TERRI AGNEW:	…On IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability call taking place on Monday, 4th of May 2015 at 13:00 UTC. On the English channel we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yasuichi Kitamura, Alan Greenburg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Avri Doria, Leon Sanchez and Sébastian Bachollet. On the Spanish channel we'll have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto.
	I show apologies from Jimmy Schulz and Seun Ojedeji. From staff we'll have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina. I would also like to remind all participants to please state your names 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. Fatima has Skyped me that she's trying to get into the AC but is still waiting. If you could please follow up with her that would be great. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? Seeing no hands up, the roll call is complete. Today we have some work in the CWG IANA, and we'll have a quick update on the CCWG Accountability, bearing in mind we had a number of webinars last week and there will be a number of webinars taking place this week as well.
	The public comment period is ongoing; closing in about 20 or so days' time. We'll probably have to be working on this today, and we'll also be able to work on it next week. Are there any other amendments to the

Agenda? Seeing no hands, the Agenda is adopted. Thank you very much.

Now we will go to Agenda Item #2. That's the Action Items. There is one outstanding Action Item, and that's for Alan Greenberg, on behalf of the ALAC, to send a note to Co Chairs and staff in support, to ask that the CWG IANA webinars this week be interpreted in the five UN languages. Alan? Is this complete?

ALAN GREENBERG: Unfortunately it isn't, but it will be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. If you drop a note we'll be able to fix that box. All the other AIs are complete.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was CWG, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was for the CWG IANA webinars.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Two of them are passed, but maybe we can try and have something for the next two CWG webinars. The likelihood of this happening is very slim but at least we'd have it on record that we've asked for it, and we can then complain afterwards. Thank you. I did note that there was an announcement that the webinars were not going to be interpreted, but the transcripts were going to be translated and distributed afterwards.

I haven't checked now, a few days later, whether the transcripts are available in other languages. Perhaps we could have an AI to ask staff or someone to make sure the transcripts are indeed translated and available in other languages. That's the transcript of the webinars that ICANN, that the CWG IANA, have held last week. Thank you.

Let's move onto Agenda Item #3 and review of the IANA Coordination Group. We have Jean-Jacques Subrenat on the line. Can you provide us with a quick update of any progress or anything that's happened on the ICG?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Yes, the only thing that's come out is dated May 1st, and from the ICG there is a short paper about how the ICG will be handling input or comments from the community, because there were some questions, and some uncertainly about that. The ICG decided to put that out. I've included this in the chat with the link to that short paper, under the heading "ICG handle community comments". I'm afraid that's all I have to report at this stage, in addition to all the many things that have come up in the webinars and elsewhere. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Any other comments on this? I don't see any comments. Let's move on. I guess we'll be waiting for more developments in the ICG and we can now move to the CWG IANA. I've just noted a note from Terri letting me know there's a problem with one of the links on there - the Sidley update legal structure; the link going back to the input template. I'll need to amend this shortly. Let's go through the first part.

As far as the timeline is concerned we had two webinars last week. There are two more now that will be held this week - one on the 6th of May and one on the 7th of May. I note that Jean-Jacques has his hand up again? We are unable to hear you now. No? That doesn't work. Jean-Jacques is now typing. In the meantime, let's go through our Agenda. As I mentioned, we had two webinars last week.

There are two webinars coming up this week. One will take place on Wednesday, May 6th, and one on the 7th of May. If you want to attend either, send an email to Brenda [Brewer]. The purpose of these webinars is two-fold. On the one hand, spend more time on the actual contents of the proposal. The initial webinars last week did not focus perhaps enough time on the content of the proposal itself. But also since it's now been a week since the content has been available for everyone to read, it's to give another chance to the community to be able to ask questions on the content of the proposal itself.

I open the floor now to whether there's any feedback, concerns or questions on the first webinars last week, and also any suggestions regarding the forthcoming webinars? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Okay, that's the webinars, as far as they're concerned. The

next thing is the different parts of the draft proposal. As you know, a public comment is open. There's a page on the public comment policy development pages of At-Large, which at the moment stands blank. The first question is whether we'll be submitting a statement of some sort.

Secondly, how are we going to draft it? I can volunteer to be one of the penholders, but I don't want to be the only penholder in this. I hope others will stand forward and we can coordinate and have a small Drafting Team to collate and collect all of the information or points that are community is bringing forward. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the only way we can do this is have people contribute in some usable form, identifying what their concerns are and, if possible, what they'd like to have as the results. Ones that seem to have a common thread or are likely supportable, we put them into our draft document. I'm willing to take part in that process. You'll see my comments, which will probably be moderately extensive, hopefully by the end of tomorrow.

I've blocked out the day with as few meetings as possible to allow me to do that. I'd suggest others do the same and don't all wait for the other person to do it. I can certainly identify half a dozen, as can you, of the specific issues that are going to be topics of discussion. There's going to be a generic one of multistakeholder components on this - that we can decide one-by-one on each component of this overall new IANA

operation not being multistakeholder, but we can't accept all of them being like that.

There has to be meaningful multistakeholder input into the process and involvement into the process. So that's an overriding one that can be solved in a number of different ways. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Alan said more or less what I wanted to say. First you ask the first question: shall we have a statement? Yes, we'll have a statement. This is very important. Secondly, how will we draft it? I think that everyone has to put their issues or concerns on the Wiki so that your text or your draft will reflect all those concerns, and if at the end you need someone to help - this is another thing, but I think that the most important thing is the data, the information - this can come from the community through the Wiki page. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have two points here. I'd like first that we try as much as possible to reach out to our RALOs and ALSes and Members of the ALSes. I know it's very tough and a complicated topic, but if we don't

get for this topic and for the CCWG, the input from our Members, we are missing one of our main missions here. My second point is that we need to take into account what was already said in different meetings we already had with the community or with some Members.

For example, what Christopher Wilkinson inputted last week. Maybe we can ask staff to put together all the inputs about this topic that we've already had in At-Large. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastian. We have now on the AC the actual Wiki page. That's there. The way we've usually done it is to have the comments at the bottom of the page from various people who are taking part in the process and bringing forward their comments. I take note of what Sébastian has mentioned about taking Christopher Wilkinson's points and adding them to this page.

I take also the point of Tijani and Alan that this needs to be an open process. I know we've already sent to our mailing list a request for commenting for our community, but there doesn't seem to have been much response. I guess the onus really comes on us to start putting a few provocative comments in there and start a discussion both on the mailing list and also on the Wiki. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I have a problem. If we ask people to deliberately put things on the Wiki and they just ignore it, there's only some level of spoon-feeding we can do. If someone says, "I cannot access the Wiki

for one reason or another. Can someone please post this there?" I have no problem acting on their behalf. But - and I'm not talking particularly about the ones that Sébastian mentioned - the concept of taking every email that might be on the subject - and presuming it is something we should be putting in there - I have a problem with that.

I think it ends up getting rather polluted, and it makes it much harder for the people who are trying to draw things together to actually come up with their ideas - not come up with their ideas, but bring them together into a unified statement. I'll point out that whoever's doing the drafting - and I volunteered to do a significant part of it - there is going to have to be judgment calls made along the way. We can't have a statement that says everything that anyone possibly says. They're invariably going to be at conflict with each other. We need to have a coherent statement if we expect to be listened to at all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. I completely agree with you, and obviously we have to run this in the same way we've run other public comments, but I'm concerned as time is ticking. The closing date for this public comment is in 20 days' time. I think it's the 24th, so it's coming very fast and we need to push then for the discussion both on the list and on the Wiki. Then whenever there's something of note on the list, either of us can put it to the Wiki, or effectively ask the person on the Wiki to add it to the Wiki. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Alan, I get your point, and maybe rather than taking notes on what everyone's already said, maybe we can send a mail saying that all the things that were already said during any mail or webinar will not be taken into account and we'd like them to write on the Wiki directly. I'm sure that people like the one I talked about, Christopher Wilkinson, will be willing to write something, and maybe others.

The second point I feel is more problematic is you want the statement everyone agrees on. I hope that will be possible, but what I hope is that different points of view could be taken into account, even if it's not the majority view. It's also important to at least gather all the points of view and then have this answer from At-Large, which will as much as possible take all those inputs into account. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastian for this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier.   I hear you and I understand what you've said about the contribution and the time is ticking. One of the methods to provoke the discussion for input is to prepare a draft and propose it so that people can comment on the draft and give input. It's one way to make people react swiftly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. Do I hear that you're volunteering to write the first draft?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You said you had volunteered for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I volunteer. Okay. Fine. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, I did already volunteer, in concert I presume with one or two other people. Regarding what Sébastian said, I think I made it clear on our webinar that people have multiple modes of input into the process. They can input into what goes into our statement. They can support our statement with a contribution themselves to the public comment afterwards, and they can put in their own statement if they choose, which either repeats what we say or differs from what we say. I feel strongly about this and I'm willing to have a debate about this right now.

I think if our report says there are some people in At-Large who think X and there are some who think Y, and there are some who think Z, and they're all at odds with each other, I think that makes for a rather poor statement. To say we're silent on this because we're not - we may say we're silent because there are differences in At-Large, and we'll let the people state their own position - that's fine.

If I have a position that's not part of the unified view, I will state that myself and I'll do that forcefully in my own comment. But I think an At-Large and ALAC statement has to say something that comes from the group as a whole, and not some total of diverse positions that are glued

together. Maybe that's something we do need to have that debate about here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Any response to Alan's points here? Fatima, you're next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Olivier. I think that maybe we are digressing a little from the main topic, but Alan's comments are really important. This is what happened many times in LACRALO. We had differing viewpoints in LACRALO, and our viewpoints were different from the rest of At-Large's viewpoint, and we couldn't contribute.

In some cases, LACRALO presented a separate comment or separate statement because LACRALO's viewpoint was contrary to what At-Large or ALAC was contributing. I believe it's more tidy to work along the lines of what Alan suggested, because if we just compile differing opinions then we're just showing that we have opinions that contradict one another, and this is, in a way, a mirror of what happens in LACRALO. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Fatima. That's helpful. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As I just said in the chat, that doesn't mean there may not be a specific area where we are divided among clear lines and we present both those alternatives - that could easily happen. But I don't think the statement we make can just be a compilation of some total of all the inputs. I think it needs to be coherent, I think it needs to catch people's eyes, and more importantly, there are some things that we're going to say that are exceedingly important, and some things that, to be honest, I can live with not getting my way.

Although we need to say all those things, we need to make it clear which are the really important ones to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani? Tijani's line has dropped. Let's move on then. We've been discussing the different issues. Let's look at the first thing - the input template that's been provided to the communities for input, to see the kind of questions we have in there and how we're going to target our input on this. The first question, I gather, is are we going to respond to the questions in the input template, or to a subset of those questions?   Or are we going to be putting together a statement that does not follow the input template? Simple A or B answer. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please use the input template. It will make such a difference. Yes, it's somewhat repetitious. Yes, it looks a little bit sometimes like you're answering the same thing in a slightly different way. But it will facilitate the aggregation and responses and reactions much, much more easily than if it comes to us in a freeform way. We've made fairly certain - and

I think you'll be relatively satisfied - to have plenty of freeform text opportunities in each of those separate sections in terms of general comments. So I'm metaphorically down on bended knee saying, "Please, use the input template!" Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. My follow up question or suggestion, because I think we might not have enough time today to do this, is to perhaps wait and first ask for input from our community, and during one of our future calls, either next week or the week after, we'll then work together and see where can slot in that text in the input template. If anybody has anything else to add to the input on the input template, how does that slide? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Look, I think that works quite well, and the other thing is we can be pushing this template out to the ALSes and indeed the regional groups as well, and say, "Please fill this in and send it back to us." We can use it in two ways. We can use templates from our ALSes or individual Members by either suggesting that they do this and send it in directly, or send it into us to assist us in aggregating our regional and/or ALAC views. So yes is the answer there. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. That's a good point. Before taking a decision on this, let me just turn to Tijani who dropped a bit earlier. I know we've moved

onto the input template, but Tijani did have a number of points he wanted to make. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Coming back to what Alan said about we may have, for some points, one point of view and the community point of view also in the statement, I would not agree with that, because this will not give any resolve. Our statement is to give a point of view to the public comment, and if we give two points of view the people who are commenting take into account our point of view, because we are not united. So it's not the point of view of ALAC, [unclear 00:28:10] of ALAC. This is the first point.

The second point is shall we use the template or make a general statement? I think we have to do both. First of all, I encourage everyone to fill in the template and submit it to the Wiki or to staff who can compile them and give them to the penholders. Secondly, I think that ALAC should give a general statement in which all the questions asked in the template should be answered, and not only those questions. We have to put in the statement everything we want to raise for this consultation. This is my point of view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I think we have agreement then on the use of the template here. Alan mentioned sending it to the RALOs, for the RALOs to ask their ALSes to fill it out. That would certainly help. Alan, you have the floor for a fuller response.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two things. With regard to conflicting positions within the paper, I agree that we do not want to have conflicting things in our formal statement. That doesn't mean we can't have alternatives. There are a number of cases, for instance, where people could have two very different positions, both of which are likely acceptable to ALAC. Remember, one of our purposes of the ALAC statement is to identify clearly the areas that, "if you do not change this or fix this", the ALAC is likely to reject this report, as one of the chartering bodies.

That doesn't mean there's a single answer that's acceptable, but identifying that there's a problem, and there may be multiple answers, I think is one of the very important things we must put in this report - even if we don't have unanimity on how to solve the problem. We may well have unanimity on a set of tools that might be acceptable - less so perhaps than others, but nevertheless acceptable.

In terms of using the template in freeform, you will recall this template concept is semi-new in ICANN. We've used it a number of times; sometimes quite unsuccessfully and at least once successfully. The once is on the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group. You'll recall the ALAC said - on my suggestion, and I take full responsibility - that we should submit a pure statement, not use the template. Retroactively I went back and realized we could have used the template.

There were opportunities to say everything we wanted to say and some extra things. We submitted a template that contained essentially the same information. Before we reject the template concept, let's make

sure there are things that we cannot say any other way. It does significantly improve the ability of staff to consolidate the information and have the Working Group review it after the fact. Yes, there may well be things we can't say, but let's find that out for sure before we make that decision. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I think we are in agreement on this. We'll have an AI to send that template to the RALO lists asking for ALSes to contribute on this and for ALSes to return the template to staff, so that we actually get the input. I'm not quite sure how we're going to collate all the information that we get through the template, but at the same time I'm not expecting 150 ALSes to be following the process so closely that they'll come back with templates that will be filled in.

We will get a subset of ALSes that will write in their points, and at that point, if we put a deadline of maybe the next ten days or so, that will give us some time in the Working Group to analyze the inputs we get from our ALSes. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It just struck me as you were saying that, Olivier - and I agree with everything you've just said, for once - that we probably, when sending it to the regional lists and asking the ALSes to respond, should say that any or all that can be filled out. I really don't mind if they only do a section or two sections. All contributions will be valuable in this process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. The only thing I would say though is that we're going to have to do something about the preamble on the template. Having seen this in the past it actually says on the template, "Send your comments to…" and it actually gives the public comment address. That's not what we want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What we can say is, "Of course, you are free to send it directly to… But to aid in the aggregated voices from our community, to become part of the ALAC statement, please send it back to…" and then the email address of us, or you, or something. We can't stop them, and indeed I don't have a problem if they send it directly, but we also need to have that information brought in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. So, since we have a copy of the actual Word document, could I ask also that .doc documents are to be amended accordingly so as to not have, as far as the information is concerned in the preamble, for it to point over to our process as well? Then we'll produce a .pdf after this. I think that's probably the way we can do that. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just out of curiosity, is the template available in other languages?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At this stage I don't believe it is, but I did think it was going to be.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, you might want to check when you're interacting with the Co Chairs.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm in the process of doing that, which is why I was asking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. From history or track record, I think the translated documents usually come available about five days before the end of the public comment period. In fact, I think in the past some of the translated documents came after the end of the public comment period. You might wish to put some pressure that they actually arrived before rather than after.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, that's in the good tradition of ICANN where travel documents come after the meeting is held.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Helpful! Great. Thank you Alan. That's to do with the template. I think we have an AI that works together… Is it Terri who takes it? Are you okay with the AI as it is?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. I believe it's going to be for Ariel and myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much for this Terri. Let's move on then. That's the first thing - the means of input. The second thing then is the actual potential issues. There has been some discussion already on this call about what we do if we have various points of view that don't agree with each other. Well, if you look on the Agenda page, there are three issues which I've heard so far, that we have pointed out here.

One is the issue of jurisdiction, and you've seen the email on the mailing list about this. I haven't seen any follow up so far on this, but I guess this was a holiday weekend, so let's see if we have any discussion on that. These are not issues as such, but these are documents that have arrived more recently. There's a document by Avri Doria on the separability process, and that's something we might wish to look at and comment on.

There's a link there to a Google Doc where the information about the separability process is proposed. Then there is the third question - the multistakeholder aspect. Here there's a concern regarding the PTI Board. AS you know, the PTI Board has not yet been decided on. There's a link in the Agenda to the latest advice from Sidley, the law

firm, that provide details of the PTI Board duties and its cost and subsidiary costs.

Subsidiary costs are one thing, but the PTI Board duties were something that the wider CWG Group started working on saying, "Well, we cannot define who will be on that Board until we actually define the Board duties." That's one more document. Finally, there's also an update from Sidley in the links to the Agenda. If you've downloaded the Agenda before the call, please reload that Wiki page because the link was not correct. The Sidley update legal structure PTI Board, Customer Standing Committee, IANA Functions Review.

These three now I updated at the beginning of this call, so there's a third document there for our use. Let's see which way we're going to move forward. We have a view of this legal summary on the AC. Alan, you have the floor?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I'll take credit or blame for moving the discussion from the composition of the PTI Board to what it is they're going to be doing, because I was the one who interjected into the discussion, "We need three people… We need two people… We need 17 people," with the question of what they're going to be doing. At that point we were being presented with a conflicting statement. We want PTI to be completely independent of ICANN - one of the reasons we formed PTI - but we want a minimalist Board that does absolutely nothing.

Well, you can't have both together. Either the Board is responsible or the Board acts as a marionette with the strings being pulled from

somewhere else, and that only other place is ICANN, or parts of ICANN. So yes, we have had to go back, and that has delayed things significantly. Hopefully we can now move forwards with some level of coherence and sanity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　Thank you very much for this Alan. What do you propose we do then? Should we have a look at the latest legal summary from Sidley on this? Or should we concentrate by looking at the other document from Sidley, the Sidley PTI Board Duties?

ALAN GREENBERG:　Not having read either of them, I can't speak. Certainly the duties is I think a prerequisite for making any other decisions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　Okay, let's start with the duties then. Terri, could we please swap what's in the AC with the PTI Board Duties? Whilst this loads, a quick reminder: the actual comment period closes on May 20th, so we do have 16 days to finish this. 16 days less the five-day ALAC vote gives us ten days to draft a comment. We have now the memorandum from Sidley on the PTI Board Duties. We'll be reading through this, not of course line-by-line, but effectively the few points that have been made by Sidley here.

First, as far as the roles and duties of the PTI Board is concerned, there are all of the roles of a Board of Director if PTI is a Californian non-profit corporation. That provides in-depth details, which might not really be

that important for us. I think originally the idea was to have a very lightweight Board reading this when PTI, if PTI is a Californian non-profit corporation, it starts becoming a bit more important, and so less lightweight than before.

We have a Board of Directors that are responsible for managing and directing the corporate power and affairs and activities of the non-profit corporation, in compliance with its articles of incorporation and bylaws. I think that's one question mark I saw, as in the corporate power and affairs and activities. It looks like the Board of Directors themselves will have the ultimate responsibility as far as that is concerned as far as if it was a non-profit corporation.

You have all of the usual fiduciary duties of a board of a non-profit Californian corporation: record-keeping, annual report and financial statements, election of officers, adoption of an annual budget, action member requests for inspection of records, designation of corporate depository and authorized signatories… These are things we cannot bypass, because they ultimately are the law, so they do need to be there.

Then you have the alternative, which is PTI as a Delaware limited liability corporation. That's Plan B. A much lighter structure. I've noted that Jean-Jacques has put his hand up, but let me finish quickly on this. A limited liability company, not corporation. That would be registered in Delaware, and that's' an LLC for short. Much lighter. There's a high level of flexibility under Delaware Law to change the responsibilities of the managers or directors of the organization, but there might also be some setbacks on this that are touched on elsewhere. But as far as the

legal side is concerned, it's much lighter. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Yes, this is something I've been calling for for a long time - it's that we should, at least as At-Large and ALAC, be more militant about this than other parts of the Internet, which is to keep open the option of something more truly international or global. I suppose that in the early stages of the CWG and CCWG there were people elbowing their way in such a way that the possibility of a [unclear 00:46:28] jurisdiction, in addition to California Law would be dropped or made to appear not operational or unwieldy.

It's very striking that either Sidley did not consider, or was not asked to consider, another more international option.   Delaware Law is interesting in the sense that Delaware status allows companies to have something akin to, say, Channel Islands. It's a softer version, but it remains, of course, under US jurisdiction and ultimately under the control of the US administration, whenever there is to be an interpretation of the law and application of sanctions, et cetera.

So my question is why was that dropped? Why was the international dimension, possibility of having say a PTI Board incorporated somewhere else - say in Geneva - dropped, or not brought up? My second question is although it seems a bit late, wouldn't it be appropriate for the ALAC to reintroduce this motion into the whole debate? Because if ALAC doesn't do that, no one else will. It's certainly not the vendors of domain names, who are making a fortune out of

domain names, who'll even think about it. Because most of them are located in the US in any case. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. Let's put the question on the side. I think Tijani put his hand up before you asked this question. Let's hear Tijani, and then I hope there will be answers to your question on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Whatever the jurisdiction is and whatever the kind of structure it is, the PTI couldn't have a [lightboard 00:48:53] for me. It is separated from ICANN, and people who are pushing to have something very light for the Board of PTI, they are trying to make the PTI not multistakeholder. For me, the Board of the PTI should be multistakeholder, and should be a real board with all the priorities of a board. The question of jurisdiction is another question. I responded to Olivier's mail and said I agree with him, but I find that it's not the only concern I have with this proposal. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. Let's go to Sébastian.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier. We seem to answer the discussion in saying that the proposal is to have a separate organization to take into account IANA. I know you and the community worked very hard on that, but I still think it's not a good way to go. We have an organization, this organization is

ICANN, and we can [under 00:50:20] the IANA function without having a new organization. If we are going to have a new organization, please, I really think that anything outside of California, if it's [to say 00:50:48] to US, will be a wrong idea.

Why not go to Las Vegas to do the auction for the new gTLD? If we go to Delaware? Delaware will bring a very badly made organization if we go there. Once again, if we need to have a new organization, yes, why don't we look at the broader picture? There are other places in this world where this organization could be incorporated or organized with different jurisdictions and a different way of working. Our organization is ICANN. ICANN is a multistakeholder organization. I really think that we need to try and keep as much as possible, everything within this multistakeholder organization and not to reinvent a new organization outside, or us outside of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastian. Let me just come back on the point you've made here. You think everything should be kept within ICANN as much as possible. Are you saying that even if post-transition IANA is a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you for the question Olivier. I think that what you are saying, if it's a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN, I don't know why we have to answer all those questions about the composition of the Board, of the place of incorporation, the duty of the Board, and so on and so forth. If we really think that it's a solution, then the solution must be a light

solution, keeping in mind that what's important is that ICANN is the multistakeholder organization for our purpose. I think that it's [settled 00:53:21] because we want one day, possibly, maybe, to be able to cut the line between what we call PTI and the rest of ICANN.

If we have this to take into account, maybe it's not the right time to do that. We can do that when we face a problem. The goal is not to have this problem at all, and we want to have the [unclear 00:53:49] and even other things to take our [unclear] with us. I don't think it's a good idea, but that's my point of view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next is Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. I'd like to come back to Sébastian's point. I'm not suggesting that ICANN or IANA or PTI operations should or indeed can be located elsewhere than in the US and therefore under Californian Law. I'm talking about the oversight bodies - on the one hand, PTI Board, and on the other hand CSC. I was suggesting in the email, which Olivier kindly forwarded on the ALAC lists, that it is the oversight function that should be, as a recognition of many calls over the years for a more international nature about this, that the oversight function should and could in fact be located elsewhere than in the US.

That would be, I think, very cost-free for the US Government, because it would not lose control over the operations, and yet it would recognize, in a way, the international call for a more global aspect to Internet

management by accepting that, for instance, the Board would be working out of, or simply have a mailbox in another place, in another jurisdiction than California, for instance in Geneva. By the way, I'm not pushing for Geneva out of the blue.

A few years ago in ICANN there was a study called "Improving Constitutional Confidence" and one of the propositions was to look at other jurisdictions. It was a very thorough study, and the recognitions coming out of that out of all the 15 or 20 places around the world that had been studied - one in Africa, Hong Kong, London, all sorts of places, Geneva was by far the most suitable for this kind of venture. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've heard a number of comments here and I guess I have to weigh in a little bit. This is my personal position, not as Chair of the ALAC. I was a bit confused about the concept of if PTI is a Delaware corporation we lose all credibility. I'm not quite sure I understand that one. Perhaps the vast majority of big companies and many small companies in the US are Delaware corporations because of the fact that Delaware Law makes life particularly easy to do a lot of things. I do question that one.

The concept that IANA stays in the US but its Board or its oversight operation is outside, I think essentially moves the operation logically

outside, so I don't think we can pretend that that would suddenly be more acceptable than moving the whole operation outside. If the entity that controls it is working under rules that are outside of US jurisdiction then for all intents and purposes, what the organization does is outside of US jurisdiction, at long as it doesn't violate real laws, which I don't think IANA is in a position to do.

Maybe I'm just blind and US-centric - and people have rarely accused me of being US-centric. If we want to insist on jurisdictional issues right now, I think we're saying this doesn't happen. It's as simple as that. I've made the comment in a number of different forums. I have better things to do with my life than to put all of this amount of time into it, as I have and many of you have, to do it on a matter of principle.

If we're going to make a statement of principle, let's do it quickly and get out of the game, because I'm losing personal life, I'm losing money on a lot of things, because of the time I'm focusing on this. I want to see an end to it that's useful and effective. I tend to agree with some of the statements made, that perhaps we don't need a separate company for IANA - let's keep it within ICANN. The community is not moving that way, and I think we're pushing against the tide if we try and go back there, although I would support it myself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Next is Sébastian.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Sorry Alan, but we are all losing time and money, and I hope that we will find a solution, but it's not because the rest of the community is going in that direction. There are things that even if the community is doing the wrong things, we as the voice need to go in the right direction. Really, if we have to reorganize a new Board with all the multistakeholder duties and responsibilities of the current Board of ICANN, then let's fix the current Board of ICANN and give them the responsibility of the IANA function. It's as simple as that.

I understand that maybe some parts of the community want to do something very different, and it's where [unclear 01:00:29] is going on, but it's not because the majority is going in that direction that we can't express the voice of the end user. I really think it's a really important matter where we need to have this in-depth discussion with as many as possible members of our end user community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. We are in an interesting discussion here. If I can just slot myself in the queue quickly, I have heard various points being made in communities outside of ICANN, having acted on indirect information and saying, "Well, they would definitely not support a future IANA if it was integrated within ICANN, and therefore if ICANN ended up performing those functions in perpetuity." But then there have been other points of view echoed elsewhere. So it's interesting how we are somehow divided on this. I see a queue. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear, I'm not against wasting my time fighting against windmills if I think the windmill must be toppled. You've seen me do that with some strength already on the Contract Co concept on the CWG. You're going to see it again real soon on the CCWG and unincorporated associations. So yes, fighting against really, really stupid things I think is important, if I think those stupid things have a chance of being put into effect if someone doesn't fight against them. On the other hand, not every battle is worth fighting. Each of us has to pick our own battles and decide which ones are worth it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Sébastian, the proposal is for an [obsolete 01:02:53] separate from ICANN, and it is the middle way, because there were two opposite positions, and at the end they tried to convert to a middle way solution, and I think they found it. If we now try to come back to a completely integrated thing, it won't work at all. Let's not spend time on it, because it's the CWG proposal now and we have to work on this proposal.

When we say the Board of the PTI, we have to work on it because it's not yet defined, and we may speak about it. We may oppose to the solution given by the CWG, but I see that our participants, our Members in the CWG, are accepting this middle way solution, and I think there is an Arab saying that if you want to be heard you have to act for something that is achievable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I get your point Tijani, but be careful - we accept something, but we don't know… We accept the PTI, and then we don't know what will be the Board, at the end the Board will not fit out needs, and we'll have a PTI we disagree with and we'll not be able to come back to the real solution, which is an integrated one, from my point of view. I understand that you spent time trying to find a compromise, but this compromise, from my point of view, is not the right way. I've said that since the beginning of the work in the CCWG.

I'm not participating in the CWG, but in the CCWG, a lot of things we are trying to put is something because we do not trust the Board. I understand that part of the community don't trust the Board, but let's fix the Board and not reinvent or invent new tools to try to have something outside of the Board control the Board. That's the same situation for this. If people outside of ICANN want something different, I'm sorry, but I really think that ICANN was created to be a multistakeholder organization and to take care of the unique identifier.

If we are not taking care of the unique identifier while ICANN is in existence, then we may lose everything - the baby and the water in the bath - and we will be out for everything, because it will be DNA who will take the lead for that, and for the domain names, for the gTLDs, and we will be outside of the game. Just be careful with all that. It's really, really important to see. We are talking about a stress test, but let's

stress test for our needs, all of that, and we will see that it will be shocking at the end, unfortunately. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Sébastian. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Look, we have an ultimate ace, so to speak, in that we have to approve the Final Report. I have no allusions that what we're going to get is what I would view as perfection. Certainly what I personally am looking for is something I believe is implementable, is sustainable, and will not clearly be prone to going down wrong paths. It's not likely to be my optimal view, it's not likely to be our optimal view. I think that's the whole concept of multistakeholderism and compromise - to try to find some middle path that does the job and can be effective. Maybe I'm naïve. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. I realize we were not going to spend so much time on this, but we are already past the halfway mark on this call. We're about 20 minutes from the end of the call and we haven't touched on the accountability process yet. Could I ask Alan and Leon how much time they will need to take us through the accountability update? Then we can work out how much time we'll have on this, if any.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon is sick and can't really speak. I cannot speak to the current documents because I haven't read them. I can speak to some of my philosophical points on what's going on. I'm not sure if there's anyone else who can speak on behalf of Leon on the actual current documents. Avri may have read them more than I have, or you may have. I haven't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: How much time would you think is needed for this? 10, 15, 20 minutes?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can say what I'm going to say in three minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So if no one objects… Hello Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Hello, how are you? I'm sorry for the bad voice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm obviously better than you are. I hope you're improving, or you're going to improve. How much time would you need for the accountability part? Just so that we can see if we can have a little more time on the discussion we're currently having?

LEON SANCHEZ: Out of the three minutes Alan could take, I'd say a five-minute update just to go through the current state of the document and highlight some

points that are still of concern and discussion. I think other than that, that would be it, considering the state of my voice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Much appreciated Leon. What we'll do, we'll have another eight or ten minutes on the CWG IANA with the current discussion, and then we'll move onto the accountability part. Continuing on this discussion, if I could ask you to look at the second Sidley document. That's the one entitled "Sidley update legal structure, PTI Board, Customer Standing Committee and IANA function review".

The reason is because I think at the moment we've reached a kind of standstill on the discussion of whether we want a PTI post-transition IANA as a separate organization - I've heard that some want it to be a separate organization, and some do not want it to be a separate organization and want to keep the post-transition IANA, all of the functions, directly within ICANN.

Then we have that second thing from those who agree with a PTI being a separate organization, the issue of jurisdiction - whether it should be an organization within the US, either as an LLC, or a not-for-profit organization, or whether it should be somewhere else in the world, in another jurisdiction. I haven't seen, so far, consensus on this point, although I think the discussion is very important. I hope we'll be able to capture this later on in our work.

Next is the legal structure. I have heard some suggestions from Jean-Jacques that perhaps the PTI would not be the only organization that would have a legal structure. There was some suggestion that the

oversight part should be internationalized, or globalized in one way or another. Of course, the direct oversight of the function is performed by the CSC, and the review function is also another committee. They are not currently designed as being actual organizations as such. If you look at that document with the legal summary, it mentioned the PTI being organized as a Californian not-for-profit, a benefit corporation, or a LLC.

But then it also mentions here the proposed structure contemplates a Customer Standing Committee that would be an independently organized group of customer representatives, but it would not need to be a legal entity, as such. I've heard Jean-Jacques suggest, unless I'm mistaken, that this could be made an organization that would be outside or would be in another jurisdiction. Currently, as you know, the CSC has been decided by the CWG as being primarily made up of the direct customers of IANA.

Then there's also the IANA function review. The proposed structure contemplates a Multistakeholder Review Team that would exercise a periodic IANA function review of the performance of PTI, as the IANA functions operator. That again is not a legal entity, and the IFR would be convened periodically. So there still a number of question marks on this. Obviously, if it's not a legal entity, there's not going to be an element of formal globalization.

That said, it may well be, since there is here the M word, the "Multistakeholder Review Team" part, there is certainly some push from Sidley or suggestion from Sidley that this would be multistakeholder in nature, and therefore could be globalized. I think

I've gone through this little part of the document that's of interest. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think on some of these crucial questions we need clarity from people making statements whether this is something that they want to see, or something that they'd strongly recommend the ALAC reject if they don't see. There's a big difference between those two and I think we need a bit of clarity on it. With regard to the CSC or various other bodies being incorporated separately in other jurisdictions, this is starting to sound amazingly close to Contract Co at this point, and I for one am not going down that path again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I misheard your last sentence. The functions review, the IANA function review sounds like Contract Co, or the PTI?

ALAN GREENBERG: If we start having multiple incorporated bodies that have to interact with each other, it's starting to sound amazingly like Contract Co.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. You're putting a point against incorporating the CSC or incorporating the IANA review function?

ALAN GREENBERG: I put an awful lot of blood, sweat and tears into helping kill that, in this last incorporation. I'm not going to be advocating doing it again in a different form. That's my personal position. Everyone can go on ahead without me, but that's my position.

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I think that the CSC should remain an operational structure, not to decide on everything of the PTI. It is only looking after the operational issues and trying to serve them as they happen. This is the mission of this structure, and trying to give it a legal structure or something like this, I don't like this at all. I don't want it to become the governing body of the PTI. The PTI should be governed in a multistakeholder way, and the CSC is absolutely registrars/registries. I will not be happy with, and I will not accept having the naming function or IANA as a whole under the control and under the governance of one single stakeholder.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. I've scrolled back. If you look on page two of the document that's currently on the screen - and I don't know whether that's currently synchronized or not - there is a chapter here, a point, in the middle paragraph: "The proposed structure contemplates a Customer Standing Committee. The CSC would be an independently organized group of customer representatives. It would not need to be a

legal entity.   The CSC would receive reports from PTI as the IANA functions operator.

"The CSC would be authorized to escalate un-remediated performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO, which would have the power to trigger an ICANN accountability mechanism, which could include a special periodic review function, or an independent review panel." That's the process of escalation.   So the CSC, the way I understand it, would actually just be looking at the monthly reports, and then if something is wrong and it's unable to remediate those problems then it will escalate it directly to the ccNSO and GNSO. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You've just hit one of the points that I have a strong problem with. I don't believe the ccNSO or the GNSO are structured or able to make those kinds of decisions, and indeed, they may be multistakeholder - or the GNSO are multistakeholder in its own right - that it excludes one of the stakeholders that I particularly think is important: us. So I have a real problem with that, and moreover, that is escalation to take radical action.

There is no escalation as I currently understand it, but again, I need to do some reading that I haven't done to handle more mundane things that have not been addressed through the regular processes. I think that part of the current structure is something that I find problematic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. As far as the more mundane things are concerned, the way I understand it is that it would remain an internal process. There is a detailed escalation process within the CSC and between the CSC and the PTI that is already there. If all of that fails, then it would go into an escalation, into the ccNSO and GNSO. For the record, I personally also have concerns about this, since both the ccNSO and the GNSO are not operational.

They don't deal with direct operations on the Internet, they deal with policy. Or at least the GNSO deals with policy. I'm not sure that the ccNSO just coordinates work in the domain name system as far as country codes are concerned. But let's not focus on that. the question is then beyond that, when I did ask the question on the Working Group, then the multistakeholder process would then be the ICANN accountability mechanism.

So the ccNSO and the GNSO, the way I was told, was just going to be channel - again, another level of escalation, and the accountability mechanism would be the higher level of escalation in which all of ICANN's SOs and ACs would have a word. I gather that by that point the question that will be asked of the SOs and ACs will be the issue of separation. I note that Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. What I understood before what you read now is that if there is an escalation it has to go through the other structure in the PTI. Normally it's like this. I never heard it would go through the ccNSO or the GNSO. Now I know it is like this, I think there is something

wrong, because it's not in the system of the solution given. The solution given has three parts - it has the CSC, it has the IFT something, and it has the Board of the PTI.

So everything should be done there, and if there is something to go outside the PTI it is the role of the Board of the PTI to go and to decide what to do, more or less. This has to be linked with ICANN for sure, but it cannot be done through a constituency of ICANN, because the composition of the CSC is made from this constituency. It's not normal. There is something wrong. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Indeed, that was also, I recall, from one of the recent CWG calls, a side discussion that we did have. There were concerns admitted about this escalation to ccNSO and GNSO and no escalation to the PTI Board. But I gather if there is an escalation to the PTI Board then that makes the PTI Board evermore important than if there is an escalation through the PTI Board.

I'm sensing that we are again at a crossroads. I'd like everyone on the Working Group to think about those issues and read those documents, and the put their points of view here, because we are almost out of time. However, I have been told by the interpreters that we can extend for another ten minutes or so, which is the reason why I've taken the liberty of continuing as we are. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do I have the floor to change the subject?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: To what? Remaining on IANA stewardship, or do you wish to move to accountability?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wish to move to accountability. By the way, it's not only the interpreter's time we have to worry about, it's our time. Some of us have other commitments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I stand corrected then. In any case, I think we have reached the end of the discussion on the stewardship for the time being. We'll continue afterwards, next week. We should really continue also on the chat and also on the mailing list, because we do have to put our finger on this and actually reach a consensus on that. Certainly the proposal as it is today, I think, is not supported by the people who are on this call. There are enough digressions from the thing that we need to actually voice these and we need to certainly put our points across.

I'll close this part of the call. Let's move to the next part - that's Agenda Item #5, the CCWG Accountability. We have about ten minutes or so for this. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The only point I want to make is the current discussions with each AC/SO having an alter ego, that's an unincorporated association, but that is not the actual AC/SO but some representatives

of it that are somehow held accountable by it, I find exceedingly problematic. I understand a very long time ago, in a different world, I actually suggested the concept of an RIR type organization that went along with the ASO. But I was wrong.

We are ending up with what I would view as a morass of different little bits and pieces that have different responsibilities and different accountability mechanisms to hold them accountable. It goes down so far as to the people you name to be representing your unaffiliated, unincorporated association, decide to go rogue and do whatever they want and not what you want, you have no ability as the AC/SO to actually take them out. All you can do is replace them and have your replacements go to court to replace them.

We're ending up with something that's going to be hard to explain, hard to understand, and potentially hard to manage. My gut tells me there is a simpler way we can do this than the path we're heading down right now. I've just identified the next battle you're going to see me fighting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Are there any reactions on this? Alan, I'm not as knowledgeable on the accountability thread as on the IANA stewardship, and even that I'm not mastering particularly well. But with regards to this membership thing, I can certainly share some thoughts as to how a membership organization works in the UK, where the UK domain name operator sets up a membership organization to

decide on its board and decide on decisions and so on. The way it was actually done was not one vote per stakeholder group.

It wasn't looking at stakeholder groups - it actually just looked at its own customers - and then the "power" of each one of the number of votes that a Member would have was related to the number of domains they were selling. What then happened is out of more than 100 members, five or six of those essentially controlled the market and ended up having the majority of the vote.

So if that handful of members are able to agree with each other, the dozens of other members will have absolutely no say into this, and that in a way could mean that the system is somehow captured. So there certainly is some concern coming from my side of the world, and I guess others in the UK who have seen this happen, and perhaps on other occasions. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There are many ways to set up membership organizations and many of them are wrong, or at least will not work in our environment. I don't think what you're talking about is anywhere near what we're talking about here, so I don't think that's [a sphere 01:29:11]. The problem is for groups such as the ccNSO and the GAC, it's likely to be impossible to have all Members of the AC/SO be Members of an unincorporated association.   We have government agencies that are not likely to be able to do that - period.

If we could do that, there are liability issues that we probably do not want to go anywhere near.   Right now, ACs/SOs make

recommendations to the Board - the Board, which is heavily indemnified and insured makes actual decisions. If we have ACs/SOs as legal entities, I don't want to be its Chair, to be honest. So I think there's a whole separate morass that we don't want to go anywhere near, and having them not map one-on-one is where the ugliness really comes in. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Any feedback on this? Any points? Tijani and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Alan, this is the way things are going now, and I am as concerned as you, and I have other concerns about the unincorporated association. You know that they can be sued, and the legal advisors told us that we may put in the bylaw an article saying that all the financial consequence of the legal procedure should be supported by ICANN. But what about the non-financial consequence? We are going in an area where we don't know what will happen.

I see that people are really happy with this solution. I don't have an absolute solution, but I don't know what will happen after that. This is a real unknown for me. It's an unknown of the solution or the possible solution for the accountability. I am really as concerned as you are. I am concerned about other things, but this is one of the main things I am concerned about. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Next is Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. There is a lot to be said in this discussion. I'm fairly closely covering all of this. In fact, I would consider myself very closely covering all of this, and even I consign myself going, "Hey, but what about this, and what about that?" and sometimes when I think I have my personal view all firmed up, someone will say something and I go, "Ooh, now, what, if and maybe?" Every time one of those things has happened on this topic in particular we've managed to get some additional information from the legal advisors.

I think it's important that we take some time, not in this call but perhaps in our next call, and work out exactly how much time… Hopefully Leon's voice will be back on top of it all. We should look very carefully at what we're being told and what the advice is and how that advice has been reframed to meet and respond to new concerns from the community, such as Alan is outlining, because it is a dynamic situation and I find that it is one of those topics where I can't just say - as I could with Contract Co - "No bloody way, I'm not interested."

Here I go, "Ah, but what if…" and then I find out something and I go, "Okay, now I understand that. What about this?" I think we should spend some time at our next meeting recognizing that the document for public comment, from the CCWG, is expected to come out at 20:00 UTC today. We do have then the 28 days. I think it would be worthwhile spending a block of time in our next call looking specifically at the PTI

and the member and unincorporated association issues from the most recent legal counsel point of view.

Because the information they are giving us at each point along the way is tempered by what they are being asked to do, and at the very beginning they were being asked to give us advice that was belt and braces, and foundation and the ultimate in everything. That of course takes us to that member model. But there is a whole spectrum of opportunities, and I think they need to be explored carefully. So I'm going to suggest we exploit the fact that Leon is not only a Co Chair, but heads up the Legal Team, and hopefully we'll get some exact advice out and get a little separate presentation done, and a proper discussion on all of this in our next meeting. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. We've got Alan in the queue and then I'm going to have to close the call unfortunately, but we will have a couple of Action Items and decisions for next week. Alan, you've put your hand down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Certainly I now see many concerns with the CWG, many concerns with the CCWG, and we've run out of time. I wonder whether next week we might not need two calls - one on IANA stewardship transition and one on accountability? Each one will have its 90 minutes

to discuss points in-depth. Certainly I find today's call - and I know that at the beginning many of you thought this was going to be a short call - but I've found this call to be very helpful indeed. It's very helpful indeed.

We need to discuss those points now. Discussing these things in a month's time will be too late, and then it will be an opportunity missed. So I'm glad we're having these discussions. Do we need more time next week? Should we split the call and have one on IANA stewardship and one on accountability? Or should we keep the 90-minutes for both calls to happen together? In fact, it will probably be more like 90 minutes plus another ten hopefully with the interpreters.

If you prefer splitting then please put a green tick on the attendee thing, or if you prefer keeping them together in one then put a red cross. In the meantime I notice Sébastian has his hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do they all have to be midnight?   If you're going to split them is it compulsory to have the meetings at midnight and 1:00 am or 2:00 am?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm fine with them as they are. They're at 3:00 pm.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not!

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I notice green ticks from Leon, from Alberto Soto, from Gordon Chillcott. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I just wanted to suggest that it's very difficult to find another slot in the week. May I suggest that we extend our next meeting to two hours - one hour for each - and like that we'll have enough time, I hope?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastian. If you think we need to have two x 90-minute calls, put a green tick. If you think we can have two hours in one call then put a red cross on the AC. We'll see. Two hours in one go, where we'll do 50/50 on that, or 90-minute call x two at separate times. I'm not going to vote on this. Now we have a majority of red crosses, which means a two-hour call where one hour would be spent on CWG IANA and one hour would be spent on CCWG accountability. Okay, sounds fine.

Let's go forward with this then. We'll have a two-hour call next week. What we do need to do is put together a Doodle with a few more hours than our usual timeslots so that we also have some Antipodes-friendly sociable hours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be a change. It hasn't been for the last 12 months. Why start now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh dear. If you had started hammering your way through 12 months ago you might have managed to make the earth flat by now and we would have all had the same hour.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's actually eight months I think, but anyway…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ladies and gentlemen, this is going beyond the time. We're already 13 minutes behind the end of the call. I'd like to thank you all for this. We've got the AIs properly recorded and the Doodle for next week is fine as well. Terri, are you all okay with this?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. All is good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks very much Terri. Thank you all of you. Thank you to the interpreter, Sabrina, for spending a bit more time with us. Let's continue, please, the work on the mailing list and on the Wiki. We can't just have a week without doing anything and then spending our time raising really important issues during the call. This needs to follow up on the list. Thanks, and this call is adjourned. Bye-bye.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]