

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Fantastic. I'll then get the recording started, and good very early morning to some people, but afternoon and good evening to everyone. On today's ALAC Leadership Team call on Monday the 30<sup>th</sup> of March at 15:00 UTC.

We have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, and Julie Hammer.

Apologies noted from Leon Sanchez.

And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. While I've still got the floor, just wish Silva a very happy birthday and thank you for spending it with us today. Thank you and over to you Alan.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Was that by choice?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you.

---

*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.*

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I will be with you in a moment, as soon as I finish doing something.

All right. The meeting is scheduled for an hour and a half, at this point, the timings are very approximate. We will not go over, if I have anything to do with it, but we may end up being a significantly shorter. This agenda was, in the interest of honesty, this agenda was prepared in the last 15 minutes or so.

My flight from Istanbul got in yesterday at around midnight, and I was sort of not in great shape. So we're winging it. The first item is a review of what happened in Istanbul. There are some substantive changes from the situation before. And well, since Leon is not on the call, we'll do our best to wing it from his perspective. We do have a few people who were on, who were present at the meeting.

So hopefully we can do that. I think we have people who are present that were at the meeting. Do we?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier was not at the accountability one.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Oh, okay.

---

ALAN GREENBERG;

And Tijani was not. Oh, Leon is now on the call, I see. [CROSSTALK] I thought, I had heard that Leon was spending time with his family and would not be on this call. Maybe I misunderstood. Leon, if you're hearing us, if you have any slide deck, or anything listing the outcomes of the meeting, that is what's going forward in our draft proposal, and can get it to staff, that will be good to display.

But we'll start off first with the IANA transition, and give Leon a bit of time to do that. Can we have...? There is a PDF linked into the agenda on the IANA transition. I don't know if it's on the version that's being displayed, because it was added relatively, no, it is. Slides from second day. If we can get that displayed in the display pod, that will be useful. And I'm sorry I didn't give you advanced notice of that.

These are a set of slides that I got a few minutes ago. They were used on day two. This was the set of slides that was being updated dynamically. This is not the final version, but is a version captured sometime during the afternoon, and it will do for the purposes of this discussion. Essentially, we went into the meeting with, one goal is to review the status of the various drafting teams, and to try to both finalize the list, find out what the status was, and make sure that things were on target.

That certainly was done. Unspoken on the agenda, was how do we reach closure on the internal versus external models? And if we reach closure, for that matter. One... And the first day went pretty well. We made good progress on the drafting teams, and I'm quite pleased where that is heading. The last part of the afternoon, on the first day, was a

---

discussion with the lawyers from [Fiddley], the team of lawyers that was contracted with by the CWG.

And that was like the sky opening up, to be quite candid. The team is very impressive, if you looked at their CVs, and in particular, the people that came into Istanbul, were very knowledgeable and very good. If we go to slide, I'm not sure which one on the, okay. Yeah. Slide three was the list of options, approximately the list of options that we came into the meeting with.

There were the external solutions that both the original contract co, and a trust solution proposed, along the way. The internal solution was accountability mechanisms and functional separation, which is essentially the ALAC proposal. And there was always a trust version of that proposed by, out of the Australian domain authority, somewhere along the way.

Lastly, there were several variations, actually three variations originally of the, what was called the integrated model, which is the version, the model that Avri proposed at some point, several weeks ago. So we had a total of seven versions. And as I said, the discussion with the lawyers was very productive, and one of the things they mentioned along the way was that, although trusts could probably do the job, as described in the various proposals, there are many jurisdictions around the world where trusts are not recognized as legal entities.

And that essentially killed this. We can't put a function as important as IANA into a legal structure that is not recognized in some jurisdictions. It just makes it too vulnerable to unknown happenings in the future. So

---

the trusts essentially disappeared. Now I'll point out, perhaps, it's not clear whether they disappeared. The expression that ended up being used in the meeting was, we are not necessarily deleting things, although maybe the trusts were deleted, but we're putting things on the back burner.

That is, they may not be deleted, but we're not going to actively work on them at this point. From my perspective, that is functionally the same, but it made a lot of people feel much more comfortable, and I'm happy with the way that went. It remains to be seen whether that comes back and bites us later on or not.

The external solution was deemed by many people, the external contract co solution, was deemed by many people, going back to the original draft that was published in December, to be too complex. The simplistic versions of it where the MRT is an external committee that controls contract co, was clearly knocked down by the lawyers saying it was impossible.

Therefore, the MRT would have to be part of contract co, to some, making it a new multistakeholder group with its own set of accountability problems. So there was general consensus, very close to the end, that this one goes onto the back burner too. That was rather surprising, that a few of the people who had been pushing it so much, were willing to make that concession, but they did.

I should say the chairs, on a regular basis, reminded us that if we're going to come to agreement with people differing, people are going to have make compromises. I'm presuming, no one is yelling out and no

---

one has their hand up, there are no questions from those who weren't at the meeting. Feel free to do so, if you wish.

We were then left with the internal solution where accountability mechanisms do everything. And the version, or two versions perhaps, with internal but the IANA function is walled off as a... Originally we called it a subsidiary. It turns out that a not for profit cannot have a not for profit subsidiary. Not for profits often have for profits subsidiaries.

You find that in universities and research centers all over the place, but they can't have, at least under California law, can't have a not for profit subsidiary, but they can have an affiliate. That makes it a separate organization, but controlled by, through a membership or something like that, by ICANN. That, interestingly enough, might, but we're not sure yet, have the benefit of protecting IANA from an ICANN bankruptcy.

That needs to be checked out by the lawyers, but if it does that, it's almost guaranteed that we would have to do it, because that's a protection from bankruptcy is a huge worry. And in most cases, there is no easy way to fit protection from bankruptcy. So this might be it. So we ended up with essentially, an internal mechanism with functional but not legal separation.

And an internal mechanism with legal separation. Perhaps sometime in the future, also controlled by IANA and the RIRs, but, in my opinion, that's not likely to ever happen. We ended up charging the lawyers with investigating a single option with variations. That is an internal option without legal separation. One of the reasons, if you remember

---

in Singapore, there was a lot of negative comment that we have too many options.

We need to narrow them down. So we have effectively narrowed them down to one, but variations which account for some of the proposals. I don't think any of us at that meeting would have put a large bet on the fact that we would come out quite as well as we did. And I know the chairs would not have bet on it. So I think we are doing startlingly well compared to where we were.

We're certainly not finished, but it is conceivable to see light at the end of this proverbial tunnel, at this point. And I've said pretty much everything I wanted to say. There were other people on this meeting who were at, who participated. Does anyone else have anything else to add that I may have missed completely, before we open for any other questions?

Olivier? Tijani? Am I talking to myself here?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

No.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier. Good. I haven't been talking to myself for 15 minutes. Olivier, the floor is yours.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. I think you've done a very, very good summary of what's been happening there. So I have very little to add to this. I can just say that I'm quite pleased with the way things went forward, and I'm very impressed by [Fiddley Austin], the law firm that is there. I think that we are going to, as a group, benefit very much from their involvement, even when it comes down to actually drafting the exact language in the proposal that will need to be drafted for some of the very tricky issues that need to be addressed there.

So there might be an expensive law firm, and they might have burnt through a huge quantity of cash during this week, but certainly, it was money well spent. And I'm feeling a lot better now with regards to being able to produce a report, produce a proposal, that will one, hold the road, and two be produced in time, so as not to have to completely delay the whole process, and put a real question mark over the multistakeholder model.

I think that, thanks with the involvement of these people in the system, we now have answers to a lot of the question marks that we had. And a lot of the questions before the question marks. And that's really a great step forward. So I'm feeling a lot better about it. With regards to the



---

different proposals, I think that the hybrid proposal, as it is called, is something that we can certainly live with.

And I also note that many of the people in our community, and both participants and members, are taking part in the design team's CWG IANA. And of course, taking part in the tracks on the CTWG accountability. So that's all I can add to what you've said. The ship really seems to now get going and we're on it, and things are moving, I think, in the right direction, as far as I'm concerned. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. A couple of things I did... One of the options for, let me back track for a second. Separate ability is now going to be one of the major concerns. Now the principles that were adopted by the CWG, perhaps accidentally, perhaps on purpose, did not say the stewardship should be separable, but said the functions should be separable. That led to a proposal from Chris [Disspain] that one of the ways you can separate the functions is IANA, or ICANN, or whoever, sub contracting with another vendor to do the actual work.

That is, in fact, functional separation, not a version of it that we thought of before. It also became obvious that term stewardship that we're using has multiple meanings. For instance, right now, the IETF and the RIRs have a memorandum of agreement with ICANN. That puts them in a position to move the function, if they ever chose to.

And that, to some extent, makes them stewards of their part of the operation. NTIA is steward of the whole operation. So we have two multiple levels, we have two levels of stewardship, although we're using

---

the same term for both. That, in fact, has caused a significant amount of disagreement, because we've had people talking about stewardship when each of them were talking about a different flavor of the stewardship.

So that has caused some problems. And lastly, with regard to Olivier saying the hybrid model is something acceptable to us, certainly the subsidiary affiliate model is acceptable, if it were to include co-ownership by the other bodies, that indeed might be problematic, I think, but we need to, at this point, just be quiet and wait to see what the legal process that comes out of this and what they say.

And with, I'll go over to Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I cannot add anything to what you said, because I wasn't on the meeting, but I can say that I am very pleased with the result. I really, I am really happy with either solution, because the most problems were removed now, contract co, for example. You spoke about separation of the function, not the stewardship, which is much better, and much easier.

Because if you speak about the separation of the stewardship, are you speaking about stewardship on the naming function, or the stewardship on the numbers function, or the stewardship of the standard function? Because there are two other parties, have their own way to look at it. So, I think that to separate the functions is more easy then to separate the stewardship.

---

So, in general, I am really happy with this, and I hope you will conclude, you will reach the final agreement, because nothing is already done. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. To answer, when you say, where we talking about the stewardship of the individual functions, well, as I said, we have been using the term stewardship regarding the individual functions, but we've also been using it in the global function, that is NTIA awarding the IANA contract. So, right now, NTIA has awarded the contract to ICANN, but then there is a separate agreement between ICANN and the, excuse me, the RIRs and the IETF, saying we will perform their functions by the IANA, that was awarded by NTIA.

So we've been using the term in multiple ways, and without ever actually recognizing that. And I agree, the fact that the principles say this is functional separation, it's a gift from the gods. I'm not sure at the time we wrote them. It couldn't have gone the other way, quite by accident, but it didn't. Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks Alan. Just a question from me. You said, in talking about the affiliate [inaudible] that it protects ICANN's...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Julie, can you speak up a little bit? I'm having a hard time hearing you.

---

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry. You said that the affiliate slash subsidiary model actually protects IANA from ICANN's bankruptcy. I'm just wanted to clarify, in my own mind, that does that imply that IANA would therefore be independently funded from ICANN? I'm just trying to understand how that would work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good questions, no answers. I didn't say it would protect it from bankruptcy, I said it might. The lawyers needed to go back and do some research, and I suspect looking at case law.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN... I'll try to explain. It's a complex issue. Normally if you have a membership organization, for instance, the members have no fiduciary duty, that is, directors of an organization have a fiduciary duty, because they have decisions to make, and if they make them in bad faith, then there are liable.

Members, in general, are separate organizations, or people, that have no fiduciary duty, but if you have a small enough number of members, like one, and that member directs what the directors are saying, the courts have judged that those members do have fiduciary duty. So the question is, what would the relationship be between this new affiliate IANA and ICANN? And it's not clear.

---

It would probably be a membership affiliation, because we can't own it. It can be a subsidiary as such, because not for profits aren't owned. Therefore, it might separate the two enough that IANA is not, the IANA affiliate is not considered an asset in a bankruptcy proceeding, or it might be. They're looking at that.

So, if indeed, it was an independent entity that was not an asset, we would have to put money aside within that cooperation to make sure that it could be sustained for a reasonable amount of time, if IANA, ICANN itself was subject to bankruptcy proceedings. So it would have to be funded somehow, and have independent funding should that scenario play out.

But again, that's almost a detail that we're not at yet, but good question. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can un-mute. Thank you Alan. Sorry, it's Olivier. I've taken my hand down, you actually answered the question I had.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anything else before we go on to accountability? Nothing. Okay. This one, we're going to have wing because we don't have a document. And, well, let me check my inbox. We might have a document, because I asked Marika for one.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. If I could just say, in the meantime, as you know, there is a webinar that will take place later on this week, that will provide an update on what has happened in, well, in the whole process of IANA stewardship transition. And I just wonder, whether we should just repeat what we've, the sort of feedback that we've just given here, so far.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suspect...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think on Wednesday or Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, something like that, with better slides, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I'm hoping that we can get slides. What I'll do is to follow-up, because I did ask if we could be given slides, to help us explain the process to our communities. I know that, of course, this week had been taken for travel, and I hope that within the next 48 hours or so, some simple deck could be produced, with just maybe a handful of slides to provide a summary of what we've discussed.

I note that there hasn't, or at least I haven't seen in my mailbox, a summary from the co-chairs on CWG IANA yet. I might be wrong. It might have...

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't seen it either. Jonathon was on my flight out of Istanbul, and he was drafting it while flying. I don't know what his plans were for today. He may actually have had a personal thing for today, as would have Lisa, perhaps. So I'm expecting to see it sometime today. They did commit to having it out today. But I don't know...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a matter of hours. Okay [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. There is also a video that was done with Jonathon and Lisa that is published, and I'll send out a link to it. I haven't listen to it, but it may well go into some details.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I don't know, should we make use of the video for that webinar?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. I have to listen to it first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, all right. We'll follow up on that in the next couple of days. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, the news coming out of the CWG is a lot better than, I think, any of us predicted it would be at this point. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Olivier, I am afraid that it cannot be the same presentation that was done today. It is for people who are not knowledgeable of anything, or who are not following anything. So it will be something for people who would learn. I do think and I do hope that it will be real productive, but for not people that present simple things, but these things, so that they understand it.

And with the result we have now, I think it is possible to make something simple, and understandable, they're just for all people who are not following the process. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: For my, to satisfy my ignorance on the subject, who do we have scheduled as presenters?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It was done [since long time], and we took people who are on the CWG or on the ICG.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Can you name them?



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Mohamed El Basher, Jean-Jacques Subrenat. It was about the transition in general. It was not exactly what happened in Istanbul.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So Olivier, it's yours. Anything I can do to help, you know where I am. Any other questions before we go onto accountability? We're using a lot more time than we had planned, so we do need to move on.

Tijani, that's an old hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. Accountability. Who would like to take the lead on that? Leon was here for a moment to say he's not going to be on the call. I don't have any document. I can try to recall what the issues were, not what the issues were, but what the outcomes were. I'm happy to try and, Tijani you can add anything that I have forgotten, or would you like to go first?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, go ahead.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Again, I'm working without any documents. Essentially, we have come up with a number of accountability measures that will be in the first draft report to be published very shortly. I will try to recount them. They're not necessarily in priority order, but the order that I remember them in.

There is the ability for the community, and I'll describe what community means in a moment, to remove the entire ICANN Board. It is a high threshold required, and nobody really expects to use this function, but the threat of it, hopefully, will ensure that the Board is more responsive to wishes from the community, especially when there are things that, wishes or concerns that span different parts of the community.

And by the community, we're talking about the ICANN community here. Another capability is to essentially veto a budget. That says, if the ICANN Board cannot accept the budget without the approval of the community. Slightly lower threshold. That is not everyone has to agree, but that ability is there. The main motivation for that is if you look at today, there is a very significant amount of budget collaboration between ICANN finance, the Board, and the community.

None of that is written anywhere. None of that is required by anything that is a form of commitment of the corporation. And it was felt that having the ability to veto a budget is something that will help ensure that collaboration continues, and in fact is enhanced. Although ICANN has been responsive to the community discussions they're not, you know, they're not necessarily, they don't necessarily agree to everything.

---

And this, hopefully, will encourage that. I have also suggested, but was not in this proposal, that we look at a line item veto. That is, if the budget was represented in such a way that we could actually understand what they're doing, which the current version does not necessarily make that easy, then we could say, "You can go ahead with the budget, but you can't fund this particular item."

And that also was felt to be particularly effective. That would have to have some certain caveats with it. For instance, the community could not veto a line item for the ALAC without the ALAC supporting it. So you know, there was a fear that if someone, if they fund another ATLAS, the rest of the community could kill it. And that certainly is something that should not be allowed to happen.

But it is of interest. I'm having trouble now remembering what the other things are that we approved. Tijani, can you help me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, about the empowering of the community. First of all, regarding the budget, Alan, it is not said, and it is not written, that the rejection of the budget requires the unanimity of all of the constituencies. So, what you said just now, I am not sure it is what is meant.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I think I said just the opposite. I said it has a lower... The rejecting the entire Board has a very high threshold, but does not require unanimity. In other words, one stakeholder group, you know, the GNSO

---

or the ALAC, could disagree, and they can still remove the Board. The budget one would have a lower threshold than that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Lower threshold means that less people agree or not, this is the lower, because of the higher threshold of removal of the Board. The GNSO cannot remove it alone. We have to have, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG; Tijani, the removal of the Board, almost everyone has to agree to do it before it would happen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG; For the budget, it would be a smaller number would want to do it before it would happen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, exactly. So perhaps if we propose an ATLAS 3, and we're the only constituency who don't agree to reject the budget, perhaps it will be rejected.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. That's correct.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So this is the problem, and we have to fix. Because we are still working on it, and it is not definite, it is not... We didn't decide anything as a fixed thing, as a final thing, but we have to try to, as you said, try to mention that any item in the budget cannot be rejected without the agreement of the constituency advocated by it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The rejection of a single item was not in the current list. It's something that we put into work stream two. So that's...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes I know, but Alan, because of one item, people can reject the budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: They could.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is the problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I don't really see that as a problem Tijani. If we reject the budget, budgets are created on a pretty tight timeline, and a very long timeline. If a budget is rejected, it's likely going to be deferring implementation of the whole budget, and I do not think that any, that the whole organization is going to get behind rejecting a budget because of one

---

line item, unless that line item is something which people feel is really going to destroy the organization, or change the tone of the organization all together.

If it be that line item were, you know, ATLAS or the GNSO going off in some new direction, and everyone feels that is really, really a mistake, then I think we have a problem and have to fix it. I don't think we're going to see it exercised, you know, out of meanness. So, you know, yes we have to consider it, but...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

What I proposed regarding the budget, is that we go on, following the budget, the development, as we are doing now, informally, but this time by a formal process, with binding results, we have to do it step by step, not at the end, because if we agree to the end and we reject the budget, as you said, the organization will stay without budget for a certain time. And this is not good for the running of the organization. So the best is to do it step by step.

At the beginning, it was rejected, but after that, the two chairs told me that they would consider it, it will be better to do it like this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

None of this is frozen yet. This is something just going into preliminary report. There were other items we decided on, but I am honestly coming up with...

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The strategic plan also, this was also rejecting a decision of the Board.

It was there also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think so. I think we could question it. I'm not sure we could reject it, but...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Challenge, it's challenging.

ALAN GREENBERG: Challenge. And that would have to go to an arbitration. Either to an arbitration or an independent...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: A RIP, RIP.

ALAN GREENBERG: The other accountability measure is we're creating a reconsideration process, not the current one, which is only on process, but on substance. And that is a very major one, because a lot of the things to be done. You cannot, under California law, you can make certain classes of decisions contingent on the community, but you can't necessarily veto anything because that makes them the Board.

So veto anything in the general case. So that's why we're using that technique. Now, we'll talk for a minute, we may have forgotten some

---

of the details, but talk for a minute of who the community is. There is general consensus that the community will be the ACs and SOs. The GNSO, in this version, the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC, and the GAC would have equal status among the membership. And the RSAC and SSAC might have a fewer number of votes, if we have, if we count them by votes.

I think we were talking about five each for the major organizations and two each for the smaller ones. There is a significant concern that some of the organizations would not feel comfortable voting, and may abstain. And then you have two options. If you count an abstention as a no, that essentially says that some of the organizations abstaining may ensure we never take the action we're looking at.

If you ignore abstentions, as the ALAC does, in normal votes for instance, that reduces the denominator in the, in looking at what the threshold is, that may end up with a very small number of, a very small part of the organization making a decision. So it's not quite clear how we're going to go forward with this, but it's something that we need to discuss.

The GAC in particular may not be in a position to vote, and we may need to have some other way of integrating the GAC into this community position. So there are still a lot of unknowns, but we're much further ahead than we were before, and certainly enough to go out for public comment, and see where that goes.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

There is another thing, yes, and other thing Alan. There is a big, big, big problem which is jurisdiction. This was proposed to be discussed, and some say that it is in work stream two, so we don't have to address it now, but the chairs were convinced that we need to at least discuss it now because the NTIA will not accept a solution where there is not visibility on this point.

And under the jurisdiction, I will let you do it Alan. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. There is a lot of aspects. Certainly it is moderately clear that the NTIA and Congress will not accept a transfer of stewardship where there is not reasonable certainty that this stays under the jurisdiction of the US. There are other parties in the world who are equally sure that no transition should happen unless there is a change in jurisdiction from the US.

Clearly these are at odds with each other, and it's going to be an interesting process to present something which is not totally rejected out of hand by certain countries, but at the same time is acceptable to the US. I don't believe we have a way forward at this point, but it's certainly going to be something that will have to be discussed.

The issue of jurisdiction is a very complicated one in that many people have different perspectives on it. And I'll give one simple example. ICANN writes contracts that say they are subject to California law, and many people feel that is inappropriate. That has nothing to do with where the cooperation is, is headquartered. That is purely a business decision.

---

If ICANN dealing with an Irish registrar says the agreement is subject to Irish law, they can. It is purely a business decision, for the convince of ICANN putting it in a jurisdiction where they're familiar with, where their lawyers are familiar with, and where there is a huge body of case law built up so you can have some reasonable expectation of what the outcome will be.

Other jurisdictions do not use case law at all, so essentially every verdict, every outcome is separate from the others. And certainly there are some jurisdictions where we might not even trust the powers that be there, but jurisdiction of contracts has nothing to do with jurisdiction of the bylaws and of where the organization is incorporated.

So it's a complex decision. It's not something we can ignore, but it's nothing we've come to closure on at this point. Any questions before we move on in the agenda? We have gone three quarters of an hour into it, and we're running just a little bit late, not a lot, but a little.

Seeing nothing, the next item on the agenda is ICANN 53, and in the absence of Leon, I presume that Gisella will lead us through this. Or somebody. Or we can cancel it from the agenda.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, it's Gisella speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry about that. Yes, just, with regards to the update on Buenos Aries 53, I sent you and Leon, as you are on the planning/scheduling committee with Leon, a rough draft agenda for Buenos Aries with some main questions, and one of the main questions is the hot topics for Buenos Aries. Once we've decided on those, that will impact the working groups.

We will have meeting in Buenos Aries. So I don't know if you and Leon first want to see what I've sent through, and then share it with everyone else. I'm not quite sure how you wish to proceed on this one, because you haven't seen the draft agenda, I presume.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I presumably have seen it. I received it but did not open it, and will not until, at best, later today. I have no reason not to send that to the ALT, so we can discuss that on the mailing list. I will give a preliminary opinion based on what you just said though, and I don't see a lot of merit on deciding hot topics, and letting that drive what committees are going to meet, or what meetings we have.

I think it makes a lot of sense to basically look at the other decisions on their merits. And understanding that there is a limited number of things we can discuss, and making the decisions based on the merits of the cases, not whether they were within the hot topic list. That's a personal opinion, I'm not wedded to it, but just the thought. So I see no reason not to send that same document to the whole ALT, with the understanding that this is just a first path, and there is nothing that is

---

carved in stone, at least nothing that we have control over that is carved in stone.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, Gisella here, Alan. Then I will forward it to the ALT and they can maybe start an initial discussion on the mailing list, and then take it onto the mid-monthly call, which we'll hold in a couple of weeks, maybe have a chunk there in the agenda to take this forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: If that timing is okay for you, yes. If you need something quicker, then let's schedule a special purpose call on it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. Yes, thank you very much Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Anything else on the Buenos Aires meeting? We then gain back some time. Next item is the election and RALO selections, we have five minutes scheduled on that. Is there a pointer in the agenda to the page that was setup? I think there is, but maybe not, yes there is. I think that whole title is a pointer. Heidi has been putting a lot of effort into trying to orchestrate things so that we are in a position to select NomCom delegates, select ALAC members, select new chairs, and secretariats for those RALOs that need them.

---

It's coming up as we speak. All right. Oops, we were in the right place. Let's see where we go.

Okay. If we go just towards the bottom of the first slide, or the first box, there is a schedule planned out there. The exception to that schedule would be the, would be NARALO, in that NARALO has a, in its principles of operation, require a 30 day nomination period, which is longer than required by the other RALOs. So they would have to start earlier.

But you can see the whole process, we're trying our best to put everything in lockstep, which is more work for staff as we go forward at any given time, but the whole thing is done in parallel. So hopefully, it's a little bit easier to handle. The plan is, at this point, was to kick off the NARALO process April 1<sup>st</sup>. Although this is the first time Holly is hearing about it, or Heidi is hearing about it, sorry, we're probably going to delay that for a couple of days.

But, you know, so we're going to have to add a couple of days to each of the items you see there, but basically we should, by the end of May, should have selected pretty much everyone associated with regional positions, and that is well in time for the Buenos Aires meeting, where the NomCom wants to know who the new ALAC members will be, at least for the three regions where they're naming people, so that they can address regional balance or other issues like that.

And they're naming people this year for LACRALO, APRALO, and AFRALO. Any questions, other than from Heidi who is probably slightly upset that we're going to delay the process by a few days?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm not upset Alan, but... Very quickly, if I may, I've been in touch with some of the RALO leaders, and for example, Wolf has said that he is okay with the ALAC and the ALAC delegate to the NomCom schedule, but he would like to postpone the EUARLO regional selection. So, it's not going to be a fully harmonized selection for ALAC, ALAC delegates to the NomCom and RALO leaders.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have you had any feedback from any other regions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not yet, not yet. But we'll reach out to them this week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Discussion we've had, periodically, over the years is, should they be synchronized? In that, if you have one coming before the other, we can have people who lose one election, or selection, put their name up for another one, whereas that's not really practical if they're run in lockstep with each other. Now, there are arguments for and against allowing people to, you know, sort of double dip, and put their name in for something if they don't win the first one.

But, you know, people have different views on it. Interesting if anyone in this group has any thoughts. If we delay, for instance, the RALO one, until after the ALAC selections are done, then someone who attempts to fill an open ALAC slot, but is not available, but is not selected, has the opportunity to put their name in for a RALO chair or secretariat, should it be open. Any thoughts on, is that a good thing or a bad thing?

---

Nobody cares. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. There is advantage in it, but there is also some...

ALAN GREENBERG: Whoops, have we lost Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ...because we will delay the selection of the RALO chair, the RALO leadership, and inside the region this might not be the right way, because the best is to have the new leadership, at least as soon as we have the ALAC members selected. So that the new leadership is, if you want, a [inaudible], the whole process. If you delay the selection of the leadership, the old leadership will be in charge of everything, and it might have some perhaps interest. Who is laughing?

This is Holly, huh? Holly is laughing.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's Holly. It doesn't matter.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's Holly. It doesn't matter. I'm amused by your politeness. What you're saying [CROSSTALK]...

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This was the point Alan, but I don't care. If people think this is better, I will not object, but perhaps it is better to make them together. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think, actually Tijani, it makes a difference from that perspective, because for most regions, and there may be an exception, Silvia or Heidi can tell us, but I think for most regions, regardless of when the selection is, they don't come into effect until the [CROSSTALK]... Regardless of the order, whether we do the RALO first and then the ALAC, or the ALAC and then the RALO, it's all the old RALO leadership that is overseeing the process.

Now I think that's not true for Latin America, where they do it out of synch, but I'm not even 100% sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct Alan. This is Heidi. They've already had their selection. They always have it between January and March, so they've already completed theirs.

ALAN GREENBERG: And when does it take effect?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It takes effect in, this time, I think, Silvia, in February or March?



---

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia. Their current leaders will release their current posts on March 2016.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: So they go through March 2016.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you're saying they've already selected the next ones to take effect in March 2016?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No. I [inaudible] will be chair, secretariat until March 2016. So by the end of the year, we have to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, okay. So they do the selection for RALO leaders at a different time, and it takes effect soon after that time.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Correct.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So next year, there will be new leadership in March, eventually new leadership in March, to oversee that election. So what Tijani was, you were saying, sort of applies to them, but it has nothing to do with what's on this particular spreadsheet because they're essentially out of synch, and are not considered on the RALO leaders at all.

So either, whether we delay the RALO leaders or not, it's always the old executive at the time this process starts, that has control over the process.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Alan, one note is that, LACRALO is reviewing its rules of procedures, the current rules of procedures, so they may have, this action might be as including [inaudible], which may or may not be approved. So we will see a new set of regulations effecting the elections, probably by the end of the year. So this may also change, the timing, the timeframe of their next elections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Heidi, you put a comment in the chat, and I'm having trouble understanding it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. It's just what I actually said a moment ago, basically, that not all of the RALO positions will be selected... That was actually, disregard that comment. I see that I meant at the same time as the ALAC. So just disregard that, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So at this point, EURALO has asked to delay the RALO selection process. LACRALO is not being considered at all, and therefore we have the other three RALOs that may or may not have an opinion on whether to delay the chair and secretariat selection. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, we need to work a little bit more with [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll handle it offline. In any case, something is going to be going forward soon. I think that we need to make sure that all the RALOs are satisfied with it, and you'll hear more. And there is an ALAC call tomorrow. It would be nice if we could settle things by then, but I suspect we will not have. Anyone else, any comments on this item? That is item five on the agenda.

We are one hour into the call, and we are a little bit behind at this point. Okay. The next item is discussion of the picks, and you will recall that the new gTLD process committee called a meeting with a few people from the ALAC late last year, and the result of that, although our request for a freeze was not accepted as such, they did want to keep discussing it.

There was a meeting that was held with a slightly different subset of people in Singapore, and with representatives from various other parts of ICANN, including the registries and the GAC. And the decision of that meeting, which we reported quite a while ago, was we would look

---

explicitly at the 39 or so TLDs that are in question, and try to understand better exactly what we were going to do about it. Some of them are already live, and delegated, and in the root zone.

Many others are contracted for, that is the contracts are signed. And some are in the process of, you know, of being contracted. There are still a significant number that are eligible for auction. And the real issue is that for things that are contracted already, whether they're in the root or not, there is no practical way to change those contracts. And therefore, to require the TLDs to do things.

For those that are not contracted, to change the contracts now, it is legally possible, but would create a very uneven playing field, and therefore, that is not something that the Board would want to do. And of course, the registries are saying, "You set the ground rules, you can't change them now at this point." Completely reasonable thing for them to say, given the investment they've made, and the timeframe we're in.

Of the 39 TLDs, there was a general belief that some of them are probably just fine. That is, even if they were in the GAC list, they were not really all of that sensitive, or the registries have provided adequate protection. And that what we were charged with doing was actually looking at the one by one. Staff did a pretty good job of identifying special protections that had been identified by the registry that they would commit to.

So far, a number of us, specifically me, Evan, and Olivier, have tried to evaluate them, and factoring in the, what we believe the sensitivity of the string to be, and it's completely arbitrary. I mean, it's not arbitrary,

---

but it's a subjective issue, what the protections are, we assigned, we made some comments and assigned three colors to them, red, green, or yellow.

Red means we think there is a real problem, green means we think it's okay as it is, and yellow is obviously, yellow or orange is somewhere in between. We have to merge it into a single opinion, and I believe the date is April 1<sup>st</sup> when we must submit it. Olivier, is that correct? Is Olivier still with us?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, if I'm able to un-mute. It's Olivier speaking. It's by tonight that we have to submit those. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can, but someone else talked at the same time when you said, so say it again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's why I was concerned. I believe that we have to provide all of these details by tonight, we are the 30<sup>th</sup> of March, so we have to provide them today, to the NGPC, who will then match together all of the paperwork and share them on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April. That said, I have just sent an email over to [inaudible] asking if I could provide another document, which is one that relates to the amount of malware and misuse of new gTLDs, and the use of new gTLDs for spam, and for phishing. And have asked if I can actually delay this until tomorrow, because, as I said, they'll send it out on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April.

---

I don't think it takes that much to send it to everyone. You might wish to fire off an email to [Akrim] and ask if we can delay our answer until tomorrow, [inaudible] any significant requirements for changes in the table that we have here. And Glenn McKnight did mention here, that he has asked, regarding the table, you can maximize the table, if you look at that specific window, there is a full screen thing, so you can make that table into full screen.

Of course, if you're reading this off a small mobile phone, then that's going to be very hard. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And as you can see from the comment I just added, there are links to the Excel spreadsheet and the PDF in the agenda, so you can look at them in any form you like. All right. If there is anyone else, who in the next two or three hours, wants to go over the 70 or so lines, in the spreadsheet and come up with their own opinion, there are 39, I believe 39 TLDs, but many applicants for some of them, because the auctions are not settled.

I haven't checked, Olivier, maybe you have, have any of these auctions happened since this table was created?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I believe not. No. I believe that there has only been one auction, which has been recently provided, and it's not one of these, it doesn't relate to one of these TLDs.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Good. So if anyone would like to volunteer to do this very quickly, get in touch with me, very quick.

I did ask Cheryl to also complete the list. Cheryl often has quite different perspectives on protecting users, so I thought it would be interesting. And she was involved in the first teleconference with the new gTLD process committee, so she was reasonably up to date. If there is anyone else, and I'm thinking perhaps Holly, who is interested in doing this, and has been involved in this discussion before, you're welcome to do something, but we're really talking a small number of hours, if you are interested.

Holly, you have your hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: The answer is no. I have got so much on my plate, there is just, number one, I wouldn't mind a few more hours of sleep. I teach tomorrow, and I've got about 17 other things. So I do not have the bandwidth for the next 24 hours to do this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted, with apologies. Again, we've had this for over a week and if I or Olivier had had more free time on our hands, we might have done something a little bit more open, but I just have had too many emails I haven't even opened in the last week.

Anything else that anyone would like to comment on this? It's worth noting that there are a fair number of these TLDs, where we are consistently agreeing. And that is, the list can be resolved, can be

---

removed, those items can be removed. If they're in a contention however, what color they are has no factor in who gets it. Remember, ICANN made the decision not to make value judgments, not to evaluate how well someone would be using a string.

It will be purely be a matter of what the participants can decide among themselves, or barring that, what happens within the auction. Now it's conceivable that a participant, where everything is read, may choose to take some action because of that, but that's a decision purely on their own part. There are a significant number where they are read, and it's not quite obvious just how one resolves that.

Now I'll point out that for Olivier and Evan, there are a significant number of them that are red, because there was nothing listed under the picks. That was a misunderstanding in that, all of those TLDs are category one, GAC safeguards one to eight, and have all implemented the version of those safeguards that was dictated by the Board. Those things are essentially the same as the GAC safeguards, with two exceptions.

The GAC wanted a very proactive interaction with any regulatory agencies, and the Board's version was not nearly as strong, and the GAC specifically asked for pre-registration, validation, and verification of credentials, and the Board basically omitted that one altogether. But they are subject to a significant number of special picks for these categories, even though they were not explicitly listed in the spreadsheet. Olivier.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and I'm sorry, I have to backtrack on what I've just said a little earlier, because the more recent auction that has taken place, on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March, dealt with two gTLDs. The first one was dot PING, that one was not on the cat one list. The second one was dot SRL, which was on the cat one list.

Now looking at the listing, SRL had two contenders, two applicants. One was MY SRL GMBH, and the other one was Google. The one which, the application from Google had the red links, as we just mentioned, for ourselves. The application from MY SRL was in green, with medium concern for misuse. Registration restrictions appear satisfactory, because in there, it mentions registrations limited to corporations with credentials.

Suspension and deletion of any registrations that do not meet requirements. Non-compliance contract will be established by the registry operator. So, there was a concern from us for misuse, but it looks as though the mitigation factor for it was good, and the auction was won by dot SRL, MY SRL GMBH. [CROSSTALK] ...will proceed forward with one that has a green light as far as we are concerned.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. So we can [CROSSTALK]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...all there has been since our last, since the last time, well, since the list was established. It is interesting in that ICANN has proceeded forward

---

with auctions. I'm not quite sure how the date of auctions is chosen, but I'm a little, I wouldn't say concerned, but maybe disappointed, or whatever, that ICANN appears to continue plowing forward with these auctions, and with delegation of these strings, irrespective of whether we're currently working, trying hard to work to resolve problems, or potential problems that are coming through.

This is just one little concern that I do have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think the answer to that, satisfactory or not, is that this whole process, including the signing of contracts and delegations, was driven by terms in the applicant guidebook, dictating what it takes to go from one step to another. And they have felt that they could not alter what is written there, that is, you cannot arbitrarily delay going forward, if someone has met the criteria.

So that's the overall rationale that's being used, and the concern that the Board has had with making arbitrary decisions to stall a given TLD, are arbitrary based on the applicant guidebook terms. The order of auctions, I don't recall. Dev may well, I think it was partially driven by the priority that was assigned to each of the TLDs. Remember, there was, the thing which was originally was digital archery, and then got changed into a different process, assigned priority to each applicant.

I don't know how they were combined in the contention sets. Dev may have some thought on it, or maybe he's typing the answer. Feel free to speak if you can, Dev.

---

I guess not. Okay. In any case, this is going forward. There should be a meeting, there is a meeting roughly at the beginning of next week, and we'll see what comes out of that. And Dev says, yes, I've got it pretty well right even though I may have made half of it up along the way.

The only part I made up was how the auction order is decided. Olivier, is that a new hand or one left up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a new hand Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Just to ask, as a summary, when are we going to send that document which you have on the screen, over to the NGPC, and to the small list of people that are taking part in this process.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I'm going to try to find out if Cheryl is doing hers or not. I expected her to do it on a plane back from Istanbul, and should have gotten it by now, and unless it came in, in the last few hours, it hasn't, so if she has done one, in a suitable form that I can just cut and paste, I will do that. And then someone, and I guess it's going to come down to Olivier and me, perhaps getting together on a Skype call, and deciding what the summary outcome is.

I think I'd prefer to do the single outcome from ALAC, even if we say the answer is varied, then giving them the confusing notes we have right now, and that's got to be done. You tell me by the end of the day, unless we can get [Shreen] to agree to a one day delay.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. Totally agree with you, with regards to having a single answer, and I think we can. I've looked at the list, and it looks as though, on 99% of the cases, we actually agree with each other. In some, we might just refer something as being either amber or red, in which case, I would then suggest that we say, well, we'll be able to discuss it, but it's just a handful of cases.

ALAN GREENBERG; Yeah, I'm not worried. I'm sure we'll do it. And again, maybe making arbitrary decisions, but we'll do something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Onto the next item, now we're starting to run out of time. The next item is the At-Large working groups and subcommittees, where we had made a number of tentative decisions. There were some consensus calls, there was at least one where we, I've put the whole item on freeze, that is the CROPP review team, pending discussions and I've done nothing on that in the last two weeks.

And that's a summary of that one. It will be on my high priority list this week. So item seven is done. Eight is policy development activities. There are two public comments that we have not decided on. One is the internationalized registration data expert working group draft final report, and we need to make a decision that closes in about three weeks, so we have a bit of time should we choose to comment.

---

I believe I had said I would look at that, and make a recommendation. I haven't done that yet. If anyone else feels that we should be looking at it in any depth, or if anyone else has looked at it, please speak up now or very quickly. I'm guessing Holly is the only one in this group who may have an opinion. Go ahead Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Holly Raiche for the record. Did you send me an email or Skype, and I'm not going to have any bandwidth until the weekend, but possibly can have a look then.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll take a look at it sometime in the next day or so. And I'll do something on it. The other item that we have is the fiscal year 16 operating plan and budget. And normally, we have something to say on that. Tijani is often the one who drafts something like that. Do you have any feelings at this point? If we're just saying, you know, "Good work. Thanks for all of the consultation, looks reasonable," I don't think we need to make a statement.

If we have negative things to say, I think we do need to make a statement. And Tijani, do you have any thoughts?

Tijani, are you still with us?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, I am sorry, I wasn't listening to you carefully. Could you please repeat the question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly. The question is, do we need to make a comment on the fiscal year 16 operating plan and budget? I don't see any merit in saying, "Yes, we support it, and yes thanks for the consultation." If we have anything specifically negative to say, that we would like to see changed, or that we feel they did really wrong in the process, that we should make a comment on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I absolutely agree with you, especially this year since we participated much better than before, because the consultation was better. And to tell you the truth, I didn't really carefully, until now, I only attended the meeting and saw the presentation of [inaudible], but I need to read it carefully and deeply to tell you if we need to comment or not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I guess we'll raise the issue again tomorrow on the ALAC meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think so.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note that you have volunteered to draft something, if something is needed and we appreciate [CROSSTALK] other people, but I really want to get out of this mode of gratuitous five line comments, which really

---

don't say anything unless we feel someone else is going to come out with a very negative position and we have to defend what is being recommended.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, so far any comment we had on the budget was with critical things. It was never being, thank you very much, it was very good. We have to say, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, I wasn't talking about budget comments, I was talking about comments in general. Yes, I think we agree totally on that. So we just need to actually read the document and then decide what to do. No more that can be said today, I don't think.

Review of the ALAC agenda. In light of when I told you I wrote this, not I wrote because Heidi did the base agenda, and when I went through and made some modifications, I have not gotten to the ALAC agenda yet. I hope to by the end of the day. If anyone has any strong feelings about things that should be discussed, or should not be discussed, that is things that are missing from the agenda, and should be there, or things that are there but should not be there, please get to me moderately quickly.

And we'll take appropriate action. And any other business? There was an item under any other business, which is not on my printout, but is on the website. Can someone remind me what it is?

---

Ah, the Internet.... [CROSSTALK] I see it now. Internet governance CCWG. You will remember many meetings ago, we met with the NCSG and decided to put together a, this was the time just prior to or just after NetMundial, I think. I don't remember exactly, but we decided...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, it was in May 2014.

ALAN GREENBERG: We decided an Internet governance CCWG was a good thing. It was widened to other parts of the community. The charter has been approved by almost everyone, the exception is us. We seem to have forgotten to approve it. So we think it should have been on the agenda sometime around ATLAS, and we got sidetracked, and it never got done. In any case, we can't find any record that we approved, so we need to do that. However, it is risen in the agenda, because you will recall that on current CCWGs, or CWGs, which are the same thing, we have members, that is voting members appointed by the various stakeholder, and we have participants that is completely open.

The Internet governance charter, I believe, and either Olivier or Heidi, correct me if I get it wrong, had members selected by the stakeholder, had, was still using the term observers as opposed to participants, and that was also restricted and selected by the stakeholders. There is no general feeling, no general desire among the other people who have approved the charter, to change the charter.



---

So what has been suggested is that we get an acceptance from each of the groups, that we basically ignore the wording that's in the charter, on members and observers, and functionally replace it with the current usage of members and participants, and go forward. That is, not formally changing the charter, but all of the chartering organizations agreeing to do this.

I see absolutely no problem, no reason not to do that, and I'm going to propose at the meeting tomorrow, that following any discussion, if anyone wants to discuss, that we, that I open an online vote to both approve the charter, somewhat late, and to accept the changes that I have just discussed. And I'll put them more clearly than perhaps I have done here.

If there is any reason anyone thinks that we shouldn't follow that path, then speak up, if not, we will do it tomorrow. Since this is approving CCWG, and it's a complex one that is with this change, I want people to have an opportunity to actually read the charter again, if they haven't seen it before, which is why I'm not going to do it with a face to face vote on the teleconference, but do it electronic. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. I absolutely agree with you. I only want to propose that the staff circulate the charter, because most of the people didn't read it. So that people read it and tomorrow, when we speak about it, everyone can discuss it and can vote on it if we go to vote. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, because I don't think it's reasonable to expect people to read it if we post it late tonight for the meeting tomorrow, given, you know, some people are doing this in the middle of the night, some in the middle of the day. I will try to circulate it today by email, and it will be pointed to on the agenda, but there will not be a vote on the meeting, the vote will start in two days or three days, or something like that.

There is no real time constraint on this at this point, so we don't need to rush it unreasonably. But we must give people enough time to really read the document. Whether people choose to work on it is a different issue, but we need to give people time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other business? I forgot to ask at the beginning of the meeting if there was any, so we'll take 10 seconds now to let people shriek or raise their hand. No one is. Then I thank you for all attending. We finish the meeting two minutes early. Thank you all.

If Dev is still there, in answer to your question on the chat, any discussion on the CROPP review team, there was a very short discussion saying, I haven't done what I said I was going to do, it will be done this week. We will have a discussion, and more pointedly, I will be talking to you one on one personally.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So it's not going to come up on the ALAC call tomorrow?

ALAN GREENBERG: And it will probably come up and say, we're probably going to be doing it in the near future, and I will not entertain substantive discussion on this issue tomorrow. We had enough of that in Singapore, and I'm not going to repeat that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right, take care then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, before you go off, so we're on for CCWG on IG, with the thing tomorrow? Is that right? He's come off, okay.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**