

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT  
Sub Team A  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday 20 January 2010 @ 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team Sub Team A meeting on Wednesday 20 January 2010 at 1800 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-raa-a-20100120.mp3>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group - Co-chair  
Paul Diaz – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC  
Elisa Cooper - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Evan Leibovitch – At Large  
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large  
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC

**ICANN Staff**

Heidi Ullrich  
David Giza  
Gisella Gruber-White  
Samantha Eisner

**Absent apologies:**

Beau Brendler – At Large - Chair  
Margie Milam  
Marika Konings  
Liz Gasster  
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: Good afternoon and thank you for standing by. I'd like to remind all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Siva Muthuswamy: Hi. This is Siva.

Michele Neylon: Hi Siva. Does anybody have a question about the documents?

Elisa Cooper Is there anything in - this is (Elisa Cooper). Is there anything in the documents that is not currently in another existing (unintelligible)?

Samantha Eisner: Well there are terms at the back. If you go to the last pages - other policies/specifications. It's on page 8. So there are a few consensus policies that impose separate requirements on registrars and registered name holders. And these are specifically required to be followed in the ERA. They don't name that - the policies themselves but the registers are bound to follow any new ICANN policy or specifications.

Elisa Cooper Right.

Samantha Eisner:: That arises...

Elisa Cooper Right.

Samantha Eisner: And so these aren't included in the agreement but they are subsumed in the agreement because of (some) the agreement.

Elisa Cooper Okay. But the document as a whole - so when I read through it I didn't see anything in here that didn't already exist some other place.

Woman: Right.

Elisa Cooper Is that correct?

Woman: Right.

Evan Leibovitch Oh. Hi. This is (Evan). That may be correct but bringing them together in this form is something that is badly needed and very welcome.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. No, I don't have any issue with that. I just want to make sure that I just understand everything that's in - basically everything that's in here. And I wanted to just call out if there was anything that was brand new that didn't - wasn't already part of consensus policy or other policy or a registrar accreditation agreement or anything like that so...

Michele Neylon: Just as - this is Michele - just as a point of information, if anything extra does appear in this document, we have to remove it because this document is meant to - it's meant to sum up the rights and responsibilities as (unintelligible) in existing contracts and the existing policies.

If anybody finds anything that isn't covered elsewhere, it needs to be red flagged immediately and revoked. It's actually - if there's anything new in there it can't be in here. It can't (exist).

Evan Leibovitch: Well if it's new but it's just is a new description for something that already exists. I mean there's nothing wrong with that staying in.

Michele Neylon: Of course not. No, sorry. Not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl I mean it goes back to the differences between what the two work groups - A and B are doing.

Michele Neylon: Exactly. But the entire point of this work group is based on the policies and contracts that (in fact) the registrars have already agreed to that a document was put together that summarizes as well - the registrars are obliged to do on what they - and what the registrants were obliged to do and that interaction between the two - between the two parties.

So - and if somebody wants to make additions then they need to move it through the other working group, not this one please.

Evan Leibovitch Michele, is the idea of the aspirational (sic) wish list as it called, is that within the scope of this group?

Michele Neylon: No.

Evan Leibovitch But it's not within the scope of group B either.

Michele Neylon: Yes it is. The aspira-okay, stuff that you'd like to see in the RAA is within the other work group. This work group is working on what has already been agreed.

Evan Leibovitch Got it. Okay.

Michele Neylon: Just so we're clear. So the - just to summarize, this work group is only to deal with what has already been agreed using the various consensus policies, contracts, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. If there is anything that people would like to see as a new edition, a new idea, a new concept or whatever, then it needs to be addressed in the other work group. Not here please because I'm (at a scope) and I will put my foot down and say, "No, I won't allow it."

Anybody has a problem with that, please let me know but I'm still not going to change my mind.

Has anybody else have any other comments of this junction - juncture? Okay. My - could somebody from ICANN staff please clarify just one thing? This document from my understanding in it's final form is something that the registrars will probably need to present to their registrants. Is that correct?

Samantha Eisner Well within the REA there is that - there is a requirement that the registrars - if there is a document such as this or using this language and moving forward with the different types of documents that the registrars, along with the registrants agreed to as a statement of registrant rights and responsibilities, the registrants - the registrars would have to post it on their Web site.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so in other words, this documents in its final form - the one we're looking at now - is something that all registrants will be presented with and it will be accessible by all registrars Web sites.

Samantha Eisner Right. I'm not sure that there is a presentation requirement but they do have to make it accessible to all registrants or anyone on their site.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Michele. Sorry, was that (Samantha) responding there?

Samantha Eisner Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh hi (Samantha). I'm not sure that we've met and I have this brain that works in putting people's mental (widges) next to them as I'm talking to them, so if I've stumbled to match names and faces in my head that's why.

The word accessible came into mind - my mind as well and one of the issues that from a good number of very important parts of the community of registrants that I think needs to be at least put on the agenda for consideration in this working group is the definition of that word accessibility.

Certainly in here (unintelligible) world in Australia with a very active and quite professional group of accessibility issue lobbyists, we live in a very dotted Is and crossed Ts world of ensuring that accessibility in all senses of our definition is adhered to and I would like to see that as perhaps something we pay attention to as well. Not necessarily in this meeting but in the fullness of the activities.

Samantha Eisner Right, and I think - and (Thea McGees) is on the call as well and I think that that will be where a lot of the accessibility obligations are also looked at because it would be his group that would really look to see at least that the physical point of posting a document on the Web site to make it accessible in

that form, his group would evaluate whether or not the registrars are meeting their functions there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's more then, however, not being more then two clicks down and being in the UN languages. And so a tier and (undistributed) definition of what is expectations under the term accessibility might be worthwhile looking at, you know.

Michele Neylon: Okay ladies, ladies, ladies, ladies, before we digress too far...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm still digressing Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm sure you are.

Woman: I think it was - it was helpful to have that - the question...

Michele Neylon: No - no way. I'm not - I don't disagree. Cheryl, do you have a definition somewhere in your files of accessibility that you could - and post to the working group main list?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have two approaches to that. One is what UDA has agreed to and has operated under in its industry code of (practice). And the second I can certainly gather for you is the idealized requirements that the - the current disability and accessibility access work group from ICANN, the Australia Communication Consumer Action Network is currently arguing for.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So okay, in that case what I would say is that rather than getting into that now, we'll wait for Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, if we're going to go down that pathway I can get some background.

Michele Neylon: Yes maybe some - I don't have an issue - personally I don't have an issue with putting that on the table but I am conscious of - we need to move forward as much as possible. Now...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh hell yes. Yes. Like I said, not at this meeting.

Michele Neylon: Exactly. One thing that I read over of the document and while I found it was fantastic to have it all in one document. I am not a qualified lawyer, solicitor, attorney or any of those things. I found personally that the document, while trying to be diplomatic here, while helpful and very - and a positive mood in the right direction, I felt that my mother would've been scared to death if I presented her with it.

But it wasn't - it would be hard for a normal human being to actually read this document, to actually understand it fully. For example, some of the language, it's - those of us on this call are probably familiar with a lot of the terms that are used in this document but it's average registrars probably wouldn't be.

Does anybody have any - does anybody disagree with me? Agree with me or otherwise - thoughts? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh you - I - my finger was - I want to put my hand up. I think that can my grandmother read it or can my mother read it test is an incredibly important one to put on these documents and you've heard the terms plain language come out of my mouth so often, Michele, you - probably while you talk to me.

As a matter of fact, (Samantha), you (adjust) this background and I did come into the call as you were explaining the challenge of moving out of one mindset and how we write things into another.

The net benefits we've seen within the telecommunication consumers understanding of their rights and their responsibilities since we changed to an industry code which for all telecommunications - here I'm talking, you know,

the hot stuff like mobile phones and mobile premium services and the whole lot - into plain language and single contracts.

It was painful, yes I admit but it certainly has been worthwhile so I think we (pass) that message - that messaging reference earlier might need to be applied on some of that. And the good test is can my grandmother read it and understand it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any other comments on that at the moment?

Evan Leibovitch Well the accessibility of the language certainly is something that, you know, you - I wouldn't have my parents read but it's not the scope of this document to engage in an ICANN tutorial.

One of the things that might be worthwhile in a preamble is to put up front an assumption that the reader has some knowledge about ICANN terminology and functions and if they're not aware of it, it'd be a reasonable thing to point them to a suitable tutorial.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anybody else?

CLO It's glossary which is something that GNSO itself could be very useful with the new Web site work.

Evan Leibovitch Right, but rather than creating a new one, to point people to what already is there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hell yes. Don't make more work.

Michele Neylon: Paul has his hand up.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Michele. Yes, I agree with - that was (Evan) just now - with what he's saying. Also I have a fear that if we try to - I'm putting it in quotations,



“dumb down,” the document to make it easy for our grandmothers to read, then we run the real risk of mischaracterizing something that is already a contractual term.

We’re sort of between a rock and a hard place in this one in that we’re not lawyers and we’re not trying to be lawyers so we just need to tell it like it is. At the same time, it’s often hard because the existing text is written by attorneys and it’s not necessarily the easiest thing to get through.

So I totally agree that let’s keep it more or less the way we have. Include a preamble and if there’re tutorials or other places folks can go to get the sort of more plain versions, great. But let’s be very careful without trying to condense the language and massage it in such a way so it’s easier read but then we run the real risk of mischaracterizing contractual terms and creating more problems.

Michele Neylon: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Just in response to Paul there. Again, one of the tools we found quite successful in the (space I’m) working within country is having things like guidelines too to clearly delineate to the more professional person involved and I did have my fingers doing quotation marks there because they can be professionally annoying people as well as professional lawyers and business people who like to nitpick on things and say that, you know, subsection 943 of page 847 doesn’t say that.

And if you use terms that are clear guidelines to a contractual relationship between A and B, so it’s clearly for the average human consumption, it avoids some of those fears. Well perhaps not the fears but some of the negative outcomes that I think Paul was trying to avoid.

And the main thing is that whatever is inked through a layered approach, if you're trying to ensure that end users and registrants have a clear understanding of what their responsibilities and rights are, is that those layers are properly linked and accurately linked to fully (grapple) legal language and what the contracts say.

Michele Neylon: Konstantinos?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes I totally agree. I mean, speaking of the (unintelligible) that we should really not change the language because we might find ourselves trapped in situations where, you know, registrants are just completely different things then we're trying to say.

However, this document constitutes and is a compilation of existing ICANN policies possibly and where feasible we could provide links. For example, when it comes to the (UDFPs), there is a very clear (UDFP) section within the ICANN Web site whereby registrants can refer to and they can understand.

The same when it comes to the database. So we can possibly circumvent the gap that exists between the legal language and the non-legal language by providing as much information as we can from the existing ICANN policies which are detailed enough for registrants to be able to understand.

Michele Neylon: Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes thank you Michele. These were all awesome ideas. Just a question, in particular for Cheryl. The guidelines that you make reference to, who drafts them? In our...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, I...

Paul Diaz: Would this be like the kind of group that we are at now across industry, various levels of expertise? Is it something that we would punt back to ICANN?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you want the exact experience from the Australian telecommunications which includes our domain name industry, those guidelines are put together by a small work group which is equally balanced between industry and consumer interests.

It's actually done under our regulators mandate but we didn't have a choice. The consumers complained and the government saved their (shell). So I assume this is something we are preferring to avoid in this current landscape to get it to be a mandate.

So that's how those guidelines were done. That said, they were built upon existing documents put together by a couple of (take) bodies for consumer actions and interest within countries. So they were models for us to work off and they were also built upon - on some of the industry developed market differentiators where some of the bigger or more adventurous industry players who had chosen to work with consumers directly on this matter, but outside of the regulatory process had started to put out very plain language, simple language.

It was a matter of formalizing those. So I'm not - I'm sort of sidestepping your answer, not trying to prescribe how it might be done in a domain name industry sense in the gTLDs base, but rather say how it was done in the much larger landscape of telecommunications in Australia.

Michele Neylon: Paul?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it may be the matter of another work group rather than this one.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Michele and Cheryl. You just took the words right out of my mouth. I was just going to ask for the group for debate. Do we believe that our charter empowers our particular working group right now to do this or for what it's worth as I would read it, we would make the recommendation, council

would take it on board and then a new work group hopefully smaller, bring together people with particular expertise, would do the crafting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A big (green) pick up on my - next to my screen.

Michele Neylon: I'm definitely not going to disagree. (David), any thoughts?

David Giza Generally I would concur with, you know, all of the positive comments that we've heard today. You know, clearly the document that (Samantha) produced is a - you know, a marvelous starting point.

And with the additions on today's call, contractual compliance can use the document very effectively as we develop some protocols and some guidelines to actually help communicate to registrars with the help of the registrar liaison team.

So I'm very optimistic and enthusiastic about the document and looking forward to moving it along in this process.

Michele Neylon: Okay, any other comments or thoughts? Oh, come on. Don't go all deathly silence on me.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm eating my vegemite on toast, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I beg your pardon?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm eating my vegemite on toast. I've moved my speaker away - my mic away from my mouth. That's - you don't want to hear me crunching my vegemite on toast. I'm a good little (hungry). It's breakfast time.

Man: What time in the morning is it over there Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: About half after 5.

Michele Neylon: God. Okay, I'm sorry I asked. Okay then so just - basically just to summarize what we have kind of decided on, if we could add in links to the relevant sections on the main ICANN Web site where these policies are drawn - withdrawn from, we generally think that that will be a move in the right direction. Would that summarize to a point what people have been saying? Yes? No?

Samantha Eisner This is (Samantha). Can I ask for clarification on that point? Would it be helpful to not just include links to the policies but also include links to the specific terms that are being discussed? You know, pinpoint the specific references from the REA? Or does that go too far?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I can jump in there, it's one of the layers that we found we had to add in because there are - it was about the protection mechanism to ensure that no one misinterprets or quotes as capital (ill) lower, what isn't.

And we also figured it was very little effort for a great deal of assurance that we have proper accuracy and integrity of the full flow of information from the sort of fluffy plain language. Have we got a deal for you but this is what it means type stuff that you'll find in some purchase points. And right through to how large the font has to be on television advertising for, you know, what actually the contract is on some of these things. So the answer is yes for me.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else have any thoughts on that? Personally - it's Michele speaking - personally I would it helpful if at least the first time that a bit of jargon is introduced that is linked to somewhere that explains what the hell it is. And at first I think that personally would be helpful. I'd agree with Cheryl.

Samantha Eisner And this is (Samantha) again. One of the things that I need help with as I do this is I don't necessarily see jargon the same way that people who aren't

working in the legal department with these contracts everyday see jargon. So having pointers from you to tell me where the jargon is and where things could be linked to or what really would be helpful to point out would be a formal productive exercise for me then for me to sit there and look at it and me trying to figure out where to go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Samantha Eisner: And that also goes with if there are places where it doesn't - would my grandmother understand this, if there're sections that maybe are still too legalized used, if you can point those out to me because I can't see them myself.

Michele Neylon: Okay so how would you like us to proceed with this? How could we help you to identify - how would you like to approach it I suppose is the - what I'm trying to ask. How can we identify those bits that might be problematic or that we think might should be worded more clearly?

Samantha Eisner: A product that would help me the most and I'm not sure what the working group process could be to get there, but the end product that would help me the most would be to have one or possibly two separate documents if necessary highlighting terms or highlighting sections that are unclear maybe with a comment explaining what way it's unclear, having something unified like that. Or having a list of terms presented to me or I see people are posting potential places to source a glossary or something for terms.

Any sort of resources that I could turn to, if those could be presented to me in a list so that I could put it back together in a preamble. Those are the types of things that could help me.

Michele Neylon: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank Michele. Right there it sounds like some work group homework. I think it's providing everyone in the work group agrees that that is within scope and my personal view is that yes, that activity is in scope. I think that's a very worthy step for us to proceed to.

Michele Neylon: One thing I would remind you all of is the conversation I had earlier this afternoon with Beau and - who was on the call earlier? Sorry my brain is...

Woman: Heidi.

Michele Neylon: Heidi. Sorry Heidi. I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She is not that forgettable Michele. We are going to estimate you (slept) through that.

Michele Neylon: Sorry Heidi. It's nothing personal. I'm just - my brain has been fried all week. I do apologize but I've been having a very bad...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Please don't be offended. We have a deadline. What was it, February 4th I think it was?

Woman: Yes.

Michele Neylon: And it's now - what date is today? The 20th - 20th of January, so we're looking at basically about two weeks, give or take. So are we - we have to be realistic here in terms of what we can actually achieve. Cheryl, I know you're dying to say something.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My heavens, you're (unintelligible) from (slide) brains to physic. I'm impressed. You've been reading too many Stephen King novels. I think that's just it.

What I was going to say is I don't think that's an unreasonable thing for one or two of us. And I would probably encourage it to be - those of us who are coming from the end user end of the spectrum in this work group to undertake that exercise at least as a first pass between now and our next meeting.

And - which I'm assuming is going to be something like next week. I know that's probably jumping ahead in the agenda. And to that end...

Michele Neylon: It's okay. I mean, it's okay, you can hijack the meeting. Never mind.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you darling. And to that end I was going to say, I was trying to scroll through the draft document just to have a quick look and sort of do some highlights and I can't actually do that. Oh, okay, someone else has to control that for me.

One of the simple things I could do to help that process is providing they have the time in their agenda, is ask the ICANN panel here in Australia to have a look at it with a view to, you know, is there much jargon that would need to go into a jargon busting document since jargon busting documents are something that that organization produces very, very regularly and is used for both industry and consumer (orgs) as sort of reference points for these sorts of things.

And maybe someone like (Evan) could put over another sort of different perspective view on it as well to highlight the other aspects, in other words, those need different approach to (unintelligible) language rather than development of a glossary.

Michele Neylon: (Evan), as you (unintelligible).



Evan Leibovitch Oh, I can certainly help. I'm still a little bit fuzzy about the specifics of what this would be but certainly the idea of going through - I don't know how much of a different perspective I would give but I'm more than happy to help go through things and try my best at least from my point of view to try and make things accessible within the limits of what we've already discussed.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Thank you (Evan). Thank you Cheryl. Anybody else have any thoughts at this juncture? No? Okay. Okay, so then could you - (Evan) and Cheryl, would you be able - in a position to make some movement on that by next week if we were having a meeting sometime next week? Or that can be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I can certainly ask.

Evan Leibovitch I can make some time available. I guess maybe we can just figure out sometime to put heads together.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I mean it's not - it's - what's the term? Not extensive or single enough. It's in no way. It's complimentary (Samantha). It is not a 75-page document is what I'm saying.

(Samantha): Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's accessible. It's nine-tenths of the way there on my (first scan). I mean, I put it up in my Google (documents). I've got to stop trying to use the lack of control in the room this morning. And yes, I've only had one coffee which might also effect what I'm able to do as well.

On a quick scan through, I'm picking up, you know, it would be a fairly easy job to do that I've undertaken on this document because it's (unintelligible). So the short answer is yes (Mike).

Michele Neylon: Okay cool. In terms of the next meeting, we would be sending out a famous doodle or daudle (sic) or whatever it is which...

Man: Daudle (sic). I haven't heard that before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele, can I jump in? Is there anything wrong in principle with having uniformity to meetings in date and time?

Michele Neylon: So what do you mean? Oh sorry, I (unintelligible) having them at the same time - same day and time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I mean my diary probably as you may well know gets pretty booked up pretty fast and if there's some sort of conformity, you know, I now actually have a part in my diary which is called doodle because the doodle machine has to block out all of these potential cross matching dates. That's bizarre.

Can't we just meet on the next time or next day if that's the day that suits the majority of the work group. And then it gets tweaked, you know. Next week can we move it up an hour or down an hour, across the day or whatever? Sorry, just a personal plea which can be ignored.

Heidi Ulrich: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Heidi?

Heidi Ulrich: If I may, Michele, we did try to have that. We always want uniformity, et cetera, but in two weeks during this time slot Michele will be unavailable. He will be in Switzerland.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They don't have phones there. That's just tragic for Switzerland.

Heidi Ulrich: So we suggested...

Michele Neylon: Well actually - okay but thank you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But also you're the coach here darling. You're not the only chair.

Michele Neylon: I - oh my god. You've always set the mark, my dear. You've always set the mark. That's why I actually said all the calls that I had earlier this afternoon were (unintelligible). Please feel free (unintelligible) the fact that I won't be around. I actually said that. I don't know if the call was recorded or not but I'm sure (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh look, I'll send you a virtual cuddle in darling. Don't worry.

Michele Neylon: Any way, in order the fact just to clarify, in two week's time, Wednesday the 3rd of February, apart from being one year older I will also probably be somewhere between an airport and my house possibly (unintelligible) totally involved and incapable of me joining any calls.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, another day and time that works then when you aren't in transit.

Michele Neylon: Yes but anyway, I'm more than happy to (take a look) at next week, for example, if we could have a meeting at the same time and everything next week, I personally don't have any issue with that because not may - although it may come as a surprise to you, Cheryl, I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, he really has got his brains right this time.

Michele Neylon: Yes I have. I too have a reasonably packed agenda because I'm...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. I wasn't suggesting you don't. I'm suggesting that because you do, uniformity might be useful.

Michele Neylon: No, uniformity would help certainly. If anybody has an issue with us, please do let us know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele, Cheryl here. Would it be an advantage to you to move it from the Wednesday timeslot to the Thursday timeslot?

Michele Neylon: Personally yes, but that's just me. I was...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well providing no one in this work group is involved in the other PPSC work group, and I'm only an alternate for that one, same time, same place, different day works perfectly in my diary.

Michele Neylon: Okay I mean, if that's (unintelligible) that will work fine. If anybody has an objection, please as usual speak up or else I'll take your silence to mean that you agree.

(Samantha): And this is (Samantha). I'm obviously not a member of the working group but I am not available next Thursday if you'd like me to be a part of the conversation. I am available on Wednesday but on Thursday I have an all day professional training that I have to attend.

Konstantinos Komaitis: This is Konstantinos. Thursday might also be difficult for me.

Michele Neylon: Okay can I suggest the next week we do Wednesday and then maybe we can look at doing Thursday the following week depending on people's availability? Would that be a compromise that would be acceptable?

Man: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, yes. Fine. I was trying to be nice to you Michele. You know, I can stop doing that. That's okay.

Michele Neylon: Cheryl, we've already discussed this thing about you being nice to me all the time. It's going to give me a bit of a (shy) reputation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm trying to ruin your reputation. (I haven't even worked that out.)

Michele Neylon: Okay.

(DJ): This is (DJ). If I can just get that in the diary for next week. That's (unintelligible) 1800 UCC, correct?

Michele Neylon: Correct.

Samantha Eisner I'm sorry, this is (Samantha) again. I don't know how essential I'd be to a conversation of this but I am actually not available next Wednesday at this time either. I have a board support issue that I cannot get away from.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is there a later timeslot on that day that would work for you then?

Samantha Eisner I'm available any time before 10:00 Pacific time and any time after noon Pacific - between noon and 5. I actually...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Samantha Eisner Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Easily you've got fair access to the wonderful world of work groups and diary challenges to most of the work groups, haven't you? Is that...

Woman: (A cover).

Woman: (Unintelligible) for one second.

Woman: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele, just so you know, Gisella - I just gave Gisella access, write - read and write access to my personal Google calendar so it was much easier then trying to work out what was going to clash with whatever else, so. Does later in that time work for you Michele? Would you be actually not in transit later?

Michele Neylon: Based on the Wednesday, I won't be - depending on the airports. But anyway, look, let's move on. Okay, next week Wednesday...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some time.

Michele Neylon: Or Thursday next - we can work something out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Michele Neylon: I don't want to waste everybody's time look - well, pause over diaries now. I don't think that's particularly productive. Okay then, so moving on, what else did we have on the agenda? Where the hell is the agenda? I (dropped) my brain. I was doing so well for like five minutes.

Heidi Ulrich: Michele, this is Heidi again. That would be the second and final point on the agenda for today.

Michele Neylon: Oh okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're really taking it very well actually.

Michele Neylon: Yes actually Heidi and I discussed this earlier. I managed to reduce the agenda from three points to two. So I decided to move one point into the other one. So actually yes, I'm quite impressed with that.

Okay then, so Cheryl and (Evan), if you could try to do something to move this forward, that would be appreciated in terms of what your - what you agreed to do or volunteered to do in your case (Evan).

Evan Leibovitch It serves me right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh (Evan), come on. You're used to it by now.

Michele Neylon: (Evan), I'm getting used to it so I can imagine you must be used to it surely.

Evan Leibovitch We'll leave it at that.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody have any other questions (at least) on matters they wish to raise at this point? No. Okay. I don't think we're going to achieve much more this evening so do you mind if we just call it an evening then? How does that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent plan.

Michele Neylon: Is that okay for everybody?

Man: Meetings running short are an unexpected pleasure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually Michele is very good at running meetings to time or less then. I'm always very impressed with Michele's management for meetings and I'm - now I'm ruining your reputation but that was an actual compliment, not me being gnarly.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Cheryl. And well thank you everybody and if there're any issues with time or anything else, please let (unintelligible) that she will be emailing list regarding timing for the 27th of January and the 4th of February and that we provisionally have - what was also an option to run the meeting according to a (uniformally) global calendar you're looking at (unintelligible) at

1700 hours (UTC). That was one thing that was mentioned but we can thrash that out on the list. (David), you're still on the call, yes?

David Giza        Still here.

Michele Neylon:    Are you reachable now or are you disappearing?

David Giza        No, you can reach me on my cell phone.

Michele Neylon:    Perfect. Okay does - if there're no other matters to be dealt with I will wish you all a pleasant afternoon, evening, morning or whatever time's on your end and I'll speak to you all next week.

Man:              Good enough. Okay very good.

Man:              (Thanks) Michele.

Man:              Bye.

Woman:            Thanks Michele.

Man:              Thanks Michele. Bye-bye.

Woman:            (Unintelligible).

END