
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to today's At-Large briefing on CWG on IANA Transition, on Monday the 27th of April at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Spanish and French interpretation. So if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other channel.

Also during the presentation, if you would be so kind as to mute your speakers, your microphones, apologies, in order to avoid interference. And also to mute, please press star six, and to un-mute, please press star seven.

Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And welcome everybody to this call, which is not essentially a capacity building call, but a webinar on the work of the cross community working group IANA stewardship transition.

We have the blessing of Lise Fuhr, who is on the call, who is one of the co-chairs of the working group. Very hard working co-chair, and very hard working group. And she is going to be able to take us through a slide deck of the CWG stewardship proposal itself.

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.

I remind everyone that, of course, because we're interpreted, if you could say your name before you start speaking, and not go too fast either, because the interpreters have to keep up on the French and on the Spanish channel. This is all being recorded, so for those people who have missed the webinar, I hope that you're listening to the recording.

Now let's hand the floor over to Lise Fuhr. Welcome Lise, the floor is yours and I believe that you will have control of the slide deck as well.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you Olivier. Hello everyone. My name is Lise Fuhr. I'm one of the two co-chairs of the CWG IANA stewardship transition group. The other one is Jonathon Robinson. I come from the ccTLD world. I'm part of the dot DK registry, DK host master. But thank you for giving me the opportunity to do this presentation.

I agreed with Olivier that I wouldn't go too much into details regarding the process, but focus a little more on the actual draft proposal. But having said that, I will quickly go through the slides anyway, and I'd like to advertise that next week we'll have an extra Q&A session, and we will publish the date and time later. So we hope, if there is anything you will join and ask questions, because we believe the more communication, the better.

Well this CWG stewardship is actually part of a process, as you might know. We have the ICG that is coordinating three proposals coming from the CWG, that's the naming community. The CRISP, that's the numbering community, and IANA plan, that's the protocols community.

So we have those three proposals that have to be merged into one. The other CRISP and IANA have already submitted their [proposal].

They did so in early January, but unfortunately, we were not able to meet that deadline. And as you see, when the ICG has made a comment, a proposal of the three submissions, it's going to be sent to the ICANN Board. And the ICANN Board is a stakeholder, like everyone else in this process. They will pass on the proposal to the NTIA, but here it's very important to understand that the NTIA will not accept a proposal that doesn't have consensus.

So we need all stakeholders to sign off on this. So what is the goal and scope of the group? Well the goal is to produce a consolidated transition proposal related to the domain name system. And we need the chartering organizations to sign off this proposal, and those are the CCNSO, the GNSO, GAC, ALAC, and SSAC.

So and as I said before, this scope is limited to the names community only, since the others have already submitted their proposals, and our scope is only for the naming community. Having said that, we have tried, in our work, not to do anything that would interfere or create any... Well, we need all three proposals to work together. So that was our aim from the start.

As you see, we have based our scope on the NTIA IANA functions contract. There are 11 functions outlined in the contract for the IANA functions operator, where we have a line that applies to ours. I can see it's very difficult to see on the screen, but those are like managing root zone cloud, change requests, managing WHOIS changes request, and

the WHOIS database, etc. You have those slides and you can see the actual line functions.

So well, our timeline and progress to date. As you can see, we're quite a large group of almost 150 members and participants. And all are participating on an equal basis. So even though we're nine members, well the plus 125 are participating on the same basis as the others, except of course, that nine members have been supported by ICANN when going to face to face meetings.

As you see, we had a lot of calls, a lot of working hours, and a lot of emails on the list. So our work began in October, and we sent out a first proposal for public comment in December 2014. And we received a lot of comments, and the feedback was that the model was too complex, and the proposal was not detailed enough. So we had to get back and work on another proposal.

And we had to adjust the timeline. So many calls and working hours later, we have actually developed a new proposal, as you see. This is actually the proposal development overview, and it's important to understand this in order to understand the draft proposal. As you see, we came out of the ICANN meeting in Singapore with seven models.

And we also realized that we had to change our working method, because we got a lot of feedback in the Singapore meeting that people were worried we wouldn't meet our new timeline. So we actually created a lot of the time teams that are more agile and an easier way to work, and kind of divide the proposal into smaller pieces, and have

those easier finished in small groups, instead of having this big proposal that we were working on all together.

So we changed the working methods, and had the design teams. Those were very good. And they're a big reason why we have a proposal today to send out for public comment. As you see, we've had some high intensive working days. And the last one was in April, just before we sent the proposal out for public comment. And I must say, I've been very impressed by the people who worked with this.

They have been very active and put in a lot of work and a lot of long hours, including people from your community. So what is linkage and coordination with the CCWG? Well, as you know, we had two processes. We have one that links to the IANA stewardship transition. We have another process that focused on enhancing ICANN accountability.

And well, the CWG proposal is conditional on the work that needs to be done in the CCWG. Well why is this? Well the CWG has a special more linked, direct link to the CCWG compared with the other proposals coming from the numbering and protocol communities, because the ICANN is actual policy body for domain names, as well as the current IANA functions operator. So we as chairs, acknowledge this early on, and we've been working very closely with the CCWG's chairs.

And we have had weekly calls with them regarding the coordination. And this is to avoid doubling of the work, and we are continuing working with the CCWG chairs. Furthermore, we have asked our legal advisors to help us identify issues that are dependent on the work from the

CCWG. And actually, we have certainly [inaudible], which is also the company of, the CCW... The legal advice for the CCWG, together with [Adler]. So, that's a very important linkage, and a very important understanding that this company, this law firm certainly has advised both group and our work.

It's a good linkage. What are the areas that we have made conditional on the CCWG? As you can see, we have four areas. We have the ICANN budget, we have the community empowerment mechanisms, we have the review and the redress mechanisms, and the repeal mechanisms. Well, the ICANN budget is, we want to ensure that the IANA functions are adequately funded.

In this structure where the IANA functions operator remains within ICANN. I don't know if something happened to my screen. Sorry. I'll just get it where it is, there it is. Sorry.

So here we need a community review of the budget, and we need a certain level of details of the budget, of the IANA functions. So we have two recommendations. And this is also dependent on the accountability group, since there are proposals from the accountability group that the ICANN budget as a whole can be not rejected by the community, but sent back for review to the ICANN Board.

Furthermore, the CWG has submitted these two recommendations you see on the screen, to the current fiscal year 16 ICANN budget public comment. Well, regarding the community empowerment mechanisms, this is when IANA review functions make the recommendation to the ICANN Board. It has to be considered seriously by the ICANN Board.

And if not, the community needs to be able to review decision and possibly take actions on this.

Regarding the review and redress mechanisms, well, we would like to have the incorporation of the IANA review functions in fundamental bylaws of the IANA Board, sorry, ICANN Board. Regarding the appeal mechanisms, this has been... We created a design team to look at this. It was a specific ccTLD survey on the delegation and re-delegation, and actually the ccs concluded that they would not need the CWG to work on this.

Instead, it should be sent to the ccNSO to deal with at a later stage, but the gTLDs, and this is very important to recognize, are still interested in an appeal mechanism. So the recommendation was that it is not needed in this round for the ccTLDs, but the gTLDs will need it. It's also very important to know that we have over 70 persons, that overlap as members and participants in both groups.

So we have a community coordination here as well. And [Cheryl?] one of your [inaudible], from ALAC is also doing stress tests for the accountability group, and she's a very active participant in the CWG too. So here we have a very important linkage too.

I talked about the design teams. And the design teams, we had 15 that were proposed, and the chairs of the group, of the CWG, Jonathan and I, gave them priorities, priority one and two. And every design team had a design team lead, who is responsible for the progress. And as you see, the primary focus of the design teams was the operational part.

We concluded much, or we completed much of this during Istanbul. And we have a few that are still outstanding or still being worked on where one of them is the design team A on several service level agreement. As you see, we have some design team that have priority two, and when assessed by Jonathan and myself, we actually concluded that they were addressed elsewhere, or they could be changed to the committee of the whole CWG.

That is the red team part that was being considered and is worked on from the whole CWG. The red team is looking at what are the implications of the proposal, what are the accountability team called stress tests, and do we meet the requirements from the NTIA, those that they set down from the beginning? Furthermore, there is a SSAC report on recommendations from what should be taking into account in a CWG proposal. This is also being looked under this red team part, and the red team is actually the whole group.

We have tried to cover pretty much all of the operational stuff, and we hope that the public comment will show that we have taken most of this into account. Well the next slide eight shows you the actual proposal. And here it's important to note that we went out of the first public comment with people being satisfied with IANA, as doing the IANA functions operator. People wanted the IANA function to stay within ICANN.

So this has been actually the premises for the model that you see in front of you. It's also important to know that the slide is a symbolic representation of the fact that the post transition IANA is a legally

separated entity, but it's a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN. It's an affiliate, with what we consider an internal light weight Board.

So as I say, the IANA functions operator stays within ICANN, and the structure is, of course, important, but so is the detail of this. The advantage of having a legally separated entity is that it is possible to have a contract that you see between ICANN and the IANA, the post transition IANA function. And furthermore, the IANA function is actually [rink sense?] in case of any future separation.

The model suggests that we have CSC, a Customer Standing Committee. As you can see, that's one of the green, yes. And it's composed of direct customers, two gTLDs, two ccTLDs, representatives IAB, and an IANA liaison, which would have, they would handle the day to day performance of the IANA functions operator. The CSC can escalate through the accountability mechanisms, and they can trigger what we call a special review.

Above that group, you can see the IANA functions review. And here we have two types of reviews. We have a periodic one, where the first review would be performed after two years, and then every fifth year. And then we have special reviews when needed, and here, again, it's important to know that we don't see the IANA functions, review function, as limited in its scope or span of review.

And one of the output of this could be separation. The IANA functions review report directly to the ICANN Board. And is ensured by the accountability mechanism if the Board doesn't consider their recommendations seriously. So as you see, it's very clearly that we have

parts of this new structure that is reliant on the output of the CCWG, in order, and in relation to empowerment, and review, and redress.

But it's also very, very important to recognize that this group has focused on continuity and stability of the operations. And any separation would need to be in the case of an extreme and absolutely last resort, when all other possibilities are exhausted. So it's not to be the first choice of anyone.

Okay. The last slide is the road ahead. As you see, we have made really progress the last six months. And well, we have a few milestones ahead of us still. We have to do a thorough analysis of the second public comment period. We have to finalize details of the proposals within the CWG stewardship, and we will work on this during the public comment. And of course, we would like to have submission of the proposal to the chartering organizations for their approval on the 8th of June.

So we had a request from the ccNSO requesting that they needed to discuss this during the meeting in Buenos Aires. So it's very important that we give the chartering organizations a proposal in time, so they have the Buenos Aires meeting to discuss and hopefully sign off so we can submit it to the ICG. We encourage, if possible, to submit their comments, and we have also made a template to facilitate this input that we will receive.

And that's a template that would give people the possibility to fill in whatever comments they have, but in sections it's organized after issues so it's easier for us in the end to compare the different comments that we get from all over the different communities. It's not mandatory

to use the template, but we strongly encourage you to do so in order to make it easier to analyze this.

And after the analysis, we will do the final revision of the proposal before sending it to the chartering organizations. Well, as I said, we're still working on some details. We keep on coordinating with the CCWG, and hopefully we get a lot of feedback from all of you. And as I said in the beginning, we will have another Q&A session next week. We hope to publish the date and time soon.

That was my first go. So I hope I didn't use too much time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not at all Lise. Thank you very much. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thanks very much for this presentation. The question now goes into, should we launch into questions about the proposal? Or do you wish to go through the template? Because we do have a copy of the template available that we can display on the screen, and that we will go through, at some point, during the call.

But it all really depends on the time that you have.

LISE FUHR: I would prefer to go through the proposal, actually, because I think it's better to use the time on this. Do you think it's needed to go through the template?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to... Yeah, it's Olivier speaking. We'll go through the template afterwards. Let's open the floor for questions, and comments, and so on, and a discussion, and then we'll get back to the template. I know you have to leave on the top of the hour, so that's why we'll go straight to this. So immediately we have people in the queue. And the first person in the queue is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. So Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Thank you very much Lise for that presentation. That was interesting. I have a question about your slide number eight, could we come to that again, to put it on slide eight? Yes. Eight. Yeah, that's right.

So the left is current contract, right is post transition. So the left part is pretty clear. On the right hand side, this is the hypothesis of a separation, a legal separation between the ICANN Board, or ICANN, and the post transition of IANA or PTI. Now, when you refer to the IFR, which is on the right, but the IFR would submit its report to the ICANN Board. But wouldn't make at least as much sense, for [inaudible] to report to the PTI Board, with perhaps certainly a copy to the ICANN Board, but certainly to underline the independence at least for review purposes and oversight, to restrict the legal independence, and the separation of the PTI Board. Thank you.

LISE FUHR: Thank you, and that's a very good question. As you see, we actually have two arrows that group, and there is nothing to say that they are

not reporting to both. But as the review function is actually a review of how IANA is performing, that's why the first goal was that it should report to the ICANN Board, which is the owner of the affiliate IANA.

So it will go both places, but it's mostly a review of, or submitting to the ICANN Board. But having said that, this is one of the details that could be put into public comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Lise. Olivier speaking. Did you have a follow up question Jean-Jacques on this? I saw your hand come up again.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, that's very kind of you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, my comments to Lise, is that I understand why there is an arrow from IFR to both ICANN Board and CTI Board. But the problem with that, it is drawn in an equivalent fashion. I would point out, and ask if anyone is interested, to insist upon having it clearly stated that the IFR should report to the PTI Board, otherwise we are diminishing this quality of independence, or even the notion of independence, of the CGI Board.

Why bother to set it up if you have two Boards which are equivalent? And in fact, for historical and other reasons, the ICANN Board will be more powerful, and have a long history in any case. So I think that, for the purposes of underlying more clearly, the independence of PTI, if that ever happens, then I think it should be made clear also in the IFR [inaudible]. Thank you.

LISE FUHR: Olivier, can I make a quick comment to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Lise. You're in the hot seat.

LISE FUHR: Yeah, that's fine. Actually this is a review function that is performed every fifth year. And we have day to day performance and meeting other, or small reviews are being performed by the CFC all the time, because they are the ones handling the day to day. This is the more, how we're doing as a whole, how is the model working, is there anything that should be changed?

And I think that's why it's important to have this sense, of the ICANN Board and not to the PTI Board. And the independence here is not independent the way if it was taking away from ICANN. This is more, we need to have this legally separated. It's actually could have functions shared with ICANN, and will, I guess, have functions shared with ICANN. So the independent is more a legal structure than an actual independence. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Lise. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Tijani Ben Jemaa, is your hand up specifically for this point? Or is it another question, a new question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, it's not far from this question. It's about governance of the post transition IANA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'll tell you what then, I'll let Alan respond just specifically to this point, and then I'll give you the floor. So Alan Greenberg, please, just on this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And if you can keep my hand up and bring me back into the general queue also. This is a very simplistic chart. From a perspective of having sat on a review committee, I would suspect the IFR, when it does finally meet, will target its comments at one Board or the other, or both, as appropriate. You know, if the comment is, ICANN you're not funding it enough, it needs more money. That's an ICANN Board issue.

If it's, you're not using the people properly and you're making mistakes, that would, I think, go first over to the PTI Board. So, I would think that the review committee is going to make sure that its comments go to the place that it thinks can fix the problem. That doesn't mean the ICANN Board can say overriding responsibility if things are going, you know, to hell or something like that.

But you know, I think as these things evolve, there is going to be a natural schema of things, but I don't think we need to worry about that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. Tijani speaking. Thank you Lise for this presentation. I would like to ask you about the governance of the post transition IANA. You said it is [inaudible] organization to ICANN, and it is legally separated. That means that it must be governed. And I don't see how we can govern it. We have the CSC, which is dealing with organizational issues day to day.

It's not the governance of the post transition IANA. I see the [NFR?], which is review. Which is review structure, and review structure, does it have an existence outside the review period? So I don't know how the post transition IANA is governing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Tijani. Lise?

LISE FUHR: Yes. Well thank you for your question. Actually, governance in more than one way here. You would have, of course, the owner that governs this. And the owner is ICANN here, but we have a separate Board, and that separate Board is going to see the governing body of the actual affiliate. How this Board is going to have its composition, is not completely decided yet.

We aim for a light weight Board, so it's not going to be a construction that creates another accountability mechanisms needed. So we aim for

a light weight structure here. But you furthermore, have this CSC that's going to be governing that if the PTI is not performing as its agreed between ICANN and IANA. If they don't meet the service level agreements, if something is wrong, you would have those that can actually raise the issues directly to the Board, and you can escalate it to the ICANN Board.

So you could, you start with the PTI, you start the IANA Board first, and if that doesn't work, you can use another escalation mechanism. And you furthermore have the IANA functions review. That's also going to be not a governing body, but it's a body that's going to take care that the governance structure is working as supposed. So this is actually a company, the PTI will have a lot of mechanisms making sure that it's actually meeting what is requested from the community.

And I see in the chat that it doesn't seem that CSC would have Board status. It doesn't have a Board status. The Board has its own status, but this is more, there are not many companies that have a customer standing committee, having oversight due to perform as you should. So this is having a special function.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Lise. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And Tijani, did that answer your question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. [Inaudible]. Thank you very much Lise. If you are going to the public comments without a proposal for the Board, for the condition

IANA Board composition, I think it would be a problem, because it is something very important for the [inaudible]. And I hope, I don't know what is happening in the CWG, but I thought that the discussion had been made to know at least how this Board would be constituted. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Lise?

LISE FUHR: Yes. Actually, we have put in the proposal that an internal IANA, or internal ICANN Board. So it comes from within ICANN, if it's going to be employees and members of the ICANN, but also part of the IANA Board, has not been decided fully yet. But the important part here is to focus on, this is not going to be a multistakeholder Board, because that would need another accountability mechanisms on how to choose it.

So we'd like to keep it as light weight Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Lise. Olivier speaking. In the queue, at the moment, I have Alan Greenberg, Christopher Wilkinson, and Jimmy Schultz. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. One of the things that is less clear to me, and it's not dissimilar from the IFR issue of who do you talk to when there is a

problem, but on a regular basis, certainly there are some things that will be escalated through the CSC. I can readily imagine that there are other things that we haven't really addressed yet, right now.

If the issue is, the CSC will talk to IANA, presumably the CSC could also talk to the ICANN CEO, if there are things like that. But is, at this point, not well specified. And I'm guessing, I'm asking Lise, to what extent do you think we need to specify that, or is that something that will work itself out as we start learning about the new operations?

LISE FUHR:

Well, I think it would be good to have it specified. And I think we should work on this. This is, as you know, being part of the group Alan, we didn't have time to go into this because we had three groups that needed to coordinate. And one of them was the review functions, one of them was the customer standing committee, and the third one was the escalation group.

And actually, as it is now, CSC escalates to the ccNSO or the GNSO. And also to the ICANN Board. So it's not cast in stone, and we have to work on this, and preferably we do that before it is sent to the chartering organizations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Lise. Olivier speaking. [CROSSTALK]... Yes, sure Alan, but I was just going to mention that perhaps a diagram of the escalation process would be helpful, since I think it's not quite clear from the text.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to make a very quick...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, a quick follow up, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very quick comment. I can't really speak to the ccNSO, but the GNSO is currently constituted. I can't think of a less appropriate place to escalate a problem like that to. But again, that remains to be seen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Next we had Christopher Wilkinson, he seems to have dropped out of the queue, but Christopher, you're still on the call and you're still on the queue?

I think we might have lost Christopher Wilkinson. Okay let's have Jimmy Schultz in the meantime, and if we manage to get Christopher back, then please shout. Jimmy Schultz, you're next.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Hi. This is Jimmy Schultz. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes very well.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Great, thanks. I wasn't sure about that. So having heard that presentation, and seen all of the development over the past couple of weeks and months, I still, there is one question which really nagged me, is that all these C letter acronyms. As far as I understood it, IFR, CSC, PTI, and [inaudible], are all within the ICANN, all elected, if I understood that correctly, those groups by the same group of people...

LISE FUHR: Yeah. Sorry. The [CROSSTALK]...

JIMMY SCHULTZ: ...deriving from the same... Sorry? Am I lost?

ALAN GREENBERG: Jimmy, you're still talking but we can't hear you.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Can you still hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Jimmy, we can hear you. We can hear Jimmy, but Lise is going to answer... Okay, Lise first.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Yeah, okay, so I'll stop and she can answer my question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

LISE FUHR: I could hear your question, and as I understood, you said that it was chosen from the same kind of community. Regarding the CSC, it's supposed to be the direct customers. That's going to be the GNSO and the ccNSO communities. And actually, it's recommended that we have some that's from, out of ccNSO and out of GNSO. So it's going to be both communities that are within ICANN, and also some that are not.

So it's trying to take into account the customers that are not within the ICANN community. Regarding the IFR, this is going to be the more multistakeholder part, because that's going to be the review of how this model is actually functioning. So here, it's not the same community. And regarding the PTI Board, well, that hasn't been decided yet, but that seems to be more the ICANN structure that chooses those, that anyway, in the proposal, if it's going to be internal light weight.

I don't know if that was an answer enough.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Jimmy Schultz?

JIMMY SCHULTZ: I understand, yeah. Thank you very much. Jimmy Schultz again speaking. I understand, but I think we have to make that point more clear, that these are independent not elected all by the same people controlling each other.

LISE FUHR: Thank you. It's a very good point. We will try and make this clearer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Jimmy. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thanks for these comments, Jimmy Schultz. They of course, I forgot to mention this at the beginning of the call, but of course, there is a comment period now, and we actually have a link from our agenda, to the public comment page where we will be collecting At-Large input, and ALAC input, from everyone.

And I think that it's a very valid point that you're making here. I hope we're going to remember it, and put it in the comments so that we can actually build this into our official At-Large comment. Let's go back now to Christopher Wilkinson, if we're able to do so. Christopher, you have the floor.

And unless I'm disconnected, which it doesn't look like, it looks like, I'm not able to hear you Christopher. And your microphone doesn't appear to be plugged in or somehow working.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, it doesn't work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Any other questions, in the meantime, whilst we're trying to connect Christopher's microphone? Alan, did you want to add a few

points? I mean, we've heard the concerns from Jimmy Schultz regarding the different IFR, CSC, PTI. We've heard concerns from Tijani Ben Jemaa, the composition of the PTI Board. Are there any other concerns in the post transition structure in itself that might be raised in the, from the At-Large community?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I'll make a couple of comments on those things. Regarding Jimmy's question, I think there are some things implied in this, and some things buried in the details. The CSC will be largely named by the constituent bodies that support it. So the gTLDs will identify their two members, the ccTLDs, and so forth.

So that is, you know, it's not elected. These are selected by the groups that they are representing. The IFR is going to be a review panel, review working group, I would presume similar to other working groups in ICANN, and those are largely self-selected by the constituent bodies. Again, up until now review groups have been with, the final selection has been, you know, our parents, the Chair of the Board and the CEO and things like that, or the Chair of the GAC.

And the accountability review is suggesting that not happen in the future. The PTI Board, we don't know what it's going to look like right now. There are some people who say it should be as light weight as possible, which is typically three in a typical corporation, or other people are saying it shouldn't be as light weight. Lise said it shouldn't be multistakeholder, but on the other hand, it's not clear that

multistakeholder means one from everyone. There could be a selection.

So we don't know how light weight it's going to be. The overall proposal, I think, is a reasonable one given where we came from and where we're going. There was some strong consideration along the way to whether ICANN, the organization needed to be incorporated, or could just be a department within ICANN. It is conceivable that the corporation could lend itself, provide a little bit of protection in a bankruptcy scenario.

That's not clear, but it might. There was a strong feeling that we needed some level of independence from ICANN. I wasn't one of those people who supported that strongly, but you know, there are some people who felt that it was necessary. And the cost of that is the Board, accounting fees, you know, and a number of other related things, and legal fees that go along with having the separate structure.

They're not huge amounts, but they are substantive, and they do make the overall process somewhat more complex. The downside, or the upside, is that should there ever be a real separation from ICANN, it would be easier at that point, but I don't think that there are many people who are pushing for that scenario.

So we've ended up with a compromise. It's not what any of us would probably have designed if we, each of us had unilateral control over it. But compared to what it could have been, and what it was along the way, I think it's a reasonable compromise. Not sure what else I could say. There is still a lot of details to be fleshed out.

One of the things that I was responsible for in the proposal is looking at how to replace the NTIA. And it turns out that the NTIA does, is always thought of as, they're the group that approved the changes before they go into the root. In fact, that's probably the least important thing that they have done over the last number of years, and they have been very involved in a number of other things.

It's still not clear how to replace them in all of the things. It's one of the points that we're still working on, but it's likely to be a really crucial one, to make sure that, as we go forward, the root can evolve, and it does so in a rationale and controlled way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I believe we now have Christopher Wilkinson on the line. Christopher, can you...

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello, good evening. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can indeed. Welcome. You have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Thank you. Greetings to everybody, and many thanks to Lise and Jonathan for their chairmanship for the CWG. The day after the London marathon, I think that says it all. Look, first of all, I've come

out of this experience with a somewhat jaundiced feeling about the efficiency of multistakeholderism.

As you know, I've started the whole of the European Internet discussion on ICANN in a multistakeholder format. But on this occasion, we have had to spend an enormous amount of time and effort, and if I may say so, the co-chairs have had to spend a great deal of patience, dealing with issues initiated and argued for by a very small number of the stakeholders present.

There is a problem, I think, here with the efficiency of multistakeholderism, if in the interests of democracy, we have to discuss conference call after conference call over the positions of a very small number of participants. Of course, most of this has been about separation, and thanks mainly to Avri, we have a compromise proposal which will, no doubt, go forward.

But may I just say that, in the event that separation does occur, five years down line, I still see no safeguards against capture. If you separate IANA from the multistakeholder structure of ICANN, which is far from perfect, and I can take another time, but not tonight, to how we should respond in multistakeholder structure of ICANN. But if you separate IANA from ICANN, frankly the future Googles and Microsofts and Facebooks of this world would buy IANA for half a billion dollars.

I don't think people realize the extent to which we are dealing with an essential infrastructure service for the whole of the global communications system. And I believe that some of the people who have been arguing for separation have seen this, and want it. So if

there is, in the final outcome of this whole story, I really want to see cast iron safeguards against the capture of separate IANA.

If it's not there, I think I'm totally opposed to separation. Now I know all of the arguments have been presented about the option of separate ability being an essential form of discipline against the, so far, unidentified misdemeanors by the staff of IANA. But I think that's for the gallery.

You've got to make sure, Lise please convey this to Jonathon, you've got to make sure that there is a cast iron guarantee against capture of a separated IANA. If you can't do that legally, then please no separation, otherwise the ICANN multistakeholder structure, which has taken 15 years to construct, for better or worse, will have been a waste of time.

Olivier, thank you. I finally get on the line. I can't stay on the call for the whole discussion, but I absolutely insist that these concerns be taken fully into account. Thank you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this intervention Christopher Wilkinson. And I hand the floor over to Lise or Alan, perhaps Lise, did you have any...?

LISE FUHR: Yes...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...any reaction to this? Please Lise.

LISE FUHR: Yes. Well, thank you very much for the intervention by Christopher Wilkinson. But I must say, this is our deepest concern is actually to make it very, to ensure this against any capture. That is why this stage within ICANN, this is only a legally separation, and we're depending on the accountability measures. So it's actually, only if the multistakeholder community think that anything goes wrong with IANA, that it's being removed.

So it's not going to be something that's happening from one little group, or just by incident. It's going to have several steps and a very large resort, and also it's a multistakeholder community that needs to have tried any other possibilities, and that's well, the change of the Board, etc.

So if it's... I think we tried to do our best, very best, to build in the, there is no capture as possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Lise. Olivier speaking. I know that you have to leave at the top of the hour, it's one minute past. Can you still take one more question from Tijani Ben Jemaa? And then we'll let you go.

LISE FUHR: Yes, I can take one more question, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Lise. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. It is not a question to Lise, but to take a more, a comment on what Alan said about the CSC. He said the CSC is composed of people from the constituencies, so each constituency appointed members. He forgot to say that it will be only the constituency of the names organization. That means CNSO, GNSO only.

If the review structure will be there only for the review period, it means every 15 years, as I understood, and I find it is very long period. And I understand now that the Board will be very light, and perhaps it would be also composed of people from the naming organizations. The first transition IANA will be [inaudible], people from the naming organizations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Just to correct you quickly, it's every five years, not every 15 years. The review, every five. Two years initially, and then every five years. Lise, did you wish to comment on this or Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I will, but let Lise go first, if she wants to, so she can leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Lise first.

LISE FUHR: Yes, well, you corrected the mistake of five and not 15, so we have initial two years. Well, the IFR is going to be consisting of all communities, so yeah. I don't think I have any more to add. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Lise. Alan, did you wish to add...?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just a couple of things. At this point, it is not clear whether the other communities will contract with PTI or will contract with ICANN. So, you know, at this point they're writing their proposals saying it's ICANN, and that will still work fine, and ICANN will subcontract to PTI. It's conceivable they could choose to contract directly with PTI. It is also conceivable, at some point, that they could request, or we could discuss having Board members of the PTI Board from the other communities.

That's something that was part of the original proposal that was made, and it's clear that at this point, they don't have the interest in doing it today, but that doesn't mean that doesn't evolve in that way sometime in the future. So those are open issues, as we go forward. But yes, right now, it is ICANN which is responsible for PTI.

Now ICANN is two of the three communities, because the addressing community is represented within ICANN. So it's just the ITF that is outside of that community. And I'm presuming that if there is an interest from them, at some point in the future, there will be a mechanism for adjusting it.

LISE FUHR: Can I quickly add here Olivier, before I leave? It's Lise for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have the floor Lise.

LISE FUHR: Thank you. And it's also very important to recognize that ICANN has an additional role to increase, both have the policy and the operation. It's different from the other community. I think I said it in the beginning, we hope that we didn't have anything that is actually going to prevent the other communities from having their proposals worked into well, to use the IANA function as they suggest in their proposals. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Lise. I noted a hand up from Avri Doria. Avri, is this in response to Lise's point?

AVRI DORIA: No. Actually just one point on the [inaudible] of the IANA function review. And it was the two and the five, but I also, since no one else brought it up, wanted to mention that if the community, either the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, or [inaudible], felt that things were going wrong, there is the ability to initiate one of these reviews outside of the [fire] cycle.

And no one had mentioned that, so I wanted to make sure... I've been trying to keep my mouth shut, but that one had been left out, so I wanted to bring it in. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Avri Doria. Yeah, it's important, very important fact as well. Well I'd like to thank Lise very much for this presentation, and for making the effort to present this to the At-Large community specifically. And the call is not finished yet, because we are now going to have a look at the template for the public comment, to just briefly go through it, and see if there are any specific points that we would like to raise.

And I see hands going up and down at the moment like people are dancing the Macarena, but perhaps that's not the case. It's to do with the questions and so on being asked. So I'll go to the queue first and then perhaps we'll go to the template. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

LISE FUHR: Bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much Lise, bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Lise. And so a question for Avri. Who will trigger the review? The [inaudible] review, the review that is regular, because if there is something wrong.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Avri? Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: I wanted to make sure I wasn't jumping the line. I believe what we've got, and I'm actually looking for the precise wording, but it's initiated by the customer supporting committee, with the buy in of at least, I think it was, [inaudible] over by, I believe, is in the proposal. And that's what I'm just confirming, if it's still there. Decision to initiate is supported by super majority of both naming organizations.

So, at the moment, yeah, at the moment it is [PSE] as agreed to by the two SOs. Now, there had been an earlier proposal for other mechanisms, and if people don't think that that one is sufficient, but they should say so in a comment. But at the moment, a special review may be should, that the CSC has gone through all the processes, and it basically has gotten to the end of its rope, and has basically said we've got a problem here we can't seem to solve.

And then it takes it to the SOs. And the SOs would, as a [inaudible] of both of them, have to agree to the out of band initiation of a review. And yes, the review goes into all communities from all of the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Avri. Olivier speaking. So indeed, there are many different layers, which might ultimately lead to what one might call the nuclear option. But the number of layers here, and hurdles, that the process has to go through, to make sure not only the GNSO and ccNSO, but the whole community is okay with initiating a process, it's, there are quite a few safeguards, I guess, at least.

And I noticed that you put your hand up again. So Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. That review would not be about separation. That review would be about, how do we fix this problem? The way, I believe it's evolving, is that at the end of that review, they can say, we need to do the separation steps, and then they initiate the separation. Whether... ..continued by the IFR, or being done by a, you know, full cross community working group, and you'll see in the document there is, that's left open, whether it's done by that, would be a separate step after the review.

So the CSC and all of those things can initiate a review, can recommend the separation steps. It's kind of like, I compare it to, there is a capital trial, the defendant is guilty, and then there is another trial to decide your penalty.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Let's hope we don't get down to trials. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. But my point, my intention is to specifically to the input table. So perhaps you should see if Sébastien's point is more general.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Cheryl. Let's have Sébastien then, and we'll come back to you Cheryl. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Yeah, I wanted to just to support or say that I am concerned and agree with the question raised by both Christopher and Jimmy. I think there are very important questions, and we really need to think about both questions. The one from Jimmy, it's important because if you look at all the organizations, including the current ones, the [inaudible], the NomCom, and the one who want to create [inaudible] the same group of people who will select those people.

Then we really need to be careful that we don't look [inaudible] the number of [inaudible] selected by the same people, even if we have a slight change in some in numbers, but again, it's almost the same. And the question of possible separation from the multistakeholder organization, it's really a very important point.

I can understand that there are people from part of the community, and mainly the provider side, who wants to be able to split that from ICANN. But I think as, I think as an organization, multistakeholder organization, it's very important to be able to keep that, the multistakeholder

organization. It seems that my [inaudible] is not good, then I will stop here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Sébastien. It's Olivier speaking. Alan, did you wish to comment on this or any points?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I already said what I wanted to say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On previous interventions, okay. Thank you. So Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I just wanted to put in an early plea before we, I just think it was something that Olivier was going to say anyway, that I've jumped in ahead of him, because I like to say what he was going to say if I can. And [inaudible] plea for people to use this template.

Yes, you can of course, put in a free form comment, but I do hope that the ALAC will be specifically using this template. I know Alan certainly understands the benefits to the template method for prompts and positions, it hosts public comments work within the group. But I wanted to also just make the point that, not only should we use this template, I'm saying should we all use this template, and that is in this

case particular, calling upon, I'm calling upon, the individual members within the At-Large community, a bit like Avri but also just individuals within the ALSs, the At-Large structures themselves, and the regional At-Large organizations to also respond to public comment, as well as contribute to the wider, sorry, the more focused and integrated ALAC one.

This is one of the rare times when a public comment process is going to be very seriously scrutinized by the community, beyond ourselves. I don't mean to be, who will be looking at many, many governments, many, many interests, many, many groups will be looking at how bottom up and consensus based is the outcomes that we are putting forward.

And one of the ways to show that is for as broad as possible number of sources for public comment coming in, especially in this first public comment. I'm less concerned when we come to the end of the second phase, and we're putting together the final bit to the ICG, because by then, we should have much greater trust in the fact that we had unanimity or as near to unanimity as we can get in consensus in our world, going forward.

But right now, at this very first taste of our proposal response, I know we've had the very, very first PC, but this one is even much more modified method than we looked at originally. The more input we get and preferably by this template, the better. Now that does mean, of course, that it might be of use if a copy of the template that individual ALS or RALO was putting forward, could go through to the ALAC. So it

could be intelligently integrated into another master input, might be a good thing.

Whether you just copy that to the Wiki page, or whatever, I don't really care, but this is one of those times, and I guess it's because I'm responsible for writing the responses in the final documentation, which outlines how we, the CWG meets the five criteria that NTIA put down, and one of those criteria is, of course, checking how broad based, and opened, and engaged with our community our activities were, and it would be one way that we can prove that.

I should put my hand down now, I already have, or someone has done it for me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Cheryl. I've got Alan Greenberg in the queue, and then I was going to ask Grace Abuhamad to take us through the template, since she is very much aware of it. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First of all, to address the point Cheryl made at the beginning, yes, the ALAC does intend to use, at least the Chair of the ALAC does intend that the ALAC use the template, to the extent the template allows us to say what we want to say. We certainly are not going to be restricted by the template, but hopefully it is designed in a way that will give us a fair amount of flexibility.

So that's number one. I'm going to modify what Cheryl said, and she may choose to argue with me, but as much as we want input from a

wide variety of sources, we're also trying not to maximize the work that the review team does in analyzing it. I'm hoping that the ALAC statements, of which we believe people will contribute to, and not just come from me, or me and Cheryl and Olivier, I'm hoping we get that statement in moderately early, not on the last day.

And in that case, I hope it will be taken as useful, if people say they fully endorse the ALAC statement, if indeed that is correct, or we fully endorse it minus something or other, which may make it easier for other people to submit things, and make it easier to analyze, but to the extent that anyone's position differs from what the ALAC ends up with, then certainly, people should be submitting their own statement.

Hopefully we can make this work in a way that shows there have been large numbers of comment, without necessarily maximizing the work to analyze it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan Greenberg. Next we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then I wanted to go to Grace Abuhamad. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I do think the best is to have the maximum of comments from our community. Making a comment saying, "I support the statement or the position of ALAC," will not have the same weight as a comment, real comment. And the comment can differ from region to region, can differ from one to the other, but I think that we have to first to work together to have at least a minimum

common ground, and then each part of the community, and each person in the community, point of view should make a comment so that the voice of the end users will be well heard. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. And I note in the chat that we do need to have the comment thing as early as possible. We're going to make an overall comment that will reflect the consensus within the ALAC. We've been thinking about the template, that famous input template. Grace Abudhamad is with us on the call, and she has about five minutes to take us through that, if you may please Grace. So then we'll have an idea of how to format our responses.

GRACE ABUHAMAD: Thanks Olivier. Hi everyone. This is Grace Abuhamad for the record. I've been listening to your call and your conversation, and it's a very interesting discussion, and I'm very glad that ALAC is hosting this webinar. So my job today is just to take you through this template. It's a 13 page template, so don't be alarmed. It's essentially the same question that's repeated over and over again.

But the goal of this template was to help the community sort of focus in on giving the CWG input by section, section by section of the proposal. So you'll see the first page is, there is a general sort of information, you know, name, affiliation. And we'd like you to fill that out, of course. When you submit the comments, generally they're attached to an email address, so there is always an identification feature to someone's

comments, but if you insisted on sending them anonymously, you could put anonymous in the first name.

Then you'll see, as you go through, what we did is we focused, I'm going to scroll quickly to section one, two, and three. So you'll see sections one and two essentially remain unchanged from the first proposal. Lise addressed that earlier in her comments. So we have just one box for those two sections. I'd say if you have any comments, you know, you can submit them there.

And what we really like, is for feedback on section three. That's the biggest section of the proposal, the section that describes the most change, and that's really where the CWG is probably looking for the feedback. So in that section, we broke it down by subsections, and sort of tried to break it down a little bit more.

But really, what this whole template is, is it is format, it's a suggestion, for how the CWG would like to receive the most constructive feedback it can get. And that's really what the template is about. So we have a Word format version of the template that you can use while, to develop comments in a group when you're submitting multiple comments. You can upload it to Google Docs, or to the Wiki, or however you prefer.

And then we ask that you submit it either in PDF or Word, just so that it's easy for us to compile these comments afterwards, and help the CWG analyze what they've received. And the questions in the template, so as I mentioned earlier, it's a 13 page template, but essentially the same question over and over again. And it's really just, if you have comments, if so, provide them here per section.

You can fill out as much or as little as you would like. As I mentioned earlier again, section three is the most, I would say the most important section of the proposal, and that would be the section that the CWG would most benefit from your feedback on. However, we've also included, as you'll see further down, we've included the annexes as well as areas where you may want to provide comments.

The last question on page 13 is just a general box for any other comments, or any other issues, that you'd like to raise for the CWG to consider. And that's really if there is something that you've seen that's missing, or if you would like to bring up an issue that is broader than the proposal itself, or maybe broader than what some of the section by section feedback would allow.

So I hope that sort of responds to what Alan Greenberg was talking about earlier, whether the template can allow for feedback to be provided in the way that everyone can contribute properly to. So I think that this probably sums it up. In the chat right now, I've gone ahead and put in the email address to which you would submit the form, and it's the same as the, it's the same email address that you would submit any comments to.

I think the goal of the template in general is just to help the CWG analyze feedback as efficiently as possible. Noting that we have a very short timeframe after the end of the public comment, and the time that we have to submit to chartering organizations. So in that timeframe, the CWG has to analyze a huge amount of comments. And the last public comment received 60 submissions, and that's a high amount of feedback to incorporate and to consider for a short amount of time.

So we're expecting close to the same amount this time around, and this would help, using the template, or at least giving feedback in a sort of section by section format, would definitely help the group incorporate that feedback more efficiently. I'm available for any questions if you have any.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Grace. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Are there any questions to Grace on the template itself?

And I can unsynchronized the template so you can all go through it in your own time.

Now that said, of course, the ALAC will be developing a consensus position in addition to having our At-Large structures and members sending their comments directly. So I'm not quite sure whether, perhaps we would also ask for the copy of that template to be sent to the At-Large staff address, so that we could also be aware of the points that are being made independently, directly to the public comment process, but also for them to be used in the ALAC statement on the matter.

That's probably something to do. And obviously, we're going to take the input that we've received, some of the input that we've received, from already this discussion that we're having on the call right now. So any questions, comments? Alan, did you wish to add any additional points? I note that we have just a few minutes until the end of this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I don't think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Well, this is quite great. We're actually are all on time. I guess the three minutes here are to find out what the next steps are. So we have a public comment that's open, as we know, and there is a page which was put together for this public comment. The link is actually, I think it's just going to be magically sent over by staff or perhaps I'll beat it to them, I've beaten them, yeah.

So that's the next steps. We obviously need to reach consensus very fast, because the end of the current public comment period is in, is it 24 days or so? I don't even know the exact dates there. It's not the comment itself, 23 days. So that's not very long, and of course, we need to look at the five day route in the ALAC for any contribution to the statement. And we also need to give some time to the team to actually draft a first draft, etc.

So I turn it over to Alan Greenberg to let us know, perhaps, what his timetable is for this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much for great warning on that. If you go to the comment page, you'll see I added a bit of a heading in bold, large font red saying, "Please make your comments." I know I plan to, and I've asked a number of other people to go through the report and identify things that concern you, things that you believe we may want to comment on, and that's what the comment is going to be based on.

So to the extent that people have done their homework and let us know, we'll try to make sure that the statement is representative. That doesn't mean everyone's comment is going to be included. Presumably, we'll have something that one person feels and the other people disagree with. As you've seen on this call, not all of us who are participating in the process agree on everything. And that's healthy.

But we're going to try to come up with an assimilated statement that the ALAC and At-Large will stand behind. I think that we have to have that done within two weeks, so we don't have a lot of time. So I'm looking for comments in the next seven days or so, not more than that, and then we'll try to pull things together to the extent that the common comment does not reflect what you may personally feel, or what I may personally feel, then that's, we'll have the opportunity of people putting in independent comments in addition to that.

That's how I see this going. To the extent that it will work, depends on how much people really contribute. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Next we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, as we reach the half hour mark. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier and Alan. Thank you for this program. I agree with you. But I would propose, if you don't mind, to have a call, an ALAC call next week to reach the minimum common ground on this report, so that our comments, all At-Large comments will be at least in this

framework, in the minimum common ground reached in the call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Olivier speaking. Alan, would you take that into consideration perhaps follow up after the call?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. I'm not 100% sure it's going to be necessary, depending on how many people actually comment. And I think our comment to the extent that the community is divided, can you know, suggest that in our response. So I'm not sure that we need unanimity on everything, but I have no problems scheduling a call a little over a week from now, if people think that there will be enough input that we can actually discuss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And we now have reached the end of this call. And before closing, I would like to thank our Spanish interpreters, Veronica and David, and our French interpreters, Isabelle and Claire. It's been a very informative session, so thanks to all of you, and thanks to our staff, especially Grace Abuhamad who has taken some more time, some more of her time to come and speak to us as well.

And also to Gisella, who has done absolute wonders in preparing this webinar. So thanks to all of you. And thanks to the participants in the

call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night.
This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]