

>> JORDAN CARTER: And we will now move to the next agenda item. Which is the staff accountability work and with -- I was former -- in a former life Avri. Sorry Avri for deserting you in that role. It's nice to be on the stage with you.

>> AVRI DORIA: You may think you deserted me. I think you as the co-raptor. Okay. I don't have slides on it. I guess someone made -- let me see what I did with my computer. I was basically going to walk through the recommendations. I have my -- my computer gotten real cute. If I touch in the right place it will go to sleep. It does. I will show you. Okay. So basically you know -- I was very grateful. We came I think at the last meeting and asked for a little bit of leeway in our charter to basically look at issues. So the first part of the report and it's a relatively short report. So hopefully people have had time to read it. It's about six, seven pages. So hopefully people had time. There's a much longer addendum to the report with all the gory details and discussions we had. First we discussed the roles and responsibility. I'm not going to walk through those at the moment but I do recommend that people read them and basically we went through the of who's primary role -- we're using the terminology that has been sort of set for this of their being three parts of ICANN. ICANN is divided into three parts. The organization, the board, and the community. And try to use that language. So part of this effort requires sort of looking at all these things. Who's role and responsibility is it. So the first section of this report looks at it -- looks at the fact the staff role is distinct from that of the board and community and looks at the people. Then the next part of the report looks at issues. What we did there was we collected individual issues and we got several sent in by different stakeholder groups, different individuals, of problems. What we did was then extracted them into a set of more general issues that the stays we received fell

into. Kind of like the baskets of issues that we had and so the issues were things we looked for were systematic and connected. And some of these and I'll just read off some of them. No clear form in which community participants can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability and likewise no clear form in which staff can raise and work through concerns about community members behavior or performance. Inconsistent with policy and implementation was also a issue. Concern express of overall culture organization being less focus on supporting community work and policy development. Other areas that touch on community decisions. No institutionalize rout for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems. Staff may not be consistently ICANN commitment in the way they summarize and respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments. There was concerns about sort of transparency of compensation scheme. What concerns about a particular incident or experience relating staff accountability. And then appropriate methods for addressing request that may exceed allocated band with. So those were the issues that the various reports we received fell in tried to abstract them tried to not generalize them and say they apply to everyone at all times but they were the kinds of issues that people were dealing with. At that point went into the recommendations. Those begin on page 4 of the document. The first ICANN organization should continue developing publicizing. So involved concise statement. So we basically went through describe the various roles and responsibility as they are now. Talk about the document that exist, and basically said we'll continue relying on it. Number two. ICANN should further development and regularly publish a detail ICANN organizational chart of all employees with clear reporting lines. So that contracted partying and other community members are aware of different level of decision making within each department for escalating and otherwise. That responded to other comment that

received about I don't know who to go to. One of the concerns that we had is how do you deal with issues before they become complaints. Yes, at the end of the role there's a complaints officer but people were looking for how do you actually get something dealt with while it's still an annoyance while it's still a minor issue as opposed to waiting until it becomes a full pledge complaint. Three, ICANN should create a four member panel composed of the -- I guess should be Ombuds now. Chosen by empower community and board member. They will review concerns, issues raised by the community Ombudsman staff or board that at least two panel members determine require further effort. While they work transparently it will edit discretion be able to treat stays require it as confidential. Going back to previous discussion. Very often that the issues that come to that are already very visible and such as require but very often they require confidentiality. One part I should explain after the recommendations there's another section that basically maps the issue to the recommendation and then discusses them in further detail. Okay.

Four, ICANN organization and corporation with the community and board should develop appropriate internal processes for ICANN staff to raise and resolve any issue they have in working with community members. One of the things that came out in this is it's all well and good for us sitting here as community to say what can we do about staff but as soon as you start talking to staff members, both within the context of this group and just privately you understand there's a shoe on another foot that leaves staff members very often with no ability to get something dealt with because the community members are sort of this in this sacred little bubble that they can't touch.

And they need a way to be able to deal with us as well as we needing a way to deal with them. One of the things that hasn't been expected at the beginning is

there really is an equal that when one ask for staff community having some notion of staff accountability staff has to have some notion of community accountability and there needs to be a way to go back and forth. Five ICANN organization in cooperation with community and board should institute information acquisition program. Surveys focus groups info from complaints, office ICANN organization better ascertain overall performance and accountability to relevant stakeholder groups. There's already some of this in place. This is more of a coordinated pulling this together. Six ICANN should continue to focus on ICANN organization as effective support system for multi-stakeholder bottom up mold who champion a culture, transparently responsiveness accountability -- there should be a regular evaluation recording skull while this may fall within the ATRT purview but may be done in a different manner but haven't gone beyond that. I think the first instinct was this was an ATRT type issue but there was also a strong comment on don't overload the ATRT it's already got a lot to do plus the ATRT has an option to take an issue so with ATRT happening every five years if one cycle of the ATRT decides not to take an issue it could be ten years before you got back there again that may not be adequate. This is a two party. Develop and public service level agreement similar to service level agreement, that clearly define all services provided by ICANN contracted party and service level party for each service and then B develop and publish service level definition that clearly define services for members of the community and department expected service level for each type of service. Now these are still some what under discussion. There was a certain concern by some in the organization and I think some other members of our group that defining service level agreements between staff and community would be very difficult to do. That there may be some resistance in that and such. But there was also an equally strong view on the side of the contracted parties that

they have to live by very strong service level great many times that are captured in their contracts and the insecurity they felt with the service level they got from staff warranted their basically being an equal type of agreement on both sides of that relationship. So that was part of that. Whereas when we looked at the service level definitions in terms of the rest of us in terms of how various constituency stake holders, ACs get their work done there were often concerns about the service levels but nothing that easy to the level of a contractual agreement that could be defined plus there's so many things that the organization that staff do for and with the community that trying to get them all defined in something strict was difficult. This as the next session indicates is really something that would be a process that starts and would be an on going effort. There was a very late recommendation 7A and 7 B. Be decided into two but I asked that that be put off between readings since that meant that would be doing a fourth reading before bringing to you all. There was I wanted to note there was a comment that I should provide. 8, ICANN organization should improve ability and transparency of the organization performance management system and processes in specific how department goals identified and mapped to ICANN strategic goals and objectives. And finally 9, ICANN organization should enhance current community related to staff performance by insuring managers seek input from members during staff reviews. Shortly we'll open up for discussion. Next session taking each recommendation, mapping them against the related issues, and then basically discussing them in a little more detail. Discussing perhaps how they might be implemented going forward and such and I'm not going to read those though more than happy to talk about any of them now. I should state that the group basically did have a consensus on submitting this report though we can continue to word Smith and argue about details for another couple months but we really felt it was time that we basically got this

down and brought it to you all for a first reading with the understanding that the comments we get here may cause a few changes before we come back with a second reading. We did feel it was complete enough and discovered issues we needed to cover sufficiently to bring it to open up discussion and to get some view points. Hi a very agreeable group of people and in the group we basically did a forced weekly march through this and the group was also very good about putting up with rotation times. We continued -- I said putting up. I saw an arched eyebrow on one of the participants. Putting up in other words we really tried to maintain we did two readings at two different times because with a -- with following the rotation of the three meetings, there's at least one time for each group of people that's impossible. And I'm calling it impossible even though I did make it to all of them. But -- well I don't sleep. So -- so we did everything with at least two readings and discussions in between. So different subsets of the group that met all had a chance to talk through things. Hopefully that was a quick walk. It's relatively short I'm hoping you have chances to read it. And that as I said there is an accompanying addendum we've put out that not a consensus document. It's just basically the collection of all the bits and pieces and documents and tables that were creating along the way as sort of a show your work type of thing so that you can go back and see the deeper discussion of some of the issues and such that were generated before we got here. And I'll stop there.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks Avri for that presentations. Comments on the content of the report of the group's report to raise their hand in the Adobe room. As soon as we finish this staff accountability we'll move on to the next item which is jurisdiction. We don't have an extra long non coffee break. I sent the list of the

advising to the same. The firsthand up. Is George not in the Adobe in the room. George go ahead.

>> Thanks very much. For the record George I'm a member of the board and I'm the liaison to this group. I attended about half of the meeting a cup until the middle of the night and I can vouch for Avri's description of the group. The issues were tackled fairly thoroughly. We went back and forth a number of times. We ended up with something that I think has value. I'm here to give what is essentially -- how do I characterize this an incomplete informal reaction of the board to the document. And let me start by saying that you see the report as being composed of a set of issues which were identified and we're not going to take any issue with those issues the roles and responsibilities that were identified and also the recommendations. We think the issues are important. We have a reaction -- a very positive and a neutral reaction to some of them and the really -- but we would like to deal all of them in a way that resolve it is problems between staff and community. It's clear that one of the fundamental problem is there's no -- this is my characterization no safe space, felt there's no safe spacing in which discussions of problems can be adjudicated between staff and community. Would you agree with that Avri that's your issue number one.

>> AVRI DORIA: I'm not sure I would agree with the word adjudicated because that involves a judge of some sort. The safe space I agree with. Adjudication I'm not sure the group got to that.

>> I'm not a lawyer. I picked that I that was probably the wrong word. Say discussion is fine. I brought this up during a number of times during the call why don't we see if we can get to the heart of some of these issues that are being complained about. The rest of the issues essentially talk about inconsistency between policy and implementation no institutionalize feedback, et cetera. All of

those if they are to the extent they are issues, then they need to be dealt with. The way in which the issue space is described is general, and without real specificity and I know that's what you wanted to do in the sense you didn't want to bring individual people and agreement into the discussion and that may be appropriate but it leaves us with the sense of all right these are things we really somebody concerned about but where's the evidence. Now you may have the evidence. I don't know how it was collected but we don't see the evidence. So our sense is that first we need to understand the issues space in order to understand whether the recommendation solved the issue. We like to stay with 2tw the issue space and make the following offer that we would like to start w dealing with these problems almost immediately and we're willing to define that safe space or we're willing to let you define it since you're really the one have to feel safe in it and then look at the specifics behind the rest of the issue space. Go ahead. I've got more.

>> AVRI DORIA: First of all I kind of believe there's a catch 22 here. We basically did collect specific issues and reabstracted them. Some of them can be found in the evidence of the work N the longer document that defines things. The purpose of the group and what we got approval for was to describe systemic issues. Now I find it personally I haven't take ton the group yet problematic, to say I'm not comfortable with your systemic issue give me the details so I can argue the details and solve the problems and not look at the systemic problems because I only care about the specifics not the systemic. So I sort of believe we're in this funny loop of give me specifics, so that I can solve them and then we don't have a systemic issue any more. Whereas what we did was we collected the issues and such and really have a problem with the notion of this group

becoming yet another complaints department for dealing with issue by issue by issue.

>> I understand the catch 22 analogy. I think -- I don't think that what we need -- what we mean to suggest is to solve all the issues. What we mean to suggest is a way of getting at this t specifics so that we can -- we can identify and understand the systemic issue. More at the detail level than the general level. It's one thing to say you have a problem. It's another thing to say well the problem occurs because of. It may be a systemic thing or a series of random things that are essentially different every time in order to understand whether the -- whether the recommendations solve the problems, it really is use to feel understand the problems space in some detail. So that is -- so we have a problem essentially being enthusiastic what follows without understanding more about the specifics of the systemic problems that you have cataloged and I think you can understand why that's the case. We do think the issues are important but we want to generate more enthusiasm about the recommendations based upon a better understanding of the issue space.

>> AVRI DORIA: May I ask. Is the issue you don't believe those issues are systemic issues that exist?

>> The issues we need to understand that. It's not a matter of belief or not belief. It's a matter of lack of knowledge, lack of understanding which allows us not to really understand that the recommendations solve the problem.

>> JORDAN CARTER: George do you have more points to raise at this point or --

>> I think that's a major point. We're looking forward to identifying real problems. And providing a real solution. That's our goal.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I think we need to think about that and take that comment as it's offered for a comment for the group to digest.

>> AVRI DORIA: Basically you rejected the notion there are recommendations until such time the board as the board is pleased with the issue.

>> No, not at all. We neither reject or accept the recommendations. Your work is still a work in progress. And we'd like to know more so that we can understand exactly what you're doing and why you're doing. What you're recommending and why you're recommending it.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks George. We'll proceed with the speaking list. Julie Hammer and David McAuley please use the adobe room. It's easier to push a key. Julie.

>> Julie Hammer speaking. In looking at your recommendation 3 where you're proposing the 4 member panel comprising the Ombudsman complaints office ripped from the impaired community and the board member, I guess I have an instinctive tendency to resist setting up more bureaucratic processes and panels and entities so I guess what -- just to help my understanding I'm wondering if you could give what sort of issue that might have to go to an entity like that that couldn't be say dealt with the Ombudsman himself or by the complaints office itself in isolation. Thanks.

>> AVRI DORIA: I'm actually not sure I got a specific issue. I have to think. Basically this came up in conversation and it was a conversation in which I think the idea first came I believe from the Ombudsman and it was issues that are

sometimes complex in terms of is it an issue of fairness, or is it a complaint. Very often when you get these issues and you sort of don't really know whether the location is so how does the Ombudsman and complaint officer and perhaps more work together when there was a need. One of the things we were trying to be careful of is not make it yet another bureaucratic entity if at least two of them felt you know I've got a problem I'm here I'm the Ombudsman person I've got a problem that involved more than just first, more than just the issues that I've got within my bailiwick how do I deal with it. Can I just sit down and fairly discuss with other. It came out of more that kind of discussion than a specific example. I'm sure we could go back and sort of craft a hypothetical that would do it. But basically came out of that discussion that we have these things the complaint officer and the Ombudsman now who gets an issue. Well if I use the word fairness in it I go to Ombudsman if I'm just complaining to the complaint officer. If I'm sort of winging about something that's unfair and -- but it's kind of related to one of the rules but -- I think it's being done wrong but it's really not fair and so all of a sudden you get something that's sort of been complex and you really don't know in which of these two it belongs because they have fuzzy borders in terms of is it fairness issue or is it a complaint. It's one of those things I have trouble personally separating it was basically to have this out if something is too complex or something fell into a -- several categories it would be possible to get the bunch of them together and sort of hash it out. But without being yet another bureaucratic entity.

>> If I might follow up. That's really my point. Surely they as professionals can interact on such issues without having to be seen as a panel as such.

>> AVRI DORIA: I'm not sure that they can. And indeed the idea did not come from you know -- you know from me or from the others it was actually -- it

started out as a third person panel suggested by the Ombudsman in the meeting and we amply identified it -- I forget whether we added the board -- since it was talking about community members but it was a suggestion that we took and built on. We could certainly go back and add more examples of something that would not you know fall exactly.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I just add to that the thing that I found most useful in understanding this panel was the discussion of bottom of page 5. Where it says panel will not have extra powers. So to me rather than felt like a -- it felt more like a structure conversation knew knowing that a group of people can tabling. Thanks for the feedback. The next person. David McAuley.

>> DAVID McAULEY: I have a question and it goes to the nature of the staff and let me preference my remark as a working party leader in one respect I have had a lot of experience with contractors who are staff in a sense and it's been yuan formally supervisor push. This is not prompted by a complaint. My question is just informational if I pissed missed in the presentation. But does your report on dealing with staff does it get to contractors as staff do all the recommendations apply or.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes the organization has been defined elsewhere to CEO and on down getting paid. As full time, part time contracted staff what have you. It's the whole you know -- anybody that's under the CEOs per view.

>> DAVID McAULEY: Thank you. Philip Corwin.

>> PHILIP CORWIN: I'm very stressed with everything going on in ICANN right now not being to be critical but thinking specifically of a situation that I and other members of the community dealt with over the past felt that staff over stepped their bounds in a process that ultimately lead to a board approval of something

based on that staff action where the groups filed request for reconsideration to no good affect. So thinking about what would I like if something like that arose in the future that I feel more independent and objective and have enforcement capabilities and I'm sorry to say I don't see that here. I see a four member panels that's noted elsewhere that has no new powers. It's a discussion group and the members of the Ombudsman who are not formally staff is described as independent but none the less paid by ICANN the complaints officer that's who a staff member of ICANN. Representative of empower community which is the one possibly independence person where at least a person more sensitive to community concerns than others on this panel and the board member and my experience in watching board in these situations is that the board tends to be protective of staff. I don't get a real -- there's a lot of other things in this recommendation I think are good ideas and useful and may get out ahead and present conflicts but when there's a real conflict between the community and staff have either over step boundary or failed to -- their authority. I don't get a real good feeling this panel is going to provide anything other than a discussion that's identify by bias to backing the staff. Those are my personal comments. I wish they could be more positive. That's my objective evaluation at this moment in your process. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: No, I do agree and we seem to be somewhere between and betwixt maybe we need to find a more enforceable way for the community to have something more to say about organizational behavior. It may be in deed the case the direction in which this needs to be reworked.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Also Philip, it's not clear to me whether it was our mandate to create new whether the existing sweet of processes that are being

improved in various ways might be better suited to tabling the situation that you've described. But feel free to tell me otherwise on that.

>> PHILIP CORWIN: Well I don't have the particular mandate for this subgroup in front of me but I would think that a group looking at staff accountability and then in the context of work stream too that the goal of which is to make ICANN more accountability would be evaluating whether existing mechanisms for holding staff accountable and intervening effectively when staff act in a nonaccountable way would be evaluating whether the present avenues were sufficient and if not what could be put in place that would be more effective. So that's the context in which I'm viewing this. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Thank you.

>> I found it a little bit frustrating that having in -- as far as I can remember through the working group we look at and mentioned some very specific issues and then really tried to work out some systematic and systemic issues. I think it was a very valid report we as a group can't evaluate and can look at every single systematic detail. George I think one of the options to go back to the conversation to the transcription and go back to the people that actually mention and gave specific examples to look at it and work on that any further but I wouldn't note -- on to the working group itself. I would see outside of the agreement. Sorry last -- sorry to the chair. There are some laptops in the room who just simply refuse to speak adobe connect and my does it every time windows updates. Sorry about that.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, Claus I think that's one thing we had direct issues and even accusations that we felt it wasn't our business but if we need to pull that

kind of you know give me the dirt for the board to be able to accept theres an issue we may just have to do that. I don't know.

>> I'm more than happy to provide some of it.

>> AVRI DORIA: Oh, no I do believe if we are forced to document dirt we can do it.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Moving along Sebastien.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Maybe there would be some choice between what subgroup are doing and the board interest with the work we are doing in general in this working -- work stream too. about four member panel. It was on my paper at the last meeting it was three person one reason I like the evolution here is also because in -- there's evolution on where possibly the Ombuds can end up to be dealing with or to be -- today's clearly is between Ombuds can w ICANN board who decide about -- and about what they do or how they work. They report to the board. If we follow what's on the review proposal then the Ombuds will be more independent from the board. I don't know if we end up like that. But it's one way. And I think it's interesting this -- because every -- three or four legs are useful. Because one of the reasons could be simply the following -- we receive complaints but both or three of us can deal with and who will take the lead or who are I do the job. It's as simple as that. We find example where more than one will need to take part of the job but maybe just to decide which one will be lead and that will be useful toed we have -- two offices -- and the complaints office. I guess I have certain point but I don't remember. That's okay. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Kavouss.

>> Yes I put seven or 8 messages in the chat. In addition from the very beginning I as participant said this was not necessary at all to create a management inside another management. A staff would not be accountable to committee. Staff are accountable to superior and superior are accountable to ICANN board and ICANN to community. It could not include the situation it may worsen may create -- unforcible situation and give -- something that we should not expect. We should leave to the Ombudsman office and the complaint office. They are more stuff to deal that. I thought that was not a sensible and useful exercise. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: We worked through the Q in the room. We've heard initially feedback from the board seeking more -- understanding of the problem space. And I think that's sort of a comment we look forward to discussing in the subgroup. Are there any other comments with the plenary on the -- anyone would like to offer at this point?

Lori, go ahead.

>> LORI SCHULMAN: Lori Schulman for the record. I was sort of lurking on some of the calls and I know how much work went into it. I want to reiterate a point I made in Copenhagen I'm not sure reflected in the report. Maybe I haven't read the whole thing. I'm just going by what we saw in the room today. It's this whole issue which I think comes to the core of a lot of complaint is staff performance tied to community performance and should it be. I mean I think that's the bottom line for a lot of things and particularly when you hear staff pressuring community leaders to get done by a certain thing. That creates a lot of the anxiety.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, it is in there but it was through discussion got very sublimated and in fact when you look at 8 and 9 in the recommendations and -- the issues it's specific in terms of not understanding necessarily the motivations and such. At one point there had been a recommendation that asked for specifics on the reviews and what incentives were et cetera, now we ran into an issue there of basically the privacy of employees and what was allowable under California law in terms of knowing you know reviews and incentives. So that's why we have 8 talking about visibility and transparency of performance management system in terms of what are the general sorts of things that people are really being rewarded for. What are the sorts of the things that have you know at risk performance measures on them so that we can have a better understanding and then the 9 was when we got a chance to look at the performance measurement practices, and notice that there was a very bright line in there that said community input. And realize there was no community member with experience on actually a manager coming in asking them about some staff member they had direct interaction is why that one became stronger is where the management.

>> Man: Yule says they should get community.

>> Can I follow up. I suspected that 8 and 9 were exactly as you said. Attempt to address the issue but I would still advocate for not supply mating it to actually put in a way that doesn't violate privacy. You don't need individuals you just need information. You adopt need to tie it to a group or person but just general information that provided with that in my opinion. I would also say I come from an organization where staff support is evaluated and the issues I support I get an evaluation on. It can be done and ICANN be done without violating. I would be happy to share those questions.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Look forward to have you participate and help get the find. Basically we got to a point got feedback from the staff and board side saying we were going too far and therefore we backed off a little but I'm really glad to be told we backed off too far and should be bolder in what we ask for. To say I got a certain encouragement from this discussion of the bold every approach than the softer approach that we've been trying to take so thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I wanted to make other comment about the approach. One is to have encourage staff to participate in the work of the group on the basis it's hard to try and shape a set of recommendations about a -- what is in large performance but the people effected by it. I think it's important this is isn't a group of volunteers trying to tell the staff what to do. It's been engaged with and get specific input and gotten specific input from staff in crafting these recommendation. Not as much as we would like. I think that's what everyone --

>> AVRI DORIA: We got senior staff. We haven't gotten regular old staff.

>> JORDAN CARTER: And that's -- so to make that point on the record. The other point to make I think it's fair to say in trying to craft this, we've been paying attention the fact that if we put staff in a position of having two matters of somehow reporting to the community as well as the CEO and the board, we will be creating problems. So none of these recommendations are intended to or in my reading at least have the affect of breaking that line management chain that allows people to have clear objectives set for them. They do tend to focus on making the performance management system more visible and effective. Lori.

>> Just a response to that line. I'm only inputting personal knowledge about this because this is in the world I live here at ICANN I'm part of the community. Back at my association I'm part of staff support. I do understand the tensions that

arise between wanting to serve the community well and at the same time having professional goal and performance review and my pay related to certain activity. That all being said what I was going to say whatever solutions are proposed in terms of how community feedback is evaluated it can be properly weighted. The decision may be made hearsay the feedback but it's not Boeing to go into the score but going into comment. This is the feedback it will be small percentage or high percentage. That's management decision. I think it's fair for community say this is p.m. manage we expect but given the importance of relationship between staff and community. I know that -- I need staff to get -- my work groups done absolutely hundred percent. I also know that if I felt staff were somehow D incentive vice there should be a way to report it and evaluate it.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. I look forward to having you participate directly in the group if you can and just everyone here what I'm going to do is take the transcript of this discussion and use it as the input that we work through this before attempting a second reading in some amount of time. So thank you for the comments.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you for the input. If I could just finish up I think this session unless there are other comments by urging you George to get a sort of a non draft version of the board input through the group ASAP so that it can be digested and taken on board.

>> Could you -- I'm having trouble parsing that.

>> JORDAN CARTER: So I think you started your comment it was initial partly formed view of the board we need probably to get to a more formed less partial view of the work to date so we can get that into deliberations of the group.

>> Thank you I understand that.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you Avri for presenting that and taking us through it. Now I'm going to turn the chairing over -- we will have a break but we'll have a break on the scheduled break. I'll turn the Co-Chair role over to Thomas.

>> THOMAS RICKERT: I'd like to invite Greg to the table.

Greg do you want know go first with some explanation or do you want to do the report first?

Greg is going to give a little report for.