TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA function, on Tuesday, on Thursday, the 8ᵗʰ of January, 2015 at 14:00 UTC.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA function, on Tuesday, on Thursday, the 8th of January, 2015 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gordon Chillcott, Thomas Lowenhaupt, Yasuichi Kitamura, Tomohior Fujisaki, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Carlton Samuels, Eduardo Diaz, April Tinhorn, Janvier Ngnoulaye, and Alan Greenberg.

On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero.

We have apologies from Alberto Soto.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Sabrina and Veronica.

I would like to remind all participants to state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Have we missed anybody from the roll call?

I don't hear anyone shouting their names out, so that's the full roll call. We have a very packed agenda today with the majority of the time

spent on agenda item number five, and that's our coordinated response to the different, the two surveys that have been sent out by the cross-community working group. Prior to that, we have a review of other operational communities progress, and also a quick update on the work and the RFP.

What I would [inaudible] is for everyone to do these reviews and these updates pretty fast. So maybe we could even gain some time over that. We've put 25 minutes aside for the updates. Maybe we could shorten this. I think the majority of the work, and certainly the time sensitive work really is in RFP3, or in the main CWG section.

Any amendments to the agenda?

Seeing no hands up, let's get going then immediately with the review of our last call's action items, and that was on the 23rd of December. There were three action items. The Doodle is obviously done. The other two for work group members to send details on how ICANN can be forced to divest itself of the IANA functions if needed, and also if working group members to look at the Google spreadsheet of the seat allocation of the MRT, that's the multistakeholder review team.

I haven't seen much movement on that. Let's keep these as action items. Could we please, after the call, send those to the mailing list to remind everyone that these two need to be done. I think we are somehow past the, well, we're past the seat validation on the MRT, perhaps in a way. But at the same time, we're not because there

doesn't seem to be any consensus found in the group, and we certainly need to develop a position.

But, are there any comments or questions on these action items?

Seeing no one put their hand up, let's move on then swiftly to the next thing, in our agenda, the next part of the agenda that's three, the review of the other operational community progress. We have three different, potential reviews here. First a quick update on the IANA coordination group.

You will have seen that an announcement has been sent out. I wonder if we could have a quick update from Jean-Jacques or Mohamed El Basher on the call. I believe Jean-Jacques Subrenat is on the call.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Hello Olivier, hello all. Happy New Year. I don't have much to report, as there have been no telephone conferences just recently in the ICG. The next one is in a few days, on the 14th I believe. So I don't have much to report. We've been tidying up, consolidating the process for the presentation of the plan, the transition plan, things like that.

But nothing of great substance for the time being. Over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And for the interest of time, there is a transition, proposed [inaudible] and finalization progress, an updated transition process timeline that

has been published. And I will let the working group members read this in their own time.

It's all linked from the agenda page that we have here. Thank you for this. Let's go and have a look at the regional Internet registry. There have been CRISP team, coordinated RIR IANA stewardship proposal team that has worked on a coordinated proposals from the RIRs. Do we have an update on this please? Perhaps Seun? Seun Ojedeji, I know that you've been following this, and maybe if Seun is not available, and I know that he was asking for a dial out, perhaps we can have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, if she is aware of what's coming up?

Seun, Cheryl? Tijani Ben Jemaa, okay. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I know that the CRISP come up with a proposal for, it is now for community comment. I am sorry, I am not following very closely this project, because now it's very, very much material, very much things to follow, and then really [inaudible], because if I follow, I think I will not follow my duties.

So this is the only update I can give. I don't have details. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. There is indeed a consolidated proposal that's up for feedback from the community. I don't know if anybody wishes to say anything about this. Anybody else? Do we have Seun on the line now?

Dialing out as we speak. Let's ask about, whilst we wait for Seun to appear on the call, let's have a look at the IETF's proposals. There has been a last call for comments on the IETF transition proposal. There were some discussions with regards to the contents and whether [inaudible] or whatever type of consensus was achieved in the IETF. I wonder if anybody could provide us with a very brief update of where the process is now, for the Internet engineering taskforce? Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SUEN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. This is Suen Ojedeji. I [inaudible]… I think I will talk about the RIR's if that does not [inaudible]… May I?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'll get give [inaudible] update. For the RIRs, I think [a pretty good?] work within the RIRs. They just a minor suggestion that we make, one of which has been [starting?] without the contract [inaudible] or not. I think that's one of the main points. The other one is for the RIRs on the IANA [inaudible], there is [inaudible]… So basically there is going to be the second draft of the RIR proposal, which is the [inaudible]… organized.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Seun. Do you have, by any chance, an update on the IETF? Have you also looked at that or…?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Okay, it's Seun for the record. On the IETF, yes, I have not been following this closely, but [inaudible] and just the meeting that has been discussed now in summary, how to properly do the [inaudible] of the summary of the different, of what level of consensus is actually, plus the proposal [inaudible] it's considered done. All comments that's currently on the [inaudible] in terms of a recap of all that has happened on the list.

So there are a few comments on what is in the details [inaudible]. I think the proposal is 69 questions. And I think it was close, but perhaps we can correct that. I think it's close [inaudible], I'm not sure on that. I think maybe the comments that are being discussed right now is the summary of the old discussions that happen between the IETF and the IANA plan [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Seun. It's Olivier speaking. And yes, I'm afraid I'm quite confused about where the ITF is now, because they seem to have reached a consensus and have a document that they can present, but then there appears to be appeals going on right now. I don't know what the appeals mechanism is, but some are disputing the consensus.

Let's simply decide that this is not our core problem. It's good that we are aware that they still have some work to do, and let's move on to agenda item number four, that's the work in the other RFPs. As you know, RFP4 is looking at the possible scenarios for transition, and that includes the timeline and the different risks, and opportunities, and mitigation facts that would be used in the scenarios that have been, sorry, in the proposal that has been put forward. Or in fact, I should say, in the proposals that are being put forward, since there is also some work in these, let's call it internal, ICANN proposal, as opposed to the external ICANN proposal.

And for all of you that have followed this, the history of it is too long to describe on this call, but the two main points, the one that we've named CWG, being an external to ICANN proposal with an external contract company. And the proposal of a few others including the ALAC, that contract co is not required, and would therefore have some kind of accountability mechanism internal to ICANN. Now, going back to this, there are timelines which are under discussion.

There is also a table which is being put together. I note that Sivasubramanian M is here, and he is one of the co-chairs of RFP4. Siva, could you please give us a brief update on where we are now on RFP4 please. Thank you.

I'm afraid we can't hear Siva at the moment. We have a technical problem. Until you get a phone call. I wish that, if you have updates, please get online or get connected, because we really have a tight deadline.

Okay, let's move on to RFP5 then in the meantime. And RFP5 is chaired by Cheryl Langdon-Orr, let's have a quick update from Cheryl please.

I'm afraid we can't hear Cheryl at the moment. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

We're unable to hear Cheryl. Okay, it's going to be one of these days.

In the meantime, do we have Siva on the line?

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. At this time, we do not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's, hello?

TERRI AGNEW: Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I heard a brief… Yes. Going once, going twice, I'm sorry, it's going to have to move because we really are pressed for time today. So that's the updates at the moment for RFP4 and five. If you have any further updates for the group, please email them to the mailing list. And let's move on to the coordinating response, to the CWG surveys then.

And here we have about 70 minutes that we'll be able to spend on this. We have two surveys that have been sent to the CWG. I understand from the call yesterday that everyone is invited to respond to these

surveys. So not only the members of the working group, but all participants in the CWG are invited to submit their responses to the survey.

The surveys are online. You will notice the link to the first survey and the link to the second survey online there, but for the [inaudible] of us being able to have a wider or bigger picture, rather than going page by page, Robert [inaudible] has very kindly supplied us with a copy of each one of the surveys in PDF format. So we've got the first survey on the customer standing committee and the multistakeholder review panel, with a deadline for submitting the responses as 23:59 UTC, today, the 8th of January, 2015.

And the second survey has a deadline tomorrow, and so we've got the two, the two links here. I invite you all to open first the first survey. But before that, we have Eduardo Diaz in the queue, who has put his hand up. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. I just wanted to point out that the document that has been [inaudible] has a different heading than the one that you sent around before the meeting. Mine says, the one you sent around, the PDF, it says, IANA CCWG Member and Participant Survey. And this one did not [inaudible]… Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this point Eduardo. Just have to have a look. Oh dear, dear. All right. What are we going to do? Let's have a look. This should be the same in what's in the link to the surveys. So the Google Doc survey should have the same thing, Google form. Yes.

So the one which was sent prior to this, I think, was… I'm just trying to see this, sorry.

Yeah. They're different things. Eduardo, there are two surveys. I think you're looking at the second survey, I'm looking at the first survey. We're not opening the one on the contract co, we're first starting with the one on the customer standing committee, and multistakeholder review panel, which is headed CWG CSD MRC survey. Eduardo?

EDUARD DIAZ: Yes, I got confused here. You are correct. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No worries Eduardo. That's fine. Fatima Cambronero is next.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: [Inaudible] raised my hand, whenever you want me to speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry. Who is this?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: Siva.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Siva, are you going to speak about the survey or about what we were just speaking about?

We can't hear Siva…

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: After you talk about the survey, I'll talk about RFP4.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'm sorry Siva, I said we've passed RFP4. We don't have time to spend on these parts. So RFP4, you'll just have to provide an update on the mailing list please.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: Okay. It's all right Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And apologies for this. We're just very, very pressed for time today. Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero for the record. Thank you very much Olivier. I have a brief question regarding the procedure, and this is, how are we

EN

going to manage the surveys? I mean, are we going to review point by point to coordinate the answers? Or are we going to have an outlook or an overview so that everybody can reply to the survey in a personal way?

Because I understood that we were not supposed to reply this until this call, and I see we were able to coordinate action. So this is a clarification question just to see how we can move forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Fatima. Olivier speaking. And it's down to this group to choose how they wish to treat the discussions we're having here. I think that the original aim was to, for us to be able to discuss this survey and somehow align our positions, or make sure that we all understand the questions that are being asked.

I know that some of us have been able to attend all of the calls, others have not for reasons that they have a proper life, as well. And so, if we can help anybody and being able to respond to the questions and align our answers, that would be helpful. Now that said, there are a lot of questions in the survey, and I would say if we go on a question by question basis, that would be a bit difficult.

So we'll probably have to go from page to page, and see if there are any sticky points or review what people are thinking about, some of those points in there. Eduardo Diaz.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ:	Yes Olivier. I suggest that we go through each of the questions, just to make sure that we understand what they are asking, and then I think we can do this pretty fast. Sticky points are the ones that would need a lot of discussion. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, excellent. Excellent idea Eduardo. Thank you. Olivier speaking. All right, let's get moving then please. And let's go through the first thing. Now you've got an introduction and instructions, I guess we all know what these instructions are about. It's got a description of what the customer service committee is, and what the multistakeholder review team are.

It starts with the demographic. Let me just make this… Can you all scroll on this document by yourselves? |
| TERRI AGNEW: | Olivier, this is Terri. I've let it so just you can scroll. Did you want me to adjust that? |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Please let everyone scroll at their own pace, because what I'm going to do in order to be able to see things, to open my own document on the screen, on my screen basically. So I can then let people, question five I think is the one that we need to look at. And it's probably easier because then also people can zoom in and zoom out of their document. |

EN

So scrolling should be enabled for everyone. And the first question of importance here in the context of discussing it, is the question number five, and the customer standing committee. Select one response. So we've got strongly agree to no response, and the question here is there should be a customer standing committee to carry out the tasks, as defined in the CWG draft proposal.

And the second question here is, the CSC should be an ICANN working group. Interesting two questions. Are there any thoughts about this? Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. First of all, what does it mean, strongly agree versus no response? [Inaudible] if you put no response, and I'm asking of that on the whole survey. I mean we are not in accord at all with the CSC, if I put in no response? Or that I don't care. I don't understand what that means. The no response column, because I know the rest...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Eduardo. And [laugh] let me be frank with you on this. I would imagine no response would just be taken as that we would pass,

that there would be an extension on this question. If you disagree with the customer standing committee, you probably put disagree, but that's my interpretation of it. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you had put your hand up. Is this your interpretation too?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. It was exactly what you said. No response means abstention, that's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Tijani. There is a question in the chat from Loris Taylor, how will the results of the survey be used? Another difficult question. I wonder if any of my colleagues who were, are colleagues who were on the cross-community working group call know the answer to this. Perhaps Alan Greenberg, did you catch how these were going to be used?

My feeling was they were going to be used as an indication of how close to consensus we are, but maybe I'm wrong, I don't know. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Olivier, thank you. This is Seun for the record. I think, that was what I was about to say. It's just going to be, the way I think, the way RFP3 mentioned, described the usefulness of the survey, is that [inaudible] to determine how close, or the next way forward during the main meeting that we will be having during the weekend.

I think that's what it says it is going to be used for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Seun. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed, this weekend, this forthcoming weekend, there are four calls of the group, four two hour calls. It's an intensive work week, and so they're hoping that would indicate what points we would really need to discuss there. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I wasn't really going to speak, but since you asked me, I'll make my position, my lack of position, clear. I don't know. It's clear on minor points of contention, these surveys may well put a way forward. It doesn't at all show how it will go forward on the major points of contention. And there was some discussion on it at the meeting today. I'm jumping a little bit ahead, but it sort of fits here, that a number of people, not started by me and Olivier, but we did chime in, pointed out that the RFP3, the group that is looking at the way forward and what the model is, has been focusing on tweaking and refining the proposal.

And basically has ignored, other than in emails, the fact that there are a significant number of people who are looking at something that's rather different. And that was pointed out, and I'm not quite sure what is going to come of it, but at least there is some discussion now that the lack of focus on the other alternatives, almost implies that they are not there. And if you start talking to people, there is increasing support for

their alternatives, not clear what that support is, and some people are expressing things in private that they're not saying in public.

But it's not clear how we're going forward, and it's not clear how the questionnaire is going to resolve some of the larger items. I have nothing more to lend to this other than a fair amount of concern that we are, do not know how to get from here to an endpoint. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. There is another question in the chat from Loris, more a comment from Loris Taylor that the survey is very different from a position statement. And Loris is wondering whether the survey opens up a variance of positions rather than a consolidated position. Either/or, I think, is the answer. If we were trying to find out if we had consolidated reviews in this group, in the IANA issues working group, at the same time, there is the bottom up thing and we're all independent.

So we're all able to answer whatever we want to answer in the survey. Obviously, it would be great if we somehow rode all in the same direction, but we're not going to have, I think, a top down where we're saying, well everyone has to block vote. That certainly is not the idea here. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I mean, one of the things that has become clear is positions are changing. The decision to focus purely on the contract co

model came out of Frankfurt, where there were very few people, other than At-Large, expressing any real concern for that model. There were a few people who were saying, "I don't like it, but if that's where we were going, then let's do such and such."

That position has changed now. There are increasing numbers, and it's not clear exactly where it stands, that are looking at other alternatives. And I think there is a realization of that right now, exactly where the split is, is not clear. The analysis that was done by staff is a good analysis, but tries to put everything into bins, and some of the responses don't fit well into those bins.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the record. I think, I would like to suggest that, [inaudible] on this survey, the chair, Olivier, you just said, let's refer to the number, tell us what you think is the view, tell us if you agree on this, with the view of making suggestions and that we are [inaudible] next question. [Inaudible]… I really like to hear the views, a collective view, not just [inaudible]… I think it would be important in helping us make our individual responses or [inaudible]…

…by suggesting a response for each of the question, and then you responded or suggest a different response. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Seun. Fatima Cambronero is next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you Olivier. Basically I agree with Seun, so I support his comments. I think his proposal is going to be more dynamic and more expedient, instead of reviewing everything on a question by question basis. What we can do is discuss possible replies, and if there is an objection, we go further into that.

But I'm more interested in our collective response to this questionnaire, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Fatima. Olivier speaking. And let's put this forward then, with question five then. And we have here the first question, there should be a customer standing committee to carry out the tasks, as defined in the CWG draft proposal. And so the question here is, the answer here, is providing…

I must say, I was not prepared to provide my answers right there and then on the spot. And as I said, some of these questions are ambiguous to answer. On this, the first question is, do we support the idea of a customer standing committee. My feeling is that we do, and my feeling is that we do support a CSC as defined in the draft proposal, although we're not quite sure what the overall composition of this CSC is.

So I would say agree to the first of this question. And the second part, the CSC should be an ICANN working group, that's a more complicated

matter, and I frankly don't know. I would probably say no, but then that might go against what we see as an internal to ICANN solution that we've proposed. Although we do have a CSC in there, we've never defined whether it would be an ICANN working group, or whether it would be outside that.

I see Gordon Chillcott. Gordon, you have the floor.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Hi, good morning Olivier. Thank you. A lot of this survey kind of confuses me, and here is one of the points. That the composition of the CSC is described, if I could use that term, in some detail in the next session. For myself, my response to the CSC should be an ICANN working group would be no response, and I'd still vote on the next section.

Being a procrastinator, that's actually the way I would probably do it myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Gordon. Good point. Does anyone else have a point of view on this? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. If you ignore the titles, and has been pointed out by a number of people, the use of the names of the groups from the CWG proposal here to some people, makes it sound as if we were supporting

the CWG proposal. If you look at it from a less slanted position, that we're saying here, the CSC seems to have, there seems to be some consensus that is largely composed of registries, but with a multistakeholder component, where the multistakeholders have the ability to raise issues.

And it's clear somebody has to be looking at the output from IANA to see whether service levels are being met. And it's quite clear, to people who have the most interest of doing that, are the people who are being served by IANA. So a group that has a large registry component, CC and G, it's almost inevitable that that group, whether it's a formal group or informal group, are going to be doing a lot of that work. So from that perspective, you can't, it's hard to not support a CSC type organization.

The details are, or rather the differences come in, what is their authority to take action? If the multistakeholder component is so small, can they be overruled by registries, and therefore only the registries hold sway? And those details are the ones that matter, not is there going to be some group of people who are looking at the performance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I think that we really need this kind of group. And each composition, and its scope, its duty will be determined by upcoming questions. So agreeing on this group doesn't mean that we

EN

agree on the composition on certain composition. We will answer questions about composition, and also we'll answer questions about the scope, if you want.

And so, I will answer yes for the first question and no answer for the second one. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes Olivier. I will say that, you know, if you answer no to the second question, I mean the question the way it's setup is, if you answer no, it's implying that you accept the fact that then it should not be within ICANN. It should be outside. I mean, that's the way I interpret that question, when you say no. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Eduardo. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yeah, I think Eduardo has identified an important issue. And, you know, my answer probably is I really don't care, at this stage, because it depends on where everything else is. If it's a completely internal to ICANN solution, then what's the difference between a group formed among registries, that is held under the auspices of ICANN, or one that is held outside?

You know, I don't really see a big difference between the two of them. So I really don't think it matters where it convenes in terms of what it is doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. So what, the way I see it then, the first question, there should be a customer standing committee, there would be agreement on there, either strongly agree or agree, and the second one, having heard the second points of view, looks as though it is acceptable to be, but there is no strong view because the importance is really how it is constituted, and what it is able to do, and that is the next question, question number six.

Everybody okay with this? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. There is some subtle differences. If you read, for instance, the registry proposal, where they are suggesting… The registry proposal basically says, "We'd like it inside ICANN, but we don't see the accountability in there. Here is a new proposal, which doesn't use contract co. It changes the name, but it's still a contracting entity." They are saying that the equivalent of the CSC, exists and it must be fully self-funded.

That is, each individual must pay for themselves. If you now say, within that proposal, it's outside of ICANN, then essentially, we're saying that At-Large is disenfranchised. Unless we can get ICANN to pay for us to

EN

participate in this outside organization, we're not likely to fund ourselves, and therefore we're implicitly going to be cut off. Whereas if it's within ICANN, it's likely to be a rationale funding mechanism for it.

So there are implications which aren't really, have to do with is it important that it's inside or outside of ICANN, but it may affect the equitability of participation because of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Alan, thank you. Olivier speaking. I'm concerned at the amount of time we're spending on one question and we have so many of them. But okay. Let's leave it at that. I hope we have an idea. I think some of us might answer agree, some of us might answer is acceptable, some of us might answer no response, depending on how you feel better about this, but it doesn't look like anyone will be saying that they disagree that the CSC should be an ICANN working group.

Disagree like specifically saying, no it should not be an ICANN working group. Maybe some will. Anyway, let's move on. Let's have number six please. And number six here has many different sub-questions. The first one, the CSC should perform the functions of the MRT. And there should be no separate MRT. The MRT being the multistakeholder reviewing team.

My personal view on this, and I, because we haven't had our inside poll, but my personal feeling is that we disagree on that, because that places the complete control over everything on the CSC at that point. So I would say disagree or strongly disagree. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Strongly disagree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Tijani. That comforts me. My wild guess here. Next one, the CSC. So number two, the CSC membership should include a substantial multistakeholder component. Remember this is the CSC, and I would say strongly agree or agree with this. I think that we have pushed for that as a community. If anybody disagrees, by the way, could they please put their hand up, and shout out here for the response.

Number three, the CSC membership should be restricted to ccTLD and gTLD registry upgraders. That one is a question which Alan has touched on, whether it should be a membership that is restricted to these direct customers, and having a strong multistakeholder subcomponent, or whether this should be a total multistakeholder component in the composition of this CSC membership itself.

Frankly, answering this one is a tough one because I think both would be, I personally think both would be acceptable, but others just might wish to say no, there should be a multistakeholder component for the conversation itself. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think everyone seems to have accepted. Remember, maybe we need to say something for the audience who hasn't

participated heavily. All the questions here basically are there because someone, in some comment, suggested something. So, somewhere there is a comment that said it should only be ccTLD and gTLD. And therefore, we're testing that water.

I think there has been general acceptance in the group that there should be some multistakeholder component. It may be small enough so there no real impact, but it's at least present. And you know, we're not keeping secrets from them. There is an imbalance because although ccTLD and gTLD registries, as a group, as individuals, may have a particular slanted view of things, between the two of them, almost the only thing they share is the desire that IANA work properly.

So, it's not likely that some particular, you know, chip on the shoulder of one or the other, is going to be carried forward by both groups, unless it is really related to IANA. So, it could probably exist without a multistakeholder component, but I don't think that's healthy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. So on 6.3, you would say strongly agree, disagree, strongly disagree?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would say strongly agree, but Tijani may have something different to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I will be absolutely opposite to you Alan. I would strongly disagree because if you take it, you are restricted to [inaudible]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh sorry. I answered the question backwards. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's very helpful Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, I got up at a quarter to six this morning. [CROSSTALK]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If we are speaking about number three, I will say strongly disagree, because I would not like it to be restricted to the registry. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Seun, you had put your hand up briefly earlier.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, I think I would just like to disagree with Alan before, I think it's fine…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Seun. Yeah, Alan has the ability to give us all heart attacks on a call. But anyway, let's move on. 6.4, this CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD and gTLD registry operators, with related experts. For example, representatives of the SSAC, the RSAC, the RIRs, ISOC, and the IETF. Note that the ALAC is not included in there. We've got the different experts in there, but no representatives from end users in the CSC.

Any thought on this? I would have say, because there are just experts as such, that would be a disagree. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. This is better than the number three, but it's still not acceptable. So I would disagree on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun for the record. I think, for me, I would say this is acceptable because one of the essence of the CSC is to ensure that we get fair analysis. So if this different stakeholders are actually involved, and we know them to be experts, I think that's already covers multistakeholder. So I think that it is acceptable, not necessarily strongly, I think. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Seun. Any other points or thoughts on this? We have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just pointing out that the question is worded such that it can be interpreted in different ways. It's says primarily consists. It's not clear if the other part of it, the part that isn't the primary, are the experts, or are there other multistakeholders there plus experts? You can interpret the question either way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. [CROSSTALK]… Okay. At the moment, I think we've got both disagree or is acceptable, which are next to each other. At least we don't have strongly agree and strongly disagree in the same group. Let's move on. I think we'll have to, I mean everyone will judge on their view, but I don't see a huge big difference between is acceptable and disagree. It just needs some [inaudible] mind and some [inaudible], maybe that is a big difference.

Seven, let's move on. Customers standing committee, and just to let you know, I'm taking notes of the responses at the moment, so we'll be able to, if you do have any questions, and actually I would probably ask you to take those as well. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, thank you. Just to note, at the way at the bottom of this section, there is a comment form. And you are… Although they didn't put comments after each question, you could say, question number four, you know, this is why I answered, or I presumed something. So you can put comments at each individual question by sliding your comment in the general form to say which question it applied to.
	So that is allowed.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yeah, that's a good point Alan. Thank you for this. Indeed, there was a question about being able to comment on these points. Now we're on seven. The customer standing committee, still the same, and we've got now the following question. If 7.4, if the CSC is only tasked with monitoring IANA performance, and not with resolving performance issues, the CSC may consist predominately of registries.
	So that narrows the scope of the CSC, is this something that one could agree to, I would say is acceptable or agree, but others might say something else. Tijani Ben Jemaa.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Acceptable.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay thank you Tijani. Any dissenting views on this?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If you didn't hear me, I said acceptable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I heard you Tijani, thank you. Acceptable. Seun Ojedji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. I think that question is in two parts. So it's going to be difficult to say it is acceptable, or I almost said acceptable, but when I read the second, the other part of this, this says, CSC may consist permanently of registries. And it's the same question, then it becomes contradictory to the previous question that we'll try to answer that has to do with the multistakeholder representation.

So maybe [inaudible] is close, but just like Alan said, I'm not trying to comment on my advantage. So I would go with acceptable with that question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Seun.   And yes, indeed, there is this element of contradiction between questions. Putting together surveys is no reason task, and this was done very quickly. Avri Doria, who is on the call, did want a group about the inability to put surveys at such a quick speed that actually work well. But anyway, Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. I think there is no contradiction since we are narrowing here the scope of the CSC, so if for that, it is acceptable. If it is for the

[inaudible] for also [inaudible] problem, it would not be acceptable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, okay, thank you for this precision Tijani. Let's go to 7.6, the CSC should include additional individuals outside the naming community who have relevant technical expertise, I would say strongly agree to this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay [inaudible] question, we jump to number six?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, yeah, I just said that. 7.6.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're on overall customer standing committee section seven, and this is question six in there, so I'm asking how that works. It's another bizarre one. So 7.6, strongly agree. 7.7, the CSC members should be drawn from the MRC so that there is coordination between the CSC and MRC on matters that are escalated. I would not mind about that. I would say it's quite acceptable.

EN

Or I would even agree to this. We certainly need much coordination between the two. Of course, another way to do it would be to have a liaison. Suen, then Tijani. Suen is that your hand, or…? Ah. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is acceptable for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Seven point, oh. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: The fact, you know, it says the members, not some of the members or something like that, and I think that makes it unacceptable. These maybe, you know, we don't know if the MRT is going to be a major job or a small job. Some people claim, if you read the various comments, some people claim it's going to meet once a year, and only if they really have to, and other people think this is going to be a full time job, and capture is going to be affected because only a small number of people who have are heavily invested in this business are going to be able to afford to maintain MRT participation.

So to say all of the CSC people come from the MRT, and remember, we've also said the MRT might consist of one person per registry, or for all of the registries, because we don't know what the composition of the MRT is, so I think, you know, saying there should be some overlap so they can coordinate and talk to each other, sure. To say it should be

drawn from the MRT, I think is something that is completely unreasonable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Alan. Are there any other views on this, because we now have views in favor and against. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun. Thank you Olivier. I think the overlap should be in the process, and not necessarily in the individual, because the more we say the CSC should have the presentations from MRT, also implies that there is [inaudible]… So it means that it is most likely going to be [inaudible] of the MRT, most members of the MRT would [end it], representing [inaudible]. So I think the process is what should determine synchronization, and not the individual.

So in that view, I will strongly disagree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Seun. I note that others are, Gordon Chillcott agrees with Alan's view on this, which was to disagree. And there is also a note from Avri Doria mentioning that the MRT and the CSC might be different skillsets. And I will draw from that, that then there is no use at that point to have CSC members drawn from the MRT.

So we do have a few different views here. So maybe the CSC members should not be drawn from the MRT, in which case the majority of people here would disagree with this.

Let's go to 7.8, the CSC should have a continuous existence. And my believe on this one is that yes, it would have the continuous existence, since it constantly needs to monitor day to day activities and responses, service level agreements, and things like that. Any views against this?

So, number eight, 7.8 would be the CSC would have a continuous existence, strongly agree. Number 7.9, members should have staggered terms. Only one-third of the members should be replaced each year, to provide continuity. I don't have anything against that. I think we're really starting to micromanage in a way that it doesn't really influence the end proposal.

And it's funny because on the one hand, we're really going to such granular detail, and some of those questions, and others like the location where the CSC is going to be, or the jurisdiction, and the whatever, those are not touched on. I'm a little concerned about that, but… Suen Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SUEN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun Olivier. Sorry, I just, did I hear you say location or jurisdiction where CSC is going to be? Because…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I had just mentioned that it's not going to be [CROSSTALK] at the moment Seun. Seun, I just mentioned that it's not being touched on. What we have here is, members should have staggered terms. But I would say, frankly, I don't really care what, you know, how they're going to be changed and stuff, but yeah, obviously, it would be good if they had staggered terms. It would certainly help. And I would say agree or strongly agree.

And that's how [CROSSTALK]…

SUEN OJEDEJI: Okay. I was suggesting because it's not very clear [inaudible]… I would suggest no response for my own answer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Seun. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I am a little bit concerned now, because you said you are concerned because the scope of the survey wasn't on the jurisdiction, on where it would be. So who did this survey? I thought it was the CWG. So you are member of the CWG and you don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Tijani. I don't know if, I mean, the survey was built by a subgroup, I think, primarily. I don't recall having designed these questions. Basically it asked for people to send their questions in, and then these

were all put together by the chairs of the working group, and so we end up with a whole number of questions in there.

And there was some possibility to come back and say, "Yeah, we disagree with this question," or whatever. But it was only a very limited amount of time, and I frankly, this whole thing took place between the 31st of December for me, 2 PM, and something like 2 PM on the 1st of January, and I had other things to do. And this should be with a smiley, but I really did have other things to do. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Just to, this is Suen for the record. Just to [inaudible]… Olivier, I thought [inaudible]… I was actually surprised, I didn't know how [inaudible]… decided to do the survey, but I also admit I did not participate in the meeting during the New Year. [Inaudible]… So that's why I did not actually majorly question the decision. So [inaudible], thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Suen. Now rather than looking at the origins of the survey, I would suggest we focus back on answering the questions. Time is going fast. Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima for the record. Thank you very much Olivier. I wanted to make a comment similar to yours. It doesn't matter the origin of the survey. We should be thankful to those people. If we don't like the

questions, okay, let's say we're not going to answer the questions, or just say no response, but let's move forward.

When it comes to question 7.9, regardless of place or the location of the CSC, I think it would be a good option to have a staggered term, in order to allow continuity, that existing members maybe kind of mentors for new members, in order to perform their roles properly. So I would say that I do agree with this option number nine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Fatima. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I know you said you don't want to talk about origins, but just a quick word. It came out of discussions with the CWG chairs, the working group chairs and staff, as a way to try to make some sense or get some clarity out of the many, many comments that were presented, and don't necessarily ever fit together in any given way. So it was an attempt, maybe a bad one, to try to make some sense of this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. So on 7.9, we either have strongly agree or for those who don't feel this question works well, no opinion on that. Let's go to number eight. Eight is still about the customer standing committee, and we have 8.10, users of the IANA naming functions should be required to go through the CSC or the MRT to address issues related to the IANA functions operator.

I don't really know what the users of the IANA naming functions is. If it's users of the DNS, and of the root, and direct Internet users, basically, I would say yes, go through the MRT. But I'm not quite sure how that question works. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I believe when we discussed this, this was essentially saying should registries, among registries, root operators, whatever, have to go through the MRT or the CSC, or be able to deal directly with IANA.

Again, the question is here because someone suggested something, not necessarily because it was a widespread belief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking. When it says here, to address issues related to the IANA functions operator, does it basically say, if you're going to perform an update, a top level domain update, then you have to go to the CSC or to the MRT? I'm not quite sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, to address issues for this problem, read issues as problems.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay, problems, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I think if you try to tell a registry that they can't speak directly to IANA, to tell IANA they messed up something. You can almost imagine what the answer is going to be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yes, we'll keep this call clean, then we'll move to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

                        And Tijani, you might be muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry Olivier, I was muted. So I would say, I would prefer that we go directly to IANA, the IANA operator, and if [inaudible] is not the result, then we go to the other, to the CSC or the other. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Olivier, I would say that, you know, the CSC is really looking at the performance of the IANA operator and the daily functions. When ccTLD has a problem in delegation based on whatever, they should go and move, whatever the IANA decide, if they don't agree, they should go to the IAB appeals panel, to resolve that problem there. But, you know, an issue of, you know, if the applicable law, accomplished goals, [inaudible] and what have you, so they have to do really, really performance of the IANA function, they performing it.

EN

And it's just like, you know, legal issues, stuff like that, should go somewhere else. And both the CSC and the MRT are looking at performing, you know they're looking at performing what they are supposed to perform. That's my opinion. So I would strongly disagree with that one. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Eduardo. It's Olivier speaking. From what I've heard, I would say 8.10 is disagree or strongly disagree. 8.11, the users of the IANA naming function should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator, rather than being required to go through the MRT. And I think I've just heard this right now, which therefore means, strongly agree or agree on 8.11.

8.12, users of the IANA naming function should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions upgrader, rather than be required to go through the CSC. Again, from what I've heard, it would be strongly agree or agree for this question.

8.13, the role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments, performance indicators, and quality assurance. And I would say strongly agree or agree on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I strongly agree.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. By the way, if anybody disagrees with the points I'm making here, please either shout your name out or put your hand up. 8.14, the CSC may go directly to the IAP, that's the independent appeals panel, rather than escalating issues to the MRT, if there is an issue that cannot be resolved. On this occasion, I would probably say disagree, but others might have the same point of view. Any thoughts here?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Why you disagree Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. I disagree because of the original diagram which was put together by the cross-community working group, it's basically the escalation, when something went wrong in the CSC or a service level agreement gets missed, etc., the escalation always went to the MRT first. And I felt that was probably an okay way to do things.

Otherwise you'd end up going directly to an independent appeals panel, but remember it is both costly, and goes straight out of the picture like this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not even clear, depending on how the CSC is organized, whether the CSC would have standing. Is it an entity which could prove it's been harmed? It's not at all clear. Again, it comes down to, if it's a

EN

monitoring organization, then it's job isn't to do the enforcement and I would disagree on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. We have a different view here. Why would you disagree and…? You said you would disagree or you would agree?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would disagree. I don't think the CSC should be appealing something when it's not a body that is making decisions. It's noting things. It's passing on reports. It's commenting. You know, the… Again, we're looking at, is this the contract co proposal? If this the contract co proposal, then the contract co has the enforcement rules and it gets its instructions from the MRT.

So that should be the first path, not go to an independent arbitrator. If it's internal to ICANN, then you should be going to ICANN, and saying, "Hey, your guys aren't acting properly." I can't see the scenario where the CSC would go to the IAP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alan. Let's keep this as disagree for 8.14. We move to nine. And I'm really concerned about the amount of time at the moment that we have remaining on the call. We have 15 minutes left. 9.15, assuming the MRT is not a standing committee, the CSC, now remember, assuming the MRT is not a standing committee, the CSC

should decide whether an instance of the MRT needs to be created to address a specific topical issue the CSC has been unable to resolve.

And this one I would disagree with, because I have always felt that it is the MRT that has this ability to decide on whether to create itself or not. But maybe others differ on this. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier. I would disagree too because of the fact that the MRT would not be a standing committee. If it is not a standing committee to the users more or less. If it is only there to meet once a year, it's not [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Tijani. Any other views on this? Is everyone disagreeing on this? Or disagreeing with the clause 9.15? Alan Greenberg, you still have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: In error.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. 9.16, the CSC may develop IANA service levels without going through the MRT. An interesting question. My feeling, and it's not particularly strong, I think it's acceptable or I would agree, because we're dealing with service level agreements, and that requires much,

EN

very much, well that requires much more within the topic itself. So there needs to be expertise in there. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I have a question on this one. How at the service level agreement setup right now? Can someone answer me that question? [Inaudible] answering that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good point Eduardo. Olivier speaking. I believe that these were developed by the NTIA back in the day, or maybe even before these started. 9.15 was disagree. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Service levels have evolved. There was recently some IANA public comment asking for questions about service levels on various things. So they have, it has evolved. Again, the answer to this is probably different depending on what the overall structure is. If we're talking about contract co, then service level agreements are part of contracts, and it has got to go through the MRT and contract co has got to bounce all the way up to hierarchy and all the way down.

If the CSC is an operational entity within an internal operation, subject to public comment and that kind of stuff, sure the CSC could propose if not establish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: If I hear Alan, then [inaudible] is acceptable. I mean, it can go either way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Eduardo. So we've got is acceptable or agree on this. 9.17, the CSC should be a subgroup of the MRT, and that goes very much in line what was said earlier, I believe the answer was disagree or strongly disagree.

I'm pausing just in case. Okay. 9.18, the CSC should be tasked with the job of resolving issues related to policy implementation, or escalating these issues to the MRT if the CSC cannot resolve the issue. I would believe that there is, is acceptable is probably the answer I would provide on this, others might disagree or agree strongly. Sivasumbramanian.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: I disagree with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Siva?

EN

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can hear you very faintly, and you said I disagree with that.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: Yes Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Is there a reason why you disagree with it?

                            Siva?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: …on both proposals, it says that either of the CSC should resolve, or if it cannot resolve, it would be [inaudible]. So on board these options, the importance… scope of 11… where policy issues that will have a role to play in the policy. And considering the part that we are talking about…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm afraid we are now breaking up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN M: Did you hear me clearly? [Inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, when you asked whether we can hear you clearly, we can, but when you explain what you're saying, you're breaking up a little bit. Please type it so we're sure about what you're saying, and let's go to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would strongly disagree on this one. Note, it's a lowercase policy. There is very little formal ICANN policy, other than ccTLD re-delegations that IANA has even a part in. There is an awful lot of practices and established policy, lowercase policy, but we don't know what's going to happen in the future. And there may well be gTLD policy which is forced upon IANA. The registries may not like it, and the registries cannot be doing their own policing of whether IANA is following policy.

If the policy is set by multistakeholder bodies, it has got to be monitored by multistakeholder bodies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alan. I believe Siva was also saying that he disagreed with this, so I would therefore, having heard two people saying they disagreed, let's hear from others. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Alan, I am reading here, there should be tasked with the job of resolving issues related to policy implementation. It is not about policy making or policy implementation, it is about resolving

issues related to the policy implementation. So I don't see the problem here, if you can explain it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, let's take the extreme case. There is policy that is not being followed, and the registries don't want it to be followed. If the CSC is largely registries, I don't expect them to do a really good job of that.

Now, can they participate? Can they initiate things? I strongly support not adding layers of bureaucracy and letting people talk to each other. So attempting to resolve, yes, but charged with tasks with resolving, I think it becomes a different issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Let's move on. So there is a disagree on this mostly. And let's move to 9.19, assuming that the CSC is composed only of registry representatives, the CSC and not the MRT would be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks such as performance review, budget review, and customer survey input.

And I would say disagree to that, or strongly disagree to that. Okay. Any other views on the call about this? No. Okay. Now 9.20, assuming the CSC is composed of registries and other stakeholders. So here it's registry and other stakeholders, the CSC and not the MRT should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks. Performance review, budget review, and customer survey input. So we have a CSC that is

multistakeholder. I would say that probably would also say disagree on it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, I agree with you Olivier, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And for the reason that the CSC is direct operational, and it's not going to have this whole reviewing part, performance review, budget review. I mean, it sounds like a [inaudible] task. I don't hear anyone else saying they disagree with that, so we're on strongly disagree or disagree on 9.20.

Now, as Alan said, there is a space for comments, and then we can go to the multistakeholder review team part of this. And we've only done a quarter of all the things we needed to do today. Statement regarding the multistakeholder review team. Number 11, number 11, question 11 is there should be a multistakeholder review team to carry out the tasks, as defined in the CWG draft proposal, the introduction to the survey, and I would say that is acceptable or agree.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any other views on that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would agree Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. So there is an agreement from Tijani. Any other view here? No? And then the MRT should be an ICANN working group. Same question as earlier for the CSC. I think that what we said earlier was is acceptable. Can't remember. What did we say earlier?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, there wasn't agreement. Some wouldn't answer, would say no answer, some said that's acceptable, some disagreed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There was a mix, indeed. It is acceptable or acceptable. I see several hands up. First, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, it depends on model. If this is contract co, which is just taken the whole responsibility away from ICANN, it's not clear that it should be an ICANN committee. On the other hand, if it's internal, with internal accountability measures, it makes complete sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, we can say acceptable if it will be a contract co external to ICANN, it would not be possible. That's all. So we will accept in the case which is possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I can live with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry [inaudible]. If the contract co is accepted, I would say that the MRT, if we say that's yes [inaudible] we are saying that the MRT should be also outside ICANN, or what?

ALAN GREENBERG: It would make little sense for the contract co advocates to say it should be outside of ICANN, I can live with it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. So that would be acceptable or agree on this, just like the CSC. Let's move on. Let's go down one more. And we're now in question number 12, I believe. And we've got 12.1, the MRT should be responsible for creating [inaudible], an entity for contracting with the IANA functions operator, only if, and when, it is needed, i.e., when the operator is no longer ICANN.

Thought on this is acceptable or agree.

Any other views? No? I don't hear anybody else. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm having trouble understanding what it's saying. I think this is what we have called the nuclear option in our internal to ICANN proposal, that says we only look at contracting when it's absolutely necessary. I think it should probably be worded when the operators no longer going to be ICANN.

So, I think this coincides with no contract co, in which case I would strongly agree. I'm not 100% sure though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Does anybody disagree or strongly disagree to this? To 12.1? I don't see anyone against it. So this is strongly agree or agree or is acceptable. 12.2, the MRT should be convened by ICANN in conjunction with the ISTAR organization. And I think I was going to say, well this actually is part of our proposal, I would say strongly agree on that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, me too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any other views about this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure with the ISTAR. It's certainly one of our options. It certainly acceptable. I'm not sure if it's a strong agree. Again, these things are so interrelated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So we've got either between strongly agree and is acceptable. We don't appear to have anyone who strongly disagree or disagree with this.

12.3, the comments, the concept of the MRT should be replaced by a dual [inaudible] vehicle, similar to that used by the addressing community. For example, an internal to ICANN structure like the address organization, the IANA supporting organization, and the

---

external structure like the number resource, the IANA resource [inaudible].

That's of course one of the options that we brought forward. I would say strongly agree on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Me too.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would, again, for an internal to ICANN… It's Alan speaking. I think this is acceptable. It's one of the ways to do things. It's adding a level of complexity which might not be needed. So I wouldn't strongly agree, it's certainly a viable way of addressing concerns that it's too ICANN-centric.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Okay. So between is acceptable or agree or strongly agree. All right. 12.4, and by the way, it is the 15:32 UTC. I have been told that the interpreters are able to remain another 15 minutes on the call, and I thank them for this. And we'll try and go as far as we can in that amount of time.

12.4, if a MRT is convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status, i.e., it would be incorporated of its own. A legal status of its own if it is convened under the auspices of ICANN. Any thoughts on

	this? I would be concerned that just brings costs up. I would say disagree on this. Alan Greenberg.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. I'm not sure what it means. Convened under the auspices of usually means it's sort of part of the family and doesn't have a legal status of its own. I'm not sure if there is a real meaning to this thing. So I would be very reluctant to support it, not understanding it.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yeah Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I would just say perhaps it could be a separate organization. A little bit like what ISOC has done having the Internet supply team with a foundation or something, and having the Internet Society next to it. So we do have this legal, what is it, separation one way or the other. It's a bit of…
ALAN GREENBERG:	It's sort of like a wholly owned corporation. The Internet foundation has a separate board, but it's effectively, it's not controlled by because that would be illegal, but it's…
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

EN

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Olivier.   This is Fatima for the record.   Regarding this question, I have a conflict as well because it is my understanding that the MRT, as I understood it, was a multistakeholder review team formed by the global multistakeholder community. Not only the ICANN community. So, if it's going to be convened by the ICANN community, then I find some conflict here.

And I don't see why it should have a legal status of its own. I would disagree with this question on the basis of the first part of the question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Fatima. So that would be under disagree, that would lend support to disagree on this. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I guess I would put it as acceptable. I mean, ICANN is the logical entity convenes things like this, even if there are components outside of ICANN that are participating. And look at the ICG. And remember, some parts of the ISTAR community are not names related, so it's not clear that the whole, all of the Internet community needs to be a part of this.

We still are only talking about the names function. So it's not clear that the RIR should be double dipping, as it were, and participating in this when they have their own path as well. So, I find it acceptable, I'm not sure it's necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So 12.4, we've got is acceptable or disagree on this, at the moment. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I do agree with the MRT under ICANN. It is not a problem for me. And I don't see why I would disagree if it will have a legal status for its own. I think it's a good thing, but I would not disagree. I would say acceptable or agree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So here we have agree, is acceptable, or disagree. I really, it's just one of the questions. I'm not going to spend so much time on this, especially with how little time we have. I'm hoping we can reach the end of the questions just for this survey since the deadline is tonight, and perhaps discuss any questions that we might have on the second survey on the mailing list. Tijani, your hand is still up. I saw Seun had his hand up earlier?

SEUN OJEDEJI:	Yeah. I wanted to comment on that, so I don't know whether I just had to drop my hand [inaudible]… I think maybe we need to clarify what legal means here, because [inaudible] I mean, perhaps the cooperating [inaudible], if it is legal in terms of reflecting the role of MRT in the ICANN bylaws, for instance, then I will agree. But if it means cooperation, then I disagree. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay thank you for this Seun. We'll have a mixed response on this, I guess. All right. Let's move to the next question, and that's 13.5, if a MRT is not convened under the auspices of ICANN, it should have a legal status of its own. And this one I would say strongly agree for the reason that if the MRT does not have a legal status, the individual members of the MRT would be liable for the decisions of the MRT.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Me too Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Tijani. I don't see anyone putting their hand up or disagreeing with this suggestion, so let's go to 13.6. The MRT should not recreate another ICANN. And here is one where I will say strongly agree.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Me too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think most of us do not want another second headache on our hands. Not implying that ICANN is a headache, but 13.7, adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT. And I'm not quite sure what that was supposed to mean. Is it that adequate care should be taken so the MRT doesn't start doing more and more and more things?

I would say probably agree on this, although I'm not too sure what I'm answering here. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I interpret this question as the dynamics in terms of the number of people that are growing, the number of people… But you might be right, maybe in the dynamics of the scope of things that we are doing. So I'm not sure why this…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Eduardo. Does anyone else have a view on this? This is the growth of the scope perhaps? It looks like the scope. So that would be agree or strongly agree, probably on this. 13.8, there should be multistakeholder representation on the MRT, and I would say strongly agree to that. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess you just have to read that question, not saying MRT, but reading it out in full. There should be a multistakeholder representation on the multistakeholder review team. Duh.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Some might disagree Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. There are…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Multistakeholder is in the eye of the beholder.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there is at least one proposal that says it should just be registries, which is just reflected. But there have been using the MRT name in this question, which makes no sense at all. So that's the origin of it for those who didn't watch this being put together.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That obviously was a trick question. So 13.8, strongly agree. 13.9, the composition of the MRT should be weighted towards greater representation of the registry operators as direct customers of the IANA function. I have a difficulty with answering this outright like this because when one says weighted towards greater representation of the registry operators, does one mean that there should be a majority of

EN

registry operators? Or should there just be a few more representatives of registry operators than others?

I'm not too sure on this one. I would say it's acceptable that there would be, the registries would have a strong component on there. But I wouldn't say I would agree with this. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. They want to have the exclusivity on the CSC, and they want to have the majority on the MRT. So they want to control everything. So I strongly disagree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Tijani. Any other thoughts or views on this? So we've got is acceptable or strongly disagree. The way you mentioned it, by the way, here Tijani, does feel like indeed, that is a question. Do they wish to have full control? Eduardo Diaz and then Alan Greenberg. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: As a multistakeholder, I strongly disagree to have a weighted representation from other organizations and groups that should be equally footing. So I strongly disagree with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Strongly disagree from Eduardo. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:	In the interest of moving quickly, Tijani said strongly disagree, nobody disagreed with him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yeah, okay. So let's strongly agree with Tijani's strongly disagree. Let's move on. 13.10, no, we're on 14.10. 14.10, membership in the MRT, the multistakeholder review team, should be restricted to the direct customers of IANA, the registries. And I would say, again, strongly disagree on this one.

Okay. I don't think anyone will disagree with that. So strongly disagree with 14.10. 14.11, control of decisions in the MRT should be restricted to the registries, even if there are representatives of other stakeholder groups in the MRT, which is strongly disagree.

And I believe for the transcript that the "Ha, ha, ha, ha" comes from Tijani. Number 12, there is a danger, 14.12, there is a danger that a MRT drawn entirely from ICANN's policy making and policy advisory organizations, will politicize the IANA naming functions. I would say, I would say I disagree with this. But Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Of course there is that danger. By saying multistakeholder, we are saying there are potentially people with different positions. That's the whole reason we have multistakeholders. So yes, it will politicize it, and yes, it will politicize the naming functions, it will politicize the

management of the naming functions, that's why we have multistakeholders.

If anyone agreed, we could nominate one king and they could make all of the decisions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So you would say agree to that then, agree to this statement….

ALAN GREENBERG: I would say agree, and in the comment say, "And it is a good thing."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. That's an important point. 12 is agree. 14.13, we are reaching the end of this call, but I think we've got just a couple of more questions here. The MRT, and not just yet, should be solely responsible for the annual IANA tasks currently performed by the NTIA. Performance review, budget review, and customer survey input. And I would say yes with that, I would say agree to that.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. 14.4, the MRT with input from the SCS, should be responsible for the annual IANA tasks currently performed by the NTIA. You will notice the difference between this and 14.3 and 14.4, is that one said with input from the CSC, and the other one says, and not input from the CSC. I don't think that these two questions are mutually exclusive.
	I think that I could agree to 14.2 too. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I strongly agree with both of them.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Me too.

ALAN GREENBERG:	13 does not rule out input from the CSC, 14 says there should be input from the CSC, which I believe there should be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you for this Alan. And now we have, I can't scroll for some reason. We are so much beyond… How many questions do we still have? We have still have 15 and 16 to look at. 15.15 is speaking about the MRT primary function to decide whether to renew the IANA

EN

functions contract or not, etc. These are important questions, and I think we might be losing the interpreters to go through 15 and 16 will probably take another 10 minutes or so.

Staff, could we have feedback on this please?

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. Yes, I'll check.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Terrible. Let's just plow on in the meantime with 15.15. The MRT's primary function should be deciding whether to renew the IANA functions contract, and whether the IANA naming functions contract needs to be amended. The way the question is asked, I have problems with it, but I would say, is acceptable or agree to this. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Wrong hand, wrong hand, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I note that Fatima is the only person on the Spanish channel. If she can move to the English channel, then we can let the interpreters go.

TERRI AGNEW:	And Olivier, this is Terri. They just got back to me, they're able to stay 10 more minutes.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you so much for them. Okay, 15.16, so 15.15 what we had here was agree or is acceptable. 15.16, the MRT should have a continuous existence, regardless of how often it meets. My belief on this is that it's agree or strongly agree, the reason being that if they don't have a continuous existence, that effectively gives a free hand to the CSC to do whatever it pleases, and the MRT to be composed of people who are not taking much interest in this, or much care in this, just have a concern about convening and un-convening things.
	I heard from Tijani that there is a strongly agree on number 16. Number 17 should be recreated each time it is needed. And so 15.17 to me is a strong disagree.
	I see a red cross from Alan Greenberg. Alan, does that mean you strongly disagree, yes?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes, I was disagreeing with the question, not with your answer.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you. 15.18, members should have staggered terms to provide continuity. I think we said yes earlier, so 15.18 was an agree or strongly agree. And 19, 15.19, the MRT should be kept small in number.

No more than a dozen representatives, and that's the one where the devil comes into the details. Who will it be? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I strongly disagree with that. I believe, that for instance, like with the CWG and CCWG, you need to give each group enough people to allocate them. Certainly in the GNSO, they're going to have to receive some allocation. In our case, we would want to. And there is a real problem with keeping it really small. Keep it really small, then you end up with a smaller number which is quorum, and even smaller number that can make decisions.

And I don't believe we should have two, or three, or four people able to make the decisions on these kinds of things, which is what you end up with if you have only 10 people in the group in total, or eight or nine or whatever it is. So I think there is a real problem with keeping it too small.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I strongly disagree with any numbers there, because we don't know how the MRT is going to look like in the end. So, you know, I strongly disagree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Suen for the record. I also disagree with a dozen, but I agree with, it's not taking too [inaudible]. I will agree [inaudible] in the cases of having safeguards representation for each stakeholder group. For instance, ALAC [inaudible] should have two, to allow for [inaudible] safeguards [inaudible], to allow for better progress. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Olivier?

SEUN OJEDEJI: So yes, in terms of my response, it's disagreed, especially based on the dozen indicated…

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand Seun. We've lost Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you are back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm using Adobe Connect as an emergency measure, whilst being dropped. So let's just move on…

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us have another meeting in eight minutes, by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, so let's go quickly then. Okay, I think I'm back on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, let's see, we are 15.19, I believe that was disagree on that. Yeah, 15.20, the MRT can be larger in number, i.e. 20 or more representatives so that broad representation can be achieved. I would say is acceptable on this. I wouldn't say I agree. I think it starts getting a bit worrying at 20 or more representatives. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well the point here is the way this question was made, first it gives you minimum of 12, and now they're giving you a maximum of more than

EN

20. So I don't know how to answer this, because really, we don't know. So I will strongly disagree with this one also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Eduardo. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, we have, even excluding the ASO, which is addressing, if you look at the number of stakeholders in ICANN, the number of ACs and SOs, there are six of us. If you say it has to be under 20, that would mean only two each. That's not going to fly in some of these groups. I think we're stuck with larger groups on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …strongly disagree. Eduardo said strongly disagree, you're saying agree…

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm saying strongly disagree. Being larger in number, so I'm strongly agreeing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Agree, yes. I agree too.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani strongly agrees. Anyone else? Eduardo, do you reconsider? Or do you strongly disagree? You think it's too many people. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this is Eduardo. I can reconsider, it's just the way that this questions were put together, I mean it's funny, but you know, more than 20, more than 12, that would be fine for me. I will go with strongly agree, no problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. So we have 15.20 we have agree or strongly agree. Seun Ojedeji, we're reaching the end of this call. So Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. You already mentioned agree, and I agree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. That's recorded as well. 15.21, the compositon and size of the MRT should be difficult to alter or amend. I would say agree. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would say strongly agree or strongly disagree. It depends. If it's an external organization, supporting a contract co, it should be really difficult to change it because that's how capture is affected. On the

---

other hand, if it's internal to ICANN, managed by the multistakeholder body within ICANN, then it changes as need to change.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So strongly agree, or agree, or strongly disagree. I would say then, include a comment in the comment box underneath. That's probably likely to be the right answer. 15.22, the term length of MRT members should be limited to two full contract cycles. I would say agree with that. I'm certainly for term limits.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, agreement from Tijani. Thank you. And I don't see anyone against it. So I think that this is what we have, that's the whole survey, that's the survey. There is a second one on contract co, and I don't know how to deal with it, since we've run out of time. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. You know in this [15.22?], I would [inaudible]… two full contract cycles, does that mean that the contract company insists that it would take care of this contracting cycle? I will agree with it, but the way it is written, it is kind of [inaudible], someone is contracting ICANN on this. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Olivier, I will interrupt because I have another call…
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, we all have other calls, and we're going to lose everyone in a moment. Fatima Cambronero.
FATIMA CAMBRONERO:	This is Fatima speaking. Thank you Olivier. I have two comments. I totally disagree with point 22. I would like a third term as was mentioned in another point. And regarding the second survey, as Olivier says, we all have a life a part from the IANA issues, but if we have time, we might get together on Skype and review the replies. So as to have a guideline that we can share with the rest of the group. This is a suggestion. I am available tomorrow, for instance. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much for this Fatima. Let's follow up on the Skype chat. That's a very good point, and see what we are to do. I'm a little concerned about conveying a conference call at short notice and having reasonable participation on this. But let's follow up, as you said, on the Skype, and we take a choice as what we're going to do on the second one.
	The second one is also up for comment, and the deadline for filling the second one is Friday night UTC. The deadline for filling this one is Thursday the 8th of January, 2015, 23:59 UTC. So when you're finished with this call, please start filling out your details here. What I will do is

to share the points in mnemonic form with the mailing list. The summary of what we thought about here. And you know, you'll all be able to see and I'll just say that these are not even guidelines, but these are the general feeling that we had on the call.

And with this, I know we've totally run out of time. Is there any other business for this call? So as usual, we'll have a Doodle sent for next week, in order for us to have a call and the same sort of timing for this week. And we'll follow up directly after this call by email, and for the Skype for the second survey.

I thank you all, and I apologize for all of the time this has taken, and really a big, big round of applause and thanks for the interpreters Sabrina and Veronica, who have stayed an enormous amount of time here, two hours with us, when we were supposed to be here for 90 minutes. Goodbye. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]