
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 Wednesday, the 28th of January 2015 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today, English channel we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, Loris Taylor, and Gordon Chillcott. Seun Ojedeji may be joining us a little later in the call.

On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto and Fatima Cambronerero.

I show apologies from Leon Sanchez.

From staff, we will have Heidi Ullrich; and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Sabrina and David.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond. We'll start first with the adoption of the agenda. Just before that, did we miss anyone in the roll call? No, it doesn't appear to be so.

So, adoption of the agenda. Today we have first a quick review of the work in the operational communities, including a quick update on the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

IANA Coordination Group. Then we'll look briefly – again, briefly – at the work in RFP 4 and RFP 5, and then we'll dig into the meat of today which is the detailing of the contract code [inaudible] RFP 3a, but which some call RFP 3. And also a summary and work on the building of the coordinated RFP 3b scenario, or should I say scenarios because there are two of them. Are there any additions to the agenda?

None, so the agenda is approved. I invite you quickly to have a look at the action items. I think it's just the call [inaudible] send a Doodle, so that's done.

Agenda item #3. First of all, I have an update from Jean-Jacques Subrenat regarding the IANA Coordination Group. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Today we had a meeting, a telephone conference of the ICG, and it was mainly about input from communities about the process and a bit about content to make sure that we were dealing with all of that properly.

But before I go into any details, I just wanted to give two pieces of information. The first is that I will not be going physically to Singapore, but of course I will be following by remote participation the pieces of the ICANN 52 meeting that I'm associated with, and of course the full program of the [inaudible] meeting also in Singapore on the 6th and 7th of February.

As you put in the agenda for today's call, update of IANA Coordination Group, well I see that you are interested especially in what is called the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal Assembly and Finalization Process. Those of you present on the call have all seen this, so I won't go into the detail. Rather, I'd like to ask if you have any questions about this or any remarks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jean-Jacques. The floor is open for questions. I had one regarding the transition process timeline. There certainly are concerns with regards to the names community input and whether this is now reflected in the IANA transition process timeline. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you. This may not be the final state of the gathering of information, but for the time being we're working on the assessment to be done on all the main contributions between now and the 15th of February. We've already got protocol parameters. We have numbers and names underway I'm told, but I haven't seen anything complete on that. Does that answer your question or was your question much wider about the overall timeline?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Perhaps the overall timeline, if there is a change, also I understand the proposals from the IETF and from the CRISP comprising the RIRs have been received. So has work started on these or is this also pending?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. Work is going on already on the contributions we have received. We're not waiting to have all of them at the same time. So we are assessing those documents we have already received.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The same question, but I'll make it more pointed. It's quite clear that the [names] proposal will not be submitted before 15th of February, given the state of the current development that there are multiple [inaudible] table and there's far from consensus on which way to go.

It sounds like it's a bit – I'll be blunt – sticking your head in the ground, in the sand, pretending that it will be presented by the 15th when it's quite clear it will not be. And it's likely to be a significant amount of time after the 15th before it comes.

I'm just wondering, is there a backup plan?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alan. Yes. There's a general remark to this. It's that we in the ICG do not believe that we have an independent plan which would be asking for contributions just to patch up or to complete our [inaudible] plan, which we devised in our own corner. I think that our attitude is quite understandable. It is, for the time being, to work according to the announced timeline, and if and when we see that this or that date is not tenable, then of course it will impact that part of the process.

For instance, the second step, which is the draft proposal production for the time being noted as between the 15th of February and the 13th of March. But if that is not tenable, then we will have to move it, and that will then have no doubt an impact on the rest of the calendar.

But I think it's a policy choice to say, well, we cannot stipulate for other parties. We published all the rationale for the proposed timeline and we cannot force this or that [part of it].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I think, Jean-Jacques, you might have dropped for a split second. Could you just repeat what you just finished saying, and Alan has a follow-up question.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, gladly. I don't know what part you missed, but I was saying that the rationale in the ICG is that we are not in the business [inaudible] a transition plan. We only assemble a plan using the elements or the contributions from community, and especially the most directly impacted communities.

So we published a timeline, and of course if one of the elements of the timeline is not met, then it will have an impact. But we're not in the business at this stage of dictating to community what they should do. And obviously, because we are not the inventors of [the plan], we do rely, we do depend on the [inaudible] to do our assemblage. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Alan, follow-up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really a follow-up, but a clarification. When I said a backup plan, I didn't mean a backup proposal on the names. I simply meant a backup timeline or backup plan for the work the ICG is doing. I'm quite aware of the fact that the ICG is not in the business of building the proposal [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I had understood you correctly and I was not suggesting a backup plan in that sense. No, no. It was about the timeline, and I think I replied to that as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Jean-Jacques, I know that the ICG is not the [inaudible] producing the proposals or who is creating the proposals. I know you are only assembling them. But so far now, you have received two proposals from the numbering function and the [inaudible]. Do you find any difficulties to assemble them? Is there any harmony? I am sure when you receive the third one it will be more complicated, but so far is it easy to compile those proposals?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Tijani. Frankly, we're not yet in the phase of making sure that there is harmony or what do you call it? Interconnection. Sufficient interconnection and avoiding repeat things between the two contributions.

So we're looking at each separately, and when we have the three main contributions, then of course we will go into the [inaudible] of comparing, making sure that there is no incompatibility, no major difficulty between what is proposed by this or that part of the community.

Tijani, does that answer your question or your remark?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Jean-Jacques. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. You mentioned making sure there's no major incompatibility. What happens if there is?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Well, if there is, I think that we have to point this out to community and say, look, is this a drafting problem on your part or is it really a central element of your whole proposal, of your whole analysis? But I think that we will probably not face that kind of dramatic situation because everyone has been discussing the various contributions for some time already and it's out in the open, so I don't think there's a big mystery as to the probable context.

There may be policy issues of great importance on which communities or parts of the community do not agree. So there's the wish to present all that in the clearest way. If there's really "incompatibility" then we'll have to refer that back to the communities very quickly to see if it's a question of wording or really a fundamental position. But so far, I've not seen anything like that, at least for the first contributions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Just one last question on this topic. I have noted both in the CRISP proposal mailing list, but also on the IETF mailing list that there have been some people disputing the fact that consensus had been achieved within those communities. Have the proposals been transmitted to the ICG and are deemed to be complete or is there a question mark over that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: We in the ICG considered this to be of sufficient importance to create a small working group especially on this and we are this week trying to determine what the process should be, the most correct and irreproachable process, on handling this kind of input or contribution about process, and within a few days or maybe within a week – a bit more than a week – we should have that out for ourselves, first of all, and also for the secretariat so that things are clear on how we received those comments or input. Some called it complaints, but I think the more appropriate word is [inaudible] input.

And how it is transmitted, is it referred back to the community of origin for treatment by them and ICG must be informed, etc.? So this is being discussed now. It was a part of our meeting today and we're getting [inaudible] proper process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Any other questions on the ICG's work? Okay. Seeing no other questions, are there . . .

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Before I leave the microphone, I just wanted to say I have another [inaudible] a bit later, so with your permission, I will not attend the full meeting we're having just now. I'll knock off in about 20 minutes, something like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques, and of course you have access to the recording later on, and the transcript of course in a week's time or so.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's move on then. Let's have a look at the operational communities, RIR and IETF. I don't think there's anything else to say. I mentioned earlier there was this appeal process. I'm not even sure whether it's reached an appeals process, per se, in these communities but I don't think we should go any further than where we are at the moment. With them, it doesn't really concern us. Seun might have been able to provide us with a bit background, but I see that he's not on the call yet.

Let's go to agenda item #4, if everyone agrees that we're done with 3. Okay, let's go to four. That looks at the work in the other RFP. First, a very brief update on the work of RFP 4. This is the RFP that is the group that is working on building the different scenarios and the case studies of the proposal and now of the proposals, since there are three of them, and we'll see that in agenda item 5.

The proposal as such, there was a call of RFP 4 earlier today. It looked further at the different [inaudible] scenarios for the contract [inaudible] proposal, so RFP 3. I think we can call it 3a now. The working group still calls it RFP 3. The main components of the scenario were on the call, and the group has collected a pretty large number now of risk scenarios

with potential mitigation. Sivasubramanian Muthusamy is in charge of putting together the document.

There appears to also have been work in the accountability work stream 1 looking at various risk scenarios regarding ICANN itself and there was a concern that the work taking place there is effectively reinventing the wheel in a way, doing double duty with the work of RFP 4, so the action item is for RFP 4 chair to coordinate the work more closely with the chairs of the Accountability Working Group or whoever is in charge of that segment of work in the Accountability Working Group.

There was also some requests to continue plowing forward. Not very much acknowledgement of RFP 3b scenarios yet. It is understood that scenarios have to be built. The person in charge of putting together the RFP 3b scenarios, Allan MacGillivray, was there and provided a quick background on what happened on the call yesterday. I think that's pretty much it for the time being.

It is understood that things will take time. It will just take more time than expected, so we're far from having finished work in RFP 4. Any questions or comments? Okay, let's have a quick update in RFP 5 work. For this, I'll ask if Cheryl Langdon-Orr could please update us. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'd love to be able to tell you that we were doing anything, but of course it's contingent on the work of 3 and 4, so we have put 5 on a holding [inaudible] in terms of meetings. However, the Wiki page is open and we certainly welcome any contributions including from anyone here. It's

open to public in terms of the Wiki to start making suggestions or putting any words of wisdom on what [inaudible] very beginnings of text for 5. That's it from me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. We have a question or comment from Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. A question to Cheryl. Hello, Cheryl. At the top of the page, CWGRFP5 NTA Requirements, and then it says within brackets "validation of". So for someone who's not following very closely the work of one CWG group, a validation of looks like the NTIA requirements need to be validated, and of course the question pops to mind, "Who?"

Am I misunderstanding something or is it just a formulation which was agreed upon but which may be not very accurate? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Thank you. It's probably [inaudible] of there's a language that is leading to some confusion and I can hop in and tidy that up. What section 5 is all about is being able to make a statement. Indeed, validate is one of the terms that we could apply as to whether or not, and

indeed to what extent, [inaudible] 5 primary request as identified by NTIA have been met. And so things like is the proposal coming from the naming community one that is not a government or semi-government organizational approach. That needs to be answered.

Now, the answer is going to be indeed it is not and that should be fairly clear, but the other thing is including to what degree the needs and desires of the IANA function [customers] is another one of those five and that needs to be responded to.

So at the moment we can certainly find another term for validation, but it is an [attestation] for want of another word of whether or not whatever comes out of all this whole process from the naming community does or does not or to what extent does or does not meet those five key criteria.

So if validation is confusion as a term, we can go in and fix that, but it's some form of yeah/nay and to what extent needs to be made as a statement. Does that help, Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Cheryl. That's very clear. In that case, may I suggest that maybe it's something like "meeting NTIA requirements"? But I'm sure you'll find a better formulation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Are there any other questions to Cheryl regarding the work RFP 5? Seeing no hands up, I believe there aren't any more questions, so

let's move on to agenda item #5 detailing contract [inaudible] RFP 3a. Perhaps a summary of what's been happening in RFP 3b as well.

I'll just quickly summarize RFP 3a. There's just been [inaudible] of various component parts of the proposal, including Contract Co Structural Analysis. And you'll find on your agenda a link to that Contract Co Structural Analysis. I believe that there is an interest in collecting feedback on that.

For RFP 3b, perhaps I should hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg who can summarize where we are at in RFP 3b and why is there an RFP 3b, indeed. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. RFP 3a, as we're now calling a as I presume everyone on the call is aware, built the Contract Co model where the NTIA would transfer responsibility for IANA to this new company. It would then subcontract with other people, presumably starting with ICANN, but maybe someone else and a number of other structures that would be needed to make this proposal work.

There are those of us [inaudible] led by the ALAC, but now significantly augmented who believe that we needed something a lot simpler, and specifically something that's largely internal to ICANN and not create a large number of new bodies with a whole set of processes and other things that go along with them.

We submitted one proposal like that. auDA submitted one, the Australian Domain something Authority. Cheryl, remind me what D is?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The Dot-AU Domain Administration Authority.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Domain – that was the word I couldn't remember. I don't know why I can't remember "domain". There were, as I said, several other proposals. In response to the belief that we needed a clearer way of separating from ICANN should that eventuality ever come about, I would have submitted yet another proposal which had the concept of a trustee involved as an intermediary, which was essentially a Contract Co like structure, but much simplified and still much of the operation of the other parts of the entity within ICANN.

That's sort of where we sit. The ICANN staff has produced essentially a consolidated non-trustee version which merges some of the ideas in our proposal in the original auDA proposal, in the dot-UK proposal to try to have a generic version of it, and that's where we sit right now. There are two b proposals been worked on – the trustee version and the non-trustee version. Work on the original base proposal, what we're now calling 3a, is going full blast ahead and how we come to closure on which we end up presenting to the ICG is not at all clear for me. There was a very clear speech given by Larry Strickling of the NTIA the other day which asks a number of rather pointed questions about the "a" proposal, the Contract Co proposal, and not dissimilar from some of the questions that we have raised and also one of his issues is asking have alternate proposals been given a fair opportunity to be investigated? Which, at this point the "b" proposals are starting to do, but of course

they were ignored largely by the RFP 3 group for a long time. It's going to be interesting. I have no clue how this is going to be resolved. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. You spoke about the auDA proposal, the creation of a trust within ICANN. That of course was already on the table last week when we met, but this week, the concept of a golden bylaw was a new concept –well, new old concept I guess. Could you just elaborate just a minute on this golden bylaw?

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly. The golden bylaw was a term presented in the original auDA proposal, the one that was submitted as a comment to the public comment period.

The term is a misnomer because if you look up what a golden bylaw is, it has to do with shareholders' rights to take certain action and that is not what we're looking at here. We're looking at a bylaw for ICANN that has the same sort of intent as a golden bylaw, but clearly is very different. And effective, it's a bylaw that ensures that the community can direct the board to – the word that we used in our proposal was divest itself of IANA to find another home for IANA outside of ICANN, should the community ever believe strongly that that's required.

It's essentially what we implied in the ALAC proposal of the bylaws that would be required to force the [inaudible]. The wording came along

with the auDA proposal. The concept is not unique to it. It's essentially [inaudible] in all of the internal to ICANN proposals. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. We have queue. First we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. You have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Yes. Alan, thank you for this presentation. I had a question. During this discussion on the topic, was the word "commitment" used at any time before trust was accepted? Because the notion of trust is valid when you have especially between two parties which are known as equal in status or [inaudible].

In this case, it's more like a commitment and I was wondering whether anyone had thoughts of suggesting something like the commitment, because then we know that whether the [affiliated] parts – the authority above it is ICANN or anybody else, then there is a commitment. There must be a commitment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, would you like me to answer?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, Alan. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Jean-Jacques, the word trust is not being used in the sense of two parties trusting each other, but in the sense of a trust, a legal structure which allows some resource to be controlled by an impartial entity.

So the same sort of thing as might be set up to handle an estate. We're really talking about a trustee who has responsibility for the IANA function and must manage that resource according to a set of rules that are put out for it. A different use of the word trust.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I think there was a parallel with the IETF trust.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Next we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to embellish slightly on what Alan has just said and outlined. I'm currently privy of course to the development of the – we call it a paper, an updating or status paper that's being prepared for Singapore. It is disheartening to see that whilst a huge amount of time and effort was being committed by everybody into the what's now known as 3a or traditional 3 contract model that the bylaw option, the binding options and the trust model, in other words, internal [inaudible]

solutions that are being [inaudible] is being written in an equitable way to that.

So you will be seeing for discussion in Singapore, and it's hugely important because our [inaudible] in Singapore is going to need to deal with this, the [inaudible] or the spectrum on the table quite clearly.

There's also been the decision to not rehash and I think it's a good idea to not rehash what we're seeing out of the intensive work weekend reviewing the public comment as generally agreed upon points of convergence. [inaudible] going to be going over those or asking questions about those.

But what we will be asking questions about and asking the community or communities in Singapore, including our own, to discuss and to get feedback into our system then on will be some questions that will specifically include those raised by Larry.

It's not surprise to some of us, particularly me, that one could interpret without reading too deeply between the lines that NTIA's opinion is an external to ICANN model, and particularly one that appears to be what we're currently [inaudible] Contract Co will not fly or won't be satisfactory – I'm putting words in his mouth there, but [inaudible].

So a set of questions about that will be in this document and we should be seeing that in the next few days. I think it's really important that we as a group from the At-Large community get hold of that and go over it in detail. Alan, I believe we should be looking towards having an ALAC, and indeed, this ad hoc committee response to any questions raised in that. So I just wanted to give everyone a heads' up on that piece of very

important work. If that means we have to bump other things, then I'm afraid it's going to be [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. I understand we're currently building our agenda for this group's face-to-face. That will definitely go into the agenda. Let's have an action item on this to put Larry Strickling's remarks in the agenda and study it carefully.

Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Do you want to make a few comments on the discussions about the trust and Contract Co. It's my understanding that the Contract Co, [inaudible] legal entity outside ICANN and the trust is a similar – maybe similar, but it's [inaudible] legal entity within ICANN with certain differences from the Contract Co.

But the way I see it in the golden bylaw proposition is [inaudible] legal entities but a set of instructions to follow in case something happens, which there should be some processing in that that supports that. It's my personal opinion that the proposal that is going to come out will be something related to changing bylaws. That's my personal opinion.

Another comment about what Larry Strickling said. He mentions in his speech that the fact of removal of directors in case something happened, that should be addressed. I think that's something that the CCWG will look at. I don't think it's part of the CWG, but I know Alan mentioning many times [inaudible]. Thank you, sir.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. In fact, we have Alan Greenberg in the queue. Maybe he might wish to follow up on comments. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll follow up on a couple of things. Eduardo mentioned that the trust solution – maybe I got it wrong. I'm going to back out a bit. Any solution we look at which involves NTIA is going to require bylaw changes. There is no possible way we can go forward without bylaw changes associated with some aspects of this no matter how innocuous they are. Some of the proposals require more bylaw changes than others.

The accountability work CCWG is clearly looking at a number of issues and all of them will require bylaw changes.

It's not an issue of some proposals require bylaw changes and others don't. They're all going to require bylaw changes. The concept of a trust being inside or outside ICANN is interesting. If you set up a trust to manage some money which will be given to your child at the age of 21 and that trust is managed by an accounting firm, the trust is sort of inside the accounting firm, but they don't have the discretion to make certain classes of decisions. There are rules laid out as to what rules – how they have to manage this.

So it ceases to be an issue of where it is and what the rules are that surround it. It's a matter of terminology perhaps.

In terms of removing directors, that is one of the things on the list of the CCWG. It is implied. Larry Strickling had some very interesting words associated with that. He said if a director loses the trust of those who appointed him or her – and that’s trust in the sense that Jean-Jacques was talking about earlier, that we no longer believe that the director who is selected by some group is fulfilling the original vision that we perhaps jointly had at that time.

That’s interesting because there are some people who say that the community should be able to remove directors in general, but were strongly against a particular community, an AC or SO removing the director that they had appointed. And his words go directly to that. I think that’s the first time we’ve heard that kind of thing mentioned other than coming from ourselves. So that’s interesting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. There was a question on the chat from Fatima Cambronero whether the trust scenario was related to membership discussions which were taking place in the Accountability Working Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don’t think it’s directly related. The discussions in the working group on membership – that’s in the CCWG – largely center around what mechanisms do we need to be able to with a California not-for-profit corporation be able to have the community to a large extent or to some extent overrule the board or have the bylaws say that they must ratify things the board does.

Membership is one of the ways we could do that. There are other provisions under California statute that may allow a similar type of function without having a formal membership. The concept of membership is fraught with a lot of problems because of identifying to everyone's satisfaction who the membership is and there have been a lot of different proposals on that.

It's certainly a viable way of doing it. Whether it's the only way or the way we want to go forward is not clear. It's although an easy thing to do under California law to switch to a membership organization, it has some very strong implications.

We sometimes assume that when we make changes – and I'm saying we in the most general sense – that we get it right the first time. When the new person, Allen Grogan, responsible for contractual compliance was put in place a few months ago, one of the things that was raised was he's going to be responsible for looking at not only whether compliance is doing a good job, but whether it's doing the right job. Did we get the rules correct to begin with?

And it's somewhat arrogant to believe in the complex new gTLD world we got all the rules right the first time, and we know we didn't get a lot of them right. In regards to the application process and approval process, why should we believe we got them right in regard to compliance?

And similarly, in this case, why should we believe if we invent huge new structures that we get everything right? We must presume that we will

not get it right the first time. We didn't get ICANN right the first time and we've made a very large number of bylaw changes since then.

And anything we do has to be taken with a certain amount of humility that we're going to get some parts wrong and we're going to have to fix it as we go along. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Seun Ojedeji mentioned earlier in the chat that there were actually, to some extent, two trust models – one being a trust that was internal to ICANN, but also an earlier trust model which Avri Doria had proposed before the Frankfurt meeting on having an external trust. Was there any follow up on that? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, in the sense that Avri is one of the creators of the new trust model. So it's not as if they're two different models. There's an evolution that proposals have now been made, which incorporates the concept of the trust, but with a slightly different slant of her original proposal. My understanding is I believe that she is one of the people who has supported model, with certain reservations as for all of us of course, but I think that's an evolution of not a unique position. And Cheryl will no doubt correct me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not going to correct you at all, Alan, [inaudible]. If you are wrong, however, I would, but I'm not [inaudible] wrong. Yeah, I think it's important to recognize that whilst it has become titled [AEDA 1] as a model, there was significant input into the pen holding of this second option coming out of [AEDA] from beyond the [AEDA] community, and if we were to do a roll call, many of you on this call would find the number of very familiar names associated with the background work that we've done on that.

So it is an attempt to find as much middle ground as possible, assuming that – the assumption was made that those who were heavily invested particularly to what's been now known as the Contract Co model, what was it in our opinion in that model that was so [damnedly] attractive and what possibly could be built that may satisfy this dire necessity some people felt to hang on to some of those principles. So that's where [inaudible] almost more as a continuum.

But the good news [inaudible] particularly in terms of the current ALAC and At-Large view on all of this is the pressure is definitely on now to have an internal to ICANN solution, which of course takes us well away from some of the concerns that we've had with the purist Contract Co model. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. I'm getting a little confused with regards to the links in the agenda. The link which are there, the no Contract Co golden bylaw drafted, is this the correct document that we have or do you have a link for the second auDA proposal? Because I understand the two links

in the agenda, so the one that's a Google doc seems to be a follow up from staff. I just can't, for the life of me, cannot find the one that was sent by e-mail [the second].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Olivier, which one are you looking for?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm looking to have – so we've got in the agenda at the moment the links to the Contract Co Structural Analysis, we have something which I misnamed [inaudible] Original auDA proposal. Hello? Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Someone said hello.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That was me. I had my microphone on. Don't worry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Eduardo. Sorry, I wasn't quite sure. I thought I'd dropped out. So we have the link to the Contract Co Structure Analysis. The link which I think I've misnamed Original auDA Proposal Creation of a Trust within

ICANN, and that was not the original proposal. Then I've got a No Contract Co Golden Bylaw drafted, which is . . .

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was submitted into the public comment field, public comment period, so there should be a link. The last submission by Chris Disspain on the public comment has a link to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you need to point to the e-mail, not the PDF, because PDF URLs change for some reason as you go along sometimes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Thanks for this, Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's really [inaudible] something that happens a lot, [inaudible] changing of things. But what happens to these important documents is I capture a hard copy and download the PDF. [inaudible] ask staff to try and do that and associate the file rather than the link [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Pointing to the e-mail always does work best. That's stable link.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. What I've done is to download the attachment from the e-mail and then upload it onto the Wiki page myself. I think that should be stable enough.

Are there any comments or questions then? Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor. And you might be muted. We are not able to hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you, Seun. Welcome.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Ah, okay. [inaudible] muting my phone for a few seconds. Okay. I just want to try and understand the golden bylaw option. [inaudible] like that of the trust [inaudible] comments in relation to the [inaudible] advice. I don't know, is there any updates on progress on that particular [inaudible]? Because I think one of the things that is very important in this is that we somehow stop waiting for advice. So is there any updates on that? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Seun. Yes. The link in the agenda, No Contract Co Golden Bylaw Drafted is staff follow up, which starts with RFP 3 draft proposal version 1.0. In fact, it should be 1.1-1. It says, "General considerations for an ICANN internal solution, creating an

entity inside ICANN instead of Contract Co.” In there, it mentions would require the creation within ICANN bylaw changes of an SO-type body within ICANN to replace the [NTIO] [inaudible] of the IANA functions.

I believe that further down it should speak about a golden bylaw somewhere. I’m not quite sure if I can find it. This is where I got a little confused.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I don’t think we should need to get hung up on the terminology. The concept of a golden bylaw simply says that there will be an ability of the community, whether it’s through membership or through some other mechanism to ensure that ICANN, as a penalty of being taken to court for not obeying its own bylaws, will take action to divest itself to transfer IANA to some other entity other than ICANN. The wording is not specified, but it’s a similar function to what ALAC had in its proposal, and to the general concept that the Accountability CCWG is looking at, that if there is a strong community-wide uprising, if we can ever all agree with each other – or largely agree with each other – that the board cannot ignore us.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you for the clarification, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. And thanks, Seun, for the question. Are there any other questions or comments on where we are today?

There is a Google Doc that was created by staff for the RFP 3b draft proposals, and there are suggestions that the working group RFP 3b members should be making edits in suggest mode or writing comments on this document.

Looking through it at the moment, it doesn't look like there have been any changes or comments, actually. Should we discuss this and make concerted comments or should we not? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. I don't think we have the bandwidth at this point to do anything in a concerted manner. It's Wednesday. I'm leaving for Singapore on Tuesday and many other people are leaving by Wednesday. There's a whole host of things going on right now. I think the most we can hope for is individuals make specific comments. I really don't think that we have the bandwidth to do anything, agree to it, and then post it. I don't see how that would happen.

Certainly, I'm likely to make some comments and I will certainly post them for this group or point to them, but doing anything on a concerted manner, I just don't see how we're going to be able to do that now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Seun Ojedeji is next in the queue.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I agree with Alan. I think I also [inaudible] that the document is actually started from section 1 up to 3 now. So [inaudible] part of the comments in my opinion has been done. If there's any changes or improvements on this current version, I think it's going to be as minor and most likely editorial. I agree that we don't really need to have a meeting for that.

Olivier, a question on the client committee legal aspects, which have not gotten clarification on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. I guess I'll point out that should we ever actually come to closure on one proposal for RFP 3, there's likely to be some significant tweaking of the details. So I don't think we need to go to the wall on this particular one. We're likely to see some merging of the various proposals, partly due to what we find out from external legal counsel as to what is actually allowed.

We're doing a lot of hypothesizing and we need to actually verify that we can craft bylaws that will do what we say we want to do. The issue that came up on one of the first RFP 3b calls was exactly what is it that trust holds? Is the NTIA going to give someone a piece of paper saying we are now granting you the right to run IANA in perpetuity since we did it until now and we got it from [DARPA] and [DARPA] gave it to us and we're now giving it to you.

The exact same question applies to Contract Co. It's not clear what the piece of paper is, what the thing is that will allow that group to be IANA. It's a relevant question, but it applies to everything. There's likely to be some tweaking as we go along. I'm not sure how much we want to invest right now in making sure that the RFP 3b sub 2 proposal is perfect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Yes, Eduardo, I put you in the queue. We first have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Just to follow on Alan, the other thing we need to recognize is as a result of external legal advice, assuming it's good external legal advice, a totally new construct or hybrid of some of the constructs is what we hypothesized about may be presented. Part of getting good legal advice on what is possible may very well show up a "Oh, and here's another way you can do this." We've got to be able to be flexible, agile, and able to interact with those concepts when and if they occur. I hope they do occur, to be honest, so we can take some of the vested interests aspects of some of this away.

I just wanted to make sure that we recognize that it's not just what's been [inaudible] by the interactions of the community to date that may come into play here. When we get this legal advice, and it'll be as soon as possible, that itself may show up some other aspects, if not actual [model options]. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl, for this. It's worth noting that RFP 3b has decided not to hold any further calls until this legal advice is received. There was a question earlier in the chat on the legal advice. I think Seun asked what was happening with the [Client] Committee. Alan, has there been any movement on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're told that it's met several times, so presumably, it's a done deal. I'm not quite sure who's on it. Maybe Cheryl knows.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Maarten, and I'm having [inaudible] on the other person. But there is the – it's being published out on her list. It's just a very small committee and it's [inaudible] proceeding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Martin Boyle. Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, no. Not Martin Boyle. I would [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought the ALAC had put forward Alan Greenberg to be on the [Client] Committee.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that was rejected by the co-chairs. They took no more names other than that were put forward during the CWG call, which was the one that I missed while I was on an airplane. Sorry I couldn't do more, but [inaudible] with whatever the CWG discussed and that's where Maarten person comes in. Let me dig that out for you. It's moot anyway. It's small, it's functioning, it's doing its job. It's a done deal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Cheryl. Alan Greenberg? Sorry, just before Alan, I know Eduardo was in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: One quick clarification. Maarten has not been very active in the group but has been a very strong proponent of the internal to ICANN solution. I think we're covered in that perspective.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to mention that the RFP 3b group is not going to have more conference calls until after Singapore, but there's going to be a document. I don't know if it's the one that you're referring to to make

comments or remember his name. He's going to be put a document for comment during this weekend to make comments and get those comments somehow put into this document by the deadline next Friday, and that document will be sent to the CWG as a draft proposal while we are thinking about [inaudible] ICANN solution. [inaudible] mention that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Eduardo. I believe that's the document that's on the Google Doc that the agenda links to, and that is also the document that's currently on the screen. I know you're offline now, but that is the document [you're] speaking about.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So my point is that if we're going to make comments on the document, we should somehow talk about it so we are more or less in synch talking about [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Eduardo. That's what I mentioned earlier, but we have so little bandwidth and I think that, on the whole, we agree with what's in there. I'll let Cheryl Langdon-Orr follow up on this or other things. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. As of a couple of hours ago, and I don't think this is being reflected in that Google Doc as yet, I thought there was some

other versions that will be updating onto that Google Doc, but we do have the questions I mentioned which is, at this stage, the list of questions that Bernie – and it's Bernie Turcotte is the name that Eduardo couldn't think of.

This is just very drafting. Here are the concepts, the questions, that we'll be looking forward to have response to and this may change, but should legal advice concerned with all three options presented in this document are actually viable, which one would you prefer and why? In other words, Contract Co, what we're calling golden bylaw, and trust, should the CWG adjust its schedule to complete its transition proposal, [inaudible] recommendations. Obviously CWG on Accountability Track 1 are finalized and sub-questions going on about that.

Then there's another question as per the NTIA questions in the draft CWG transition published and so inserted there, could the creation of a Contract Co interfere with the security and stability of the DNS during and after transition? Which was question one from the NTIA. With creation of Contract Co generation [inaudible] accountability issues, which is question four of NTIA. Considering the three models presented in this report, etc., etc.

And there's two more questions. I'm not going to read them all now, but what I'm saying is I think we need to put our bandwidth onto responding, as I said earlier, to these questions rather than [inaudible] and prettying up drafting for the concept. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I think both of the “b” models that we’re talking about today meet the overall principles that the ALAC stated. I don’t think either of them we would attempt to veto any of them if we have to have a veto.

My preference certainly is always towards the simpler one, but if the trust model gets other people on board, I’m willing to accept it. Again, I’m stating a personal position, but I think it’s in line with what the ALAC has said formally.

I agree with Cheryl. Answering the questions that have been raised by the NTIA [inaudible] which, from my perspective, have been a real gift to us because it focuses on a lot of the substantive complaints we had with the [TWGa] proposal, RFPa proposal. I’m, again, agreeing with Cheryl. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Alan. Cheryl, as one of the RFP chairs, has there been any discussion with the co-chairs of the CWG as far as timing was concerned? We heard from Jean-Jacques earlier that the ICG is going on with its work, of course not having not received the names proposal yet. I recall an e-mail from Alissa Cooper, the chair of the ICG, requesting the Names Committee co-chairs to provide an idea of the timeline that they would require. I think [inaudible] was asked by the end of this week, if I’m correct. So with two days remaining, has there been any discussion on this? And I don’t know whether you’d know. I see Alan has put his hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Let Alan go and I'll . . .

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to ask a different question of Cheryl, but I'll ask her so she can answer everything at once. Given the state of affairs right now, has there been any discussion with the co-chairs of scheduling another face-to-face meeting? I cannot imagine that we're going to come to closure without one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you to both of you for your questions. Yes. That's an answer to both of you. Let me expand. To you, first of all, Olivier, not only discussion but a two-hour meeting. What would normally be the [inaudible] meeting time for this week's CWG call was very much devoted and extended in the time committed to it to look at the timeline question. When you see the agenda and when you attend the call for CWG this week, you'll find a significant and I think well fleshed-out timeline proposal will be put to your – it's realistic, and of course with the CWG's, I trust, agreement to it, then it will go off to the ICG response to its request. That's the long version of the answer that I said yes to Olivier.

In that, however, you will see the little green dot, little rolled up milestone-looking dotted things. Yes, there is definitely proposal for face-to-face interaction, and indeed an intensive work weekend – you've

heard of those before – in that timeline, and the very first date for intensive interaction is [inaudible] end of March.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I understood you correctly, you're talking about an intensive remote participation at the end of March and presumably a face-to-face sometime after that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. We're talking the after that would be – I'm trying to remember. I think it was April-ish, but it will be presented during the meeting anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan, and thanks for your explanation, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I could, sorry. It's just really important, because of that, that if you can't make this week's CWG call that people get a hold of the transcript

and the notes and [feed] into the members from ALAC as best they can, because agreement on that is going to be time critical.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Cheryl. I'm afraid I think I won't be able to make the call tomorrow, but I'll definitely be looking at the transcript and listening to the recording over the weekend. That's much faster than the transcript in the short term.

Now, we have several meetings in Singapore. The first that I can see where the discussions on NTIA IANA function stewardship transition will take place will be on the Sunday. There is a 45-minute Hot Topic 2 session. I'm correct on this, yes.

Now, I understand there's no name next to that, actually, Alan. I'm not quite sure who is to lead this and what will be discussed specifically in that meeting. Do you have any idea, please? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: My idea is we have a whole week-plus before then and we're going to have to be doing some talking. We don't have a detailed agenda, but I think the two of us are going to have to come to some closure on that as we go forward.

The timing of that meeting, by the way, may change. There is a potential for me being called out sometime in the afternoon for another interaction that I would have to go to, so we may juggle with the timing of exactly when that session happens for those who are going to be participating remotely. So keep an eye on the Wiki. There's a to-do for

the two of us, and Cheryl, I'm guessing, to decide exactly what is it we're going to have to discuss at that point. I think there's also an ad hoc group scheduled sometime during the week as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's correct. There is Tuesday, the 10th of February, from 17:30 to 19:00 local time a meeting. And we've got a very plain agenda at the moment. Update from IANA Coordination Group, Discussion of CWG proposals, internal to ICANN proposal, external to ICANN proposal, Contract Co, and next steps.

This really is a moving topic. It kind of changes from day-to-day. That's probably the most we can focus on at the moment, but no doubt that might be completely different when we all reach Singapore. Any other comments or questions?

Heidi mentioned in the chat that there will also be a long session on this topic. Yeah, there's a long session on this topic in Singapore, but there are also several sessions that will take place for all of ICANN in the public meeting. First, there is on Monday, the 9th of February, from 10:15 to 13:00 immediately after the Welcome Ceremony, responses to the ICG RFP regarding the IANA stewardship transition. That's going to be a very important meeting. I see there's responses now, so that will probably be discussed.

Alan, in the afternoon, there's SO/AC high-interest topics. Is this likely to be IANA stewardship transition again or will people be sick of the topic by then?

ALAN GREENBERG: I honestly can't remember. Heidi might, or Gisela if she's on the call. Gisela is gone. Heidi, do you recall what subject we're talking about there? For the life of me, I can't remember. I wouldn't be surprised if it's IANA and accountability again, but I can't actually remember. I think it is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Which session was that again?

ALAN GREENBERG: AC/SO high interest topic.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will double check on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had a discussion the other day regarding WHOIS.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was not it. That was a possible conflicting session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. But in that discussion, you and I discussed what the high interest topic was. I think it was accountability and IANA, but I'm not sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm quite sure it is, but let me see if I can get confirmation. I'll be right back with you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, all. That's going to be an interesting day, because immediately following on after this SO/AC high interest topics, there is the CCWG Accountability working session in parallel with the SO/AC high interest topics. There is All Things WHOIS. It just seems to be very well-framed.

Anyway, we will leave those overall agendas because I think they're probably likely to change by then, as we all know. Are there any other questions or comments on our own process and our own next steps?

I think we've pretty much beaten the topic enough. We have one more thing in our agenda, one more part, if I can find it quickly. That's any comments on – and that's agenda item #6. Any comments on the CCWG on accountability? It has been flying or moving forward. Is there anything that happens there that related – well, I guess work stream 1 – that we need to know about? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the only comment is if the accountability work stream 1 gets its way, if indeed we do what people are currently envisioning will be done, there will be [sufficient] accountability for any IANA transition plan. There's an if there, but certainly within their frame of reference, they

believe they will be addressing something regardless of which plan goes forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Just one question, then, for all of our colleagues here. Has there been any timeline with regards to work stream 1's work and how that will feed into the CWG on IANA or how that will affect it? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: There have been some talks on timelines. I really don't remember the details. My current understanding is that it will not feed into the CWG, but it is presumed that whatever goes from the CCWG to the board and is accepted by the board will then feed into NTIA to convince them that indeed there is sufficient accountability to implement whatever it is the ICG is proposing. That's my current understanding.

The other part that is less vague based on the timeline that was presented on the last IANA call is there do not seem to be allowing times for the chartering organizations to approve the outcomes of the CCWG before they go to the board. That's a little bit confusing and needs to be understood more. Perhaps, Cheryl or Tijani have some insight into that. Thank you.

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I don't think that the CCWG will [inaudible] inputs for the proposal they are working on and they will propose. I think the [inaudible] because this will decide on, for example, Contract Co. The accountability mechanisms will be something which will decide on internal mechanisms. The accountability [inaudible] will be different.

I don't think also that the CCWG chairs and the CWG chairs are looking for input from CCWG to CWG. They are trying to make coordination. They are always talking together, but there will not be, in my point of view, an input from CCWG to CWG for the development of the proposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Tijani. Any other comments or questions? We have three minutes remaining on our call. I note no hands up, so it looks – I see. Cheryl follows up on the chat with regards to the makeup of the [Client] Committee. For the record, it's the co-chairs of the CWG, Greg Shatan and Martin [inaudible]. The latter being the two lawyers on the committee. There appears to have been – Cheryl did argue the point that this might be unbalanced somehow. There was no support from Chuck or [Robert].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I talked about the perspective and the perception. I talked about how it looked optically and [inaudible]. The view was that “our best interest” – in other words, we [inaudible] a couple of lawyers – interests would be looked after by the co-chairs. And I said if only I could believe that. There you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Could I just ask one question? Was it a Cheryl moment saying, “We are not amused”?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We didn’t actually quote that, but I think it was [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I have a comment and any other business. I don’t know if I can make that comment now or if there is any other comment regarding the point under discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. We have reached any other business, so you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I have a personal comment. I would like to apologize to all the colleagues in this group and in the different subgroups because in the last 15 days, I haven’t been participating very actively in the mailing list, on the calls, because I am relocating for professional reasons. I will relocate in another country and I have been running some errands, working on documents, paperwork, etc. So I do hope that I will

be participating more actively and engaging more in the near future. So my apologies, and thank you for understanding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this note, Fatima. Have a safe and not too stressful move. Moves often are stressful, especially if it is to another country. I also understand that it was your birthday this week at some point. We're not going to go any further, but one last note that was there – just to point out Heidi Ullrich mentioned the three topics for the SO/AC high interest topics. Work stream priorities, knowledge management, and outreach for new volunteers. This would be a moderated session.

With this, we've reached the halfway mark at 18:30 UTC. We're just on time. I'd like to thank our interpreters, Sabrina and David; thank our staff, Heidi and Terri; and thank all of you for being on this call. It has been pretty productive. I look forward to speaking and following up in Singapore. Safe travels for those of you traveling to something. I hope that those who are not able to travel to Singapore will be able to take part in the discussion, using remote participation.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and goodnight. This call is adjourned. Bye-bye!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]