CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Welcome Team, one and all. You'll note I've put in Agenda Item #0, which you will see on the Wiki page for today's meeting, and that's something you'll see hopefully in all the future meetings, because that makes it easy for you to link back to the material from the previous meeting held. So if you've missed a meeting or you want to refresh your mind or double-check on something it should be that for each of our meeting Agendas we'll have a link to all of the Wiki page material.

Hopefully that will make our lives easier, not more complicated. If everybody takes the time – and I know some of you have because some of the Sub-Teams have done homework, thank you very much. And I know Maureen's about to do homework because on this coming weekend she's got yet another meeting with the Secretariats. Part of which I note on their Agenda will have her interacting regarding our APRALO Rules review. So it looks like all of our Sub-Teams are up and operational.

You'll just have to forgive me if anyone puts their hand up for a moment, I will not see it. Nor will I see any chat because my Adobe room is reconnecting again, but I'll assume that you'll just yell out at me if someone wants to speak. As we move to the next point in our Agenda, we've already done our lack of apologies, but I will ask if Nathalie will read out all of those in attendance. Over to you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much Cheryl. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, this is the APRALO Rules of Procedure Review Working Group meeting on the 10th of October 2013 at 6:00 UTC. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ali AlMeshal, Gunela Astbrink, Karaitiana Tiauru, Maureen Hilyard, Siranush Vardanyan and Lianna Galstyan. We have no apologies. From Staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, 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 Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Nathalie. Moving along now then to our quick review of the AIs that came out of the last meeting, which was held on the 24th of September. You had them on the Agenda meeting page and also showing in the meeting pod in the Adobe Connect room. But I'll just quickly go through to assure you that of the nine pieces of action noted at our last meeting…

They ranged from Julia to send Doodle polls, which clearly has been done or we wouldn't be meeting, Gunela and Ali gathering together and starting to work as a team, which is certainly happening and they've already held a meeting and we look forward to getting a bit of an update from them shortly.

Matt was to set up to make sure Gunela and myself have done the [editing? 03:55] right. I know I do and I can only assume that Gunela does as well. I also note that Matt, here, caught up on a previous Action Item from the meeting before, which was to set up our email list. Thanks to go Matt for doing that as well. Maureen has picked up the metrics issue as is relevant to this review.

KT has not only put together an excellent framework but has harassed, to the best of his ability, people to get comments onto his Wiki page. We'll hear more from him a little later. Silvia didn't get a chance to put the audio and transcripts from the previous call onto the next meeting's Agenda because I beat her to it when I edited the template Agenda that came out to me. But that is the #0 on the Agenda that I mentioned at the beginning of the call.

So eight out of nine have been done. However, I am [? 04:59], I'm afraid. The one outstanding Action Item is to me and it says I am to get conversation going on the APRALO Members' list, and I have not done that yet. In fact I'm unsure whether I'm going to have a great deal of time to do that with the Australian IGF next week and then Bali the week following. But let's leave that one open and carry it over. Mea culpa. We can but try.

Nathalie, the bad news from me with Adobe Connect is the message now reads: "You cannot access this meeting because your meeting login has expired. Please log in to the meeting in a new window." I will go back to the calendar and I will log in that way. But would you be so kind as to give my usual 'grr' and general dissatisfaction about the current

state of Adobe Connect rooms to the IT Staff yet again? You may as well just set a template up saying, "Cheryl's not happy," because this is becoming more and more problematic.

I don't actually live in a third world or emerging economy, despite the fact that we don't have an [NBN? 06:23] and it is not an Internet connectivity issue because when I am logged in it stays green, it just drops me out. Okay, enough grumbling from me. The next thing I want to move onto is Part #3, the continuation of review of our Rules. I'm going to ask your indulgence and your advice. It happens to be the next Item, and I know that Nathalie has organized to put on the shared screen, in the center pod in the Adobe Connect room, a copy of that current Rule so that we can have a rumination over them.

But the following Item, which is the Work Team activities and updates, I wondered whether you wanted to switch the order of those and deal with those updates first? What's your view? Do you want to do the running order as is writ or do you want to do your Team updates and then jump into the Rule review? KT, I'll put you on the hot spot. What's your view?

KARAITIANA TIAURU: Yeah, I think maybe updates first might flow on a bit easier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's right. I obviously didn't have all my synapses engaged when I put them in that order so unless anyone else objects, let's switch

Items #3 and #4 around now and we'll now run with a brief update on the Sub-Teams. I don't know, Gunela, whether it's you, Ali or both who wanted to give everyone a quick update on what's been happening, but I'll let you two fight it out. Gunela, I guess you can start and invite Ali in as required.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: I just wanted to just ask first of all… Ali and I are termed as co-penholders. Is that the correct word for us?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Okay, good. All right. Well, I've tried to work out a little bit about our task, to [09:31] which is to do the scope and a possible charter. Looking at the documents that are up on the Wiki page and throwing something together very basically to try and get my head around it, that was just something very brief and it was really necessary for a Sub-Team to meet, which was Cheryl, Ali and myself with support from ICANN Staff. And we had a meeting a day and a half ago and Cheryl really was very helpful in guiding up through what a charter meant in ICANN language and the idea of the scope for this particular Working Team.

So from that it has certainly given me – and I'm looking forward to hearing from Ali too – an idea on where we are heading on this so that

we as co-penholders can start drafting. One of my tasks will be to look at some charters that have already been developed, and I'm looking forward to seeing some of those. I think we are going to get some help to locate them. I have looked at a charter from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and that's more like a Rules of Procedure, so again we've got some terminology issues I think.

I also should say that I'm involved with the Australian IGF and the IGF in Bali so there will be a little bit of time-lag before I'm able to do very much. Ali, would you like to add something?

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you very much. I don't have that much to add on what you have said. As you mentioned, we've just had our Sub-Group meeting a day and a half ago and I'm looking forward to how ICANN puts my input and feedback to the… As I mentioned, this will be my first [12:23] so I'm really looking forward to it and looking to [12:30] and I will be very much happy to access and see how I can do that. That's all I have to say at this stage and hopefully by our next meeting I'll have more to share with the Team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Ali and Gunela. As I say, I'm very pleased with where you two got to in your initial meeting chat. I certainly appreciate that everyone is busy right now and so there is certainly no undue pressure on anyone. If we don't have a draft charter to the regional

meeting this month we certainly can get it in the following month, and to some extent there may be an advantage to that because many of us will be face-to-face during the Buenos Aires meeting, holding that APRALO meeting. So feel no additional pressure – you all have priorities, I understand that – as we all do.

KT, I think you're the next cab off the rank. I did try very hard to copy and paste the link into the chat from both the meeting page that Ali and Gunela ran, and that I attended, and also, KT, your excellent Wiki page as well. Every time I do that the Adobe dies on me. KT, if you're not in a position to put that link in yourself I might ask Staff if they can grab both the links to those pages and just pop them in for everybody's update.

It would be particularly good because, Gunela, within 40 minutes of us closing the call off yesterday morning, I had put all of the templates for your reading pleasure on that meeting page. So you should have quite a bit to look at already, but we might as well share it with the rest of the group as well. KT, I commented! Did you get anything from anyone else? [laughs]

KARAITIANA TIAURU: There was only one other comment on Wiki today and that was from Rinalia in regards to electing an [15:15] Officer. And I guess most of us will remember there was some discussion, as early as this year or last year, regarding the [15:29]. There were some points from there. I've also copied out the ICANN bylaws which specifically talk about the ALAC appointment process so that we can… It's got the bylaws [15:49] as

well. And of course it will hopefully get everybody's comments and there's obviously a lot there to think about. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you very much for that KT. I think we should certainly not hold back on asking and encouraging the ALS Members to make some comments on this page, but I would perhaps like to take the opportunity of while we are in Bali, as many people who will be attending Internet governance forums are also people who are thought-leaders or representatives of At-Large structure, I think what we might do is make sure that whenever two or more of us are gathered together we encourage them to look at these Wiki pages.

And to that end, it might be a good idea for each of us in the Work Group to have copies of the URLs so that we can give them to people when we're talking to them. So if we gang up on them over coffee or lunch we can get them to log on there and then… I don't know how you want to do that, and it might be appropriate for it to be written up, if I have the time.

If not, I don't know, Silvia, if you're practiced at this? It strikes me that a link to those Wiki page URLs might be an ideal thing to be turned into the Q-code, printed on A4 paper and put up somewhere in the ICANN information booth, that will be running at the Internet governance forum? There are a number of free web-based services that turn a URL into a Q-code, but I'd also be very surprised if ICANN didn't have its own.

Can I ask you to explore that for us please Silvia? Because I think that would be a lot easier.

If you then send a copy of that Q-code to this Working Group as an image then we can all just have it lurking about at an appropriate SMS or email on our phones and people can follow through. I trust you think that would be a good idea, KT? Because you're not getting enough feedback just yet, and we need to do some outreach, I think.

KARAITIANA TIAURU: I think that would be wonderful. I'll also try and create some more conversation and motivation on that as well.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, so I would say the Action Item then is for one page [19:25] so that they can be distributed among the participants of the APRALO regional meeting, [19:25]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Silvia, that would be great. Beyond the actual representatives who will turn up to the meeting during Bali, I think what we'd also like is a more outwardly-facing opportunity for At-Large Membership to have a say as well. And that would be where there Q-codes would be. The idea of a Q-code is of course that you just take a photo with your smartphone and it will take you to the exact Wiki page or web-page that we're talking about.

If you like I can discuss this with you further off this meeting, but I think, as Maureen's pointing out, she gets lost finding Wiki pages. A shortcut is the best way to get… Oh, and Lianna, can I just break in saying fantastic to hear your good news in chat. Lianna has just informed us that she will be in Bali and she got her tickets yesterday. We look forward to that indeed. Okay, well, let's just roll on with that one and we'll drum up some business somehow.

Maureen, I know you've got… Ah! And Maureen's all confirmed as well. Well done. I expected you to be there however, my dear. Maureen, I'm just going to ask you if your audio connect is fine, with a very brief what happened with the Secretariats and where you think you might head? And if your audio isn't fine, feel free to type it at us. Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right, well the session that I had with the Secretariats at the last meeting was abominable because my audio was crap. So I ended up having to write what I wanted to say in their Wiki space, which probably worked out a lot better. But I think if I can get another session with them and also meet up with the Secretariat Members hopefully in Bali, as you mentioned, that would be really good; we can get some dialogue going about how we can promote what we're doing in this Group and get it out to the end users.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Maureen. I think we'll probably find that Bali will also be an opportunity for you to do some of the particular outreach as well. So if you have any Wiki page needs or space requirements to set up before Bali, let me and Staff know and we'll sort that out so that you too could have your Q-code leading to your space, for feedback from the At-Large structures and their memberships. That's all great.

Silvia's mentioned that she's very pleased to provide time in their schedule for an update to the Secretariats' meeting. That's great. Okay. Now, back to what was #4 but is now #5 on our Agenda. I am pushing this fairly quickly today because I do want to respect your valuable time and if possible spend even less than our allocated 60 minutes together. If you can just tell me – do you all have your own ability to scroll the document that's on the sharing screen? The Operating Principle 2009?

Okay, that's great. Good. Because I didn't want to zoom into the bits that I'm interested in and take you all with me and make you dizzy. Great. KT in particular, I guess this part's going to be of interest to you because when we do this quick run-through and ask for input of anything obvious, that clearly needs to be updated, you're probably going to be thinking about the new proposed structure at the same time. So we'll make sure that we get the transcript of today's meeting out as soon as is possible so that you can have exact recall on what was suggested.

Let's jump right in. KT, I meant to say to you, and also to Maureen – if you two need to coerce or cajole at anyone else to join you in your Sub-Teams just do so, and let us know who you've managed to bring on

board and we'll make sure that the Administrative notes all of that. All right. On the existing Rules, which we do admit are particularly lean, but they serve their purpose well and in fact only went through one basic set of amendments in March 2009 and they were minor amendments. They've done okay but they're probably not robust and resilient enough for a much larger grouping of At-Large structures.

They're certainly not good enough to pick up on necessary changes that we need, some of which we will talk about today, and one that comes immediately to mind is the inclusion of individuals as Members in some form or other, into each of the regional structures. Just to bring everyone up to speed on that – and it does sit nicely under what is currently Section (2), the definitions are of the APRALO Operating Principles –, at the moment we define a "Member" as "a full Member of the APRALO unless otherwise specified", but what is a Member of the APRALO is an At-Large structure.

We also have the category of "Provisional Member", which is the status we give the organizations that have applied to be At-Large structure, before they get the ALAC approval, but after endorsement has been given by the region. So both those terms are clearly going to need a bit of work and definitional work.

It might be a good idea to approach someone with legal training, and we have plenty of them, including our own Chairperson of APRALO, of course. We can do a rough draft but I think we certainly need to make sure we don't get into any legal quagmires.

In the absence of any Working Group Member who has the legal experience – of course [28:21], her work is based predominantly in the Latin American and Caribbean region. We should also remember that our very own Silvia is in fact a lawyer by training. So she should hopefully make sure we don't get into too much of a terrible mess.

But we do need to change the definitions to include the now requirement on all of the regions to find a way of engaging as Members individuals. The North American region has done this from their very beginning, and we should perhaps take time to look at how they've done it, as one way. And I do know that Europe has started to grapple with the process but I'm unsure how far they've got. Silvia, can I ask you where the other regions are up on individual Members?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. NARALO, yes, they accept individual Members. Latin America, not yet. EURALO are having a discussion between [29:40] and individual Membership. But they still haven't approved it. [29:55].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is Africa doing anything?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Not at the moment. They haven't [30:07] theirs yet.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you Silvia. So other than the very regional model, which is the North American model, it looks like we don't have other precedents to look at, so we can put up a straw-man concept and see what the region likes, but it's not a choice – it is a mandate under the last ALAC and At-Large Review Procedure, it is one of the recommendations and we have to find a way to engage the individual Members.

I note that Siranush, who isn't on audio today, has just said that EURALO accept, as a new ALS, Euro-individual Members, which means they've gone along the way of creating a virtual organization to house the individual separately, and that means we do have a second model to look at. Thank you for that Siranush. I want to open the floor to your view now.

That's the one I know clearly has to come into our definitions. Are there any other things you are aware of at this stage that we will need to be reviewing and recreating under definitions? I'm assuming that no one wants to change the name of the organization? I've skipped over that. I notice Maureen's typing. Just jump in if you want to make a comment. Maureen, we couldn't possibly change APRALO. That would probably require all sorts of legal wrangling with ICANN as well so I don't want to go down that route.

If no one else is coming up with any, just make sure that if we think of anything that does need to be added into the definitions that we do a running tally of those. But "Member" now needs to modify some way, shape or form to be inclusive of individuals.   And our Rule on "Provisional Members" will have to be very carefully looked at if we

were to go down the pathway that Europe has and create a virtual ALS. That may or may not satisfy…

We may need to do something about our provisional status as that would go, because it may end up being a little complicated, because that ALS could at some point in time have less than five people in it, which of course would not, under the requirement of the ALAC, be acceptable as an ALS. However, let's think about all of this. We're bound to uncover as many complexities as simplicities when we're going down these ways.

I want to ask you, before we move onto the objectives, which I doubt we will be doing much with, do you want to include in "Definitions" other terms such as "consensus" and define a meaning of "consensus"? Something that we've noted in the past that we've wanted to put into our APRALO Rules is the concept of "proxy". That could either be handled in the definitions or only in anything on voting.

And there may be other terms that come to mind but "consensus" is one that probably is worthwhile defining. And of course I've dropped out of the Adobe Connect room yet again so I can't see if any of you have any ideas on that, so just yell out at me.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: I've put something in the chat, which you wouldn't see, and it relates to the full name of APRALO. In our definition the full name is different from what's on the Wiki, so I just wanted to mention that and just to be clear on what the full name is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, and that is something we can chew over. Actually, Maureen has always included the Pacific Islands – that's the Pacific part. Its At-Large website name, it's Wiki name, specifies Australia and Australasia in there. That's a disconnect that we will also need to get some ICANN legal advice on, because the RALO name is APRALO but the region of course has been labeled under what was a more UN convention, and that actually predated the RALOs as such.

So let's definitely put that on to discuss with legal. I don't care which way it goes but yes, that definitely needs to be sorted out. So we've got "consensus", we've got our title… While I'm at titles it struck me whether or not… Let me wind back the clock. When we met in Bali in 2006 or 2007, and put the very first Operating Principles together, we called them Operating Principles because no one else in any other region had any other name for anything.

Since then the ALAC and to some extent the At-Large community looked at ALAC terms and will get confused if regional terms are very much different. Since we've gone to the way of using Rules of Procedure rather than Operating Principles, and should you so desire, there is no reason why you can't change your new document, your revised documentation, to be an APRALO Rules of Procedure rather than Operating Principles. So you might want to consider that.

What we might do is have a poll in the next meeting on how you all feel about that. It's probably going to be important to do some polling of our

wider membership as well. Again, I'm back in the room but I don't have any chat or Agenda or anything showing.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello Cheryl, [38:27] Action Item to follow up with ICANN Legal on the issue of the name, the full name of APRALO and to make sure that we can take advantage of this review to change the full title and complete the [38:39] guidelines in the new [38:43].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific, okay. Of course the Pacific part of Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization, one assumes does cover the Pacific Islands, inclusive of other parts of Oceania, but let's chew on that and of course our memorandum of understanding with ICANN also specifies what the region is going to be called as a RALO. So we'd obviously have to keep in-synch with that as well.

So that's probably going to come into KT's world as well. If I can just make sure, Silvia, that anything you find out not only goes to KT but obviously the rest of us would be interested but it probably needs to go to KT first. If you can draw your attention to Section (3), which from memory is in definitions…

Sorry, is there someone wanting to speak? Go ahead. No? Section (3), which is objectives, I think, I doubt that will need any modifications other than where it is not clear what a term of art is or if KT finds that there is something in the ICANN bylaws that is not properly reflected in

our purpose. If you're all happy with that, can I suggest you all look at that Section once KT puts some work together on the bylaws? Because he may have some very specific advice for us on that. The next task is membership.

This is again where we will probably have to be particular to make sure we bring in something that's clear, that Members as At-Large structure, as well as some mechanism to bringing in individual membership. But when I read this Section (4).1, .2, .3 and .4, – and I'd be very keen to get everyone else's opinion on this – I actually don't see anything in those terms that would suggest an individual cannot be a Member. So you might want to think about that.

We may in fact only need to change definitions of Membership, not the Rules of Membership. But again, I'll leave you to ruminate over that as we move on. In terms of Part #3 Management, this is one where we do need to be a little bit clear and we need to be quite specific. Obviously we have Chairpersons and our two Vice-Chairpersons and in fact it was the moving to two Vice-Chairpersons that was part of the 2009 edits or modifications for the Operating Procedures.

I would suggest that under (5).2 we probably do not need to maintain the historical record about the Fiscal Year 2009/10 and we can rewrite that to simply reflect the fact that the Vice-Chairpersons are normally in alternate years, unless someone has a desperate need for documents to accumulate old history – I'd certainly be encouraging you that way. But I'd like to know if there's anything else you believe should be made clearer?

One question I'm asked almost every year is whether or not there has to be a selection process for our Secretariats. Many of the RALOs select or elect a Secretariat. It is a Leadership position which the [44:05] Members vote on. We've never done that. We've always maintained that we will appoint a Secretariat if needs be, and to that end we can unappoint them when we so desire as well. So there isn't in fact any requirement under the current Rule (5).4 for a Secretarial appointment to be reviewed, other than when we so desire.

I don't know whether you would like to consider the fact that we have traditionally used a Secretariat? That Secretariat has for many years been the Internet Society of Hong Kong, and the Internet Society of Hong Kong has a primary sponsor who has kindly allowed one of their employees to do the actual work of the Secretariat as a pro-bono activity. It has certainly worked for us to-date.

You might want to say that (5).4 could be modified to say: "a Secretariat of APRALO may be appointed and has done since "insert date" can be reviewed by APRALO and its Leadership from time to time as needs be." Or something along those lines, just so it's clear that we don't need to run annual elections for them but we do have the right to change should we so desire.

I don't know of any other changes that we might need to do for the management, but obviously we would want to have another discussion on that – this is just a first reading really. Meetings – talks about our AGM, talks about our Fiscal Year, talks about our annual general meeting requirements, all of which we've never had a problem with up until now.

I would like to suggest that if there is anything that we do need to change that this is one Section that will have to have a great deal of community input, because if we change the expectations of how meetings are run and what quorums are then we really do need to take those to AGMs and to have them properly and thoroughly discussed.

I'll just note at this point in time that it was ruled (6).4 under "Meetings" where the quorum for an AGM or a meeting was changed to not only be one-third of the Members – Members being the At-Large structures – but in fact was allowed to be seven Members. As we grew the one-third… We were having trouble getting quorum by 2009 – not so much at AGMs but at meetings.

And we felt that having a seven Member and one-third of the Members, whichever is greater, was a reasonable one. But you might want to review "quorum" again as well, because there are times when even getting seven Members at a meeting might be difficult. I think the rest is pretty standard stuff. Under "Decision Making" that would be where we would bring in the concept of what a consensus is, because that is where the term "consensus" is mentioned.

And we would also need to note, depending on how we take individual Members and get their engagement will also affect whenever a vote is called, how their vote and their voice is reflected, will need to be carefully designed and managed. I would suggest that probably by January next year we probably will be finished with some of our Sub-Teams by then, and we might need to form a slightly larger Sub-Team to

just look at the specifics of voting and decision making as we grow larger and larger. So we might want to put that one as a little flag item as well.

If you would bear with me – I've got no visual on the Operating Principles… Could someone refresh my memory of what the next Section is? Membership, meetings… I think there's only one Section to go. Decision-making… Is there another Section after that?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Yes, it's "Dissolution".

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Gunela. No wonder I don't remember that one very well. It's the one I don't want to even think about. [laughs] Okay, well, yes. "Dissolution". Yes. Should the unthinkable happen we have to have Rules for it. Hopefully we don't have to go down that pathway but we probably should have another look from the Legal perspective, just to make sure that our Rules for dissolution are quite reasonable.

That part of the Rule will have been written back in 2006, because I think the Rules came into effect in 2007 so an awful lot has happened between 2006 and 2013, so we probably just need to run "Dissolution" through the vetting of legal advice as well.

Okay, well, that's the first reading with the full Working Group. What I would suggest to you is that we take another opportunity, say two meetings ahead – so not the next meeting of the full Working Group but

the meeting after – to do a brief, short form of read-through again. What we really will do then is ask each of you to bring to the table any new proposals you've come up with in your work or your individual readings as to what particular Rules issues we need to work on.

With that I'd very much like to ask for any discussion on our timeline. At the moment we're planning to meet monthly, is that the case? And if that's the case it means that the Sub-Teams will have at least three other weeks in every month to pull meetings and do their own work. I'll just remind you that we will be wanting to have a final version of our new Rules of Procedure ready by the 8th of March 2014.

But I also do know that Gunela and Ali are also going to be looking at a work plan so they will be looking at key dates, such as the Singapore meeting and when we would want to get our other milestones between January and March. At that point I'm going to call for any other business. I'm not expecting any but it's polite to ask. Yell out if you've got any. I'm not hearing anyone.

I'm just going to see whether there's any need to review any particular Action Items. I can't see what's been captured. Is there any clarification of Action Items needed at this stage? Silvia, could you speak up a little bit? I can barely hear you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: For the next meeting we will send a Doodle for the same time, or would you like to change the time or the meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we did mention at our last meeting that we would put times that were at both ends of the regional spectrum, and we've clearly gone for the most popular time of day at this call, but we do need to settle the question of whether or not we will be switching times. That will either be a 12-hour switch or to the next most popular time, which is eight or more hours away. Do you want to rotate or do you want to have a fixed time?

Because I've dropped out of the room again, if you could just type your responses in the chat so Silvia can know whether or not we want to have a fixed time, at this time, or a rotating time…? Once there's a majority that's what we'll do then Silvia. Now, before I dropped out of the room I noticed Maureen asking a question about when the next Secretariats' meeting is. As far as I know it comes on the equivalent of our Saturday, but again I'll ask Silvia to clarify that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: The next Secretariats' meeting is on November 1st.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: November 1st? Okay. All right. It might be good Silvia if you could be in contact with Maureen and give her whatever assistance to make sure she's got any support to get herself a small slot in that, that would be great. But if it's November 1st I would think that Maureen will also have a fair amount of outreach she will have been doing during Bali that she

will be able to report on to the Secretariats as well. Do we have a general will of the Group on fixed or rotating times?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I was also kicked out of the Adobe Connect. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Nathalie, can you tell me? Do we have a clear majority for fixed or rotating?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Fixed time seems to be popular. We're just waiting for confirmation from Ali.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, it sounds like fixed time. That would be fixed time at this time, which is the ideal. I'll leave that with you. And with that, just before the top of the hour I'd like to thank you one and all, and thank our amazing Staff. It's all well and good for them to be at our beck and call, but there are four other regions so they are split five ways and we really do appreciate the support you give us.

We do recognize that once we break into Sub-Teams that some of us will be asking for additional assistance with setting up calls and things, but you've done wonderfully by us to-date and we thank you as we do on so many other occasions. We literally couldn't do it without you. That said,

we couldn't do very much without our volunteers, and thank you one and all for spending this last hour getting into the thrill-packed and exciting world of reviewing the Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization Operating Procedures. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]