NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the ATLAS II survey working group call on Thursday, the 7th of November 2013. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siranush Vardanyan, Roberto Gateano, Darlene Thompson, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Natalia Enciso, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Wolf Ludwig.
	We have apologies from Eduardo Diaz and Jordi Iparaguirre. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Carlos Reyes, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Wolf.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay, thanks a lot Nathalie for the roll coll. As you've seen on the meeting minutes, this call is next one, what was agreed at our last meeting call, when the survey was just completed. But some summary information on long lists which didn't really allow proper analyzes of sort data on a click view.
	And as far as I can recall, we were asking staff to provide us with a better format to read and analyze the outcomes of the survey. As far as I know, staff was working on this until the last moment. So I do not know whether there was any update sent with the format. Tijani and I asked at our last meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Matt, this is Heidi. Do you want to answer that please?

MATT ASHTIANI: Good morning everyone. This is Matt for the record. I've been working with [?] … and well data cannot be put into a new format, or [?] think would require a developer, but they can't actually confirm it because they have to work on it, and that would take quite some time. So [?] to try to put the specific questions in which it would be in a different format into [?] on that.

But, at this time, it's not possible to put it into a different format [?] or from the current results that are shown on the screen.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, I don't know Matt if I understood all of what you said because the line [?] wasn't very clear to me. There is no possibility to get this data available in a different format because the way it is now, to have this on a screen doesn't offer a good or sufficient opportunities to me to make any good conclusion out of it. So this format as it is, as it was last week, as you said already a week ago, is not very useful for us to come up with a real and substantial conclusions from the survey outcomes.

So it's a bit difficult in my opinion. I don't know what the others think about it. I see that Tijani has raised his hand. Before I give the floor to Tijani, just another question. I would like to get short information from staff about the feedback from the regions to this survey, whether in all

regions we have a high call of responses. Could perhaps Heidi or Silvia give us a last update about response calls for regions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Matt, do you have that information?

MATT ASHTIANI: I think you're asking for the response rates from each RALO. I couldn't really understand you. We actually do have that. One second please. In the survey, it's actually just on the screen if you give me one second, I can get there. And of course, the Adobe Connect room just quit on me. I think I have a print out of it right here though. 92 ½ % of the ALSs actually took the survey.

From each RALO, I have the raw numbers in front of me, but I don't have the percentages. I can give you the raw numbers and I think it might be, you might be able to give that, or if you can give me about five minutes, I can do the very simple math.

WOLF LUDWIG: Matt, you can give us the final because later again, but it's good to know at this stage that we have return of more than 90%, that is already very good information and confirmation to me. I give the floor to Tijani first and afterwards to Dev. Tijani, you have raised your hand first and then it's Dev Anand.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you Wolf. Tijani speaking. I really have to shape the work done by Matt, even if the spreadsheet for me isn't helpful, but at least the result given by [?] was better this time. I am working on, and I already have some results. For example, 2.1 I have it, now I have even the percentage, I have the first – the most preferred item, and then the second, and then the third, etcetera.

I have this… I used the accent to make this work, and I think it is easy to do, it is not very difficult. But it takes time, especially for the weighted response. For the other responses, for the responses that everybody will give, it's more difficult because you have to compile all of those responses, 140 I think responses, so you have compile all them and they come up with the binary, it is not easy.

And if it says something that we have to be several people to work on, and we have to share the load. So perhaps everything which is weighted response, from one to five, I will do it. it is not a problem. For the others, we have to share it between us so that, for example, 2.3, [?] will take it, and will give us the response the, if you want, how to say, the final resort.

The result which will be needed for defining the team, not the team, the items that will be tackled during the summit, for example. This is the main issue of this survey. The second main issue are the teams, or the area of capacity building the ALSs need, this is part three. And I will do it later. But I think we have to concentrate on those very important elements that will help us to begin working on the schedule on the program. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot Tijani for this explanation already that we can partly use compiled data already, at least, as a weighted part of the survey. But I would like to give the floor to Dev now.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Wolf. This is Dev Anand speaking. Well, what I did I started looking at the big pulse link that Carl has put up earlier, and that's the summary page where everything was put together, and then I started bringing that all into the spreadsheet, and I posted that link to the spreadsheet below.

So I was able to complete all the section one and aggregate that properly, and the challenge with the question 2.1 is that well, I have two sheets with in that, the 2.1 aggregate and the 2.1 that Matt was able to extract and make as a separate sheet. The challenge is, of course, it will be a challenge… It's a multiple challenge, but it is a challenge to get the results into a better tabulated form.

Particularly where we want to find out, for those persons that checked other and they put a particular topic, what exactly is the ranking, and it's very difficult right now, we can't really do that from the summary page. So I'm still working on that section.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks for this other comment and other information Dev. It seems to me, it's the Tijani at the moment who has the closest look, and

the closest idea, and who as most kind of analyzes of the data. I think it's under 2.1, and I would like to give the floor to Tijani again.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Wolf. What I was doing, I took the link to [?] and I took the data from there, it is better for me than the spreadsheet.   The spreadsheet is not helpful because you all have the data inside, so for me we need several tables. For each question, we need a table so that we will have the ranking, the good ranking of those items.

I work like this, I am making one table for each question, if you want, and I take my results from the big [box] not from the spreadsheet. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.   Well would you like to continue to, according to your spreadsheets, what kind of conclusion we can already draw from the results?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I will give you, for example, 2.1. One moment. Here it is. Okay. For 2.1, the first item choosing the more popular was, item transparency and the accountability.   The second one is the future structure and governance of ICANN. The third is IPv4 to IPv6 migration. Number four is [?] top level domain. This is what we need, we need this ranking.

According to this classification, we will decide on which item we will put in the program, and the program of the summit. So this is an example of the result I already have.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Tijani. Olivier you have raised your hand, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier for the transcript. I'm not quite sure how Tijani did his calculations on the most important parts of question 2.1. My understanding of how the table works was that when you have got one, two, three, four, and five, it says here, "Please rate your current concerns on a rail of one least important to five most important."

So we get, yeah, I guess one as being – one as being one point, two was being two points, and three as being three points, four as being four points, and five as being five points. So is that how you've done it Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, exactly, exactly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I've also done something like that pretty much. Just give me a minute, and I'll be able to share a table with you, in just a moment. So I'll be back in a second.

WOLF LUDWIG: In the meantime, Matt has raised his hand. Matt, you have the floor.

MATT ASHTIANI: [?] …one would be [?] five would be the least [?].

WOLF LUDWIG: Matt, I have difficulty to understand you. You sound very distant and with a kind of an echo.

MATT ASHTIANI: Sorry about that. Yeah…

MATT LUDWIG: Much better.

MATT ASHTIANI: I just wanted to confirm, I've spoken with [?] and I've confirmed one is in fact the most preferred and five is in fact the least preferred. So in terms of the ranking…

WOLF LUDWIG: [Laughs], repeat please Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: I'll repeat, and if I can't be understood, then I'll redial in. One is the most preferred, so if someone clicks the one to a topic in a rank question, that is the most preferred answer. Five would be their least preferred answer.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please, Wolf, may I continue?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Matt, in our question, we said that five is the most preferred one, and one is the least preferred one. So how the results are presented [?] form. I don't understand.

MATT ASHTIANI: I can look into that right now, give me one second please.

| WOLF LUDWIG: | Okay. Thank you. Take your time. I think this is very important, a crucial point for any further interpretation and discussion [laughs]. |

| TIJANI BEN JEMAA: | Because if it is like he says, ICANN geographic regions will be the first item, the most preferred one, and the least one is ICANN transparency and accountability, which is strange for me. |

| WOLF LUDWIG: | Yeah, I would totally agree with you Tijani on such preferences of weighting of responses. If you take the first point, or another one like At Large engagement in ICANN, etcetera, if it would be the other way around, then only a small minority would be in favor of this topic, which has 12 under one and 46 under five. |

| TIJANI BEN JEMAA: | Yeah. For me, this item is blanket as a first one. The first item preferred is At Large engagement in ICANN. |

| WOLF LUDWIG: | Okay. |

| TIJANI BEN JEMAA: | Which is more or less the logical one, it's not strange. |

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Matt do you still have your hand raised? Could you find out anything that can provide some clarity in this respect, avoid any further confusion or misunderstanding?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi Wolf. Yes, I'm just trying to access the AC room. My computer keeps freezing on me right now, so just a few seconds please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Wolf, I don't, perhaps – we not wait, if you want to speculate or do something. We have, I think, this call must lead us to the next steps. Now we have those tentative results, now we are working on, we have to share the load and we have to decide what will be done next.

WOLF LUDWIG: I agree with you Tijani that the next steps is the most important part of the outcomes from today's call, but I trust, now try if we can have some first consolidate info about to survey the outcomes, and then at this point would be, what are we going to do with it? Olivier has raised his hand again. Olivier, you want to come in again?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. Yes, it is Olivier speaking. And I'm going to ask staff to be able to let me share my screen, because I have, whilst we've been speaking, been making a few tables out of, what is it? Not Adobe Excel and so on, and I think I've got something that we can probably check with you.

Let me see how I can do this applications …sharing with you. I don't know whether you can see that. So basically, yeah, I think you can see this?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So what I've done is a cut and paste from the [?] analysis without doing exploratory or anything like that. I've put it into an Excel document and we've got two ways to look at it. If one is the least preferred result, so if one checks one, two, three, four, five. If one checks one and it's the least preferred result, then our formula here is one is only worth one point; two, two points; three, three points; four, four points; five, five points.

Therefore the higher score is the most popular subject. Okay? So the highest score is anything that scores with a five. So we've got here, at the moment, ICANN transparency accountability, and we've got the whole list with other scoring the lowest. Now, if on the other hand, since we don't know which way of the two we're going, if one is the most preferred thing, so people have put things in order.

So one would be scoring five points, and two would be scoring four points, etcetera, etcetera, this provides us with a score, you rearrange it, and that gives you the overall table. And again, other scores the lowest in there. That's four 2.1. Regarding 3.1, and I mean, everyone this has just taken me like 10 minutes to do.

So it's not exactly rocket science and things, but we've looked at the next one which has got weighed up things is, do you find any of the following areas to be a challenge in relation to participation within ICANN At Large as policy processes? And in there it says that one is least challenging, five is most challenging. And so, looking at our formula here, I've weight as one as being one point, as two, two point, three points, four points, five points, as we are.

And so we are ending with time consuming being the biggest challenge. Lack of understanding of subject matters within ICANN being the second biggest challenge, etcetera, etcetera. I've only managed to do this in 10 minutes. I'm sure that there are other things in there that can be done in not even 10 minutes of work. But I would have hoped that this was going to be ready for this call, and this is why I'm sharing it with you now. That's all thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Olivier. Question from Tijani, this goes with your findings Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. Exactly. We did the same calculations, so we get the same result.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So we can say, we can take this as a solid basis for our analysis and for our conclusions already.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But Wolf, I have a concern. The most difficult is among those weighted responses, those weighted answers, the most difficult are the [beta] question that we have to read all the responses and to try to find what are the main common responses. So it is very long. You have to go through 140 answers for each question.

This is why I said we have to share the load. We have to spread those questions on all of us so that everyone try to take at least one question and try to analyze it. I told you that the weighted answers I can do them, no problem.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So I think this brings us to the next step. How we can share the huge workload among us to go through the second part, and to try to draw any conclusions out of the mess of the answers. I think this is really the next important and the most challenging step. Oliver you have raised your hand, you have the floor again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. So I've noted that we've got nine people on this call. Do we know how many of these questions with full answers are there in the list? Because if we know how many there are, then we just divide them evenly among each person on this call, and so we might each one or two questions to deal with.

And that again will take us 15 minutes to deal with, we'll say half an hour to go through and we'll come back with the next call and we'll have all the answers. It's not such a huge task. If we all look at, as a group, at all of the questions ourselves, we're to never to go further than the survey part, and I'm really concerned about this.

So as Tijani said, let's spread the load. I was hoping that staff was going to give us, today, details of all of this, the statistics on the actual survey and to actually chop this up into more than one files. So put the quantitate stuff on one file and the qualitative stuff on the other, and all of the actual personal information, which by the way, should not be published, in another direction but unfortunately I see that this hasn't been done.

So I guess we just have to get things done ourselves and very fast and share it among each other. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier. Back to Tijani again.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Wolf. Tijani speaking. To tell you the truth, I was expecting that big pulse give us better result. Why we wanted it to be done by big pulse, it was because I thought my proposal was big pulse because I thought that big pulse can give us, how to say, processed results. But unfortunately, they don't give that and it was exactly as we did it manually, because we have to go through all the responses for the direct questions.

And I deeply regret that we asked those direct questions on this. It was good to put them in the shape of weighted answers because it would give us better manner to treat them. So now we have what we have, and we have to work this data. I propose that each one take only one question, only one, and work it properly.

Let all the weighted responses, I can do them, Olivier can do them, no problem. We will not speak about them. We are speaking about the direct questions that are answered by everyone and we have to go through all of them to come up with the result at the end.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Tijani. I must admit, it was also my assumption that either get this information on Excel sheets by big pulse. Olivier just said do not expect anything, it's not their job. Or that we would get such spreadsheets from At Large staff. At least to have the data in a form that makes it easier to us to go through it and to analyze the survey results part by part. As we do not have it so far, I think the most pragmatic approach is what you suggested Tijani, that we have to subdivide these parts with, the [?] responses from the participants among us.

But let me ask staff again, Matt again, whether they can assist and help us to make our work a little bit easier if possible.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt for the record. I think in terms of big pulse being able to do that, it should not [assume] that they can actually provide, I can help

you out as much as possible to make up for the ability to do so. There are certain workarounds that we can do that I found out last night working with them such as, getting the individual poll results for each question.

So I think there are things that we can do to help speed things up, but from big pulse that doesn't really seem possible plausible or likely at this point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you please confirm that five is the most preferred choice? Because it was unlikely.

MATT ASHTIANI: I know we asked it like that. I'm going to reconfirm. I think Dominic from big pulse got confused yesterday when I was talking to him, but before I give you a final answer, I'm checking. I want to absolutely make sure that it's right.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot. May I ask who on this call would be ready to help in the way what Tijani suggested? That we subdivide, so go part by part and try to this way to bring it together and then share the respective

results from each of us at the next call. Cheryl has raised her hand, Cheryl you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I think at this point in time, with our thinking increasing levels of frustration starting with the, how to [?], I think all of us, [?] said they didn't want to contribute. However, rather than be too democratic about it, suggest that we're just allocated the questions, and that question is simpler. I mean, we work on it and get back it. If it means that we get two, then fine but at least at this stage it allocates, and I suppose on this call, one if not two of the questions, and that the specific data set should be allocated and [?].

Because what I don't want to have happen is two people duplicating efforts and [?]. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks Cheryl. This is probably the most pragmatic approach. Let me just allocate the workload to the members on this call. I see Roberto's hand raised, Roberto you have the floor.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah, I'm looking at the file. It seems to me that the questions need further analysis. Not really that many. I think that, I mean justified here, and I think that the question should some analysis, I have the first one here. In your role as a representative [?] concerns what kind of activities, and blah, blah, blah, that is 2.3, and then 2.4, 2.5.

EN

I mean, there aren't many. I thought we are not going to make any analysis, any further analysis on who is going to be the representative at the summit and such other questions. So I think that the work load might be a little bit lower we fear. I'm ready to take one question, I'll take the first one that I can see is 2.3, but I'm happy with any question that is allocated by the chair.

And do the analysis today, in a couple of days and come back with the analysis. The problem that I see is that each of us is going to use a personal approach on methodological approach on the analysis, so we might come up with a non-uniform treatment of the questions as if it was the case if the questions were analyzed by the same person, by staff or whatever.

But at this point in time, I don't see any other possibility because we have to be at Buenos Aries with a consolidated results of these, because then the events working group has to start working on the result of the survey in order to prepare the events, and time is getting short. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Roberto. Well, I see and I agree with your concerns and I agree with your point that it is partly risky, that a few people may do this analysis from different backgrounds, experience, and angles, etcetera, and that there may not be as unified and standardized as we would like them to be, or would like them to have.   But under different circumstances, I think it makes not much sense to [?] …I think we have to concentrate on what we need and what we have to do.

And choose the best and most pragmatic and quickest way, simply means to subdivide the different questions among us and come up with a respective analysis during the next stage. And I agree, we must have this ready until Buenos Aries [?] what is left, about 10 days. And let me suggest that we agree on this issue on this procedure, and when at next decide on who is taking what. As Tijani has raised his hand again and Tijani you have the floor please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Wolf. Tijani speaking. Roberto, for this kind of questions, they are five questions by the way, that we need people to analyze. We have 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.8, and 3.3, that's all. The others can be processed by Excel sheet and I will do it and I will cross-check with Olivier. We can do it together and we can cross-check the results.

So we have five questions. I don't have your fear about [?] because those are questions where we have an answer per voter. So you will take the answer, if you have several people who gave the same answer, you mentioned that we have five or six, I don't know, people who voted for that, and if you have several like this, and at the end we'll have a list of answers that are given by only one person. [?] and with this result, we can say that this is important, this is very important, that's all.

We will not interpret what the voter said. We would report them. So I don't think there is a big problem of different person within different results. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay, thanks a lot Tijani. I've just seen in the chat from Roberto, I volunteer for 2.3. Ken in the chat has asked for one of the questions [?] I would like to do now. If Roberto is going for one 1.3, who else is ready taking another part? Let me know now so that we can make…
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	It is Yuliya who is writing on the chat. That if we don't have the same way to analyze, we will have different results. So it is what I said before, I said there is no analysis because we are reporting. We are not interpreting.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Yes, I think it's basically accounting and reporting back and concentrating on a particular part, what shouldn't be that difficult. So I think we must do it in this way, and I'm now waiting for some more names besides Roberto. I'm of course ready to take one part. And we now have to do this listing, and I would like to have staff for the action items to note who is going to take over what and until when. Yes Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay. I will do all the weighted answers, the weighted questions, and I will also do 2.6 and 2.7 who are yes or no questions. Those are all processed by Excel. So there is not manual work, it is project by Excel. And after that, we'll see if we have people to take the other questions, it would be good, otherwise we'll be obliged to share them even if we have more than one question, if we have more than one task.

If there is not other people to take those question, I will take one of them.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Good, thanks a lot for this Tijani. I see Siranush, give me 2.5. Okay. And then Olivier has raised his hand, Olivier you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. So as far as [?] questions, and assuming we do eventually get an answer from Matt on which way is more preferred and least preferred, the only questions that are weighted are 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2, I believe. I finished the tables for these, so I'll be able to send these to the mailing list [?] but they are there.

With regards to all of this though, there is a section in there which says other, there is, and other allows people to type things underneath. So, looking at all of the questions, what you have is 2.1 has got an other choice, 2.3 is a question which says, "In your role as representative of Internet user concerns, what kind of activities of the summit do you think will help you RALOs to more effectively represent Internet users?"

There are 142 comments there to look at. 2.5, "What do you need for your ALSs participation at the summit? For example, do you have language needs beyond the six UN languages?" And that's 133 comments. That's a very short one by the way, because most of it is just yes/no, language, travel, this sort of stuff.

2.8, "Anything else?   Please feel free to share any comments or questions or thoughts that can help us to make the summit a success." There are 149 comments in there. Then there is 3.1, which as we said earlier has got a weighted reply, and you have to analyze the other choice.

And then there is 3.2 where the other choice has to also be analyzed. Then there is 3.3, additional comments or requests, which is a very open question. That has got 52 comments. And that's all I've been able to look at so far. Well, this pretty much is it actually. I was looking at it, yeah, that's it. 3.3, that's all of it.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks Olivier for this additional info. I've seen, under the action items, there are five names, listed [?] taking over different parts of the work. And Cheryl is just typing what I was going to ask. If we leave 2.8 and 3.3 to be taken, so I'm ready to take one of them. Okay. I will take 3.3.

And Tijani, so it's 2.8 for Ludwig, and 3.3 for Tijani. And then I think we should be complete with subdividing and sharing this work to be done. The next question then would be, well it's my understanding when we work on this, and we have [?] with that, we should share it as soon as possible on the ATLAS II Survey working group list. And exchange and discuss info online already.

So the deadline for this respective [?] should be, let's say by the end of the week. Is this realistic? Is this feasible for all of you?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Wolf, I am travelling on Monday.

WOLF LUDWIG: So you must have this ready the next day I guess. Yeah. So what about trying to have this ready by Saturday?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

WOLF LUDWIG: And after we have exchanged this on the working list, do you think we need another coordination call? Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I'm sorry if I'm going back where we were before, but we haven't filled up all of the boxes that need to be filled up. We've got Roberto going to analyze question 2.3; and Tijani analyzing 2.6, 2.7 and 3.3; Siranush 2.5; Dev 2.4, etcetera, etcetera. We know what we haven't looked at yet. So…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can I answer?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, with this we'll, all of it will be done, no problem. We have only the others or the, if you want, others of the weighted questions that have to be…

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes exactly. Yeah, so we need to share that as well.

WOLF LUDWIG: And the deadline would be Saturday, 9th November at midnight? Can we have this other on action items as well? And do we need a final coordination call among us? Tijani he will travel from Monday already to Buenos Aries to be in time for the ICANN Academy, I guess.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

WOLF LUDWIG: First, do you think we need another coordination call? Or would it be enough to exchange this online? And if it's a yes, we would need another coordination call, when this call should happen, should be organized? I don't know whether you are available on Sundays, usually I try to avoid call meetings on Sunday, but under certain circumstances or urgencies, for me a Sunday call could be an option.

I do not know whether this is feasible for the rest of you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I raise my hand and it is immediately removed, I don't know why. Anyway. I don't think we need another call. First because we don't have time to do it. At least I will not be on it because I will be traveling, and the second because if we share the results on the Wiki or through the list, it will be okay, and we have to agree the whole results. So perhaps when we have all the questions analyzed, we can perhaps work through them and make our comments on the Wiki if there is something which is not normal, which seems to be not normal, etcetera.

And I think that the Buenos Aries, in our meeting in Buenos Aries, we should announce those results, and we should kick off the preparation of the program according to the result of the survey. And also kick off the preparation of the capacity building program we need to do for the ALSs before they come to London. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks Tijani. And I tend to agree with your suggestions. If we do all of our work properly over the next days, and if we come up with the analysis of our respective parts, then we will have the information all

together on the list, on the Wiki, what gives then more or less a basis for drawing our final conclusions on this survey and the different parts.

And then we have this consolidated basis for the next round of discussions in Buenos Aries, and then I think it will be starting up part of the programming, I hope, etcetera, what would be checked by you Tijani. And what I think this seems to be realistic or feasible procedure to me. Can we have an approval among us on this next steps and on this procedure?

Yes, I see several of, yes I think we can take this as a broader approval among us and we should proceed in this way. We have the action items. We have the different people listed with different parts of analyzing the survey and coming up with their [?] until Saturday. And then we do the next exchanges via the mailing list or the workspace and then continue this work and build upon the results of analysis in Buenos Aries with the first [?] discussions.

Therefore I think we are under difficult conditions, but we are finally through this part three and part four, next steps. Are there any further questions or comments from your side?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Wolf. Can you please Wolf remind the list of the questions with the people who will tackle them. I'll read them. 2.3 Roberto, 2.4 Dev, 2.5 Siranush. 2.6, 2.7 and 3.3 Tijani. 2.8 Wolf. We have the others, and I am hoping that Olivier will help us with the others.

WOLF LUDWIG: Heidi, may I ask that staff will send us a copy of this action items immediately or this afternoon via the mailing list?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. We'll absolutely, it should be out in the next hour or so.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Can you use this as a memo, etcetera, and since we all now know who is doing what, etcetera, and this could be a very important and helpful [?]. Thanks. Is your answer, is your question answered by this Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So we will get a copy of those action items here on the AC via the subgroup mailing list, etcetera, and to have this memo available in the next few hours, and to start our jobs with the analysis in the afternoon or in the evening. If there are no further questions or comments from

your side, let me thank all of you for your active and constructive contributions, and especially of taking over [?] from this survey.

And I hope that we get this survey results finally ready and we can find some common conclusions until the weekend. Thanks to all of you and wish you nice afternoon, evening, or a nice day.

[Various people say thank you and goodbye].

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]