want to take their time because obviously as they upgrade it it's not just At-Large, it's the entire ICANN eco-system – gNSO, GAC, all of those things. So I think they want to undertake it... And of course they'll want a backup everything before they actually upgrade.

But I hear you. So thanks for that. All right. Sorry for taking on the “any other business” but I think we can about end the call now. Let's see. I'm not hearing anybody on the call. Okay. Well, I think we have about three minutes left so that's three minutes to have a cup of coffee or refreshments.

I'd like to thank everybody for being on the call and for those that are listening or reading the transcript, I hope to collaborate on the mailing list on all of these Action Items before the next Technology Taskforce call. The next call will be next week to evaluate MeetingBurner conferencing solution. The following week will be the next formal Technology Taskforce call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev, this is Heidi.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a quick question – just to confirm that I have not heard a yes from you about holding a Technology Taskforce meeting in Buenos Aires, so can I assume that that will not be held?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think that would be the case. We will do any updates during the regular ALAC At-Large meeting, which is usually done on Tuesday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so just the updates but no specific meeting for the Technology Taskforce?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That's correct.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Heidi. All right. With that I think we can now end the call. Thanks everyone. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]