

MEETING ABOUT THE PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL BOARD

MINUTES

The meeting was held in the Embassy Springs Hotel, Franklin, Nashville, TN, USA on Sunday 11th July 2010 from 8.30 am to 1.00 pm. It was chaired/facilitated by Brian Lennon from Ireland. Maria LaFond recorded minutes of the meeting and Brian Lennon has added further details to complete this report.

PRESENT (75 persons)

Dr. William Glasser, Carleen Glasser, Linda Harshman

AUSTRALIA: Chris Bolton, Garry Garnaut, Ivan Honey, John Cooper, Maggie Bolton , Nancy Snow, Raelene Beale

CANADA: Ellen B Gelinas, Jean Seville Suffield, Maureen McIntosh, Nancy Grant

COLOMBIA: Giovanna González, Juan Pablo Aljure, Marcela Muñoz, Marlen González, Monica Bernal, Patricia Gutierrez, Sonia Muñoz

IRELAND: Brian Lennon, Ken Lyons

KOREA: Aeryung Woo, Jai-Whang Park, Rose Inza Kim

SLOVENIA: Darja Boben Bardutzky

USA: Albert Katz, Alexander Gittinger, Anna K.Cooper, Barbara Lombardi, Beverly LaFond, Maria LaFond, Bob Wubbolding, Sandie Wubbolding, Bradley Smith, Connie Holliman, David Jackson, Deborah Idzelis, Deborah Woltag, Ed Holly, Emerson Capps, Frank Dunn, Jane S. Hunt, Jeanette McDaniel, Jim Atkinson, Jim Mishler, Judith Ashley Krefmar, Judith Claps, Judy Comstock, June Garlick, Katherine Ross Gray, Kathy Randolph, Kim Olver, Leon Cooper, Linda Harshman, Lucy Billings Robbins, Maria LaFond, Martie Fagan, Marty Price, Megan G Fates, Mike Fulkerson, Nancy Herrick, Nano Farabaugh, Pam Glasser, Pat Robey, Peter Appel, Peter Driscoll, Rhon Carleton, Rosemary Capps, Sarah Babb, Sharon Carder Jackson, Shearon Bogdanovic, Sue Tomaszewski, Thomas S Parish, Wendall Walker,

WELCOME

Brian Lennon opened the meeting by welcoming all those present especially Dr. and Mrs. Glasser whom he thanked for their support for this proposal. He acknowledged the great work done by the Institute so far and the indebtedness of countries outside of North America to the USA organisation.

He emphasized that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposal:

“That The William Glasser Institute will set up an International Board to act as custodian of the core ideas of Choice Theory and of official training in Choice Theory and its different applications”.

He explained that he had formed this proposal many years ago, that it had been supported by a European faculty meeting in Izola, Slovenia in 2005 and was further mentioned in last year’s International Conference in Edinburgh.

He indicated that the role of this meeting was to take the proposal forward, that those present were not representative of all the members but that hopefully would do their best to represent their views. The role of the meeting was comparable to the “seconding” process for a motion.

His aim in the meeting was to provide a forum for all views, to be fair in the procedures used, to achieve friendliness in all interactions and to move forward. He outlined the four divisions of the meeting based on how it had been presented on the WGI website: 1. The Proposal itself, 2. The Tasks of an International Board, 3. How Representation would work and 4. Planning the next step.

Brian pointed out that before the meeting members had been invited to send their ideas especially if they could not attend. Several such documents were made available to those present. These were from Jean Suffield (Canada), Rolf Ahrens (Canada) and John Brickell (UK). At John’s request the headings of his document were read out to the meeting.

OPENING DISCUSSION

Dr. Glasser: Keep it simple. It is difficult to distinguish between Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. The move from Control Theory to Choice Theory has enabled us to move forward. Respect for the past. He liked the use of Choice Theory in the title and preferred Reality Therapy not to be used.

Carleen Glasser: She disagreed and believed that Reality Therapy was important. Tradition, people get attached to the way things were. The merging of CT and RT is very valid. Universities around the world are teaching these ideas. Dr. Glasser has always evolved in his ideas. It is important not to throw out the baby with the bath-water. It is important not to depart too far from our own traditions. She is very excited about this world organisation. It will perpetuate the ideas and legacy of Dr. Glasser. We stand for his ideas and those of others who have contributed. This is the time to become worldwide, not to be isolated, to create standards that reflect what Dr. Glasser has written. Importance of the ideas not being contaminated.

Dr. Glasser: He disagreed with Carleen about Reality Therapy and said he will be mostly remembered for the ideas of Choice Theory rather than Reality Therapy. Keep it simple. Choice Theory stands on its own. Alex Gittinger's animation speaks only of Choice Theory.

Carleen Glasser: We need to recognise the hard work done by people in this organisation. CT is what we are going to be teaching. The mission statement is to teach CT to the world.

Dr. Glasser: RT is like an old car, a good car. We are going on to a new car. We are trying to make a democratic organisation.

Linda Harshman: CT is the umbrella. The implementation of this theory is very much based on RT. Both are extremely important.

Brian Lennon: comment that the Glassers had given us a model of how we could disagree about some points but share the same purpose. The importance of taking Dr. Glasser's view on board that Choice Theory is at the heart.

Bob Wubbolding: Both Bill and Carleen have said the train track is CT, RT is the train, both needed. People say Glasser will be remembered for RT.

Shearon Bogdanovic: Wished to acknowledge those who have come from outside the USA. A time to recall our relationships.

Jean Suffield: It is not either/or; we can embrace both ideas from the Glassers.

Tom Parish: Mission statement, teach CT to the world, needs to be up front.

Juan Pablo Aljure: has been teaching CT as explanation with RT and LM as applications. If we focus on CT we are focusing on Joyfulness. In all applications the focus is the same, how the mind can achieve joy.

Leon Cooper: Acknowledging all before. RT is only one application of CT.

Al Katz: The practical part. We don't have a disagreement. To the world it is seen as RT in universities but not so in schools. Need to write both words.

Jane Hunt: RT is in QW of many people.

Maria LaFond: New! Her field is teaching about relationships. The whole world is not about counselling but about relationships. She doesn't teach RT to her patients but CT.

Dr Glasser: When the EAP recognised RT it was upsetting. He would prefer to see RT replaced by CT. He no longer thinks of RT but in terms of CT.

Rhon Carleton: The procedures that lead to change is what RT is all about and it may be better to think of it as that.

Lucy Billings-Robbins: We have lost sight of our purpose. Dr Glasser has said he would like it to be CT.

Peter Appel: We are focusing on the procedures WE need to change. That was mainly RT in past. What does certification need to change if we focus on CT? We will need new models, e.g., funding. The words we use to describe what we teach are important.

Bob Wubbolding: we need to move on but the board can consider this.

David Jackson: We are talking about two separate issues. Mission is to help people gain own mental health. People will learn from CT how to run own lives. RT process is important in using CT professionally. Mission of CT to those who aren't getting professional help and they will learn how to live their own lives successfully by learning CT.

Rose Kim: It is difficult for Koreans to teach RT. Freud's followers called themselves Freudians so we call our people Glasserians. We teach CT and in counselling RT.

Connie Hollyman: CT is about self & others behaviour but RT creates the relationship. RT is a Relationship Language.

INVOLVEMENT EXERCISE

Breakout session: tell name, country, what you like most about your own country. Change and find someone new, tell typical food. Change and tell which countries you have been to. Change and shake hands with as many people as you can. GO!

DISCUSSION PART ONE: THE PROPOSAL

PROPOSED: That The William Glasser Institute will set up an International Board to act as custodian of the core ideas of Choice Theory and of official training in Choice Theory and its different applications.

SECONDED: Dr. Glasser, Carleen Glasser, Beverly LaFond, Emerson Capps

Brian suggested some discussion of the formal proposal in groups prior to voting but Leon Cooper proposed that voting should go ahead now and this was seconded by Chris Bolton. By a show of hands the vast majority of those present voted in favour of going ahead with the proposal vote.

Jean Suffield: Asked how the proposal would be enacted.

Brian Lennon: This would be outlined in the tasks. Current institute will not be obsolete. Nothing today is written in stone. Things can be changed as we go along.

Juan Pablo Aljure: nothing is perfect.

The proposal was put to the meeting for voting by a show of hands and was carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION PART TWO: THE TASKS OF THE BOARD

Brian invited members to form groups of about eight to brainstorm what they would consider to be the main tasks of the board. He clarified that the word “international” meant all countries. At the end of this discussion and due to time constraints Brian suggested that these lists should be passed to the Board itself for consideration. (A classified version of this list is provided as an appendix.)

POSTER SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Items which were marked as more important have been moved to the top of each list and carry an asterisk

A	*Effective communication among members
	*Role model CT/Relationship building – walk the walk
	*Determination of equitable representation
	*Faculty quality assurance/standards – ongoing lead management
	*Business model to reach everyone
	*Reach communities of the world
	Survey country’s perceptions of CT
	Documentation for historical purposes
	Preservation of core ideas/definitions
	Cultural competence
	Evidence-based practice
	Revisit mission and vision
	Alternatives to certification
	Developing competencies for teaching tracks
	Official world recognition/intern’al foundation
	International web store w/approval
B	*Market Choice Theory
	*Unify certification requirements
	*What title does certification give you?

	*Gatekeeper for certification: Practicum Supervisor? Instructor?
	Keep us multiculturally sensitive
	Make sure materials are in different languages
	Update Glasser references in university texts – more recent works
	Research
	Flexible models of training
	What would name be? William Glasser Institute International?
C	NETWORKING – a. Between countries, b. Representatives and their people, c. Membership
	ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE – a. Responsibilities of the Board, b. Board member criteria for eligibility, c. Relationship with WGI USA legal board
	FUNDING – a. Membership dues, b. Other activities
	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – a. Core curriculum for universities, b. Standards for faculty members, c. Standards for certification process, d. Standards for other forms of delivery
D	Training: define competencies and standards
	Monitor all training, applications, funding, and quality
	Endorsement and validation of writings and materials
	New ways, ideas and tools for training
	Disseminate CT ideas to the world in new, innovative ways
	Develop funding ideas for this new agency – administration
	Decide on representation and structure – Coalition of countries? Each member per country? Population? Number certified?
	Translation into many languages of written materials
E	*Fidelity to core concepts
	*Establish research/evidence-based organ.
	*Oversight – congruence of practice and delivery – training coherence – definition/clarification of ‘competency’
	Standardization of ‘brand’ i.e. “Glasser Sunbelt”, Korean Assoc. of RT/WGI
	Develop code of ethics – grievance procedures
	Continuing education policy
F	*1 Democratic process in perception/and implementation /constitution
	*2 Mission statement/1 st vision
	*3 Advisory or governing board? Name
	Relationship WGI US vs international boards exec director, dir training
	Information gathering/repository/dissemination
	Training standards
	Recognition of diversity/culture
	Representation equality [Fairness/equity] (country/region chooses rep) criteria needed
	Delivery systems and models
	Assess appropriateness of current cert for cultures/populations
	Open communication – dialog – dissemination of info

	Use of technology in teaching
	Reframe of mission for [custodial]/inclusion of LM/RT etc.
	Finance/cost effectiveness
	Alternative means of meeting
G	*Linking countries together
	*Promoting and marketing
	*Maintain credibility and standards
	*Gate-keeper/filter as ideas change
	*Connections b/w other boards/units
	*Overseeing/sight
	Caretaker
	Stewardship
	Umpiring inclusion
	Supporting all countries
	Include the Director of Training + Executive Director + Director of Marketing + Editor of Journal
	Clarification network
	Ombudsman/woman
	Complaints
	Explain the changes to countries outside of USA
	Sharing of skills, knowledge, cultural aspects
	Representation
	Relationship to other boards
	Broad boundaries of how we operate
	Links to peak bodies
	Whether or how ideas evolve/dissolve
	Not to micro-manage

DISCUSSION PART THREE: REPRESENTATION

Brian invited the groups (people wished to stay in the same breakout groupings) to come together again and discuss the topic of Representation under three headings.

- What do we mean by “members”?
- Structure – what type do you want?
- What type of person to be your representative and what skills?

He prompted that members might mean certified, certified and paid-up, maybe trainees.

He explained that structure was complex and, to help the discussion, provided those present with an estimate of current statistics (see Appendix B) regarding

people who had completed Basic weeks and Certification weeks. These were broken down by country. He pointed out that if we were to adopt, by way of example, an ideal board membership of eight, then dividing the current total of certified people by eight would give approximately 1000 people per representative. This could mean 3 representatives for the USA and 1 for Canada. The other countries would need to form alliances of approximately 1000 people each.

In answer to several questions from members about the role of the current advisory board Linda Harshman explained that the advisory board is for the USA. She also pointed out that there were about 800 dues-paying members worldwide and that these were mainly faculty. Some countries have dues to belong to a region.

CONTENTS OF POSTER SUMMARIES

GROUP	MEMBERS	STRUCTURE	CANDIDATES
A	Any dues paying person who has complete Int. Basic training	Overall knowledge and experience with your country Skype/communication cross cultural Geographic challenges (current structure OK for now) 3yr term staggered (max 2 terms)	Passionate – walk the walk Skill set – varied diverse – communicator Experience Resource/flexible/computer/cultural Reliable/responsible/respect Speak English or cover cost of own interpreter
B	Paid vs those using CT/RT on local level	1:1000 is reasonable Rotating representation Term of office limited	Consensus builder CT/RT Trained/current IT savvy Lead Manager Administrative skills Visionary/creative
C	Number of Representatives/Group not dependent on RTC people because this could backfire with lots being certified to get elections dependent on active leadership	Group division criteria: a. geographical proximity b. language similarity c. Emphasis on competencies and leadership: CTRTC numbers, conferences/workshops (Mental Health,	Certified in CT Communication Skills Technology Skills Leadership -> proven

		Counseling, Education, Parenting, Leadership), quality schools, university curricula, updated in the evolution of the ideas, continent development	
D	Dues paying member Based on number of paid WGI members	Meet Coordinate among boards of each country Clarify relationship to WGI (legal board) Determine – membership criteria, selection process, representation Training delivery systems Teaching CT to the world Recognize, respect and communicate differences among countries/regions Look for ways to carry out mission Ask each country if they want to be involved	Passionate about ideas Willing to work Certified Broad range of knowledge about CT/RT/LM Availability Wants to represent group not self Ability to communicate across language barriers Technologically literate Visionary
E	Current dues-paying Associate Patron	Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International/Sovereignty • 3-phase obligation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. current 2. immediate-past 3. representative-elect • Division <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Throughput 2. Historical/Cultural dissonance 	Time and energy Certified Current and active in the org. Collaborative and collegial Passionate leadership

F	<p>Issues: \$\$\$ - need for dues-paying or non-dues representative board or not levels of membership international or country How much? Give time</p> <p>Recommendation To teach the world CT – anyone may become a member and Int'l Board establish who has voting privileges</p>	<p>needs to be meaningful under a constitution with operational procedures and specify ex-officio (info but no voting rights) involving structure with representation fluctuating as needs arise Int'l Board needs to verify number of reprs with countries concerned Chair + 9 members e.g. subcommittee of training officers in each country has dialogue input (no voting but recommend) or input could come from reps no matter which of above – must have dialogue re training for reps from each country</p>	<p>minimal (certification in any country) passion > ongoing commitment to Institute observable involvement in work (bringing the message) visible and active relationship-building critical/analytical thinker observable decision-making thinking outside the box communication skills written and verbal skills open to everyone in country availability time 3 yr term</p>
G	<p>Ones paying or not/issues of \$ Representation vs voting – Int'l Bd member will be elected by dues paying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - full members - cert full - Assoc members - non-cert partial <p>Bd members will represent everyone in any CT level of training Create structure so training fees</p>	<p>Election by dues paying members of WGI – Intl Rep to Int'l Bd will be dues paying member Goal to have countries (perhaps 38) all represented by their own country people as much as possible – working towards cooperation modes (for “consensus”) while starting by Brian's model – and noting Skype</p>	<p>CT/RT certified Experienced in use of ideas: cross cultures, across applications technological skills Big picture people listening facilitation summary</p>

	include dues		
--	--------------	--	--

After a spokesperson for each group presented the details of their poster Brian Lennon made a brief summary of the reports observing that most seemed to concur on the general characteristics of the type of person who should be on the board.

Regarding membership he said that many countries or regions had their own system of membership and it might be an idea for there to be only one form of membership in future with a portion of the fee going to the region and a portion going to the International Institute. He indicated that in some countries “associate” membership was intended for those who wished to share in newsletters but would not have voting rights. Such grades of membership could be detailed further in the process.

He commented on the idea that each country should have a representative pointing out that this would be costly for some countries and could produce a board that was so big it would not be efficient.

He explained why some geographically distant countries had been put together in his sample grouping. It was because they were the newest countries in the Institute and had only a few members. It might be an idea, he added, to have one person on the board representing “developing countries”.

Judy Klefman asked about the small number of dues-paying members and why this was so.

Linda Harshman explained that most of these were faculty.

Brian Lennon said that we need to be careful to remember that we were not an employment organisation, that this was not our primary mission. It would be important that Board members represented the ideas and not any private agenda.

Tom Parish suggested that certain roles such as Director of Training and Journal Editor might become ex-officio members of the board with full voting rights.

Emerson Capps explained that a working board could work out the details over the coming year.

Brian Lennon said that our priority now was to set up such an interim board, to obtain nominations.

Bradley Smith suggested dividing into country groups now to make nominations.

Brian Lennon said that such nominees could be voted on by members at a later date.

DISCUSSION PART FOUR: FURTHER PLANS

Brian Lennon invited the members to divide into national groups and to consider nominations for the Interim Board that would have responsibility for setting up the initial structures of the International Board.

He distributed cards to each group asking them to write down:

- the area represented
- who should be voting
- the nominees

AREA	Voting Ideas	Nominees
Canada	The WGI-Canada Board mandated the 4 of us to bring back information to ratify the nominee because this is an interim board for 1 year	Rolf Ahrens, current V.P. with WGI-Canada
Australia	Assuming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information goes to other countries in our group • we dialogue in our region 	Sylvia Habel Maggie Bolton John Cooper
Colombia – South/Central America	Voters – active members of Fundacion Elegir	Juan Pablo Aljure
Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia Herzo. (Italy?)	All certified members	Leon Lojk (Boba Lojk)
Ireland, UK, Spain	All certified members OR as a standing nomination with election only after interim board term	John Brickel
Asia China Japan Korea Taiwan Singapore	Active members of WGI Active members of Korean Association of RT	Prof. Rose Inza Kim

United States of America	This committee (Jim Mishler, Judith Klefman, Kay Gray) will collect a bio from each and let us know the vote. Bios going to central persons.	Lucy Billings Robbins Al Katz Bob Wubbolding Tom Parish Nancy Herrick Kim Olver Emerson Capps Sara Babb
OTHERS	Note by Brian Lennon: many other countries were not represented at this meeting.	

Brian Lennon proposed that the election process should aim to be completed in 4-6 weeks from today. At that point the Interim Board would begin its work of putting in place all that is necessary to create the first fully elected International Board.

CONCLUSION

Brian Lennon explained that Dr. Glasser had asked him to chair the new board and that this presented him with a dilemma since his proposal was to create a democratic board. He accepted the invitation from Dr. Glasser on the basis of a two-year term with the idea of helping get the board established. He clarified that he would also need the vote of those present and he obtained unanimous support for this.

He agreed to type the list of participants together with their email addresses and send this to all the participants.

All present were invited to stand together in a linked circle and final comments were invited.

The meeting concluded shortly after 1 pm.

APPENDIX A

TASKS IN CLASSIFIED FORMAT

The following list presents a rough classification of the suggestions from the seven groups, listed not in any particular order but asterisked items are placed at the head of each category. The suggestions are presented as provided by the groups and the source of each suggestion is indicated alongside.

TOPICS (CLASSIFIED)	GROUP
COMMUNICATION/SHARING	
*Effective communication among members	A
*Linking countries together	G
*Connections b/w other boards/units	G
NETWORKING – a. Between countries, b. Representatives and their people, c. Membership	C
Clarification network	G
Explain the changes to countries outside of USA	G
Sharing of skills, knowledge, cultural aspects	G
Open communication – dialog – dissemination of info	F
Alternative means of meeting	F
Information gathering/repository/dissemination	F
MANAGEMENT	
*Role model CT/Relationship building – walk the walk	A
*Business model to reach everyone	A
*3 Advisory or governing board? Name	E
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE – a. Responsibilities of the Board, b. Board member criteria for eligibility, c. Relationship with WGI USA legal board	C
Relationship to other boards	G
Links to peak bodies	G
Not to micro-manage	G
What would name be? William Glasser Institute International?	B
Include the Director of Training + Executive Director + Director of Marketing + Editor of Journal	G
Relationship WGI US vs international boards exec director, dir training	F
Broad boundaries of how we operate	G
REPRESENTATION	
*1 Democratic process in perception/and implementation/constitution	F
*Determination of equitable representation	A
Decide on representation and structure – Coalition of countries? Each member per country? Population? Number certified?	D
Supporting all countries	G

Representation	G
Representation equality [Fairness/equity] (country/region chooses rep) criteria needed	F

FACULTY

*Faculty quality assurance/standards – ongoing lead management	A
Developing competencies for teaching tracks	A
New ways, ideas and tools for training	D
Use of technology in teaching	F

MARKETING/PROMOTION

*Reach communities of the world	A
*Market Choice Theory	B
*Promoting and marketing	G
*Maintain credibility and standards	G
Survey country's perceptions of CT	A
Cultural competence	A
Disseminate CT ideas to the world in new, innovative ways	D
Translation into many languages of written materials	D
Update Glasser references in university texts – more recent works	B
Standardization of 'brand' i.e. "Glasser Sunbelt", Korean Assoc. of RT/WGI	E

CORE IDEAS/MISSION

*Fidelity to core concepts	E
*Gate-keeper/filter as ideas change	G
*Overseeing/sight	G
*2 Mission statement/1 st vision	F
Revisit mission and vision	A
Documentation for historical purposes	A
Endorsement and validation of writings and materials	D
Preservation of core ideas/definitions	A
Caretaker	G
Stewardship	G
Umpiring inclusion	G
Ombudsman/woman	G
Complaints	G
Whether or how ideas evolve/dissolve	G
Reframe of mission for [custodial]/inclusion of LM/RT etc.	F

RESEARCH

*Establish research/evidence-based organ.	E
Evidence-based practice	A
Research	B

CERTIFICATION AND TRAINING

*Unify certification requirements	B
*What title does certification give you?	B
*Gatekeeper for certification: Practicum Supervisor? Instructor?	B
Alternatives to certification	A
Flexible models of training	B
Training: define competencies and standards	D
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – a. Core curriculum for universities, b. Standards for faculty members, c. Standards for certification process, d. Standards for other forms of delivery	C
Monitor all training, applications, funding, and quality	D
Training standards	E
definition/clarification of ‘competency’	E
Assess appropriateness of current cert for cultures/populations	F
Delivery systems and models	F

INTERNATIONALISM

Official world recognition/intern’al foundation	A
International web store w/approval	A
Recognition of diversity/culture	F
Keep us multiculturally sensitive	B
Make sure materials are in different languages	B

FUNDING

FUNDING – a. Membership dues, b. Other activities	C
Develop funding ideas for this new agency – administration	D
Finance/cost effectiveness	F

POLICIES

*Oversight – congruence of practice and delivery – training coherence	E
Develop code of ethics – grievance procedures	E
Continuing education policy	E

APPENDIX B

Sample grouping of countries used in Part Three of the discussion dealing with Representation. The statistics are not fully up to date nor are they precise.

COUNTRY	BASIC	CERT	POP	PS1	PS2	IN1	IN2	GROUP
United States	32005	3157	295734100	257	146	94	46	A
Canada	9622	1105	32805000	72	47	27	14	B
Ireland	3826	787	5790700	14	14	11	6	C
Spain	18	2	40341500					C
U.K.-England	646	75	49138831	7	6	5	1	C
U.K.-Scotland	106	28	5062011	1	1	1	0	C
U.K.-Wales	47	10	2903085					C
Austria	4	2	8184700					D
Belgium	3	2	10364400					D
Bosnia and Herzegovina	61	18	4025500	3	3	3	0	D
Croatia	1165	572	4495900	18	10	8	1	D
Denmark	1	1	5432300					D
Finland	55	8	5223400					D
Germany	20	5	82431400	1	1	1	0	D
Iceland	23	1	296700					D
Italy	65	9	58103000					D
Netherlands	13	2	16407500					D
Norway	274	33	4593000	3	3	3	2	D
Russia	55	9	143420300					D
Slovenia	1015	428	2011100	21	16	14	2	D
Sweden	4	1	9001800					D
Switzerland	3	2	7489400					D
Australia	12366	440	20090400	18	15	11	5	E
Kuwait	219	38	2335600					E
Malaysia	40	5	23953100					E
New Zealand	1094	29	4035500	2	2	1	1	E
Singapore	939	98	4425700	6	5	4	2	E
South Africa	33	22	44344100					E
Thailand	3	2	65444400					E
Argentina	2	2	39537900					F
China	2	1	1306313800					F
Colombia	368	88	42954300	3	1	1	0	F
Dominican Republic	1	1	8950000					F
India	87	1	1080264400	1	1	1	0	F
Israel	262	38	6276900	2	1	1	0	F
Japan	3220	187	127417200	9	9	6	2	F
Korea S	4272	514	48422600	24	18	13	4	F
Mexico	14	1	106202900					F
Taiwan	3	1	22805547					F

GROUP	TOT CERT	REPS	PS1
A	3157	3	257
B	1105	1	72
C	902	1	22
D	1093	1	46
E	634	1	26
F	834	1	39
G	0	0	0
H	0	0	0
TOTS	7725	8	462

RATIO

1000