TERRI AGNEW: …13:30 UTC. On the English channel, we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Gordon Chillcott, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Sebastien Bachollet, and Loris Taylor.

I have apologies from Alberto Soto, Heidi Ullrich, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Mohamed El Bashir.

From staff we'll have myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters will be Veronica and David.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Do we, have we missed anyone in the roll call? Has anybody's name not been mentioned so far?

Okay. Hearing no one, let's first recognize the absence of our, my friend and colleague, Tijani Ben Jemaa, with the whole events that took place in his country Tunisia. It's terrible that terrorism seems to be striking blindly everywhere in the world. Our thoughts are with you Tijani.

Let's look at the agenda, as we have today, and we have first a quick review of what's been taking place on the ICG, the IANNA Coordination

---

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.

Group. Then review of the progress of the cross community working group on IANA, that will pretty much be the same as last week.

We'll have a short added part of the Istanbul meeting update for this. And then a little interlude between part one and part two of this call, we will be tackling the working group name chance with a few suggestions being made here. And then afterwards, CCWG on accountability updates and discussions.

Is there any other business or any amendments to the agenda that are wished by any one on the call? I don't see anyone putting their hand up or typing anything in the chat, so let's move on. The agenda is adopted, and let's go to agenda item number two. And that's the review of the action items.

For some reason, my browser seems to have collapsed, so there were two actions items. One being the name change for the group, and of course, we have an agenda item later on today, and the second one being the Doodle, and that's been [effective]. So let's move on swiftly to the next part of our agenda.

It's interesting, my Mozilla [inaudible] basically, okay. As I try to grapple. And this is the CCWG, sorry the CWG on IANA stewardship transition. There are quite a few small updates on this. First, you will notice on the agenda, the addition of meeting number 13, which took place today. That was a very short meeting. The work [inaudible] design team taking place.

And I think that we should be doing [inaudible] to look through those design teams, shortly. And have a look at how we are progressing on these, what is the current progress on these. And then, afterwards, we'll be looking at the legal advice update, very short. In fact, I think I can provide an update right now. There hasn't been very much moving with [inaudible] LLT, the firm that has been retained.

Apparently the lawyers, the team has been hard at trying to be ready to provide answers by the Istanbul face to face meeting. And so, that's effectively where we are at today. No response on any of the questions which are out. And the progress seems to be running, I would say, quite swiftly hopefully. If we are concentrating on the questions.

So I note the brief report on the ICG report, yeah. Sorry. I'm a little perturbed because of my browser having completely crashed and I'm running blind. Alan Greenberg and then we'll go to agenda item number three. And I apologize for this mess. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out there was a document distributed from the external lawyers today, that has a significant amount of substance in it. It's a draft, but it was distributed by Jonathan on the CWG list. I'm trying to find exactly when. But…

Yes, it was distributed about an hour and a half before the meeting started. So you may want to check your email. And I'll forward it to this group. Olivier, are you there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks for this Alan. It's takes a little while to un-mute. Thanks very much for this Alan. Yes, I will forward this over to the group. On the call, we didn't have any chance to look through that document in detail.
ALAN GREENBERG:	No we didn't. I glanced through it very quickly though, and there is a fair amount of substance there. So there are hard at work.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. I'm not sure, I mean, are we going to have time to look at it today, or should we just follow on the mailing list at that point?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't know whether we'll have time. I was just, you had said that there were hard at work, but there was no output. And I was just pointing out that there was output very recently.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	All right. Let's go now in the right order of things. Let's go check out item number three, review of the IANA coordination group progress. With us, we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor to provide us with an update on this.
JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:	Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I thought I would say a few words here, although there has not been very strikingly new. And

the reason is that I think it may be useful to read into this into the record of our meeting, and not only in other places such as the ICG.

The first thing I wanted to do is to attract your attention to the fact that now there is a very useful website, and I've just provided the link to that, where on a bi-weekly basis, updates are provided anything to do with the IANA stewardship discussions. As you click on that link, you will see your volume two update on IANA stewardship discussions.

And I suggest that we use that quite systematically. So, I'll report briefly on the work that we have done. The protocol parameters and number proposals, which were submitted to us in January, have now moved into step two of the proposal assembly, and finally [inaudible] process, finalization process. And interestingly, you remember in the early days, a few months ago, many people were looking towards the ICG to try to get guess what was going to happen there.

But now, the tables have turned, and we in the ICG are looking at least with as much interest to CWG stewardship and CCWG accountability. In order to see what's happening there, because of course, the two sets of work in progress are of mutual interest. I just want to point out, finally, that the ICG teleconference call, which was initially programmed for the 25th, Wednesday 25th of March, will not take place due to too many other meetings involving most of the ICG members.

And therefore, it was considered not possible to go a proper ICG meeting at the prepared date of the 25th of March. That's all Olivier, but

I'm at the disposal of our colleagues if there are any remarks or questions, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this quick, but complete, update. Are there any questions or comments on the work of the ICG, on the current status?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so thank you very much for this. And let's now go to number, agenda item number four, the review of the progress in the CWG IANA. Before that, may I ask if Terri could actually take note of the link which you have shared with us, and perhaps added to our Wiki pages somewhere, where it's important to have.

Certainly that bi-weekly update is very helpful, and I have forwarded the one which was received by email, to the IANA working group. And we certainly have some, well it's very helpful in that everyone is able to find out what is going on at a glance, rather than having to go through weeks and weeks of emails, sometimes amounting to several hundred emails. So very helpful indeed.

Right, so agenda item number four is now looking at the, and this is the wrong link by the way. The work of the different [inaudible], so at the moment, the ones which are actually active and moving forward are designing to A) service level expectations, design team B, assessment of the level of consensus within the ccTLD community in regard to a possible [inaudible] mechanism for the ccTLD delegations and re-

delegations. Design team C, which goes with the customer standing committee, the CSC. Design team D, that looks at authorization processes, sorry, the authorization function.

Design team L , which is much further down, that's the IANA function separation mechanisms. Design team M, the escalation mechanisms beyond the CFC. And design team N, which is the [inaudible] view of the IANA functions. The reasons for these to be active before the others, is that there have been deemed to be a priority one.

So they have to effectively have an attempt to be finished before the face to face meeting, or at least have made significant progress by the face to face meeting in Istanbul. And the priority two design team will probably start either during the face to face meeting in Istanbul, or after, immediately after that. I have a small concern that I haven't seen many people, myself included, joining any of these teams, from the At-Large point of view.

The teams, I remind you, are not just restricted to members of the CWG, but they also involve any participants in the CWG. So if you do have an interest in some of the issues that are listed there on the page which is currently shared on the Adobe Connect. Please volunteer. I understand the ones that are already moving forward, design team A, B, C, D, these are probably already sailed a little bit further, a little bit too far already before we can think of doing any work on them.

It's a little late on this to start. But the others are definitely important, and benefit directly from our input. On design team A, there are

EN

already a number of documents, which are shared. So there is a statics and flow chart, which will be shared with as far as design, sorry, service level expectations are concerned.

On D, a number of documents are there, including a survey, which was sent, the survey of the ccTLD community. There doesn't appear to be a final document as yet on this. On design team C, the customer standing committee, there is a template that's a Google Doc, that will allow you to have a look at how the current draft is being put together, I believe. You can see some text already be laid out.

On design team D, the authorization function, there is already a draft which has been shared, that is in PDF format. So, I would, and this group, by the way, is led by Cheryl Langdon-Orr on this. That's the authorization function.

On design team L, M, and N, I believe that we're still in this sort of earlier position. There is a template, which has been put there in a Google Doc is being used to draft the document. Christopher Wilkinson, for our community, is in that group. On design team N, which I remind you was, I can't remember now, on design team M, we, there isn't anything yet.

There is just the other [join] template. So M is still to move forward. Are there any comments or questions on these design teams? Any discussion that we should have on these? Do we have any…? I mean, I would like to get sort of get some feedback and found out if anybody is

planning on joining some of these teams, especially the ones that are yet to be formed, at the moment.

I've volunteered for the team that deals with the INT function, that's design team L, no it's not L. It is… I can't even find it. Here we go, INT operations, design team H. So that's one that I can cover, use some knowledge and background. Obviously we need to have more people involved in the other design teams as well. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier. I'm still trying to catch up with everything that went on while I was away. I will be signing up for some, I'm not quite sure which at this point. I have a fair amount of concern about how slowly things are going. The whole idea was to have these design teams create substantive work, and then be reviewed by the CWG. And maybe we'll get a flood of them suddenly, but I'm starting to worry we're spending all of our time in the CWG on purely administrative issues, managing the process as it were.

And I guess I'm worried that we're not getting enough results back quickly from some of these. And I was a little bit dismayed about the discussion of the review of the IANA statement of work, and how well they're doing, where we had a 15 minute discussion today that was identical to the same one that we had at the last meeting.

So I'm starting to worry that we're becoming so process focused in the CWG that the work isn't being done. And that's coupled with some of

the design teams that are not populated yet, even though the list is priority one. I do have some concern with this process. I understand why we have gone down this path. I'm just raising a flag. Nothing else we can do anything about it except to encourage people to try to get these things going.

And I agree, I would like to see more At-Large people involved in these.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. A couple of points, I agree with you with regards to the IANA, the CWG, the complete CWG calls. We appear to be spending so much time on process. And wasn't there a decision that one of the two weekly calls will be dealing with process, and one of the two weekly calls we'll be dealing with the actual drafting, and the actual parts which have been designed.

Wasn't that the case?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't party to that, I don't know. I find scheduling four hours of work, when we're just talking about managing the process, it's somewhat of an overkill at this point. It may be coming out of the face to face meeting, that will change.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's one concern. Of course, the work was going on in the design team, so it might well be that the actual discussion, the bulk of the discussions will take place on the design team. I do have one concern, which is that if the bulk of the work takes place in the design team, and no discussion takes place on the overall working group, at that point, does it mean that the work which has been done by the design team is pretty much final, or seen as being final?

That's a little concern, like this.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Certainly, they're supposed to be coming back with something which they think is going to be palatable to the entire group. So to the extent they're guessing right, yes, that does mean we're not going to have a lot of substantive discussion, to the extent that they are misreading the intent of some of the participants in the CWG, there may be significant discussions.

I'm not as worried about that process. I like chartering small groups to do things, and then bringing it back. I'm just worried that we have a face to face meeting scheduled, and not enough real work to do at that meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Agreed. There is a question from Carlton in the chat, which asks what mechanisms are in place to keep these teams inside the fence, and who or what is

EN

responsible for the interface management? My understanding is that the teams are pretty much free to design their work, and then to oppose it. And it's the overall working group that discusses whether it's a defense or not.

I might be wrong on that because it's another one of these process issues, which I think probably the co-chairs would know better, the co-chairs of the CWG. [Inaudible] they're not able to have Cheryl with us today. So I'm not exactly sure the ins and outs of how these things are decided, as far as the fence is concerned. Alan Greenberg, perhaps you've got a thought on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. The template that describes each of them, you know, is attempting to being pretty descriptive as to what they're doing and not doing. I think we're probably wasting more time on that then we should be. I would prefer to see some overlap, and then debate on the different approaches taken, then spend all of our time building the fences. So I don't think there is a problem on that.

Everything comes back to the CWG, if there is any overlap, or miscommunication, in terms of how the various parts fit together that will end up being resolved. So I'm not particularly worried about that. Given that my larger worry is that we're not getting enough work done, I don't want to build more controls into the system. You know, I think probably less are necessary. And the co-chairs have said they're backing

off, and they're not being as tightly in control, because they were worried about their part in the process of slowing it down.

I'm not convinced that them leaving is going to speed it up at this point. But that's part of my overall concern.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. There are a number of questions in the chat. And I'll try to go through them as diligently as I may, so the, let's see the next one is from Glenn McKnight. How do you join these groups? I know [inaudible] would be interested in team A. Now, that's kind of two questions.

How does one join this group? When you see those groups, you respond to the mailing list of the CWG, and to staff at the same time, and you say, "I would like to join this design team," which ever it is. So that's the general, the way that they're, that you can join them. With regards to design team A, the work has already taken place quite extensively. And as far as I can understand, the design team for the maximum of six or seven people, this was primarily done with…

This team was primarily made up of ccNSO and GNSO registries. I see [inaudible], Jeff [inaudible], Jeff Newman, Jay Daily, and [inaudible]. You might wish to email [inaudible] and find out if they do accept someone on the team at this late stage, but it will probably just be down to the need on that design team. And I guess it would be the case for many of these.

And I think, you said, I know Alan well, I'd be looking at team B rather than team A, since Alan [inaudible], from dot ZA, is in team B. B, yeah. It was saying team A in the chat originally. Okay, so you can get in touch with Alan [inaudible] and find out within, if there is still some space in there. I note that there are only four people in the team at the moment, so I've looked at the website.

So Alan [inaudible] is probably very likely to be quite happy to have you on this team. The next question in the chat. I'm just scoping through it at the moment. So we've answered the question from Carlton on this. Delivery date is 20th of March, 2015 correct? That's the delivery dates for the work, and that's unlikely to be held. [Inaudible] to that. And indeed, Eduardo mentioned that the important design teams are the cat one design team, the category level one.

Like the chair of the CWG said, the others might get into a future proposal. Well, in fact, I think they will get into a future proposal, but that will probably be discussed face to face in Istanbul. I certainly have been in touch with the chair, with the lead of design team H, which is the one that I was going to join, Elise [inaudible], and she said we would speak face to face in Istanbul to get the work going.

Are there any other comments or questions on this? I'm trying to read through the chat at the moment, but I don't see any other comments or questions on this. So that's the design teams. With regards to the other, the document, the responses from [inaudible], I have just sent this a moment ago to the IANA issues mailing list. So I'm not sure

whether any of you have had a chance to scope through it, but I'm just checking, no, it hasn't reached your mailboxes yet.

It takes a little while, there are a number of things. I haven't had a chance to read it yet. So, I'm afraid we can't really discuss very much of that on this call, except if anybody here has already read it.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Okay. Let's follow up by email on this. Alan Greenberg, you have raised your hand. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. As I've said, I certainly haven't read it, but I skimmed part of it during the last meeting, and they are starting to address questions like, can you have a cooperation, you know…? For instance, could you have a cooperation, contract co, with an external body, MRT, directing it? The answer is no, you can't. That violates California law, and maybe legal in some entity, in some jurisdiction, but they didn't offer anything.

So they're starting to answer the questions. I certainly haven't read it in enough detail to know what it means, but they are diligently going through our questions, to the extent they have any meeting, and trying to come up with answers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. And I'll raise the point that we haven't seen very much traffic on the [inaudible] committee mailing list, and I think that, at the same time, there is no such thing as, one

could say, foul play. In other words, the mailing list being bypassed in direct emails, and flocking taking place behind the scenes. It wouldn't be the case, simply is working hard at the moment.

There isn't really very much to share.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's worth noting, because I don't think it seems [inaudible] in this group, that the list of team members in the [inaudible] group, and their credentials, is very impressive. They have found people who, you know, in their prior lives, they play lead roles related to the kinds of things we're talking about, or have very extensive legal knowledge in them.

So it's a very impressive lineup. So I'm optimistic we will get good answers, whether they will help us go forward or not, is less clear. But I think we've engaged in a really impressive group of people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. And one question actually that I have, and I might have missed it on the call, but was there any feedback? And I'm asking anyone here. Was there any feedback on whether there would be someone from [inaudible] in Istanbul?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I believe they said two of their people, and I think I remember the California law person, and the non for profit person will be there, but

EN

I'm not sure those are the two that are not, but I think there would be two people at the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon probably knows who they are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately, I don't see Leon…

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm here, I'm here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh you are here. Okay, I wasn't aware, I couldn't see anyone on the listing. Leon, do you have anything to let us know about this? Are you aware of who will be coming from [inaudible]?

LEON SANCHEZ: I believe that Holly [Gregory] will be there, and I'm sure that someone else from [inaudible] will be there, but I've been told that at least her and one more of the partners, or associates will be [inaudible], the Istanbul meeting. They will however might not make it to the CCWG

portion of the meeting, but they will be there for the CWG. So, yes, we will have legal [inaudible] person on site.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's great. Thanks for this Leon Sanchez. Any other questions or comments on the general work of the CWG? And the design teams? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So once again, I ask you please volunteer for these design teams. We really need to get this work moving, and if we have any specific forte in some of these, or any point that we would like to put forward, it is always better to be part of this design team, and have the discussion on the design team, rather than waiting until the design team will come to us with a fully ready text, and then [inaudible] off the text afterwards.

That, I think, will probably be seen as, where were you when we were drafting this? Why didn't you say that earlier? Okay. So, that's one part. Now the next thing is part C, and that's the Istanbul meeting update. There is a link in your agenda, which takes you to the Istanbul face to face meeting page. Today, starting early on at 9 AM, daily and then finishing at 6:30 PM, with [Sidney] basically taking on the discussions, sort of late afternoon on each one of the days.

And with provisions for an evening session, if necessary. We have been told by Jonathon Robinson on the CWG call, it would be probably wise to not accept any other conference calls, whilst in Istanbul, that might clash with the evening. And because it's probably highly unlikely that we will have some evening sessions being added.

I have noticed that the primary amount of discussion here seems to be the detail work on the design teams, certainly on the first day. On the second day, the morning deals with the design teams, and then we just leave it to the afternoon. There appears to be just one hour in the afternoon, with view of draft proposal.

And I have concerns at the moment, that none of this appears to be looking at the different proposals that we have on the table. I don't know if anyone has any information on this, or whether the concern is shared, but I would have hoped that the face to face meeting will be put to good use, in actually discussing the proposal, putting them side by side, and finding out which, where are we going to move forward.

So I'm a little concerned about this. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Certainly you're not the only one concerned about that. The saving grace is that the legal opinions may well exclude some of the flavors of the proposals. So that's part number one. Part number two, is if you look at something like the, and we haven't discussed this yet, but a new document was sent in by Chris [Spain] early today, wearing his hat as CEO of [inaudible], on what is being called guidance on a number of issues.

And they are essentially proposing, it's not quite a full proposal, but it's several of the components on how they are projecting things will work. They've invented a whole new set of acronyms, which I, you know,

maybe a good thing, because it allows you to focus on the substance, not compared to the previous version.

The impressive point of it is the list of registries that are supporting it. And the list includes, obviously [out-a], also includes Internet New Zealand. And [out-a] and New Zealand have violently disagreed up until now, includes several other large ccTLDs, including dot CA, from my perspective anyway. And includes a significant number of gTLDs. And some of the very important players in the GTLD world, not including VeriSign, but including PRI affiliates, [off] registry, and a number of other ones.

So the fact that there is a strong push from both ccTLDs and gTLDs, on a number of issues, may well force a pass, although the document does not talk about internal versus external, the mechanisms they're looking at clearly are aimed at an internal version, or internal methodology for supporting IANA. As I said, it's very silent on it and probably correctly so, but clearly what it's talking about is internal.

So, that may well be a sea change in where we're going, and help guide us obviously.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. And I have forwarded that to the IANA issues working group mailing list. More acronyms, as you mentioned, and so this certainly looks like an additional proposal. Jonathan Robinson today on the call was very quiet as to how this would be treated, whether this was going to be treated as an additional proposal taken in

or not. I suppose that everyone is currently reading through it, and we will see some follow-up.

And I have sent an email to [inaudible] to ask to how this relates to the other proposals which are out there, and I'm hoping that the chairs, the relationship between this and the other proposals, would meet. And if that's the case, then I'll ask if I can then share this on the reviews. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I should note that, if it had been called a proposal, it would been automatically shelved, saying we're not talking proposals now. So, you know, we've set up rules and their following them at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. As you know, Alan, if it tastes of alcohol, and it smells of alcohol, is it alcoholic or is it not?

ALAN GREENBERG: That may not be a bad thing if we get a lot of people supporting it and it's palatable. And you know, what they're proposing is very heavily registry focused, unless you come to a crisis situation. And that may not be completely irrational.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's follow-up by email Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Let's follow-up by email, and I'm afraid I can't comment on it because I haven't read

the proposal. I scoped through it very fast, but I don't have any points that struck me, a part from thinking, oh this is another proposal. And it seems to be taking and mixing a few points from here or there, how does it work? What are the potential dangers for the end users? What are the potential advantages for end users? And I haven't had a chance to look through this.

If I could ask you all to read through this and follow-up on the email that would be helpful. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've said this before, and I'll say it again, when you look at this from a rational point of view, not from a powerbroker point of view of, you know, making sure that we're in a position of control. There has got to be a high level of synergy between the interests of the registries, from an IANA point of view. We're not talking about from their financial point of view, or that kind of thing, but from an IANA operational point of view, there has got to be a high level of synergy between user interests and registry issues.

I mean, their whole interest is that the registry works, and works transparently, that the DNS works transparently from the point of view of each of their registries. And it's hard to come up with situations where that is not the users, to the benefit of the users as well. Now, maybe I'm missing something subtle here. But that doesn't mean that we don't want to be part of the process, but it's hard to come up with

EN

---

scenarios, where the registries are completely happy, and users are unhappy, or vice versa.

Again, talking about from an IANA operational point of view.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alan. And let's follow-up by email on this. I realize the time is ticking. We then have agenda item number five, the working group name change. That's a very quick agenda item I hope. Last week, there was a discussion on the proposal to replace the full name of the working group, which at the moment is the At-Large ad-hoc working group on the transition of the US government stewardship of the IANA function, into a wider group that encompasses the accountability side, the accountability cross community working group members.

So the proposal is to replace the name by full name of At-Large ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability. Now this was shared on the call last week. It was shared on the mailing list. There hasn't been any voice going against this renaming. I ask one last time here, whether there is any voice against renaming it with this name.

At-Large ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and accountability. Let's do a quick consensus call on this call here. And I see no one be against it. So if that's the case, then I will be asking the chair of the ALAC to ask the ALAC for, because I believe it is for the ALAC to change the name of the working group. For the chair of the ALAC to propose

EN

this name to the ALAC, and they can change that probably as a consensus call as well.

I know, and I would like to point out, that the ALAC has already decided that the ICANN accountability work would be working with the At-Large ad-hoc working group on IANA transition. So the joining of the two topics was already given a green light. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I think the name is still too long, but there is not a lot of words you can leave out without compromising understanding of what we're doing. So I think there is only a limited amount of time we should be spending on the name of the group. Especially considering how awkward the one that we're using now is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly. Thanks for this Alan. Now, two quick questions. One was to do with the Wiki pages, quick technical thing, perhaps we can have a section that will be related to IANA issues and a section on ICANN accountability with a landing page that links the two together. And so I've send that over to the mailing list and ask questions on this.

If you have any points on this for or against, please follow-up on the mailing list. And secondly also, I would like to somehow keep the mailing list, at the moment we use IANA issues at At-Large list dot ICANN dot org. If we create a new mailing list, with another name, then

we would have to close IANA issues at At-Large list dot ICANN dot org, and we might lose the actual archives on this.

Are there any thoughts or points that anyone would like to make on this? Any preferences? Keep the name, change the text describing it. That was the suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Olivier, when we changed the name from ex-com to ALT, we came, the list is till the ex-com list. The text that we used describing it in title tends to be ALT, we've survived. Let's not overly complicate our lives.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. And therefore, I think, I'm not seeing anyone speak, pointing in any other direction. So with this, I think we can move to agenda item number six, and I can hand the floor either to Alan Greenberg or Leon Sanchez for CCWG accountability.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm glad to have Leon do it, I'm just trying to catch up to speed, and I don't think I'm there yet. So I'm happy to have Leon lead this.

[CROSSTALK] …told Leon that ahead of time.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. This is Leon Sanchez. You might hear some children noise in the background, I apologize for that in advance, that you have to listen to the background noise, [inaudible] might not, children jumping.

ALAN GREENBERG: We love children.

LEON SANCHEZ: I do too, thanks. So well, the next point in our agenda, let me just… I'm sorry, I'm lost here. Could someone guide me here? Okay, yeah. So, the review on the CCWG plans, as you might be aware, or might not, the CCWG as well as the CWG, intensifies its work in different working groups.

From our previous calls, I have been updating you with the work of the working party, one working party two. And [inaudible] those working party, as well as the legal [inaudible] work so far. I believe that the working party one, working party two, are doing very good progress. I feel that working party one is far ahead from working party two.

We are still trying to get working party two up to speed with the rest of the groups. And the working party on the stress test, has I believe, already finished their work. Of course, this work is to go through validation and discussion with the wider audience, with the wider group. But at the end of the Istanbul meeting, to have this stress test [inaudible] and discussed by the larger community.

So we can agree on whether we have a final model for stress testing. We need, of course, more ironing on the proposal, and the different templates that have been designed, not only for the stress test, but also for working party one, with regards to empowering the community, and with working party two in terms of having mechanisms that would allow the community to past review and address mechanisms.

So this is why [inaudible] about the work so far. So it's a very lean description of, in terms of our, of these working parties. And I would like to open the floor for comments or questions. I see Olivier's hand is up. Olivier, take the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I'm very interested in the stress test that you have mentioned, since of course, part of the stress test scenarios would be very important for the CWG IANA proposal. And primarily, in fact, for the CWG IANA proposal. So my question was whether, you mentioned the stress test were pretty much ready.

Were these going to be shared with the CWG IANA at any point? Prior to them being completely finalized? And secondly, would there be a chance at that point that these would have gone far enough to be included in any proposal of CWG IANA Istanbul?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Olivier. We will sure share these with the CWG. We will have a coordination meeting with the co-chairs of the CWG in Istanbul in between meetings. As you might recall, we'll have our CWG meeting on Monday and Tuesday.   And then on Wednesday, we will have a coordination meeting with the co-chairs of the CWG.   And then the CWG meeting will happy on Thursday and Friday.

So I think that this product from the working party of the stress test, will be shared of course, with the co-chairs of the CWG, and of course, it will be desirable to share with the larger group within the CWG. I don't know yet if we are ready to share this with the CWG, since it is a work in progress. And we wouldn't like to pollute the work so far in the CWG with some, well work in progress that might not be the final version of what we're going to propose.

So I guess, yes, sharing is in place.   But I don't know what this page, whether this will happen right after our Istanbul meeting, or a little bit later, when we have our final product. That is of course, we're sharing with the CWG. I don't know if that addresses your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Thank you for this update, and I think it might be helpful, maybe not specifically with a stress test since it's still under discussion in the accountability working group, but certainly share it on the IANA issues mailing list. So that those of us who don't follow the accountability process so closely, that relies so much on it, and the internal to ICANN,

the so-called internal to ICANN option, would be able to keep track, and not receive that document the day before we meet in Istanbul, on Thursday and Friday. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. I will make sure to circulate the last version of the stress test document, to the IANA issues list. And I, of course, emphasize that this is a work in progress, and it's not considered to be as the final version of anything that the CCWG is working on. But I will make sure that you get this document before our Istanbul meeting.

Well on the advice side of the CCWG work, I can update you. We are pretty much closer to having a long term engaged with the CCWG, as you might recall. And Olivier has stated this in this call. The CWG engage with [inaudible], and the CCWG has, of course, considered this same law firm to be the one that provides legal advice for the CCWG as well. But we also felt, and by we, I mean legal sub teams within the CCWG, we also felt that is what's worth to [inaudible] to at least one more law firm, in order to better get the feeling of the skills and expertise from the law firm.

So that we ensure that the position we make while engaging a law firm to provide the legal advice. We think that's the best position in hand. So we went to this other law firm, which, whose name I cannot disclose at the moment, since this call if, of course, let's see [inaudible], and will be public. So for example [inaudible] the name of the other law firm at this stage. But we are in the process of determining whether we engage

with one or mainly two law firms at the same time, and all the attempts in the call that we will be having right after we finish this call of the IANA issues working group.

And we might as well be able to update the larger group later today, on whether we'll be engaging with [inaudible] or whether we will be engaging with the other law firm, or maybe with both of them. So we are really, really close to getting to this position. I would say that our friend would be [inaudible] to have this position, as I said today, or as late as tomorrow.

And of course, we will be hoping for either law firm to be present at our Istanbul meeting. And of course, provide initial legal advice. We have to remember that the legal advice will come as [inaudible]. It will not be just a [watershed] document, we need to review, of course, the answers that the law firm will provide us when they come in. And of course, make the clarifications and comments that are, that will be increased when their advice comes.

So that's the update on the legal advice. I don't know if anyone has [inaudible]… at this point, so far?

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. We'll find a line.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. I see no hands up. No questions with regards to legal advice update. Okay so now we'll go through the Istanbul meeting agenda. As

you know, this will take place at the Istanbul [inaudible] Hotel. And we're having, at least from the CCWG side, a couple of informal meetings before our actual meeting. We have an informal meeting for working party one and working party two.

And of course, in this informal meeting, is to focus and coordinate our actions before the [inaudible] of the meeting on Monday and Tuesday. This informal meeting, of course, will be open to anyone that wants to collaborate or attend this informal meeting. We have, so far, the meeting room number 19 reserved for this informal meeting. And I believe that more information will be available as soon as we get to Istanbul.

We will also have, actually not us but the advisors, remember that the CCWG has also an advisors team, an extra group, that will be providing advice to the CCWG. And they will also be meeting before the general meeting of the larger group. And in the beginning, this meeting [inaudible]… but others seem to be only for the advisors. But there were many concerns raised by the larger group, on whether this meeting should be open for everyone to at least observe.

And since this is an accountability work, and we cannot afford lack of transparency concerns, of course we asked the advisors if they will be okay with opening the meeting, as we agreed, to have this meeting opened. So if anyone gets to Istanbul in time to attend the advisors meeting, of course you are very welcome to join them.

EN

It will be also an open meeting. While there will be no remote participation for the advisor's meeting, everyone that is already [inaudible] of course, to attend. And of course, notes are highly appreciated at this stage. As many of us won't be able to make it in time to join the advisor's meeting.

Then we will have, of course, two dates of work [inaudible]… Our first date, which will be Monday the 23rd, will be meeting the session from 9 AM to 6 PM Istanbul time. And all of our sessions will be from one hour and a half to two hours. So I think that the sessions will be quite intense for all of us. And day two is practically mirror agenda from day one, and of course, what the [inaudible] so far have discussed is that we would like to focus the discussion to a different date.

For example, being one, we would like to have the discussion on the outstanding issues for the larger group, and update you will would like to deal, at least, initial proposal or a final version of the different documents that we will be discussing on day one. And by if, I mean the templates from working party one and working party two. And of course, the final version for at least, for public comment version of the stress test working party document.

If there, are there any questions or comments with regards to the Istanbul meeting agenda at this point?

Okay, I don't see anyone raising their hand. So now I would like to ask Terri to please display the document on criteria for comparison of

EN

accountability mechanisms in the Adobe Connect room. So, it will be shortly on our screens.

And this document is intended to serve as a guide for the audience, or for the [larger] group to evaluate the convenience between different mechanisms that are going to be [inaudible] of course. And as you can see the document here is, it deals with different issues with our place in the left side column, which is under the title of comparison parameters. And then there are a couple of questions that are related to that parameter, and of course, we have an option A, B, C columns, into which we will would like the members [inaudible] group to evaluate in order of preference, which is quite suggestive, I'm aware.

But it will help us guide the [inaudible] to think of that position possible. So if we go through these documents, we will see, as I said, one of the comparison parameters is transparency. And then one question would be, does one option provide greater transparency?   And here is that greater is a very subjective word, so we will have to deal, of course, with subjectivity, but I think this will be definitely help us [inaudible], which is the best option, at least, for the majority of the group.

And then we will be able to build consensus from there forward. The legitimacy, this is one of the options for legitimate in its nature, due to higher scope for transparency, [inaudible], rationality. Of course, as I've said, all of these documents are a work in progress. And it would be very useful if we could go through the whole document. I am mindful of the time, we might not go through all of the document in this call, but I would encourage all of us to go through the document, and try to enrich

EN

the different questions that are related to the different comparison parameters.

The next one is legality, is a level of certainly about [inaudible] ability based on legal advice, for instance, greater for one option. As I've said, we're dealing with very subjective questions. But I feel that it might be just [inaudible]. Are there any comments or questions with regards to these comparison parameters document at this point? Or would you like to comment or go through each and every parameter at this stage?

Okay. I see no one raising their hands. So should I continue to review the rest of the documents? So if there is anyone that wants to raise another question, please raise your hand. So [inaudible], is implementation of the options more simple in terms of [inaudible] or operations. So this will be another comparison parameter, and of course, simplicity is very, very important to the work that the CCWG will deliver.

As we expect that the shortened time for implementation and the simplest implementation possible, would be better received by the NTIA, I believe. So this will also be a very important parameter to evaluate with regards to any proposal that we could move forward.

[Inaudible] does one option provide greater potential for being used for multiple powers or deal with existing mechanisms? Well that is, of course, something that might be implementation, and therefore we should be mindful of evaluating [synergy] between the proposals, and for example, where does our proposal [inaudible] CCWG feeds into the

CWG work with regards to accountability and of course, the large picture of the rest of the proposals from the other communities.

Liability from the financial point of view is one of the options for [inaudible] due to the simplicity of operations, including a level of attention, and resources required from the community to make the mechanisms work. Then accessibility with regards, referring to recognition, is one of the options more supportive and recognized due to the [inaudible] or current legal [inaudible] and concerns.

Rationality is explaining one of the options internally and externally, rationally, I'm sorry, and simplicity or design. Then utility, does one of the options provide [inaudible] or address, which I believe that for being one of the most discussed parameters, as the community really seems to be empowered to be able to have access to review those mechanisms.

So I anticipate that this will be a very intense discussion. Then independence. Does one option provide better independence? I think [inaudible], which should be able, or to keep in mind what we understand by independence, and independence [inaudible]. And then consultation. Does one option provide better consultation? We have to remind that one of the advisors have told us that the four parameters for accountability for, let's say, a better practice parameters for accountability are concentration, consultation, [anticipation], I think, then [inaudible] redress.

So of course, consultation being one of the axis of transparency and accountability. Then we will have to access how this fosters a better consultation process with the wider community. I'm sorry for that. Stakeholder based is one of the options, extend accountability to more relevant stakeholders. One of the concerns raised by many members in the working group, is not only that accountability should be available for anyone that is concerned with any particular matter, but also that we don't create any barriers as to the access, the effective access to the accountability measures.

So I think that, of course, the simplest mechanisms were designed with the left cross barriers, and other barriers for instance, having [inaudible] having access to any accountability mechanisms, the more successful we will be in our deliverables. And on the surface, does one option enable accountability to more of the relevant accountability preferences.

Then indispensability is one of the options, indispensable due to some legal answer. [Inaudible] this is of course something that we will more life when the legal advice comes back to us. And then is one of the options entering the standard check and balance, and mitigating capture. Capture being understood as the action as having the community or the organization paralyzed by either the action or inaction of a particular stakeholder or group within the community.

So now I'd like to pause again for any comments or questions on these comparison parameters. Does anyone have any comments or questions so far?

EN

I see Alan Greenberg's hand is up. Alan, please, take the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, a question for you. And I'm not quite sure where this fits in. As you know, the ALAC has been looking at the interim report of the policy and implementation working group. And one of the concerns we raised in our comments is that we have, just to brief other people who aren't familiar with it. One of the things that have come out of this working group, is the concept that, we used to think as policy as what is being set in the GNSO PDP, and the rest is implementation.

The outcome of the discussions, is that it is quite possible during the implementation phase, things come up, which were decisions will have to be made, which will impact stakeholders. And those are deemed to be policy and must go back to the GNSO for discussion. So the Board cannot arbitrarily make, the Board or staff not arbitrarily make decisions, just because we're in the implementation phase, if there is going to be significant impact as a result of this decision.

An example of that is the creation of picks, the public interest commitments, which were created out of whole cloth, sort of out of nothing that was discussed during the policy discussions, during the implementation phase. And the ALAC has a concern that the current structure of the GNSO may make it virtually impossible to make decisions like that within the GNSO structure, because if contracted parties, both registries and registrars, are at odds with what we sort of at At-Large let's say, view in the public interest.

EN

They effectively have a veto. And that's endemic in the structure of the GNSO. And the question is, is that an issue that the CCWG is in a position to address?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. This is Leon Sanchez again. I am not sure if the CCWG is in a position to address that problem. We will certainly need to deal with it, and I am aware that this is something that is being arising recently. We've had a couple of discussions in between the co-chairs. And you can tell that this situation is becoming more and more frequently mentioned.

Yes, I can see, in our near future, that we will be facing some intense discussions, which requires at this point, that you rightly raise. I don't know how we're going to deal with this, but that's something that we definitely need to address because as you say, if we stand to the point we're going to have work stream one sufficient point back and forth, then the transition with a parameter, or might not take place at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure at all this is a work stream one issue. But clearly, if we have set up organizational structures that might inhibit us from honoring the public interest, to the determent to the contracted parties perhaps, then clearly we have a serious issue.

Since you know, yes part of our bylaws and articles of incorporation saying we want to foster a vibrant business environment in the TLD

world, but we also have to do the public interest. And if we are in a position where one of these is safer over the other, by cause of our structure, than that is an accountability issue. So somehow I think we need to do it.

So I think what you're saying is yes, it should be raised, and it should be raised in the public forum, and then we'll, it's not out of scope for the CCWG.

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly, I think it should be raised. Eduardo Diaz has put in the chat, that this sounds like capture, and I agree that it might be considered as a capture [inaudible] of a certain kind. Well, that leads me to the last point in the CCWG accountability agenda, which is that we have a March 20th deadline to bring outstanding issues for discussion. And I think this point I've just raised is an excellent outstanding issue that should be raised, and hopefully addressed in our meeting in Istanbul.

If you agree, Alan, I would encourage to raise this point to the list, or at least to the co-chairs and [inaudible], to see how we can fit this into the discussion in our agenda in Istanbul.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I have all of one day to do this. Okay.

LEON SANCHEZ:	Okay. Sorry for the short notice. Okay. Well, are there any further comments or questions with regards to the CCWG updates at this point?
	Okay, I don't see anyone's hand raised. So I'd like to turn back to Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the rest of our session. Thank you very much.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Leon for this. And we now go for the next part of the agenda. And that's any other business. Anyone have anything to bring forward? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I just have a couple of more housekeeping things to discuss quickly. I see first two hands. So let's have Sebastien Bachollet. Sebastien, you have the floor.
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you Olivier. Hello everybody. I asked last meeting if we can have some time face to face for ALAC member of those groups, and I still ask this question because I think it will be important. And my second point is that we understand that we get a lot of information [inaudible] our call, but we need to find a real way to have an in-depth discussion.
	I don't know where to fit, I still don't understand why the CWG working group number one, or work stream number one, [inaudible]… And I would like very much to have a discussion with you, and now a topic with this one wasn't in that discussion. But trust me, we need to have this information, and it was very well done.

Now that we have five minutes and not enough time to discuss the subject. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Sebastien. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Leon, do you have any thoughts on this?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Olivier. I agree with Sebastien's suggestions. Unfortunately, our time is very constrained. And it is very difficult to coordinate the logistics for a simple meeting in many aspects, so I apologize for not coming back to the group with potential space for us to meet, and because… And I agree that we should definitely be able or [inaudible] that we'll meet at some point to coordinate between ALAC representatives [inaudible] with the group.

So I should… I mean, I couldn't agree more that we should find space for this. But at this point, I don't know if we do have a time slot for this. The agenda is so packed at this stage, that I think that when we get there, I would encourage all of us to just gather and see if we can discuss. I agree, or I am mindful that this might not be the more efficient way to coordinate with so little time, and so many information at hand.

I think that's the best thing to do at this stage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Alan, was your hand up in response to Sebastien's intervention?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it went up prior to Sebastien saying anything, so no it wasn't. But it does address it partially. A couple of comments. With regard to people meeting, I believe we should. I believe we need to do just a little bit of coordination. To that end, I would like to request that staff, in the next day, put together a list of all of the At-Large travelers who are going to Istanbul, with their travel schedules when they're arriving, when they're departing.

Whether they do that asking the individuals, or get it from constituency travel, I don't much care, but I think we need that before people leave on planes, and some of us are leaving on Saturday. So, I really think that's important. So all of the travelers, when we get on a plane, know when the other people are showing up and we can at least try to arrange some sort of meeting between some of us, if not all of us.

So that's number one. I think that… I agree with Sebastien. We should be having more a discussion on the issues, and giving direction to our members. We haven't done that very well, and part of it is because we are not at the point, at this point, where we have either/or options. And it's unfortunate that going into Istanbul well we're likely to make at least tentative decisions. We don't have those options on the table ahead of time.

But that's the reality of the situation. But we do need to at least coordinate, and when we can identify things that we need to bring to this group for discussion and to solicit input, I think we need to be able to do that nimbly and quickly. That was, well, the two points I want to make.

The third point is to thank both Olivier and Leon for taking over in my absence for the last couple of weeks. And I thank you for doing it and for being willing to put the extra time in it. So thank you.

Am I still on? Are you still on?

LEON SANCHEZ: I think Olivier might be on mute. This is Leon Sanchez.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's probably having a really good conversation with himself.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, well then, thank you very much Alan for this. And I think that there is no other business, and okay, I see that Olivier's line is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, to correct the action item that was put on, not only who was travelling, but when they are arriving in Istanbul and when they are leaving.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, that's [inaudible]. So staff, could you please correct that? And I don't know if Olivier is already back on the phone.

ALAN GREENBERG: And how quickly people can dial.

[CROSSTALK]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I ask that we don't wait for staff to send us a request, but we send to staff our travel details [inaudible] so that we can put together, so they get it from another [inaudible]. But let's be quite [inaudible]. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Sebastien. Olivier is back, so Olivier please, the floor is yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And yes, I dropped indeed, just as I was trying to follow-up on what was being said, but I heard what happened in between through the Adobe Connect room. So thanks for taking over and filling in Leon.

EN

A couple of things. Indeed, the list with arriving and leaving. Terri might not be aware of this list, but during each ALAC, sorry, each ICANN meeting, there is a long list that was put together. I don't know who put these together these days, maybe if Terri could ask other At-Large staff to have the template for this list, rather than having to build it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's normally Ariel, but she gets it directly from constituency travel. If she or someone could do that quickly, that would be effective. Otherwise, we need to get the information from the travelers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. That would be great. That's really, I think that would probably be the most helpful thing. What I would suggest is that the members of the accountability working group, maybe could meet on the Sunday before the start. They could just set some time aside in the bar or someplace, in the corner, and discuss things before the meeting even starts.

I understand most people would be arriving throughout the day. I don't think that anyone arrives late enough, so not to be able to meet in the early evening. Other points for, to do with housekeeping. Regarding the merging of the IANA and the accountability thread. I've looked at the list of participants in the working group, at the moment, on the IANA issues page, and that list is incomplete since we now have a list of participants from the accountability thread.

EN

I don't know if Terri, would you be able to update all of this? Build a fuller list of participants in the working group? Perhaps with their primary interest being either IANA or accountability. And also, I don't know whether any request for participants have been made to join the working group on accountability to the wider ALAC list, because so far, I must say the majority of traffic on the IANA issues mailing list is related to IANA. Very little traffic related to accountability.

And obviously, I certainly can understand Sebastien's concern that there doesn't seem to be much coordination of the accountability right at the moment. Terri, any feedback on the points I made?

TERRI AGNEW: No feedback now, Olivier. I'll get that taken care of.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. You've caught all the things I've said.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, or I'll go back and listen to the recording, but yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. As you're not asking me to say them again, because quite frankly, I can't remember now, all of the points. But anyway, Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I don't think there has been a lot of decisions that we… I mean, we've been talking out ideas. And to the extent that other people in this group have contributed some of them, and they have, those have been put into the mix. But I don't believe we're really, we have been at the point where we're really asking for direction.

So I'm not as worried as Sebastien is. I think we will be coming to that stage very soon, and it may be unfortunate that we're not at this stage already, but I don't think… We've been raising the issues, and there has certainly been input into the process from various other people, because I know I've gotten ideas from people and changed my ideas because of discussions.

We've had, you know, in various forms.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Just on my question of whether there has been any calls for members of this working group on the ALAC lists? Do you remember if that has been the case?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe staff did send out such a message. I'd have to verify. It would have gone out after I was on vacation, but I think I saw one, but we need to validate that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thanks. And we'll check with Terri when she has the time, after this call. When the members were all folded into the one mailing list, we need to have a full look at who is what from where and for what topic. And update the Wiki pages accordingly.

Okay, any other, other business? I don't see anyone with their hand up except someone who is going to take it down. So, thanks to everyone on this call. Next week we will not have a call because, obviously, many of us will be in Istanbul, or travelling and therefore unable to speak on the call.

However, of course, for those people who are not travelling to Istanbul, there will be remote participation. So I please encourage you to be on the discussions that take place in Istanbul. Both for the CCWG accountability discussions, and the CWG IANA discussions. And finally, we just have to, as you can see in the action items, to do a number of things from now until Istanbul.

There are a number of documents that we've spoken about today that have just been shared on the mailing list. Let's continue the discussion on the mailing list. Please, we need your input. We need the input of the ALAC and At-Large members that are interested in these topics, and I know there is an enormous amount of things going on. So these calls primarily involve updates about what have been happening.

But let's have the discussion on the mailing list until we meet face to face. So ladies and gentlemen, I thank you all, and I thank our two interpreters, Veronica and David, for the great interpretation. And also

Terri Agnew, who has been doing extremely well in supporting, single handily, these calls. And supporting the working groups with all of the updates on the Wiki.

So thanks and good morning, good afternoon, good evening, goodbye. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]