

**Geographic Regions Review Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday 20 October 2010 at 1200 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Wednesday 20 October 2010 at 12:00 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,

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20101020-en.mp3> on pages:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

**Present:**

David Archbold  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

**Staff:**

Rob Hoggarth  
Bart Boswinkel  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent Apologies:**

Fahd Batayneh  
Paul Wilson  
Carlton Samuels

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone on today's Geographic Regions on Wednesday, the 20th of October. We have David Archbold, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. From staff, we have Rob Hoggarth, Bart Boswinkel, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White, and we have apologies today from Fahd Batayneh.

If I could also please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you David and Rob.

David Archbold: Fine. Thank you. Well officially good morning everybody. It's far too early for me this morning. I must admit that I did not get the latest version of the report

until I got in this morning, which was about ten minutes ago, so I'm behind the ballgame on this.

However, I think Rob in the earlier discussions made a good point that the main thing that we can perhaps look at is how do we move forward with the report to get it published before Cartagena and I think that's really where this meeting today has got to concentrate on. Although you will see that also on the agenda was sort of an acknowledgement of the letter that had been submitted by the Arab Region about wanting to have their own ICANN meeting, which is something that we've known about in the past from some people, but this is the first time we've seen anything official from the Arab League.

Okay, any feedback that anybody has been able to have that managed to read the full report before coming online this morning - any comments. And I suppose I'm looking primarily at Cheryl, because I saw that you did get it some time ago.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well not terribly long ago I will hasten to add.

David Archbold: I understand, but I know how quickly you work Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I actually liked it. I found it easy to read; I found it raised the issues as my memory serves and I've got a bit of a long memory on some of this.

David Archbold: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought the input and sources from public consultation deserved (to be peaked). It's the sort of thing that we do need to see in reports, which was excellent. I would like to perhaps if at all possible delve in - and this is just sort of flagging things as I suspect you are speed-reading through. I think the next steps we need to discuss if we could this evening, though my evenings are your mornings.

I think we're just a tiny bit short on the number of people for input on doing other than sort of (housekeeping) on how we will put it out and what we will be - you know are we going to - we have time for example to put it out for public comment (before) Cartagena - that sort of thing.

Other than that, I found it a very easy and a very rewarding read and probably for the first time I suppose I thought I could have (peaked out) the online entry and go, "Oh, I definitely prefer you know what's been described in Option 48 as opposed to 50," so that's sort of where I'm up to.

David Archbold: So getting there is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not only getting there, getting there nicely. And in fact, my flippant reference to numbers is actually not far off the fact (sheet that's scrolling up). In fact, I would be thinking we could pose some questions to the community asking their opinion on the various other options that were explored out of the UN model - the various UN models and ITU models with the recommendation of what would fit ICANN's needs better.

My personal opinion - I mean we could poll each of their communities and get a bit of a feedback on comfort levels (with these). What I don't see however is that we have enough people for - you know it would be nice David if (they) just did whatever you and I said, but they probably won't.

David Archbold: Yes. Sorry. I'm still reading and listening.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and David, this is Rob. You know with the lateness of me getting that out to you all, I didn't envision a host of detailed comments particularly noting that a number of other working group members weren't going to be able to make this call.

My chief interest from a staff person perspective that you won't recall today but perhaps over the next several days by email is you know I think along the

lines of Cheryl's feedback in terms of are we in the right ballpark or not. Is it close to a point where with some additional you know edits, polishing, tweaking with maybe you know some members saying, "Oh, I really don't like that option," or, "Can we expand here or can we change this or that language."

That we could move toward a potential publication schedule that looks at having potentially final working group approval by perhaps early November as in November 8, which to your point Cheryl would allow us to get the translations processed and the document on public notice by the 15th. You know certainly post it on the ICANN Web site by November 15 so that it could be subject to discussion in Cartagena.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You see drawing from some of the discussion points and also not unreasonably I suppose drawing from my general comfort zone and experience of hearing what people say in the space that I work with at least in ICANN, we could pose a couple of - perhaps recommendation is too strong a word - a couple of potential hypotheses.

A recommendation for example along the lines of rejigging the geographic regions to match the RIRs. We saw that a few times in the issues raised in the consultations listed. It also to some extent would then lead us to a subset of trying to meet the need coming in from the League of Arab States, and (I will start by saying) well the RIR geographic is one way.

Here are a couple of other international organizations' mechanisms of carving up the world. Can any of these be prioritized you know in a preference order. I guess I'd like to discuss with the work group whether some of those need to be (culled out of the list). My personal prediction would be yes, some of those would be valid to cull out of the list because they are just too far away from our current operational mechanisms, but some of them are just a tweak away from meeting some of the need we're hearing about.

David Archbold: Yeah, I mean the original concept was - when we first started out was that this report would not go that far into sort of recommendations, but I think until we do something like that, we're not going to get engagement.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think you're right. We need to get them something to get their teeth into, and that's why I wouldn't go as far as calling it recommendations, but I'd like to test a few hypotheses you know.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Would the operational organization of the ICANN SO and AC be benefited by a reallocation of geographic regioning in the following. A, along identical lines to the RIRs; B, along insert; C, along Insert 3 or 4 you know.

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe - or maybe some alternative ways of looking at it as well.

David Archbold: Yes, because I mean asking the questions just as you posed them just now making an assumption that it's the same for everybody anyway, which may not necessarily be the case.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: I mean could your organization, meaning ALAC rather than ICANN, have one regional structure and ccNSO will have a different one. Would that matter? I'm asking the question - you know posing the question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it possibly could. How that works when it comes to what the bylaws would look like would be kind of exciting, but...

David Archbold: (Maybe) it would indeed, but in any case, it's also ignoring some of the uses because some of the things that the ccNSO use regions for you don't use them for at all, so there are different uses as we've seen by the different bits of the organization.

Bart Boswinkel: Are you already...

David Archbold: So I think we've also got to look at the uses, because we could perhaps do away with some of the uses as an example.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But hang on, hang on, hang on. That's pushing ourselves way into an entirely different field. What we're looking at is reviewing the geographic regions within ICANN, and it's perfectly fitting for us to look at, explore, and have listed what the usage of those regions are, but the primary purpose is geographic diversity.

What ICANN does with its geographic diversity is sort of a subset of that that belongs very much in the SOs and ACs that do it. I think we'd be taking it a step too far if we were trying to propose that GNSO suddenly used the geographic requirements in a different way than they have - having just gone through a review decided to do so or established that doing so.

And from the ALAC point of view, it is a logistical issue. We would be using four regions or seven regions in the same way as we use the five we have now.

David Archbold: Fine, but that's not - that doesn't necessarily have to happen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well now you have lost me. What do you mean it doesn't necessarily have to happen? ALAC is specifically designed around regional structures. Any change to region has absolutely effect on the number for example of what constitutes the At-Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC.

Now it doesn't matter whether or not the rules say we carve it up 3 ways, 5 ways, or 15 ways. The mechanisms and how ALAC and At-Large work would

just be you know adjusted to work within 3, 5, or 15. There's other ramifications; I'm not trying to say there isn't.

There's huge ramifications, but I would have thought the same would go for the GNSO or the ccNSO. How we work within our own silos in the regions still comes back to what we're doing in terms of trying to ensure maximum geographic diversity and input into whatever it is we do.

David Archbold: Yes, sure, but I mean obviously I know the ccNSO best. I mean the ccNSO said, "Hey, yes there are issues, there are problems. We want to get them sorted out, but we shouldn't get them sorted out purely within ourselves. This is bigger than just us." And that's why it went to the Board and that's why we got you know a cross-organizational working group to look at it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but...

David Archbold: I don't the ccNSO - sorry Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry. Go ahead, Dave. Go ahead, Dave. Sorry.

David Archbold: Yeah, I was just going to say I don't think that ccNSO would object to the working group. Indeed, I think it expects the working group to say, "Well, there are these uses that you put it to. Are you sure you are achieving what you are seeking to achieve," or, "Here are possible other solutions that you - or other ways of looking at it."

Sorry Bart. You interrupted and sort of broke (my thought), but I'm sure you've got a good point.

Bart Boswinkel: No, I don't know if it's a good point. I think this goes back to the - say the way I understand it Cheryl is saying we've identified functions of geographic regions and these functions are a given.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And say how this - how we can achieve these functions or how we can achieve the goals for these functions - there are different models for it. Now you could go even a step further by saying - and if I understand Cheryl correctly, say the at-large geographic regions and they are defined could be different from the ccNSO way of defining of defining geographic regions. Because in a way, you see some SOs - say like the ASO has a different definition of geographic regions as well.

And how this would be implementable, that's the next phase, but as a starting point. Or you could say as an alternative model all have to be similar, and there you have already two options for discussion at the Cartagena meeting and for public comments.

David Archbold: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: And recognizing say - and maybe that's - because I think Cheryl's point is very valid. It is recognizing these functions (via they are) a given. I don't know how to phrase it differently.

David Archbold: Yeah. Yeah and I think there are differences Cheryl as well, even with the reviews. I mean GNSO - I agree. It has just gone through close -detailed reorganization and in fact has if you like slackened off some of the previous regional requirements that they had to make it more workable for them.

You've just had a review that because of the very nature of your organization looks at regional structures; my understanding is the ccNSO review didn't look at this area at all. Am I right Bart?



Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, you are right.

David Archbold: So we've got quite a different scenario as far as the ccNSO is concerned where some of their rules are far more I would say restrictive than anything whether it's in ALAC or anything that is within the GNSO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: With - instead of potential remodeling options, wouldn't one or more of whatever is put up for the community so you can see the - a preferred or ideal option to meet the needs and concerns of the ccNSO.

And you're coming from ccNSO. What do you think should be in your utopia the geographic regionalization just to suit ccNSO and ICANN? Should ICANN first of all have them or not, yes or no?

David Archbold: Yeah and that's one option.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Then if you've established no, well then that's simple. If you've established yes, what form is it?

David Archbold: Yeah, but I would...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because there are several models we can look at. Let's look at some of those models and see what (fits).

David Archbold: But the issue for the ccNSO to some extent is how are those - the region - whatever the region is used within that organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm saying that's where it belongs in the organization, not in our work group's recommendations.

Bart Boswinkel: Or you include it say and that's why this is a broad working group. Perhaps (with) every SO/AC, you come up with the similar types of questions. You come up with different models for every SO/AC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that can be a first layer of questions after the yes or no.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's okay too.

David Archbold: I mean to some extent, we have dealt with it. I can't remember whether it is still in the report, but it's something that we looked at earlier when we were looking at the uses. Remember that one where we said, "Well uses as far as the Board is concerned is no particular problem as long as you've got your regions properly defined." And I don't think there were particular problems for ALAC or GNSO, but we did highlight in fact the ccNSO. Do you not remember when we went through that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbold: Anyway, I think the main point here is that we should have some issues with it or potential suggestions within the report that can stimulate some response out of the various organizations. We don't need to get into the detail of what that is at this stage. I think we're looking at the principle. That this support contrary to what we originally (envisioned) may move on somewhat and try to get feedback on specific scenarios.

Am I getting agreement Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I think without that all we've done is put out another report that people will enjoy reading the text of and not know how to respond to.

David Archbold: Yeah, I agree. Any problems from Bart and Rob?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, I agree with say taking the next step. That is if you go back to the whole structure that was envisioned in the whole charter is say you've got the issues report, and this interim report is in fact setting already a tone for discussion by the community and a tone to come up with - to final recommendations. So it is the turning point from analysis to resolution.

David Archbold: Okay fine, so Bart is happy. Rob.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One of the opportunities here if I may Dave is because we've got this now in a piece of serendipitous timing able to be translated and out as a preparatory document to Cartagena, if we give ourselves a (slotting) in a forum, we can do some group think work shopping on it.

You know we can throw up some of these options and sort of get the feeling of the room and get the room starting to think about it. And then they can all wonder off and put more thought and more debate into it in their own silos and come back with something properly thought out and productive for us rather than just a knee-jerk reaction going, you know, "Yes, of course, we should have you know small (islands) in Arab states standing on their own."

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because you know that's real nice to say, you know. (Martha was good too. I would have laid apple pies beside it). Yeah, I mean and then what? You've got to have another layer of consideration.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

David Archbold: And you know just to be very flippanant, the more we carve up geographic regions, the stronger the ALAC becomes. And the more (costly) we become, the more diverse we can say that we are definitely being, because you know we can carve Asia-Pacific and our current region up perhaps even into four

ways. And then we would have mandated three people -- two from the regions and one non-com -- from each of those geographic localities. We would have a huge advisory committee.

Now whether it would be any more productive, I wouldn't venture to say it would be - probably quite the opposite, and that's going to be a different set of questions if we go for a single model. If we go for - you know find whatever works for you. The Board can be different to HSO different to HAC, and that brings you into another pathway of sort of thinking about your very pretty diagrams Bart when we met in a previous meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, (it was Saul).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, (Saul). No, so head down this pathway and then these are the decision (notes). Head down this pathway, and then these are the decision (notes). But we could do that in Cartagena as an interactive exercise and get valuable information back from it.

David Archbold: Now do we have time still to get a reasonable claim on (the somewhat short time)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, because nothing has come out unless it has happened in the last few hours. You haven't even got the forms have you Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: My understanding is that either the forms - I'm trying to recall from my bleary eyes last night. There is going to be a meeting before the end of this week of the staff that will include circulation of the forms and a timetable for publishing the schedule, so I think we are on the cusp of actually material Cheryl being released, which is a good thing. And to answer your question Dave, we do have time.

David Archbold: Okay, because I just remember the last time. Trying to fit in a meeting was almost impossible, wasn't it?

Rob Hoggarth: It was. We ended up with a meeting. I think it was emblematic of the challenges that the community and this working group have had fulfilling the charter, which is because it's still been in this "discussion fact-finding research mode"; it hasn't engendered a tremendous amount of interest. I thought you made a tremendous presentation in Brussels. Unfortunately, it was only available live right to about two people. There have been hits on the session page since, but in terms of a robust you know community-wide discussion, I think it fell short of that. I think the working group has time between now and Cartagena to actually design a really good session that would be able to build on a list of options or questions going in the direction that you all are discussing right now.

What I would ask for for working group members out of this discussion would be you know can we identify four or five specific direction questions as you all have been talking today to work into perhaps Section B of the Interim Report where you already have some general questions Dave to sort of tee things up.

Then what we could do is you know with that input from working group members, we could punch up the executive summary to highlight those questions.

The fact that this interim report will build on to a public workshop in Cartagena, and so right out of the box readers would say, "Oh, okay. We're now moving to a point in time where I can contribute. Where I can you know engage with my fellows in the community and have a robust discussion that will help the working group develop a good final report."

David Archbold: Okay, fine. Good. Sorry.

Rob Hoggarth: And one other observation. Please don't use staff satisfaction as a measure of anything, because we will do whatever we are instructed to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm so glad you said that Rob because I would have said something like, "And (the care factor on stuff section) is...?"

Just coming back to that planning, you see what we've got already in the text in Part B, which gives a whole bunch of - you know there are options that are out there. They have some standing because of from whence they come.

If we are going down a set of decisions to raise - and I think some of the stuff that Bart was leading us through and (Saul) was really important here. It really doesn't matter which pathway we take because we can still use these as examples and accept anything new that happens to come out from the exercise as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah. Yeah and that's the nice thing about an interim report isn't it? Yes, nothing is carved in stone.

David Archbold: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: This may make your hair stand on end, but you've got an opportunity to give us something better.

David Archbold: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean the first question to the community is you know does regionalization along geographic lines assist or facilitate diverse input into ICANN's activities, yes or no. Or whatever sentence works for putting (in there).

Yeah, now if they all go, "Oh, hell yeah," bravo boys and girls. Here's the next (unintelligible). "At the ICANN Board level, what does this mean? At the various SO levels, what does this mean? At the various (IC) levels, what does

this mean?" Yeah, lead them through a little bit of an exercise to sort of get the juices going and then you know pose some of the questions.

Bart Boswinkel: Or you could even - yeah, you could include them in this report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Oh, you want to give it up front? You want to put the script or the theme here. Oh, all right. You just know they won't read it until they get in the room (don't you).

Bart Boswinkel: You know that's fine, but from a process point of view, say as in the worst-case scenario we end up with something like in Brussels - 203 and the response. At least you've got a document that we posed these questions and this is based on the feedback. You can't introduce during the Cartagena meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it also means that they know why they are wanting to come to the room, because these are the questions that they (care to have any) input on.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yes. Yeah. Yeah.

David Archbold: Okay, the timing now - we need another teleconference. We need some input by email on the present state of this and then another get together to try and get more than just Cheryl and me on the line.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we avoid the IDN (CCC) meetings please.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it won't be in a fortnight's time is what I'm saying.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I've developed a tentative time schedule looking at the calendar the other day, and let me just work this through. I don't know if any of you have calendars in front of you, but with the present draft document and

potentially looking for feedback by the 28th of October, that feedback would include questions from working group members submitted by email that would be added into this decision tree or you know to beef up Section B.

We would then look at a further revision of the document circulated by the first of November with a working group conference call you know by you know the end of that week in hopes of getting final feedback, polishes, and edits done by November 8, and then that document could be posted I would hope. Certainly the English version, but I think we'd also have certainly French and Spanish translations and probably most of the translations done by the 15th - Monday the 15th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Depending merging) - you also need to put your (biddings) on a bit of floor space in an adjacent room that maybe we will want to find and come and join (us in).

Rob Hoggarth: I wouldn't (technically) include in...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (In Cartagena).

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, I would certainly include I the report this discussion and a list of to-dos for the working group members and staff that we'll schedule a time. We don't - none of us have the benefit right now of the block schedule. But once we have that, we can perhaps discuss by email and then conclude on the next call of the working group what day and time you guys want to slot.

If experience from Brussels holds true, and if you know the same principles are applied, there are probably going to be about seven or eight hours during that week where there will be an available slot. It will obviously not be an exclusive slot; it will probably go against some other meetings, but we will have a targeted time. And if we sell it right, then we'll get some good participation.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I suppose it should go without saying that we already have our ALAC and at-large schedule time completed. The agendas are not flushed out, but the rest has been approved, so you've got that that you could (steal off Heidi) and therefore ensure that we - you find blocks of time that we can get all of our community into this room. Because (I've got the ability of saying) it's compulsory (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: That would be great. I will coordinate (with Heidi).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But only if it's not competing with one of my own meetings.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: Understood.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Heidi) can get you that on request. That's not a difficulty at all. (A meeting) about 12 hours ago - I had a meeting that we finalized all of that so that's ready to go.

Rob Hoggarth: Oh, super. Okay.

David Archbold: And obviously the later in the week we make it the fewer people we're going to get there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not necessarily. It just - if you want the GAC, and I think we probably do, you need to keep it sort of pre-Wednesday or pre-Thursday morning isn't it Bart from memory?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I think Wednesday afternoon is - most of the time they are communiqué drafting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's either late Wednesday afternoon or early Thursday morning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, those seem to be the prime times, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And it's the same (for the cc) crowd. It's - Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday are out. They are just blocked because of all these meetings themselves for the ccTLD community.

David Archbold: Yeah. Yeah, so late Wednesday or early Thursday.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: Going into Friday and you lose a lot of people.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Oh, we won't have time to meet) on Friday. Friday the dogs - (it brings us to the) dog and pony show and we don't want that.

Rob Hoggarth: We will shoot for those time periods.

Bart Boswinkel: I think - and yeah Monday is going to be difficult and Sunday is going to be difficult as well. Say from a CC perspective, Monday is - Monday afternoon will be probably full of IDN stuff, so that's out, and Monday morning is (deck) working group for - and those CCs who will be around will most likely attend that session or those sessions.

David Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Including your Chair.

David Archbold: Indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well I've got another call starting in a few minutes gentlemen.

Rob Hoggarth: One last thing Cheryl just in terms of the agenda that we had circulated, we've noted just acknowledging the League of Arab States letter. I'm just trying to track down - because as you may all have noticed, that was sent to the CEO at the end of August.

I haven't confirmed whether there was an official response or whether one is being drafted. You know but we circulated that to you all just to give you the heads up that it was there. There's no requirement from a working group's perspective to acknowledge it, but wanted you all to be aware of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think we need...

David Archbold: I would be interested in any replies that they got.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it would be quite appropriate for us to ask about the reply that was sent, and then I will take off my work group hat and put on my ATRT hat. And if you find out there has not been a reply...

Rob Hoggarth: Will do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it's perfectly appropriate for us to make that request because such correspondence should be publicly available on the site.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and it is. The letter itself is available (after I found it).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean the reply.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we just go, "Oh dear, it hasn't been posted yet. Please send us a copy." We're sure you've almost got to uploading it, but...

Rob Hoggarth: Well with your permission Dave what I will do is circulate based on my notes the list of next steps and to-dos (and what you and Cheryl is going to edit).

David Archbold: Yes, please and the date.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, will do. We will get out a - our staff to-do in terms of the next meeting will be to get out a doodle to make sure we aren't giving as an option any IDN call times.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the IDN call times (takes up) this time every fortnight.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: (In principle).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I have a meeting every fortnight that starts at the top of the hour following the IDN call. So if it's going to be on this day, it needs to be an hour earlier. If it's going to be on another day, you need to talk to Gisella.

Rob Hoggarth: Will do, because I don't think Dave (can go an hour earlier).

David Archbold: I cannot go an hour earlier. I just - my brain doesn't operate an hour earlier.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would not have thought that was fair or reasonable to suggest an hour earlier. I was just saying if it's going to be on this day, the (preference) would be to shift days.

David Archbold: Yeah, I don't want to (offend).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And to be honest Dave, you know talking to you all at 11:00 pm to follow a call at midnight is not the high point of my week either. I prefer a red wine and cuddling up with my husband in bed, but there you go. I'm with you boys instead.

Rob Hoggarth: Well please thank him for us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely. All right then.

David Archbold: Thanks Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a problem. Are we finishing then?

Bart Boswinkel: I think we are.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave are you adjourning?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, bye.

David Archbold: Okay, take care.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you everyone.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Bye-bye.

David Archbold: Yeah, bye. Thanks (now).

END