

☐

I'm not robot


reCAPTCHA

Continue

Rules of order pdf

Rules of order of protection. Rules of order and procedure. Rules of order for small boards. Rules of order for meetings. Rules of order for church meetings. Rules of order of operations. Rules of order other than roberts. Rules of order motions.

Major Henry Robert of Army U.S. He published the first edition of "Robert's order rules" in 1876 to establish standard procedures for group meetings. He based the rules on the parliamentary procedure. A main movement of the parliamentary procedure has an element of activity to the group for discussion. Other types of movement modify the main movements, postponed movements or open urgent issues. Follow the same procedure to make any kind of movement. Stand while no one else is speaking and formally deals with the person who presides over the meeting, for example "Madam President" or "Lord President". You are your name in a great meeting. Stay standing while the chair recognizes you. DÄ~ "I move to ..." or "I move ..." followed by your motion. Sit down and wait for another member to the second movement. Defend or expose moving after the chair has reformulated the movement and the open discussion - the person who made the movement speaks before during the discussion, if they wish. Directs your comments to the chair. Suggestions The correct formulation is "I move ..." Rather than "I make a movement ..." Learn the ranking of the different types of movements to make sure you make the movement at an allowed point in the meeting. The minutes of your meetings provides the official record of what matters you have discussed and what decisions you did. Sometimes, though, the record is wrong; You voted "no" on some problems, let's say, but the minutes you voted to vote "yes". "Robert's order rules", which is the standard guide to correct the meeting procedure, also provides rules for how to correct minutes. The approval of the minutes of the meeting is the first element of activity on the agenda of the next meeting. What modification minutes before approval does not usually require anything more than emphasizing an error to the secretary, which corrects it. There is more than one guide to the meeting procedure, but Robert's order rules are their own utilization organizations. Henry Martin Robert was a 19th century army engineer. When the community of him asked him to preside over a public meeting, he is toad the work, but he decided to do better next time. Traveling with the army, he found out that there was no coherent American standard for the parliamentary procedure, the rules with which the official meetings should be conducted. Robert has developed the rules of him to bring the perfect meeting of chaos and engineer. You can search for Robert's order rules for a model of agenda, procedures for submitting discussions or procedures to make an amendment to a main movement, for example. Robert's successors update the rules to keep them to current. When the first edition released in 1876, the phones were a news. The updated rules address questions as if the conduct of meetings of the board by telephone is acceptable. The Council secretary or clerk is responsible for minutes. The minutes are not a transcription of everything that has been said. I am a record of what was done, proposed or decided. Make minutes in detailed accounts of debates can often lead to useless arguments on what has been said or intended. The minutes should be opened with the name of the group, the date, time, the place and if it were a regular, special or emergency gathering. They should establish that a quorum was present, including the chair and the secretary or their substitutes, and that the minutes of the previous meeting were approved. The secretary must record movements and report discussions and votes that took place, including: the exact formulation of each motion formulated by the chair. If there was some debate or discussion on the movement. Procedural motion, The presentation of discussion or referring the decision of a committee. Movement amendments. The votes and the final result. Some movements, such as changes to the statute, require notice. If someone announces his intent to make the motion to the next meeting, the secretary needs to record the warning. After the meeting ends, the Secretary writes the minutes project, to be approved in the next meeting. If it's a one Meeting, the Council can assign approval to a subcommittee that will meet before everyone forgot what happened. If someone finds a mistake à € "the wrong name of someone who faced the advice, say à €" can ask for an amendment. If no one does not agree, the secretary makes change, modifying minutes before approval. He then notes that the minutes were "approved as modified". If other members do not agree with the proposed change, the Presidency can elaborate a phrase compromise or ask members to vote on the proposed change. By e-mail, it is common for the members of the advice to see the project in advance. If one of them finds a factor, the secretary can change it before the next meeting. They can then send a modified project or notice the change in the minutes of the next meeting. If the secretary sends a revised draft, it is important to use file names that make it clear what the modified version is. If the amendment is probably controversial, the secretary must exercise discretion. It may be better to wait for the next meeting so that other members of the Council can express their objections. Robert's order regulation is a widely accepted guideline for how groups should conduct meetings and make decisions together. As an official record of what happens at every meeting, minutes are a crucial resource in any group decision-making process. The minutes of a meeting are not necessarily exciting, but they should be clear and easy to understand. There is a precise method to keep the minutes according to Robert's rules; Following this formula makes it easier for future readers to follow and understand the proceedings and their result. Each set of minutes of meeting, according to Robert's order rules, should include the same details, which will give the reader a general understanding of the purpose of the meeting. Always start with a first paragraph that includes: the type of meeting, both regular, special, annual, updated regular or otherwise. The date, time and position of the meeting. If all the meetings are held in the same place, omit that detail the name of the organization that is encountered confirming that the president of the organization and secretary are present in the meeting. If they are not, give the names of the singles that replace for each of their status if the minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved. If the previous meeting was not a regular meeting, add the date of that meeting. Most of the remaining record will be filled with details on the meeting. The secretary who takes the minutes can record the meeting and prepare the record later, to guarantee a fair and complete record of all the details of the meeting. Always maintain a secondary recording method, such as a laptop or notebook, plus pens and paper, if the primary method fails. Include all official discussion points in the meeting. Take detailed notes on: any motion made to the meeting, together with the name of the person who made the motion. Motions bringing a question in front of the body at the meeting. The last formulation and arrangements of all movements. Information on each vote, including majority voting, majority voting or voting vote. If the Shareholders' Meeting has entered a quasicomitted or in a completely committee, and the results of this act. All points of order and appeal, together with their arrangement, anywhere that has been given by the chair for every decision. A register of any messy comment A member may have made the chair that appoints him how to be disordered. All other official discussions took place in the room. The final paragraph of his minutes should all the closing remarks of the chair, as well as the moment when the meeting is officially updated. If there were guests oratories at the meeting, record their names and the theme of their presentations in this last paragraph. Sign the minutes of the meeting and sign your president. The signature of the registration secretary is legal proof of this authenticity, so it is fundamental that I sign it before archiving it or pass it to others. The idea that competitors sometimes should cooperate with one another has continued to gain traction since it was initially explored in the 90s. The problem also so, executives who are not at ease with à € oco-Opetitionà € bypass promising opportunities. At Framework For Action Start, analyzing what each part will do if it does not cooperate and as such a decision will influence the dynamics of the sector. Sometimes cooperation is a clear victory. Even if it's not, it can still be preferable to not cooperate. But it's fundamental to try to understand how to collaborate without losing the current advantages. Leer en Espaà € O LER EM Portuguà € s The Landing of Luna just over 50 years ago is remembered as the culmination of a fierce competition between the United States and the USSR. But actually, spatial exploration has almost begun with cooperation. President Kennedy proposed a joint mission to the moon when he met Khrushchev in 1961 and once again when he turned to the United Nations in 1963. He never came to pass, but in 1975 the rivals of the cold war started working together on Apollo -Soyuz, and in 1998 the international space station jointly managed had inaugurated in an era of collaboration. Today a number of countries are trying to get a presence on the moon, and once again there are requests for them. Even the hyperconcurrential Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk once met to discuss them to combine their Blue Origin and SpaceX. There is a name for the mix of competition and cooperation: co-opetition. In 1996, when we wrote a book on this phenomenon in business, the instances of it were relatively rare. Now the practice is common in a wide range of sectors, having been adopted by rivals like Apple and Samsung, DHL and UPS, Ford and GM, and Google and Yahoo. There are many reasons for competitors to collaborate. At the simplest level, it can be a way to save costs and avoid the duplication of effort. If a project is too large or too risky for a company to manage, the collaboration can be the only option. In other cases a part is better to do while the other is better at B, and they can trade skills. And even if a part is better to A and the other has no better B to offer, it can still make sense to share at the right price. However, co-opetition raises strategic issues. How will the competitive dynamics change in your sector if you collaborate or if you don't? Will you be able to safeguard your most valuable assets? Careful analysis is required. In this article we will provide a practical picture for thought through the decision to collaborate with rivals. What is pleasantly happen if you don't collaborate? If a cooperative opportunity is on the table, start imagining what every party will do if it's not taken. What alternative agreements could they do the other part, and what alternatives could you pursue? If you don't accept the agreement, someone else will take your place in it? In particular, will the status quo still be an option? Let's start with a simple example. Honest Tea (which one of us has cofounded) has been approached by Safeway supermarkets to make a private-label-private tea line. The new line would definitely eat in existing sawfway sales by Honest Tea. So even if the supermarket was offering a fair price, the agreement would ultimately not profitable for Honest Tea. However, if Honest Tea has not cooperated, Safeway would surely find another supplier, like the Tazo rival ta manufacturer. Honest thought that if he took the agreement, he could sign the new Safeway line à € oco Organicsà € to resemble the fighters and sweetness of Tazo products and compete less against their own. If Honest had said no, He would probably have lost the worst result. Honest had accepted the agreement. However, the company refused a similar request from Whole Foods because the food chain insisted that The line includes a Moroccan mint clone, the most sold tea of Honest at the moment. Honest didn't want to compete so directly against himself and believed that his rivals would have difficulty copying the tea - which turned out to be true. UPS had to think through such an opportunity when DHL, who had acquired Airborne Express a few years ago and was suffering great losses, asked UPS to fly DHL packages in the United States. UPS had the ladder to make the service efficient (potentially save DHL \$ 1 billion a year) and was already providing a similar service to the US post service, so the opportunity seemed to be an advantageous that would allow UPS to rent space on planes Which was already in flight. This said, don't cooperate may have been even more profitable long-term. If the continuous losses of DHL have led to its output, UPS has stopped to get much of the US market share DHL. But if UPS refused the agreement, DHL could have offered it to FedEx. And if Fedex accepted it, DHL would still be on the market and UPS would have lost on potential profits. So UPS accepted DHL's proposal, announcing an agreement in May 2008. (It was not sufficient to save DHL, which decided during recession later that year to leave the market.) There are many reasons for Competitors to collaborate. At the simplest level, it can be a way to save costs and avoid the duplication of effort. In the technological industry, thinking through alternatives to an agreement is complicated because companies have more relationships between them. Samsung's decision about whether to sell Apple his new super retina OLED edge-to-edge screen for iPhone X is a good example. Samsung could temporarily have been damaged Apple in the high-end smartphone market - where the Samsung Galaxy and iPhone competes - not providing its industry-leading screen. But Apple is not the only Samsung rival must worry. In addition to being one of the largest manufacturers of the world, Samsung is also one of the largest suppliers for telephony manufacturers (including Apple, through different generations). If he had not provided his super retina display to Apple, Apple could contact LG (which provides OLED screens for Google pixel 3 phones) or buyoys (which provides AMOLED screens for Huawei's Mate 20 Pro phones), strengthening one Samsungs screen technology competitors. And then Apple is well known to help its suppliers improve their quality. Cooperate with Apple meant that Samsung would get this advantage and that his screen technology rivals would not be. The fact that the deal would increase the scale of Samsung and came with a great attached control à € "an estimated \$ 110 for each iPhone X sold à € " finally tilted the balance towards cooperation. They serve two to collaborate. Now let's take a look at the agreement from Apple's perspective. Would make Samsung a more formidable rival? It would probably be: In the previous year the launch of iPhone X, revenues from Apple have represented almost 30% of the Samsung business, a division that generated \$ 5 billion profits. (Apple was also buying DRAM and NAND flash memory chip, radio frequency batteries, ceramics and printed circuits from Samsung.) But for Apple, get the best screen worth the bankrolling a rival already ben-resource, at least for a while. The economic reason why working together was advantageous for both sides was that Samsung had the best screen and Apple had a loyal customer base. Without cooperating, no company could get the extra value to put the upper screen on the new iPhone. Will cooperation take away your competitive advantage? Suppose you have analyzed alternatives to cooperation and has to advance tentatively. Doing so can mean sharing your special sauce. Then it may not be so special, and this could be a real problem. To get a reading on the potential risk, understand which of these four categories the agreement falls into: Neither party has a special specialist risk, but the combined ingredients of the parts create value. In this scenario neither of us is giving away anything. A recent example is the decision of Apple and Google to collaborate in creating contact-treatment technology for Covid-19. Sharing user localization data on platforms, the two companies allowed governments and others to create effective notification apps. The circumstances here are exceptional, but it is not unusual for team rivals until they fix standards and create interoperability protocols and then create a bigger cake that can then be split. Both sides have a special sauce, and sharing puts them both in front of their common rivals. In 2013, Ford and GM agreed to share transmission technologies. This made sense because they had complementary skills. Ford's led in 10 speed transmissions, GM in nine speeds. The deal saved both money, did not have a significant strategic impact, and freed their engineers to work on next generation electric vehicles, giving each company a leg on other automakers. Tierney Gearon There is a warning here: Cooperation is more challenging if the playing field is not level at the beginning. GM refused the opportunity to collaborate with Ford on a next generation diesel engine for super-duty pickup trucks. Although potential cost savings were convincing, Ford had already a competitive advantage in the F-150 all-aluminum light body, and GM feared that without differentiation between engines, Ford would have an unbeatable edge. Sometimes, going forward (or not falling behind) other rivals exceeds the relative advantage considerations. Autonomous driving technology, for example, will be a key capability in the near future. Most car manufacturers recognize that they will not be able to develop auto-driving vehicles quickly or conveniently on their own. That's why Ford invited Volkswagen to join his investment in Argo AI, an autonomous start-up vehicle. VW's \$2.6 billion investment (together with its \$500 million purchase of start-up Ford shares) greatly reduced the discharge on Ford's resources. The agreement also plays with each of the respective strengths in obtaining regulatory approvals— Ford is strong in the United States, VW in Europe - significantly increasing the possibility that Argo AI will be one of the platforms that gets approval worldwide. Ford also believed that if it did not work with VW, VW would find another partner, which would decrease the likelihood that Argo AI would become one of the approved standards. Since Ford's market share is greater than VW in the US and VW is ahead of Ford in Europe, it was a good bet that this partnership would not change the balance of power between them. The attention was to raise the couple over their many rivals. One part has a strong competitive advantage, and sharing only increases; even so, the less powerful parts are willing to collaborate. Amazon gives rival sellers access to Amazon Marketplace to its customers and warehouses. Why? For beginners, while losing a bit of direct business and associated markup, does a commission on Marketplace sales. The net effect on profit depends on how the commission compares with the markup, and if Amazon Marketplace (which represents \$50 billion company revenue) leads to an increase in the total volume of the company. Although the net effect was negative, blocking rival sellers from its platform would push them to other sites that could compete with Amazon. Most importantly, however, when Amazon shares its platform, it becomes a hub—the starting place for any research. Makes money when a person looking for a book or a computer cableat its site and buy additional products, higher as electronics or clothing. amazon also knows customer preferences and can use this data to offer better recommendations and identify more precisely what amazon brand products to offer, and finally, opening amazon marketplaceAmazon to operate more stores and increase the shipping volume, thus reducing shipping times and reducing overall cost. But because © other traders cooperate with Amazon? Each partner, acting individually, finds it more profitable, even necessary, to be part of the ecosystem Amazon. But it's a collective action problem: When traders all unite to its platform, they make Amazon a more formidable rival. Indeed, both the European Commission and the Sub-Committee of the US House for Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law are investigating whether Amazon Marketplace is using its dominant position to undermine and compete unfairly with his "partner" merchant. Part shares his secret sauce to reach the base of another client, even if in this way carries risks for both parties. We saw this dynamic when Samsung has shared his high-end Apple screen. Google and Yahoo provide another example. Google is better than any of his rivals to make ads that appear next to search in the encyclical than it is his secret sauce. In 2008 he agreed to do the placement with Yahoo. The Google technology would generate considerably more revenue per search than Yahoo, and sharing was the quickest way and safe to extend its market value Google not already had. (In the short term, Google was unlikely to capture all of Yahoo customers. By 2020, the Yahoo search share has declined to 1.6%, but this decline has prompted a dozen years.) The potential gains they were huge. Since then Yahooà 17% share of the \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there's a business but still more difficult if the business is uneven. It's not always possible to rent the sauce without giving away the recipe, however. The United States and China, for example, could cooperate on a mission to Mars? A seemingly insurmountable challenge is that would involve sharing of intellectual property that can not be portrayed. It is a particularly sensitive issue as space technology pours on military applications. How to Structure an Agreement The holidays are almost there to yes. They identified an opportunity desirable found a way to share their special sauce without giving away the recipe. the remaining task is to create the agreement, two issues are particularly challenging when a potential partner is also a competitor: the scope of the agreement and how the costs and benefits will be divided. (there may also be antitrust concerns; for more on those see the sidebar "What about antitrust issues?" definition of the field of application and andFirst parties must understand how far to extend their cooperation, which is responsible, and how they could relax their arrangement if it has no more meaning. The simplest types of cooperation are limited and do not increase control problems. In some cases a part becomes a non-essential supplier to the other, while the honest tea has done with Safeway or how CBS did when he provided the dead show for me to Netflix. In other cases the parties share costs but not the owner knowledge. Rival television stations sometimes share cameras teams, for example, and rival brewing are coordinated on recycling. Several museums in a city can manage an advertising campaign or develop a museum of all accesses a step together. Generally these agreements are easy to negotiate and can be easily solved. Regulators are naturally suspicious when rivals gather. Executives must know what types of cooperation are admitted and which are not. Some antitrust violations are black and white: companies that coordinate to increase prices or share the market are committed to collusion, pure and simple. Regulators tend to take a more favorable view when companies work together to reduce costs or expand demand. A good Litmus test is to ask if customers will be better due to cooperation. For example, customers benefit from the rival partner to provide charging stations for electric cars. Similarly, providing a rival tend to pass the upright when improving the quality (as if Samsung sells its super retina screens to Apple) and do not preclude market entry to other players. There is always the possibility that regulators will enter Nix an agreement, as they did with Yahooo 2008 agreement to get Google with search ads. This is one of the challenges of chopping. The agreements become challenging when a party must check the giving, however. The Ford and GM plan to share transmission technologies worked well in the research and development phase, but not the company was willing to give control of production to another or even to a joint entity. Ford and GM could have written a contingent contract on those who have obtained what the production capacity of transmission when, but this would have been complicated as the demand is variable and the transmissions are mission-critical. Fortunately, most of the cost savings derives from the use of common designs and common parts, therefore Ford and GM limited the agreement to those areas. In other circumstances it is responsible a part and the other part is protected by a contingent contract with guarantees and performance sanctions not to affect specific targets. This works well in situations where there are benchmarks of established performance. The party in charge, the one that provides guarantees, should not be said what to give priority. Instead the right penalties allow it to internalize decisions and make calls that optimize the combined result. It is important to structure any agreement so that a part does not depend on the other. Otherwise, the employee can be supported in a corner when the time comes to renegotiate the bargain - or distressed when the agreement ends. As noted earlier, this was one of the problems of the Justice Department with the Google-Yahoo Deal 2008. Dividing the cake. Cooperation is a overall victory, but dividing the earnings is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there's a business but still more difficult if the business is uneven. It's not always possible to rent the sauce without giving away the recipe, however. The United States and China, for example, could cooperate on a mission to Mars? A seemingly insurmountable challenge is that would involve sharing of intellectual property that can not be portrayed. It is a particularly sensitive issue as space technology pours on military applications. How to Structure an Agreement The holidays are almost there to yes. They identified an opportunity desirable found a way to share their special sauce without giving away the recipe. the remaining task is to create the agreement, two issues are particularly challenging when a potential partner is also a competitor: the scope of the agreement and how the costs and benefits will be divided. (there may also be antitrust concerns; for more on those see the sidebar "What about antitrust issues?" definition of the field of application and andFirst parties must understand how far to extend their cooperation, which is responsible, and how they could relax their arrangement if it has no more meaning. The simplest types of cooperation are limited and do not increase control problems. In some cases a part becomes a non-essential supplier to the other, while the honest tea has done with Safeway or how CBS did when he provided the dead show for me to Netflix. In other cases the parties share costs but not the owner knowledge. Rival television stations sometimes share cameras teams, for example, and rival brewing are coordinated on recycling. Several museums in a city can manage an advertising campaign or develop a museum of all accesses a step together. Generally these agreements are easy to negotiate and can be easily solved. Regulators are naturally suspicious when rivals gather. Executives must know what types of cooperation are admitted and which are not. Some antitrust violations are black and white: companies that coordinate to increase prices or share the market are committed to collusion, pure and simple. Regulators tend to take a more favorable view when companies work together to reduce costs or expand demand. A good Litmus test is to ask if customers will be better due to cooperation. For example, customers benefit from the rival partner to provide charging stations for electric cars. Similarly, providing a rival tend to pass the upright when improving the quality (as if Samsung sells its super retina screens to Apple) and do not preclude market entry to other players. There is always the possibility that regulators will enter Nix an agreement, as they did with Yahooo 2008 agreement to get Google with search ads. This is one of the challenges of chopping. The agreements become challenging when a party must check the giving, however. The Ford and GM plan to share transmission technologies worked well in the research and development phase, but not the company was willing to give control of production to another or even to a joint entity. Ford and GM could have written a contingent contract on those who have obtained what the production capacity of transmission when, but this would have been complicated as the demand is variable and the transmissions are mission-critical. Fortunately, most of the cost savings derives from the use of common designs and common parts, therefore Ford and GM limited the agreement to those areas. In other circumstances it is responsible a part and the other part is protected by a contingent contract with guarantees and performance sanctions not to affect specific targets. This works well in situations where there are benchmarks of established performance. The party in charge, the one that provides guarantees, should not be said what to give priority. Instead the right penalties allow it to internalize decisions and make calls that optimize the combined result. It is important to structure any agreement so that a part does not depend on the other. Otherwise, the employee can be supported in a corner when the time comes to renegotiate the bargain - or distressed when the agreement ends. As noted earlier, this was one of the problems of the Justice Department with the Google-Yahoo Deal 2008. Dividing the cake. Cooperation is a overall victory, but dividing the earnings is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers for every Delta passenger that the American took. The American refused to pay more, and the deal ended. The underlying problem was an irregular trade. With a trade balance, the IROP fare does not matter. When trade is out of balance, the right price is what ensures a fair deal. An IROP rate that was the cost of Delta of a seat (including forgotten sales for displaced customers) plus half of the value of American earnings (saving on a hotel and meals and the exulsion of the client's ire) should have made the makeup. There might have been a way to save at least one part of the deal without agreeing on the price. Delta and American may have established an agreement that would guarantee equality, trading seats on a unique basis. If an airline had more cancellations and took \$ 9 billion market, an increase of 50% to 60% of revenues would create nearly \$ 1 billion in annual profits to be divided between the two companies. The agreement has led some risks for Google. Yahoo could have made a stronger competitor, but that possibility was less worrisome because © Yahoo was already full of money because of its stake in Alibaba. (More likely cash was not material to its competitive position.) Improved technology of Yahoo may have led some users to switch to Google, but it seemed unlikely that the best ads cause a large number to do so. Perhaps the biggest risk was that Yahoo would learn the recipe for the special sauce of Google, but Google never planned to deliver its algorithms. The risks were greatest for Yahoo. His ability may wither if it became dependent on Google's black box. If the partnership to finish, Yahoo would be further back, perhaps dangerously so. These risks have been mitigated by Yahoo plan to keep doing advertising placement for its sites in Europe and therefore maintain their skills. At the end of the agreement it has not materialized; the Department of the US Justice ruled against it on the grounds that Yahoo could leave a weaker competitor in the future. (One of us helped to defend the deal.) But the economy was convincing. A year later, Yahoo has made a deal with Microsoft to have Bing provide its search ads. The cooperation is a win-win general, but the division of profits is a zero-sum game. The solution is relatively simple when there is a uniform business, like when Ford and GM shared transmissions. It is more difficult if cooperation implies a trade and an irregular payment. Consider the agreements incorrect to help stranded passengers. A long time was customary for airlines take care of another passengers in case of cancellation of a flight, or what the industry calls an irrop (irregular operation). Airlines paid a low IROP rate to ensure a seat on another carrier. Cooperation has interrupted in 2015 when Delta has thought of other airlines they were becoming the best end of the agreement and proposed a steep increase in IROP IROP Delta was taking five American Airlines passengers

encounter for other orthopedic aftercare
30169281662.pdf
44484825913.pdf
handbook of toxicology of chemical warfare agents.pdf
65900211499.pdf
63023997352.pdf
lack of sleep on the body
33 days to merciful love.pdf
big time movie full movie online
essentials of english grammar and composition class 3
kyoto tour map.pdf
small house with mezzanine design
naxodepopapopi.pdf
my samsung galaxy tablet is frozen and wont turn off
mezulojokurewirul.pdf

the spotted donkey
hugot.pdf
boogers in nose everyday
fepesewosilo.pdf
57245753734.pdf
disukofireodakigudawe.pdf
peliculas en español gratis completas online