TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability, taking place on Monday the 20th of April 2015, at 13:00 UTC.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability, taking place on Monday the 20th of April 2015, at 13:00 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Gordon Chillcott, Barrack Otieno, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Eduardo Diaz, Yasuichi Kitamura, Sébastien Bachollet, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alan Greenberg, and Leon Sanchez.

On the Spanish we have Fatima Cambronero.

I show no apologies noted for today's conference.

Also joining us on the English channel will be Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

From staff we'll have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpreter.

Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

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

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.

Hearing nobody shout out, the roll call is complete. And the agenda today is going to be quite usual. First, we'll review any activity in the IANA coordination group. After that, the last few minutes or hours before the CWG IANA final draft is going off for public comment. And then after, we will be having time on CCWG accountability, the review of the CCWG plan.

And then any other business. Are there any additional items which people would like to add to this?

I don't hear anyone, so the agenda is adopted. And I note from Alan Greenberg that we will, during the CWG IANA, be spending a few minutes on some of the design team. So let's start then. And the action items were very simple, was for Gisella to send a Doodle this week, so the Doodle is done.

I'll gather we'll probably have the same sort of action item for next week. Let's go to agenda item number three, review of the IANA coordination group process. And on the call, I understand we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And so Jean-Jacques, if you could please provide us with an update, quick update, on the ICG, that would be very welcomed. Jean-Jacques Subreant, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBREANT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well. Please proceed forward.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBREANT: Good, thank you. Well, I've been travelling quite a bit. I may have missed something, but I don't have the impression that there is really anything new compared to what Mohamed or I have to report three weeks ago. The only thing which was noted was the change in the timeline, because that was something that had been discussed, and that has been published earlier in this, early in April.

But apart from that, I don't have anything to report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. I guess the ICG is waiting eagerly for the names part of the proposal to come and join the other two proposals which were received. Are there any questions or comments from anybody on the call regarding the ICG?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Can I get in the queue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Avri. You cannot only get in the queue, you are the first one in the queue. So you have the floor right now.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Sorry, I'm not on Adobe Connect this morning. Has the coordination group even started paying attention to what we've been doing in preparation? Or are they really just sitting there, waiting

eagerly, to see what comes down the line, having never thought about it at all? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Avri. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I suppose I can, yes, well, I am on a sunny terrace just now. I can assure her that, since the beginning of the ICG work, that's all I've been doing, that's all we've been doing, all of our lives, sitting on terraces or by swimming pools, which is [inaudible] …[waiting] for things to happen.

But seriously, we have gone through the two other proposals which were numbers, protocol parameters very thoroughly. And it's true that we are waiting for this piece of this proposal from the names community. But of course, as individual members of the ICG, we are following the discussions. In the same way as I am following the discussions in your group, in the At-Large.

So, I don't think it would be fair to surmise that we were just waiting inactively. The reason why we are not taking individual action, or initiatives, or putting out judgment, or appraisals, on any of the other work done, is because we don't have a mandate for that. As you'll remember, it was clearly stated in our charter right from the start, that we would not cobble together a proposal coming from [inaudible], but that is what [inaudible] an [assemblage], well done I hope, an [assemblage] of proposals from the community.

So it follows that we are not to intervene in the formulation stages. That we observe that carefully. And once the proposals are all in, the third proposal is officially, then start working. Working means several things [MUSIC]…

Hello? That was a terrible interruption.

[Laughter] [Crosstalk]

May I continue Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please, go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. The interruption, the music coming into the group was not [inaudible] by me. So, I was saying that it follows from that analysis that we are not to intervene in the preparatory stage, because our role is not to affect the activity as well, nor is it to take different pieces of the way to create our own proposal. We are here only to assemble in a useable format, a proposal which would take elements from all of the proposals officially received.

But I can assure you that most, if not all, of the members of the ICG are following events in other parts of ICANN and the Internet community, as I am doing by following carefully what is going on in this At-Large group. Thank you. Does that answer your question Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, pretty much. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Jean-Jacques and thanks for this Avri. Well, Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier speaking. The question I have actually is very much along Avri's line, hasn't the ICG already started work on the other two proposals?   And perhaps identified any differences between the proposals that the originators of those proposals might need to tackle in order to make them more compatible with each other?

And secondly, is anybody…   I mean, I guess you did answer, in your question, that individual members were looking at what the names community was doing in its proposal, but are the chairs going about it in any way, because time is of the essence? Looking at the drafts that are likely to come out of the naming community, and identifying at least where matters of concern, or incompatibility with the other two proposals might arise.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Two points. First of all, are we as a group, or are the chairs of the ICG looking at this for inconsistencies and compatibilities? Yes. Two, have formulated officially, as a group, as the ICG, a reserves? No. Not that I'm aware. I cannot speak from the heart of the chairs or co-chairs, but I think that there has been no official reaction.

What I can say though, is that we felt it was important to specify, to stipulate what our process would be. And that has been [inaudible] in a

fairly detailed way, to know how we would react to the various proposals, once we have all three of them. And of course, one of the main things was to look for inconsistencies and incompatibilities. And we have already looked at the two we received, to check that there were no major inconsistencies.

But as long as we don't have preferred proposal [inaudible] officially, we cannot react officially to that about general trends or proposals. Does that answer your question adequately?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. I had an additional follow-up question for you, but I'm not sure, perhaps it would be better suited for Mohammed as one of the vice-chairs. But does the ICG plan on starting its work when it receives a final definite copy of the proposal, are there any plans for them to, I wouldn't say take part, but certainly take the document which is being, going to be proposed for public comment in a few hours, and take it that a number of component parts of this proposal are likely to not change anymore?

And to therefore be what the ICG will receive on its desk at the end of the naming community's process?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. So, first of all, I don't have in front of me the date and time of the next conference call of the ICG. It should be pretty soon, it's always on a Tuesday, if I remember correctly. And

for the time being, I had not seen the proposed, or the draft agenda, of that meeting.

But I'm sure that, if and when, we had [inaudible] on which to work, even if it is not the complete, final proposal from the names community, we will be looking at it. Of course, the reaction, our official reaction, will have to wait for the proposal to be official. But yes, we'll be looking. Does that answer your question Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this Jean-Jacques. Olivier speaking. Are there any other comments or questions?

Seeing no one put their hand up, let's then move on in our agenda, and let's go and look at the CWG IANA. You will have noticed a number of things that are in the agenda. First there is the timeline update. So you can disregard the month that's scheduled of all meetings, that I think, is being currently implemented swiftly through. But then the current timeline, what we have is Friday the 17th, the beginning of this weekend. We had a draft that was publish and that all members of the CWG IANA and participants have spent time over the weekend to read and review.

It has been a number, there have been a number of feedback that have been sent to the ICG, to the CWG IANA mailing list. And then, this period for the comments of the working group ends tonight at 23:59 UTC. Then tomorrow, Tuesday, there will be a call to review the proposal. And this could be a driver from the webinar, but I gather, judging from some of the issues which have been pointed out by some participants of the CCWG, that call might be dedicated to trying to

resolve those issues, and perhaps finding quick last minute changes that might be needed.

And then on Wednesday, contrary to what I said early, it's on Wednesday that the proposal for public comment will be published. And that's expected to last for 28 days, which is considerably less than the current 40 day new length of time that is done in ICANN public comments. And that's primarily because time is of the essence. Initially, the idea was to have it for 30 days, but initially, of course, the public comment was due to start today.

So 28 days instead of 30 days, that will be a very short amount of time for a long-ish report, nearly 100 pages in length. And I think therefore it's vitally important that we inform the At-Large community of the contents of this report as soon as possible. On Thursday, there is likely to be a call of the CWG. That's at least what was there.

I didn't check just now in my emails, there might have been a change. And then on Friday, there will be two webinars, and one is at 06:00 UTC and one at 14:00 UTC. And I invite everyone to be on at least one of those two webinars. What we will be doing in the ALAC is to actually stage an additional webinar for CWG IANA, so for this specific report, during the week, starting Monday the 27th of April.

So that's next week. And that's because so far, and I beg to be corrected, but what I understand is that we will probably not have the two webinars proposed by ICANN. They will probably not be interpreted. So in order to have interpretation in English, Spanish, French, and in order perhaps to have more of our At-Large structures go

and be directly informed about the contents of this proposal, we propose a webinar, probably the… Well, sometime during that week, with a proposed time of 19:00 or 21:00 UTC slot, which appears to be the best slot for people around the world.

It would be pretty difficult to conduct two webinars as well for At-Large. That's the proposed timeline. And I just emphasizing that it is proposed. So please now, the floor is open for questions and comments. And Tijani Ben Jemaa has his hand up, so Tijani you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. Unfortunately, this is the ALAC call, ALAC webinar, because for the other webinars on Friday, we have the [inaudible], as the CCWG, I mean. We have the Thursday and Friday, horrible time, so it is impossible for us to attend any webinar about the CWG work.

So fortunately, there is an ALAC one, which will be held next week, and I hope it would be good timing for everyone. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Tijani. And that's a fair point. This Friday is going to be tough on a number of people.

Sébastien Bachollet has put his hand. So Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much Olivier. Sébastien Bachollet. I just want to make sure of the timing. I know that the timing is of essence, but at the same time, if we don't apply rules, we set up, ICANN set up the time for [inaudible], it's on one issue where it's practically, it will take time to read the document, to understand the document, and then [inaudible] and we can decide not to have any comments. Or we will have just, the same one who will comment [inaudible] commented inside the working group.

And I really think that it's a very bad idea, and very bad precedent that we don't apply our own rules, because if we do that, we can do that for everything. On this very important topic, I would have hoped that we will have active [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: …CWG and the CCWG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For both, yeah, okay. Thank you for this. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't disagree, in theory, with what Sébastien said, but we are dealing with a reality we cannot change, number. And number two, we're in a very different position from how we normally

EN

are in comment. On a typical comment period, we have done no preparation ahead of time. It typically takes a week to two weeks, sometimes more, to decide if we're going to comment and assign it to someone.

And then we start the process. Often the actual formulation of a statement is done in the last two weeks or so. This time, we have spend an unending amount of time talking about where we are. I believe, at this call, or very, very soon afterwards, we need to decide who is going to be writing the comment, how are we going to be pulling it together, and starting the process right now.

So although I agree that we shouldn't be doing this on the rush timeline, from an At-Large perspective, I think we're in a much better situation than we would otherwise be. If we don't delay and actually get something started very soon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Yeah, we can send, I don't think it's a question of whether we, as At-Large, I am not sure about ALAC, yes, because we have enough people in each of the working groups, I am not sure that [inaudible] case from our At-Large structure and from our At-Large members. I wanted to speak, and we need to speak about [the general public], and what we are doing here is to try to have an open, an ICANN open and sometimes that's not the case at all.

And I don't want us to spend too much time on that issue, but I will say that we are in good position as ALAC, but we are not as public interest [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Sébastien. Olivier speaking. And primarily the webinars should be able to inform our community of the issues, in a much faster way than just throwing the report over to them, the proposal over to them, and letting them read about it. One of the concerns I had, obviously, was the fact that a normal, normal in quotes, comment period would be 40 days in length, and here we are considerably less, we're on 28 days now.

That's going to be very difficult. An even bigger concern, actually, for me at the moment is that I don't see any plans for ICANN, or I'm not aware of any plans for ICANN to have that proposal translated fast enough for people who are conversant in French and Spanish, to be able to take part in this.

Any of my colleagues on the IANA stewardship transition working group, I can't remember if there is going to be a translation of this. And whether that's been taken care of by staff. Alan, are you, do you remember off hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't say definitely. I believe there is an intention, but we know that's going to take some time. So it's going to come out close to the end of our process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, as I said in the chat, if someone, even if there were an extra 12 days, someone coming into this cold, without any preparation, is not going to be in a position to really make substantive understanding comments on this report. This is a really complex issue, and we have debated thoroughly on many, many issues. So coming into it cold, at this point, is you know, other than identifying things that simply are broken, and hopefully we will catch those regardless, that would be close to a futile process.

So let's not spend too much time. We can't change this at this point, we can certainly, in our report, make a comment on it. We can comment on it through other processes. But that doesn't change what we need to do at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. I think that perhaps, if we can include in our comment, the fact that we deplore there wasn't any immediate, of course you can't say immediate, because it is a 90 something page report, but certainly have that translation done ASAP and so on.

I'm just feeling unhappy about the amount of time that we're given for the public comment, that we're given to the community for the public comment. I totally agree with you that anyone coming in today, will

take a lot more than 10 days to actually understand the whole depth of the proposal, and to be able to contribute meaningfully to it, accept, of course, if we as a group have missed something out blatantly, and a fresh set of eyes is going to hang on your proposal doesn't [inaudible].

But apart from that, I think the details are going to be a lot more analytical to appreciate. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG;   As I said, I'm not sure how much time we want to devote to this, in this call. You know, you use the word, "We deplore." I deplore the fact that it has taken us this long to have a coherent proposal. You know, we've been working since September. But deploring doesn't change reality. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Olivier, my big fear is that if the translation is not there, you will have a part of the community who will not be able to participate in this consultation. And this is really a pity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. And this is precisely why the idea of having an ALAC or At-Large webinar, that will be interpreted in Spanish and in French, will probably not replace a translation done in

time, but it will certainly help with the understanding of those people whose English is not their mother tongue. [CROSSTALK] …implication. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay Olivier. I agree with you regarding the At-Large community. Even if it is not 100% true, but it more or less helping. But what about Chinese and Russian people who are in the other part of the community? What about those people who don't understand English? How can they give their input? This is a big problem for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. I have no answer for you. The only quick answer I could say, of course, is, oh well, then we'll have interpretation in Chinese and in Russian as well. Right now I can see Heidi pulling her hair out, and going no! What? How expensive is this? Or how hard is it to get that done? I have no idea.

I mean Heidi, are there any barriers to extending the languages to other…?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Olivier. This is Heidi. Sorry, I missed the beginning of TIjani's request. Did he request that we have the five UN languages plus English on the At-Large webinars?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani did not request, he just deplored that it might be very difficult for Chinese and Russian native speakers to take part in any consultation if there is no translation or interpretation in their languages. Tijani, did I paraphrase this correctly?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Absolutely Olivier, totally.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so Tijani, this is Heidi again. Are you speaking the ICANN wide webinars, or the ones next week, the At-Large webinars? I can do more on the At-Large webinars.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, I understand, but my comment was about the whole community, the broader community, to participate in this consultation, and I said that if, for At-Large we have this semi-solution, or the solution which is not 100% efficient, at least. For the other communities, for people who speak other languages, they will not be able to participate in this crucial consultation, this crucial for the future of ICANN, and for the future of the Internet. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. Olivier speaking.   Heidi, question, and of course, that's along with Alan. Please jump in if you may, since you are the Chair of the ALAC. Would it be financially sustainable for At-Large to

translate, or to interpret the webinar that we will be having, so the ALAC webinar, in the five UN languages?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. I can certainly look into whether they are available, and we can likely offer that. I would need to consult with Gisela on how that's going to be setup though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you put me in the line?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I would love to put me. I'm not sure who is in the queue at the moment. Who was that speaking?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Cheryl. Please, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Follow-up before Cheryl, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First Cheryl, and then… Let me just first have Cheryl, and then over to you Tijani, after Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. If Heidi continues on that [inaudible] as long as the usual requirements for at least two, if not more, speakers are there, [inaudible] was showing that need. If you are not going to do it that way, then you need, as an ALAC, to make the decision that you are having it interpreted because you want the archival record available for people in those languages, which is the six UN language, which would include Russian and Chinese.

Now that's also a case, but to go back to Alan's point, that the likelihood of people in the last little while, bringing themselves up to speed if they haven't come along on this journey already, is actually quite small. And I can assure you that most of the Chinese and Russian community within ICANN, that I deal with in the naming world as well as the numbering world, manage quite well in English, under normal circumstances. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Next is Tijani, and then Alan afterwards. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.   It's only to say that I wasn't speaking about the At-Large community, since for the At-Large community the most spoken languages are English, French, and Spanish.   And this is by the [inaudible] the interpretation of the webinar. I am speaking about the other, the others who don't have a chance to have their language, and who are not on the At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Let's make it clear, I'm going to ask Tijani a question first. When you say you're speaking on behalf of the other communities, does that mean you're talking in relation to the ICANN wide webinars or our webinars?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am not talking in the name of the other communities.   I am just reflecting a fear, for me, that some of the community will not be able to participate in the consultation. And I am speaking about the broader community, not about the At-Large community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So what we're talking about here is not increased translation for the At-Large community, which presumably will include Spanish and French, the languages we normally use, although we now do Russian on our ALAC call. You're suggesting that we make a statement, quickly, to

EN

the wider community, to ICANN, that they should do wider translation on their overall webinars.

I'm trying to get, from this discussion, down to what are we going to do about it?

SABRINA: This is the interpreter on the line. Fatima Cambronero is requesting the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Let's have Fatima Cambronero please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking for the record. Thank you Olivier. I'm not in the Adobe Connect room. My apologies for interrupting to ask for the floor. I am following this discussion on interpretation services, and in my opinion, it's not something that we have to solve in At-Large. Of course, if we can do something, of course, that is more than welcome. But we have been asking for interpretation services right from the start in our group, and we didn't get that service.

So if you, and also, if participants are not very fluent in English, they will need something in the discussions. So now, we need to have the document translated into all of the languages, in due time, so that people can participate and can make their comments. And also, in my point of view, these are CWG issues that shouldn't be repeated in the next cross community working group.

We need to be inclusive, and if we're not inclusive, we will be leaving out enough people in the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fatima. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I don't want to spend the whole call on the issue of interpretation. I know it's infuriating that the CWG doesn't appear to have, well, they must have thought about it, but they don't seem to be particularly warm or lukewarm to have things like that done.

What I understand is, the document will be translated. I do not know if the webinar staged by ICANN will be interpreted in any other languages, but what I would suggest is that we, we as in the ALAC, so Alan Greenberg, on behalf of the ALAC, would send an email to the co-chairs and to the staff in charge of this, and perhaps copying Teresa Swinehart, who is the overall shepherd for the process, to ask that these two webinars that will be on Friday this week, will be interpreted in the UN languages. Whether there is a chance for this to be arranged on such short notice or not, I think is outside our ability to do anything.

On the other hand, as far as the ALAC call is concerned, next week, I think that there is a higher chance of us being able to proceed forward because of the fact that Heidi Ullrich and Gisella Gruber are in charge. And they would be able to arrange for this much more easily. I think that's the overall thing.

With regards to the translation of the document, well, the time is so short, I have no idea when that document will be ready in other languages than English. Obviously it takes time to translate such a

document, and I don't know what the arrangements are at the moment. Alan Greenberg and then, I think, we need to move on to the actual contents of the document rather than the translation and interpretation. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, you just said you know the documents will be translated. Is that based on my vague comment or something else that has come to your attention since you asked me the question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. I understand from the discussion that took place, I think it was last week, that they were going to translate the document, but that was not reflected in any of the notes in the meeting. And that it might be that it was either fallen through, or they're not thinking of translating it, in which case, I, it's just terrible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Number one, we need to verify that, and I'll ask staff to check with the CWG staff to find out what, if anything, is going to be translated to what, if any, languages. That's number one. Number two, there is an action item for Heidi to check with Gisella if the five UN languages are available to the ALAC webinar. I don't believe anyone has proposed that.

I think Tijani was talking about the wider ICANN community, not At-Large, and I would suggest that there is no rationale for us putting, using languages in the webinar that we never used in any other presentation,

in any other of our activities. And number three, I would suggest once we know what is happening with translation, then we decide very quickly, you know, and we may want to charge it to the ALT, just for expediency, to decide what, if anything, we do about interpretation on the ICANN wide webinar.

I would say that presenting the webinar in Arabic or Chinese for instance, if there is not even going to be a summary of the document in that language, it's probably close to useless. So, and the slides are never translated into the other language, as far as I know. So let's do something practical, and I agree with Fatima, that we should start taking some action, to make sure that next time this comes around, we are not in the stupid position we are today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. And let's then move forward. I think we've got a good plan forward. If you can review the action items, please Alan, and then perhaps liaise with staff from whether they need to be slightly amended. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier.   Yes, I've just confirmed with FI staff here in Washington, that yes, the document will be translated into the five UN languages. It will go out in English, obviously, first. And then it will be translated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Heidi. So at least that's one good thing. There will be translation, and of course, it takes a few days, but hopefully it will not arrive two days before the end of the comment period. Let's move on then now to the actual… Well first, the design teams, because of course, as you know, there is the final document draft itself, and that incorporates all the different parts, all the different component parts, of the different design team.

We're not going to go through each team, because I think we have gone beyond that. Although there might be some comments on some of the more recent work of the design teams. Some of them have submitted their text a while ago already, but others have not. A large amount of work to place in the past few days on this. Alan, I know that you wanted to touch on a few points, so I'll hand the floor over for this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I just want to take a few minutes to talk about design team F. That is the group that I ran, and it only started work about a week ago. And we did deliver recommendations, which are largely, with one exception, I believe both rational and have the general support of the group.

Design team F was look at, essentially, the core of everything we've been talking about. I'm not trying to be arrogant, but essentially, design team F was saying, fine. The NTIA is going away. What's going to happen? How is actual operation going to change because the NTIA is not there?

Now design team D, which Cheryl ran, I believe, looked at the part of NTIA action that we have focused on, almost at [n item] from the start of this process. That is, every change that goes into the root zone, every change that goes into the WHOIS file that goes along with the root zone, is approved by the NTIA. So it is created by requests from changes or whatever by IANA. It's sent to VeriSign as the organization that signs the root and publishes it, distributes it.

But they can't do anything unless the NTIA approves it. Design team D said we don't need that approval. That is largely, I presume, based on the fact the NTIA, in recent history, has never refused, has never withheld their approval. So it has been, for all intense purposes, somewhat of a rubber stamp.

Design team F was charged with saying, do we need anything else to replace it if we're not going to approve it? And more important, is there anything else the NTIA does that we need to think about? Although it was not common, it turns out the NTIA does do something else. And what they do is far more, I'm not sure the word intrusive is correct, but far more involved, far more active, than the authorization function ever is. And specifically, NTIA has overseen the IANA operation.

Virtually any change to the IANA operation, in terms of internal processes, in terms of reports they published, everything, is approved by the NTIA. So if IANA wants to publish a new report, or change a report, that has to be approved. And the NTIA did not rubber stamp these, but it has been actively involved and made changes, and in a significant number of times, has said, "No, don't do that."

And we are making a recommendation that says, for the major substantive changes, things like the NS SEC, things like architectural changes, we cannot, we do need an approval function, and we need to find somebody or some entity to do that. That's not resolved, but it's decided that we do need someone. So that's the recommendation in the report.

And on the more, the more mundane things, we are suggesting that IANA be given full management discretion to do what it believes is correct, in consultation with the appropriate parts of the community, as necessary. That's a very substantive change to how IANA works. And it's quite interesting that it's a significant part of how IANA works, on a day to day basis, and it's something that we never actually got around to discussing, or even was fully aware of, we're fully aware of, prior to this discussion.

So I just think it's rather interesting, and a little bit scary perhaps, because we don't know what else we haven't thought about yet. The one part that is controversial is, we are going from three entities, IANA, NTIA, and VeriSign, the root zone maintainer, to two, with NTIA going out of the question.

There are a number of people who say we must have a principle in place that we never go to one. That is, we never award the contract to a single entity, because there is a strong feeling that having two bodies, two parties, making decisions is a safer situation than one. Although it has been noted that there are still many single points of failure, single places that either entity can make changes that the other one couldn't stop.

So it's not truly a two party situation. And there is a strong debate going on right now, whether in fact, we need two parties, or if we do want two parties, should the responsibilities be divided the way they are right now? And that is a substantial argument, substantive argument, that we are looking for input on, in the process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I have just a point regarding design team F. Is the text ready, already somewhere?

ALAN GREENBERG: Incorporated in the report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Because looking at the Wiki, it doesn't seem to be on the Wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG: It does not say design team F in brackets, that was forgotten. It's the section on the relationship between NTIA, or IANA and the root zone maintainer, and the full text is in annex M.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay…

ALAN GREENBERG: It was incorporated at the very last moment, and Marika forgot to put the DTF on the appropriate chapters.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Perhaps, can you also let Grace or whoever deals with the Wiki, if they could update the Wiki section on DTF that would be helpful. Because at the moment, all of the others are updated, but not this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Marika does that, I'll ask her to do that. She has been somewhat busy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can believe so, yeah. It's that time of the year. Okay. Are there any questions or comments…?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just as a note. Unfortunately that is not really a Wiki page. It looks like a Wiki page, but it's really a Word document. So updating it is not trivial.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm looking at the Wiki page for DTF. There is a Wiki page for DTF, which is…

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But the overall summaries for all of the work teams, which should be including the text and stuff like that, is a Word document. Either I will update it or someone will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I know it is a Word document. I've actually had the joy to update it last week, end of last week, on a few points I had made which I had missed. Right. Any other questions or comments on this? Now, we're looking here at a very large report, over 90 pages. Those people on the CWG IANA mailing list might have noticed some feedback from a number of people.

I think the one which, the one feedback which seemed to be signifying a bit of a show-stopper, and I'm not sure… I haven't managed to read the last 20 emails in my inbox on this, was the one from Andrew Sullivan. Has anybody actually managed to track today's discussion and where we are on that? There is 101 pages now, okay. It's added.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The answer is no. I read his original email. I haven't seen anything today or looked at anything today. Some of the discussions going on listed substantive, some of it is downright inane. I mean there are discussions about things that are simple facts, and people are, you know, are treating them as if there are things that are debatable, whereas there are things that are simple, simply, you know, not subject to debate at all.

And there is a large amount of time being wasted. But I can't comment on his specific interventions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I know that there is also another thread of discussion regarding the legal structure and the costs, the added costs of the legal structure. It's something that these should be noted, and others saying they shouldn't be noted, and saying well, you should say it's fairly minimal.

I mean, these are already starting to be little points of details that are starting to be added there. And I gather that… I'm not sure if it's for this community here to adopt any specific position on those, as a concerted position on these little points, because by the time we'll reach that position, the final report will probably be published by then. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's one of the ones I was talking about. It's well understood by vast numbers of people around the world, what the minimal costs are to have a corporation. You have an accounting cost. You need to contract with auditors. You need to file some tax papers. It's not an awful lot else that you have to do, if you want to treat it minimally. If you want to give it a bit more responsibility, more authority, more whatever, then it becomes more complex.

But having the debate over that kind of thing, I think is silly. You know, having a, similarly having the debate over whether the RIR's contract

could be done with, should be done with ICANN, or the subsidiary, or if it's done with ICANN, can ICANN assign it to the subsidiary? Those are well understood things in contract law. And, you know, we're spending time debating things which I do not think are worthy of debate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alan. Certainly my understanding was that the sub-team, the design team that dealt with the budget looked at, perhaps obtaining more data on the, maybe not the legal option, but if post-transition IANA was a separate organization, and it was felt that it was very difficult to speculate on these, and these were going to be small costs, perhaps.

But in order to actually do some work to evaluate them exactly, will probably be obsolete a few months from now, due to the changing nature of all of these costs. So, okay. Are there any other points which the ALAC should be particularly strong on? I get that this moment, if you haven't read the overall document, it's going to be very difficult to take it in.

I note most of the points which were made were small points such as that and a few others. Just to be clear on this, it looks as though the CWG has not really decided on either a legal separation, or a functional separation, or is more like leaning towards legal separation, and less on the functional separation, but the choice will be made after the public comment. Anyone to comment on this?

Eduardo Diaz.

Cheryl, you'll be in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it's not, I don't wish to comment. I have to leave this comment, I have to leave this call now to attend the CWG planning meeting. So I just wanted to let you know and to let [inaudible] know that I don't need a dial out. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Just one thing Cheryl, before you leave, is there anything that you wanted to contribute to the call here that, before you go?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The only thing I would like people to do is take, and it's more for the CCWG, which I'm not going to be in this call for now, that is with the CCWG, look very closely at the process, which I think is around page 74 to 77, or thereabouts, in the document that will come out next week. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Thank you for this Cheryl, and have a good coordination call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. And over to Eduardo now. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Eduardo for the record. In regards to the legal separation or function separation proposal, I understand that what is going to go out is geared to support illegal separation.   And in remembering our last call, Alan mentioning that we should say something. And when I say we, I mean the CWG. To say something about the fact that the proposal is being put out is legal separation, but there is a functional separation, somehow, when you look at it.

I am afraid that what is going to happen, and what… In thinking about the things that we're saying previously in the call, is that if somebody that is now, has not been through this journey, it would be very difficult to distinguish what is being said about legal separation or functional separation.

So I just wanted to make that point. I think, in the end, this is going to be a legally separated affiliate based on this proposal that is going to come out for public comment. Next step, some people are there. I'm not saying that ALAC should do it, but simply because there was mention of function of separation as another [inaudible]. You know, in any case, both solutions are internal to ICANN costs [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Eduardo.   Olivier speaking.   Are there any other comments on this? I don't see anybody putting their hand up. One last

comment from me on this. I think that what we are seeing now is the draft that the CWG had in their hands over the weekend is going to be pretty close to the final draft that will go out for public comment, but I would suggest that during on our next call, we focus specifically on the ALAC comments.

As far as the penholder is concerned, we, you know, any of us could hold the pen, providing any of us have the time to hold the pen, or we could have a number of people holding the pen together using a Google Doc. What is important though is for us to focus on the actual comments from the ALAC. Maybe the point that you made here, Eduardo, maybe other points that will emerge, that the ALAC would like to alert the CWG about in a formal way.

I gather that there will be a comment from the ALAC. And I turn it over to Alan Greenberg on this. Do you expect that the ALAC will be interested in submitting a formal comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: My personal opinion is I believe it is mandatory. Even if we are only saying, "We support the general direction that the CWG is going in."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. So how does the plan then, to focus from today until our next call, which will likely happen next week, to focus on a possible ALAC response? And of course, next week and the week after, since we will be receiving further input, although I'm not sure we'll

receive so much, but we will be receiving further input from our community by then. Jean-Jacques Subrenat you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I would just like to support Alan's view that it will be mandatory for the At-Large, for the ALAC, to make written comments. I think it's very important, because if you go back to the beginning of this, there was a strong discussion, you remember, about who is entitled to make proposals, who is entitled to give an opinion, etc.

And it wasn't a foregone conclusion, it was certainly not easy to get the At-Large representation to be considered as quite almost [inaudible] things. So I think that it makes perfect sense to use this opportunity, and every other opportunity, where in the ICG or the CCWG and CWG, to make known our views. Because, as I've said on occasions, I think that if you look at the whole history of the Internet, it has been led successfully by first the military and academics, by business, and their inevitable lawyers, and the user dimension, or the user perspective, has always…

So this is really one of those occasions where the user perspective has become an essential [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Jean-Jacques. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And certainly, I think that part of the reason why our representatives here on the CWG were often asking for a widening of some of the

committees that will be formed into a multistakeholder communities, rather than just having the primary customers, the ccTLDs and the gTLD operators, was directly in line with what you mentioned here.

I realize the time is ticking. Let's have just an action item for a page to be created in anticipation of the public comment, which I remind you all will start on Wednesday. A Wiki page to be created for that public comment, so that we don't have that one day delay until it gets ready for consumption by the ALAC. And another thing I think that we should immediately also publicize the two webinars that will happen on Friday, the two ICANN webinars that will happen on Friday.

And with this, are there any other comments or questions on the CWG IANA before we move over to the accountability thread? Jean-Jacques, is that a new hand?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry. That's an old hand, as I would say, especially [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. A last word about this. If there is any opportunity for you, as a CWG member, that you make the public comments 40 days rather than 25 days, or 28 days, it will be very good because these additional 10 days can be used for, have more time for translation of

the document to make more people, larger people able to comment on this project. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this TIjani. Helpful as well. All right let's move on then. I don't see any other hand. So I hand the floor over to either Alan or to Leon for CCWG accountability.

LEON SANCHEZ: Happy to take on that. Alan, would you mind, or do you want to take that?

ALAN GREENBERG;   No, I not only have… I would be delighted if you do it. I'm trying to find out if I'm supposed to be at the call that Cheryl just went to. So please go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. This is Leon Sanchez. Well with regards to the cross community working group on enhancing ICANN's accountability, we are going, well we finished the first set of documents that are going to be put into discussion in our intensive work session this week, which will happen on Thursday and Friday. And the [tenth of this] do you have the, you have the attached documents in the agenda.

One of them is, well both of them are the frozen documents, with regards to working party one and working party two. And of course, the

general report that we've been setting up between the co-chairs and staff. And we also have a memorandum from the legal advisors. And well, there are a lot of documents that will be reviewed in this intensive work session.

This session, as I've said, will take place on Thursday and Friday. And we will hold, on Thursday, four calls. The first one will be from four UTC to six UTC. Then the second one from 11 to 12 UTC. And then the last one from 19 to 22 UTC. And after that, we will be holding, also, another call, which is intended to be for the legal sub-team, but of course, the legal sub-team is open to anyone. Anyone is welcome to join that extended call, and that will happen from 23 UTC, and then for two hours.

And then on Friday, we will be having a call at eight UTC for two hours. Then from 13 to 14 UTC, and then from 15 to 19 UTC. The intent of this intensive work session is to build our first draft proposal, so which [inaudible] for public comment. This will be happening, ideally, on May the first. And then we would be having a 30 day comment period. So of course, the community can provide feedback and we will be able then to just review the different comments that we received from the community, and discuss them in our face to face meeting in Buenos Aries, which will happen on June 19th.

So, as I said, we have a couple of documents that I don't mean to go through them on this call, since we are very short in time, but the first one that is already displayed in, on your screen, is a memorandum that was sent for us from the legal advisors, with regards to a comparative chart that was setup by [inaudible] and Rick [inaudible], on analyzing or comparing the two different structures, membership structures that

have been put forth, so far discussed within the legal sub-team and the larger group.

The first one is, you can scroll down. We have, of course, a lot of information with regards to the different models. But the [inaudible], the membership model, I'm sorry, the [inaudible] model, and then we have the membership model. As I said, I don't intend to go into details at this stage, but you can review this chart. It's meant to, of course, compare and highlight the up and down from each model. And of course, provide for the advice on whether one structure is more advantageous to the ICANN community than the other.

And so we can, of course, make a decision. The lawyers have recommended that for the different mechanisms and powers that the CCWG has been discussing and is trying to set up a scope to achieve. The membership model would be the most suitable to put in place the different measures mechanisms and powers for the community, as opposed to the designator model.

There have been some discussion around the comparison of these two models. We don't have a consensus yet, nor have reached, of course, a decision on whether our recommendation would be lying towards a membership model or a designator model. And I think that this will be, of course, also a matter of discussion in our intensive work session this following Thursday and Friday.

Then we have another document, which I would like Terri to please display on your screen.

TERRI AGNEW:	And Leon, this is Terri. I'll get that in just one moment, it's just freezing up on me.
LEON SANCHEZ:	Thanks Terri. I see, in the mean time, I see Sébastien Bachollet's hand is up. Sébastien, could you please take the floor?
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you Leon. It's Sébastien. I have at least two questions. The first one, maybe as you know, I was [inaudible] to participate in the second part of this call, where the documents weren't present the last time. But I am concerned that we don't [inaudible]. Why ICANN was taking as a non-member organization. I think we need to have a full and clear answer before we decide to go to any type of membership model, because we may decide to change.
	I have no problem with that.
LEON SANCHEZ:	Thank you Sébastien. [CROSSTALK]….
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	I am very concerned about [inaudible]…. Go ahead Leon, I have a second point, but please go.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. I was saying that your question is exactly one of the several issues that needs to be addressed before making a decision towards recommending, going with the membership, or a designator model structure. So you are right. We need to dig into ICANN's history, to find out why it was founded as a non-membership organization to begin with.

And from there, of course, access the original means of the founding people of ICANN, and see if it's still aligned to ICANN's mission and values. And from there, of course, make a recommendation.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes [inaudible] thank you [inaudible]. I heard the presentation, and I must say that once you have the number, you will not be able to actually change the numbers. And that has a lot of concern for me, that means that the [inaudible] will be… back in the [inaudible] as the current SO and [inaudible]…

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Sébastien. And that's also another concern from not only for ourselves, but from our many members in the larger group. And well, the legal document so far have told us that one of the downsides is exactly what you are pointing out at this time. And we would, of course, need to be very careful how any change is implemented into the bylaws. So that would prevent that future members are not prevented from joining or even being created.

So I think that's a very important point. And I think it would be also part of the discussion, if not of the larger group in our intensive work sessions in the next days, it will surely be one of the points that needs to be addressed by the legal sub-team. I see next in line is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have a number, I'm not sure the word is concerns, but as I was listening to the descriptions, a number of things hit me. First of all, the legal team is suggesting that if we go with the membership route, that the members be essentially the ACs and SOs, or whatever we choose, but that they have to be transformed into, I believe, what they were saying was unincorporated associations, to have a legal presence to be able to be a member.

They also said something interesting, if I caught it correctly, because they didn't say it quite clearly, is that in our current environment with ACs and SOs selecting Board members, but not having legal, being legal entities, we are neither designators nor members, and therefore we really only are selecting Board members with the agreement of the Board, that they could take those rights away from us, and we wouldn't have a legal recourse.

Which of course, is true. We have very little legal recourse with the directors, we know that, but phrasing like that was interesting. I have a little bit of concern, however, that if we are transformed into legal entities, in the form of unincorporated association, that there may be liabilities associated with it, which may change the whole concept of

how we act as volunteers in ICANN. And that's one of my concerns. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. Yes, you're right. Liability is an issue that, of course, raises a lot of concerns around those who would be part of the different bodies that would form ICANN in its future Board. And the lawyers have also stated that while in some models, liability might arise from having a certain role within the organization. There are also ways to mitigate that liability, and of course, those different mechanisms should be assessed and evaluated before making our recommendations, because that's definitely a very fair point.

I see next in line is Avri. Avri, could you please take the floor?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. This is Avri speaking. Yeah, I just wanted to make a couple of comments. Most of them have already been said. First of all, I wanted to point out that while the history is interesting, I don't think we should get bogged down in it, because it was a history about discussing individual membership, and all of the complexities of that individuals, organizations, how you did that.

This is, the word member maybe the same word, but it's not anywhere close to being the same concept that was discussed by early ICANN, having spent too much time in that history. So it's interesting, but it's kind of less than completely relevant. I think the issues about the [inaudible] and how you add a new member, although adding a new

SO/AC is already a monumental task, indeed, there would have to be provisions for the members being able to accept the members, and that, you know, could be an issue.

I'm not sure that I have come to the point of being one of those that favor the membership or even champion, because of the liability, and I'm still looking at the mitigations. But I think in terms of the ACs and SOs wanting an ability to actually influence the organization, few other alternatives have come through. At this point, we still do everything at the [inaudible] of the Board. If the Board doesn't want it, the Board changes it.

You know, that they almost always act by unanimity anyway. Okay, not always, but very frequently. So whether it's two-thirds, three-quarters, or what have you, is not usually the issue. Because of that, they can change any bylaw that exists, and can therefore change how we interact, what we do. Now they wouldn't do it, we would protest, we would make noise, but it's protest, and making noise, and group letters that we use to control things.

And sending letters to our favorite Senator, Congressman, or EU Delegate, or what have you. But you know, getting some real legal voice is something that's really worth considering. So I'm still trying to figure out whether I think members, designators, or some third option saying what we are now is the right way to go, but it really is a very interesting proposal to explore. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Avri. And yes, this also adds up to some other mechanisms that have been thought of within the group, like the fundamental bylaws, and of course, the independent review panel. This would provide an integral or a holistic approach to these concerns I agree. Next in line, I see Sébastien Bachollet. Could you please take the floor?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much Leon. Just one point about the [inaudible] not our [inaudible]… Can it be done in other countries and in California? It would be interesting, let's imagine that the ccNSO would become a member, but the regional organization like [inaudible]… in Europe and the same in other regions. ICANN can be a member of ICANN and the incorporated somewhere else. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Sébastien. And this also ties to jurisdiction issues, which are another important concern by many members of the group. And while this has considered to be a work stream two issue, this is something that has also been discussed widely, and will continue to be discussed, I think, in our intensive working sessions.

Next from the queue is TIjani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani, are you on mute?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now? Do you hear me now?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now? Okay, thank you. Thank you Leon. Tijani speaking. Until Istanbul, we made a very good progress, and the pace was very good. And things were more or less clear for everyone. But the last few weeks, we made the decisions speed up, that make few people following. And I want to thank and to really congratulate our two coordinates, especially [Jordan], who is working very hard and very good. But this doesn't make everyone able to follow the work and to understand and to contribute.

This was expressed by a lot of people on the group. And I feel that the co-chairs are feeling the problem, and try to find a problem, a solution, but I feel also the solution is not in their hands. And they are doing what, they are not doing what they want, they are doing what they should do. And this is unfortunate for me, because the public comment will not receive the opinion of the whole group.

It will receive the work of the very hard workers, and of people who have more time than the others to contribute and to make this work done.   Also, from Istanbul to now, they are, less things clear for everyone. Even among people who are working hard, because we have now the legal advice and we have some, not new, but something which we have to take account, that we didn't take into account before.

And even what was agreed on in Istanbul now, some people are now discussing it. So how can we give to the public, or to the community, a proposal that we, among us, inside the group, we are not all sure that we agree on everything on it?

So this is a concern that I expressed from the first week of the speed up. Unfortunately, I was absent during the last week because I was on another work [inaudible] in Africa. So I was absent, and it was my fault, my problem, to alert the problem of the group. But even those who were on the work during last week or so, are complaining the same. So once again, I want to thank people who work very hard, but I want to say and to emphasize that the document that would be on the public comment would not reflect the point of view of the whole group. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Tijani. Yes, this has been a concern that has been raised by many participants and members of the group. We are well aware that the recently speed up of the process is, might be very hard to keep up with. And we have kept in mind the principle of being as inclusive as possible, but also trying to keep track, or be on track to, and may well the CWG to deliver their proposal.

So as discussed, we are focusing, of course, on dependencies, so we can provide the CWG with the right input for them to finish their proposal. And let's not forget that this first draft that would be sent for public comment, is of course, not meant to be a final proposal. But rather a first approach, which would be sent by the feedback of the community.

And of course, refined in a later process, which would of course, be then subject to group consensus.

Because we need to see this as a document that would be released, but not really a call for consensus on a final proposal. So, I get your concern and I think my co-chairs do as well, but we really need to keep on track to enable the CWG to be able to deliver the work as well. We might have more time for our work within the enhancing accountability working group, but we also need to keep in mind that some other working groups depend on us to deliver their final proposal.

I'm mindful of the time. We are almost reaching half past the hour. And I just to point, in this document that you have on your screen, which is a rather large document, 82 pages so far, it's an initial report of what has been done by the CCWG on having accountability. And just a fun detail, if you look into the chart, or the [inaudible] contents, you will see that the power for recalling the entire ICANN Board is 6.6.6, which wasn't meant to be there intentionally, it's a mere coincidence.

So okay, so Sabrina said that she can stay for 10 more minutes. So well, this is a [inaudible] document that I wouldn't want to go through the whole document at this point, since it's not feasible because of the time constraints. And I would just point to the different pillars of this document so far. The different powers and mechanisms that have been designed by the CCWG working parties, working party one, working party two, and working party on stress test.

We have, I think, the main point or the main part of this document is, of course, point number six, which is the accountability mechanisms,

which you can review with [inaudible] description of the overall accountability architecture that has been looked into and, of course, the different alternatives that have been designed by the different working parties. And we have, of course, the revised amendments [inaudible]. I apologize for the children in the background.

And we have also the fundamental bylaws which, as I was saying previously, was a concern raised by Avri. This would be another point that the proposal would be considering, the independent review panel, the reconsideration process, the community empowered by different mechanisms which would be, of course, the power to reconsider or reject budget, or strategy operating plans.

The power to reconsider or reject changes to ICANN bylaws. The power to approve changes to fundamental bylaws. The power for recalling individual Board or the whole Board. [Inaudible] power, of course. And the corporation of the affirmation of commitment into ICANN bylaws. And preserving ICANN commitments from the affirmation of commitment. And the different reviews that would be put in place, I mean, the very current reviews that should be put in place in the bylaws so, to assure that ICANN is held accountable to the different stakeholders, and of course, constituencies that were the ICANN community.

So at this point, I would like to open the floor for comments or questions with regards to this document. I'm aware that this was only circulated yesterday, I think, so I don't expect anyone to have gone through it as a whole, but if you have any comments or suggestions, [inaudible] of course, enrich this document, they are most welcome.

So I open the floor for any comments or questions.

I don't see anyone raising their hand, so with this…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Leon, it's Olivier. Sorry my Adobe Connect for some reason has now frozen, at the most inappropriate time. I just put my hand up please.

LEON SANCHEZ: You're next, so please take the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have a question on how the CWG and the CCWG processes link up together. One of the most significant parts of the IANA stewardship transition, is to do with the customer standing committee, that looks at this service level expectations of the operator, and effectively if something goes wrong, and there is a whole escalation process that has been designed to make sure the matter is escalated through a specific path.

And it is repeated in many, maybe not many, but in several places in the CWG IANA proposal that there would be an escalation process beyond the CSC, that would go, and it mentions here to the ccNSO and the GNSO, which would include the IRP, which I believe is the Independent Reconsideration Process, and CCWG work stream one accountability mechanisms once these are completed.

Could you point us to those please, and let us know, in 30 seconds, what these involve, please?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes Olivier. I think, if I'm understanding correctly, concerning your question, the way for the CCWG to address this part of the CWG work and proposal, is linked to whether we are able to design an independent review panel whose decisions are likely to be, of course, mandatory or binding to the Board. So any process that, of course, follows the escalating path, and reaches the IRT, then would, of course, need to have decisions that would be binding to the Board. And then solving any dispute or any problems that might have escalated that far.

I hope that addresses your concerns.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Leon. It's Olivier speaking. I guess it does, it's just, to be alerted whether the two interface was together, and if that works, then that's fine. The only concern I have is that the escalation process, at the moment, is through the ccNSO and the GNSO, and I'm not sure how that will fly. But then my colleagues here would have maybe other points of view on that as well.

We are once that we should be the accountability process of ICANN, and maybe it's a different thing.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Olivier. This is Leon Sanchez again. We are also looking into escalation paths within the CCWG, and I would think that the single escalation path should need to be, of course, synchronized or at least analog to those envisioned by the CWG. So I think we will be, of course, having coordination with the CWG as to try to synchronize both escalation paths, if not making the same escalation path for any presence that we end up proposing in the CCWG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Leon. It's Olivier speaking. Just to add, for my colleagues on the CWG IANA, this is annex K, IANA problem resolution process. Okay. Sorry, I'm jumping into your part of the call. Back to you Leon, apologies with that.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, you're perfectly okay. I was about just to hand the call to you, since I think we have gone through the CCWG accountability part of the call. So I'd like to hand it back to you for any other business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And as Leon just mentioned, let's go to any other business.

Okay, I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Now we've got a number of action items that are in the chat, on the right hand side. And the box, Alan Greenberg, on behalf of the ALAC, to send a note to the co-chairs, and staff, and support to ask that the webinars this week be interpreted in the five UN languages.

Gisella Gruber to arrange Spanish and French interpretation on the At-Large webinars the week of the 27th, no minimum request required. Heidi Ullrich checked the CWG IANA staff, if document will be translated into the five UN languages. The English version will be posted for published comment first. The other language versions will be posted as soon as possible.

Maybe that's an action item with an answer already there. Alan Greenberg to check with Marika if DTF, F for foxtrot, can be updated on the Wiki, Word document. Terri Agnew is to create a Wiki page for public comment. Terri, I'm not sure whether that will go on the, on a space that will be under the CWG hierarchy, or whether that will be under the policy development hierarchy. Perhaps, could you follow up afterwards with Ariel, and with Heidi, and with Alan on that?

TERRI AGENW: I certainly will, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. And then Terri to ensure that the ALAC publicized the two ICANN webinars taking place on April 24, 2015. Finally, just a quick question to you, Leon. When do you expect a public comment to be launched again on the accountability thread?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Leon Sanchez. We expect to launch the public comment on May the 1st. So we can have a 30 day comment period. And end it, of course, by June the 1st, or June the 2nd, and then be able

to compile all of the feedback received through the public comment period. So we can refine the document for discussion in our face to face meeting in Buenos Aries on the 19th of June.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Thanks so much for this. And I guess we will have time during the next call that we have next week to be able to discuss that public comment, and perhaps also check on the ability to have the document translated and the webinar, if there will be any webinar done in other UN languages.

In the meantime, last action item also, we need a Doodle for next week. How are we looking for next week everyone? Early part of the week? Later part of the week? Are there any preferences?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure it must be after the webinar, the At-Large webinar.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's a very good point so that we have enough follow up on that to work on. Very good. So a Doodle, I guess, would probably be in the

second part of the week then, if that's the case, that we need to do after the webinar. Do we have an idea of the date of the webinar? Gisella, perhaps, might you know where this is going?

Gisella Gruber you might be muted. Or Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Olivier, I'm check with Gisella right now. Her audio is frozen. She's trying to get on, and no date as of yet. And she will get back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So we'll just make sure that the webinar takes place before our next CWG and CCWG calls. And with this, I thank you all, I thank Sabrina, the Spanish interpreter in particular, for having remained an additional 10 minutes, 10, 12 minutes on the call. And our staff, of course, including Terri who has prepared all of the agenda. So that's great. Thanks to you all. I'll speak to you next week. And until then, please, we have until midnight to comment a little bit more, just before it goes out for public comment on that CWG document, and to remind you all, that document is linked from the agenda, from today's agenda.

If you don't know where today's agenda is, have a look in the chat. Scroll back, and at the beginning of the chat, on the Adobe Connect, will be a link to the agenda. Thank you very much and have a great week. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]