OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So let's get going please.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin the recording at this time.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability call, on Tuesday the 2nd of June, 2015 at 15:00 UTC.

On the English channel we have Gordon Chillcott, Tom Lowenhaupt, Eduardo Diaz, Tomohiro Fujisaki, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Beran Gillen, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, León Sanchez, Barrack Otieno, and Yasuichi Kitamura.

On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto, and joining us shortly we're hoping to have Fatima Cambronero.

We show apologies… And Alan Greenberg just joined us as well.

We show apologies from Seun Ojedeji and Sébastien Bachollet.

From staff we have myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today will be Sabrina.

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

Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And apologies for the delay in starting the call caused by a few technical problems on my side. Anyway, we are now all on the call.

We've got first discussion, as usual, on the progress of the IANA coordination group, then we will have discussion on the CWG IANA, including all of the loose ends that still need to be discussed and flagged. We have reached the end of the public comment period, but a lot of work has taken place in the CWG since then, and of course the comments are now being slowly taken into account, and amendments being made to the final proposal.

And so we'll be discussing those issues to resolve. And then finally, we'll have, the last 15 minutes of this call [inaudible]… And there we are right in the middle of a public period. Well, just a few days left actually. Why am I saying in the middle? It's tomorrow. The 3rd of June. So just a few more days left to comment on this, and of course, a lot of work also taking place there.

Are there any amendments to the agenda that anybody would like to add?

Don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's say the agenda is approved. Let's go straight to agenda item number two, that's the action items from our last call. Just the usual action items that were there, for the Doodle to be sent, so that's all done. Let's move to agenda item three, and that's the review of the IANA coordination group progress.

We have, on the line, if I can see… I'm not seeing either Jean-Jacques Subrenat, no Jean-Jacques is here. Okay, let's hear from Jean-Jacques Subrenat please, on any progress regarding the ICG.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello Olivier. I'd like to be excused for having joined this call late. I just managed to do the connection, there was a slight problem. [Inaudible] the only thing I can [inaudible] to regarding the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you Jean-Jacques, please go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: …that the… …hear me? Hello, hello, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Thank you and sorry I was late for about eight minutes. I had some connectivity problems. I was saying that our meeting of last week, in this format, there has only been, to my knowledge, one thing worth your attention in the ICG proceedings. And that was a letter sent by the chair and [inaudible] of the ICG, to the Chairman of the Board of ICANN.

This is a consequence of the letter that the ICG received from the head of NTIA, requesting further information about timelines, and more specifically about the time it would be necessary to add to the current timeline, in order to implement. And you may remember that last week, during our last meeting, I had pointed out that the way that implementation was used, left some ambiguity.

However, the letter shown to the ICG to the Chair of the Board of ICANN has been sent. And [inaudible] of the Chair of the Board of ICANN. As far as the content of the letter is concerned, we requested ICANN to indicate, in its view would be [inaudible] find elements which we should take into account, including about implementation, in the presentation of the final transition of [inaudible] plan.

That's all I wanted to report at this stage to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And the floor is now open for questions or comments on Jean-Jacques's short report. I don't see anyone putting their hand up in the room. I do note that there was a discussion, a short discussion, on the CWG IANA with regards to this

timeline. So far, we're still looking at [inaudible] to find out how the review of the public comments is going to take place.

So no immediate response yet as far as I know. Perhaps if others are closer to the chairs of the CWG IANA, we could add to this. But so far, not much progress. Okay. Any questions? Seeing no one put their hand up, thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I don't think we have Mohamed El Basher on the call. I was going to call upon him if he was here. Is he perhaps just on the phone?

No. Okay. Let's then move on to the next part of our agenda, that's the CWG IANA…

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Jean-Jacques. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Just to let you know that I will be on this call for another 47 minutes, I'll leave at the top of the next hour. [Inaudible] be excused.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this heads up Jean-Jacques. Let's move on and go to agenda item number three and number four, CWG IANA. The latest news, well there was a presentation of the actual process by which the

CWG and the CCWG did their work. CWG IANA and CCWG accountability. That presentation took place at the [inaudible] forum in Geneva last week.

There is a link in your agenda to the actual session, and the PowerPoint presentation, which you might wish to use in your own community, if you have to explain how the process to reach the current proposals went, and where we are going. The session was very well received. So I'll leave it to you. The link is in the agenda page.

Now with regards to the public consultation. There is a tool for comment analysis that was prepared by staff, very important tool, 250 plus pages of comments. The working group has now been slowly churning through some of the comments and going through them. It's an intensive work day Thursday and Friday last week.

Some of the design teams are being recalled to work on the specific points, and either respond to the point that is made by issuing a negative response, or by taking into account the points that was expressed and adding it. Of course, when there was a negative response, there is an explanation as to why the advice, or the point was rejected.

I don't like to use the word rejected, but not taking into account in the final proposal. And with regard to the others, there are amendments being made. I'm not sure whether we need to focus on any specific points, but I'll definitely open the floor now, I think, with regards to the public comment only.

Then what we're going to be able to do is if we have any additional issues to flag, any points that we need to ask as work progresses in parts B and C, the issues to resolve, I think that Alan covered this pretty well with our group last, but there might be more needed. So first, the public comment feedback. First on the trigger is Alan Greenberg. You have the floor Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think from an At-Large perspective, the only real unknown right now, is we, to some extent, laid down the gauntlet and said that the current plan of referring the CSC escalation to the ccNSO and GNSO was not acceptable. I was moderately surprised that there was general agreement. And I believe that was being changed to escalation to the ccNSO and the registry stakeholder group, for ratification.

That is to make sure that the lone, potential lone wolves representing them on the CSC, whatever their position is, is being supported by the larger group. And I think it makes complete sense. What is not known is what it goes to next. And the design team that was responsible for that is reviewing that, and if they have had answers, which they may have, there has been a lot of network traffic which I haven't looked at all.

It's not clear to me whether that's being resolved in a way that's fully acceptable to us or not. So I think to a large extent, whether we have major problems or not hinges on that, and maybe there is someone else on this call, I'm thinking of maybe Cheryl, who might have been paying more attention to that than I have, or maybe Eduardo.

And to know whether, in fact, it's going in the kind of direction that we're going to be happy with, with more of a multistakeholder component, in the decision factor of what to do and how to escalate. And you know, exactly what to do given the specifics of the situation. That as I see it, the largest single problem, issue that the ALAC raised that we had a problem with.

I haven't seen anything else, any other changes, that really raised a lot of red flags for me of things that were going to be changed because of the comments, that would cause us to have a problem. I might have missed something though. That's about all I have to say on the CWG, and I would welcome input from others.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan…

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl says she doesn't have anything, but there are four hours, or two hours of calls right after this on CWG, and we may have a better insight at that point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I was going to add one point though, and that's, again, the call that will take place later on today. That's to do with the budgeting of the IANA functions. There is some discussion going on about registries funding the IANA function directly. That raised a red flag with me, because I don't believe at the moment, there is any

funding of the IANA function. It's just a function as such. But there is no billing of anyone specifically for this.

And therefore a question mark at that point, with regards to having registries pay for the function. To me, that spells trouble, because that actually tells me that they're looking at a system whereas the funding for the function comes directly from the registries. They could take that function out of ICANN, and they could completely forget about ICANN as a policy body.

And I'm not quite sure that [inaudible]. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll hold on to my thing. Can you explain that last sentence you just said? They'll take things out of ICANN? I've lost you there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. What I'm saying is, the registries are looking at the level of funding that they would have to pay to IANA, whether it would be a fee on domain names, or whatever it is. What I've read in the whole discussion, is they're looking at firming up what level of funding would be needed by the registries.

Opening the door to registries paying for the IANA function, maybe on a per update basis, or a per month basis. Leaving ICANN out of the equation all together. I'm a little either confused or unhappy. One way or the other. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you're confused. The position of the registries is exactly opposite to what you're saying. Currently there are no fees, period. All the costs of IANA are simply absorbed by ICANN, but clearly ICANN has certain sources of money. The largest single source of money is registrar fees, registries contribute a fair amount of money. Some ccTLDs contribute money, in varying amounts.

Some under actual contracts, some under various voluntary positions. I believe they get a significant amount of money from RIRs. So, all of these things go into ICANN general funds, and therefore are used to fund IANA. The registries have a great concern that after spending a huge amount of time building what was going to be contract co, which was in my mind, would have been enormously expensive, and now taking the position that the current separated IANA, in a separate corporation, is a mandatory requirement, or at least by some of them, not all.

They're now worried that it's going to cost more money. And where is ICANN going to get that money? Will ICANN use the increased IANA cost as a rationale for increasing registry fees, among other fees? But clearly the registries are worried about the registry fees. Moreover, they worry that should separation every happen, and the new IANA, still under ICANN's stewardship, is done by a third party, the costs may go up even higher, which is likely to happen.

Lastly, we are building, when we are building these expectations, and if you look at, when we're looking at service levels. People are saying,

"Well, right now IANA is guaranteeing 21 days. They typically turn things around in two days. Therefore we want them to guarantee four days."

If you look at the design team F outcome, that is how do we replace the backstop, not the backstop, the NTIA function, there is a whole section there saying, well maybe because there isn't an extra group, even though NTIA hasn't done anything, maybe we need to do a major review and look at the robustness of the root zone, and add a lot of extra stuff to it.

The term is being used by a lot of the people, certainly some ccTLDs, is we're looking for a gold plated IANA. It's working well right now, but let's add a lot of bells and whistles in it. Let's wrap, let's crank up the expectations, so that IANA has to turn things around in two days. Let's put extra checks and balances in to make sure that there is absolutely no chance of failure, even though there is currently no evidence of failures.

And all of these things, they worry, might push costs for IANA up significantly, not necessarily with any great return on investment from the registry's point of view, but increased costs and at that point, what happens when ICANN starts looking for more money? We've seen ICANN budgets be retracted recently because of the lack of expected success of the new gTLD process, which has caused budget constraint.

And they worry about when there is a next budget constraint, will they say, "Oops, we have to increase registry fees, because there just isn't enough money to fund IANA to the extent that the community is

demanding we fund it." So it's all of these things together, that they worry that their costs may go up. And indeed, they might. And that's the concern they have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alan. Any comments or questions? It's Olivier speaking.

Okay. I don't see anyone putting their hand up at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier? Sorry, Cheryl here. I was having trouble getting my hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm staying on mute because tonight is one of those nights when my husband is snoring really loud, and you've all heard that through meetings before. And he's here while I'm talking now, my apologies for that.

This is an important issue, but I think it's one we may find some solace from expert input from David and the finance team in the not too distant future. I think we might need to remind everybody that if there were some form of [inaudible] increase in the future, [inaudible] IANA circumstance, or indeed, and probably more likely, in the case of during transition away from, for separation stage. It will be far more likely,

because a third party, non relatable, finishing would be more expensive than running internal [inaudible] continuous.

Keep reminding that of course, it will inevitably cost up the registry more. The businesses in the middle, registries and registrars, are hardly going to be absorbing these costs, and provide a good [inaudible]… situation between them, [inaudible]. Thank you.

Difference to us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. The good news is the current cost of IANA, we think, is about $4 million or something like that. It's a small percentage of the total ICANN, relatively small percentage of the overall ICANN budget. A few percent. So even if it goes up by 20%, and certainly paying for the new corporate structure, and some accountants, and some auditors, and some lawyers, should not push it up much more than that, it's not a huge amount in absolute dollars.

Now if we make changes, that could bubble the cost, and then it becomes a significant issue. So I find this very curious that at this stage, we're now talking about what if registry fees go up because of this, whereas we've been playing this enormously elaborate structure in talking about, you know, enhancements all along and it wasn't raised as an issue until relevantly recently. So it's one of these things that be careful what you wish for, because you might get it, I think. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Any other points to be added to this? As was said, we have a significant amount of our work later on today again. There is nothing else to report really for these two work days, in just a case of going through each one of the points, proceeding with either giving the point over to a design team, we just saying, "Yes, we agree," although we don't agree.

Right. Let's move on then to the next part. Any issues, additional issues to be flagged? I personally don't have any additional issues to be flagged. I think that the thoroughness with which we're going through this, with which we're going through the whole set of comments that have arrived, is raising, well, is looking at many issues that have been flagged.

Obviously, the ALAC points were also taken into account. And these are being discussed, just like all the other comments as well. I certainly haven't found any additional issues that we need to flag out there. I note that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to say something nice. I had horrible expectations of how we were going to be handling these comments. And the number, there being close to 50 submissions and hundreds of specific issues raised, and staff have done an absolutely marvelous job of breaking it down. They created the 250 page tool, but then we're not using it. We're

using other summaries they built to actually drive the discussion in a more effective way.

And I think they've done just an absolutely marvelous job, and I think we need to give as much credit as we can for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Alan. Just a question actually, because I've had computer trouble these past few days. Has the tool been distributed to everyone? In other words, been shared with all of the other communities?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember. We had a very significant discussion at the last call about whether we should distribute, I mean it's publically available, if you know where to look. Whether we should sort of post it on the thing, I think the decision was not to because the chances of people misunderstanding… The fact that staff have drafted answers for a lot of the things, ahead of us actually having the discussion, I think there was some fear that would be misconstrued, as staff sorting of leading it.

And in fact, although they have drafted a lot of answers, most of them were thank you for noting that. Where there were real substantive discussions, they simply, you know, highlighted the fact the CWG will need to discuss it. So I don't really think there was anything negative in what they said that could be perceived negatively, but there was a lot of concern, and I think the decision was made not to formally distribute it at that point, but I don't know that for sure.

And I haven't paid much attention on the lists.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. Well we have a link on our agenda to the actual tool for comment analysis, if anybody is interested in digging through those. Issues to be flagged, are there any issues to be flagged in addition? And Alan, you have mentioned that I gather, probably not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not with the CWG, not that I'm aware of. But I will be candid, I have been partially been distracted by some personal issues the last few days, that have caused me to be out of the house most of the day yesterday, and by the CWG design team F, which I had to reformulate everything on. And the CCWG response, which I've been putting a fair amount of time to do.

So there has been a lot of mail on the CWG list that I have not looked at. I mean, that's not true. I tend to glance at the first lines and see if it's something I need to look at right now, but I haven't looked at in any depth, other than the ones that were particularly aimed at me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. It's Olivier speaking. I'm looking at [in particular] the other members of the working group, Cheryl or Eduardo?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, I'm really in a not dissimilar situation to Alan. I do scan the headings, and I'm busy and I have been busy [inaudible] over the last [inaudible] with other things. Again, we've got four calls today, there will be an awful lot more after this call. It's just a matter of timing, I think. Normally we're meeting after our meeting [inaudible]… for some bloody reason.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well understood. Thanks for this Cheryl. And I guess we can therefore move on and look at the issues to resolve. Alan, last week, took us through a number of issues that required input from us in order to be able to drive this in the cross community working group. Alan, are there any additional issues that you thought would need to be clarified within our working group prior to moving the, back to the working group in advance, of course, of the call we have, the forthcoming call that's coming up.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't see it. I mean, we talked about the issues of Board composition, and the various forms of corporate structure. I think those decisions are sort of going to be made quickly, and as I said last week, from a personal point of view, and I think from an ALAC point of view, any of the solutions are going to be acceptable.

The Board composition one, which implies how escalation of real problems will be handled, a bad decision may make problems harder to resolve. But in terms of assuming things for the next while anyway are going well, I don't think any of the decisions matter, from the insider

Board to the outsider Board, to various compositions. I think we're going to end up with a largely insider Board because of the accountability issues.

But if we end up with an outsider Board, you know, named by the ACs and SOs, we'll survive. I don't think it's going to make a really big difference. So I'm not really concerned… I'm concerned about how we're going to make the decisions in the group, which is far from fair at this point, but I'm not particularly concerned with the [inaudible] position.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. How about the issues of escalation where there is the GNSO and ccNSO in the past of escalation? That's something we've been able to push back on in some way.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I think the GNSO is gone now. I think it will be the registry stakeholder group, and it will be going to those groups for ratification by their larger group, that's a small number of people on the CFC are not acting out of some whim. It's unclear what the next stage is to address, and that's what I'm waiting to come out of the team something. I don't [inaudible]… Don't remember the name.

So I eagerly will be awaiting this call, because I think we'll hear something about that then. And I think that's crucial, whether we see a good multistakeholder involvement at that point or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's Olivier speaking. We'll have to see until the next call later on this afternoon, or this evening, or this morning, or us throughout the world. I think that we're pretty much set for the CWG. Perhaps you can have more time on the CCWG Alan. I know that there is a comment that is currently in the process of being built. It is on its final stages, since today is the deadline I believe.

So with this, I can hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg for the second part, or León. I'm not sure who will be running this part of the call. León Sanchez or Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll start. It's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I believe the comment closes tomorrow. If I'm wrong, someone tell me. But the date I have in my mind is the third.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's the third, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I definitely still want comments. I haven't checked if there is any on the one I posted last, my last night, about 10 hours ago or so. I did see a

number of email comments saying people were satisfied with it. I'm going to state my displeasure and disappointment I think, not displeasure. We spent a lot of time, in At-Large, talking about reaching consensus.

And I find it rather unfortunate that in this statement, everyone feels, everyone who doesn't agree with the majority view, if and when there is a majority view, there isn't for everything, that their position has to be explicitly stated. The normal mode is that we decide by majority, if necessary on a vote, but typically we try to decide by consensus, which implies vast majority. And then that's the position that the group takes. And there has been a huge amount of pushback this time around, that anyone who doesn't agree with what seems to be the direction that the group is going, wants to make sure that the report, the comment, completely reflects the fact that they have disagreed.

And I find that a little bit troublesome, because it really gives us a much weaker statement then we otherwise would have. So I find that a little bit disappointing. And the other thing is on the straw poll I did, I was rather surprised, I'm not going to say disappointed, but I was rather surprised at the large number of people who feel that…

And I understand and I agree with the fact that the, we should be looking at accountability measures that have more of a good faith on it, and not necessarily a legal enforceability. But I was surprised at the number of people who said, if we end up getting legal enforceability, ALAC should reject the final proposal. Now, that rejection is not going to happen, rejection or acceptance isn't going to happen until Dublin.

It's not today's decision. But I was rather surprised at the number of people who said if we don't get exactly what we want here, then we should reject the proposal, which probably means the accountability measures will have to go back to the group, and potentially endanger the whole transition process. And I just find it a little bit surprising.

I tend to side with Olivier, what Olivier said, is we don't need that level of legal accountability, but if we, if it's there, we're not likely to use it, and we can sort of live with it. And I was just surprised at the number of people who were willing to potentially jeopardize the entire transition over that issue. But, you know, people obviously make the decisions they want to make, and we will honor them.

So other than that, I don't have a lot to say. The statement, I believe, went, that I drafted yesterday, addressed most of the issues that people raised. And many of them were, in fact, I didn't agree with the statement so make sure the comment says that. And I hope it's ready to go forward right now, or will soon. I wouldn't mind some input on those issues that I've just raised right now, because I think we have a much weaker statement when we have to say the majority of, or many people say, something instead of the ALAC says.

Other than that, I don't have any real comment. And I don't mind if we adjourn early.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, do you want me to run the queue? It's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, if you can run the queue, I'm not focusing on it. I will if you want.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. No, [CROSSTALK] León Sanchez is the first in the queue.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. I agree with what Alan said. As I put in the chat box, I think it's better to not to need it, rather than needing it and not having it. And by this I mean that I think it's better we have the ability to legally enforce whatever rights or powers we're trying to provide the community with, rather than not having that ability.

I mean, I think that I agree with what most of us think that if we have to come to the point in which we need to exercise the [election against ICANN] than, that might be the end of it all to begin with. But then again, while I trust on the good faith of the different parties and the different community members, I think that so far, the concerns that is amongst us is that sometimes there hasn't been that good faith, or there hasn't been reactions that have been in the best interests of the community.

So if we don't have these remedy, just as I said on the list, to speaks [inaudible], then I think that we might as well just not look into enhancing that accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much León. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Again, I'm in agreement with León and Alan have said, but I think perhaps we need to make sure that, perhaps less so regarding the subtle nuances of what has been discussed, but I think we should ensure that there is time, specific and very definite time, in your case, [inaudible] meeting coming up in Buenos Aries, just to make sure that the ALAC members are clear with each other on how much of an absolute consensus they can give on a few things.

I think the difference between the [inaudible] you know [inaudible] sort of thing, we can stand on your ground and be [inaudible], but I do think that it's something that we probably definitely need to have in the roundtable. And perhaps Alan and Olivier, Tijani, the leadership team, engaged in, leadership members engaged in these activities. You should perhaps even try for a consensus call in that face to face context, because it's not even more powerful statement to be able to say, the ALAC has reached consensus whilst it recognizes within it's At-Large structure [inaudible]… Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Cheryl. Points raised. Anyone else in the queue? Any response from Alan, or León, or anyone on the, anybody else who is in the CCWG?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'm make a couple of comments. As I mentioned earlier to the, I think to the ALAC, I might have to this group as well, I don't remember, that Olivier and I were interviewed, as it turns out, immediately proceeding this, by the US Congress GAO, the group looking at, essentially accountability issues within the US government.

And one of the things I noted, and one of the questions was, you know, to what extent, you know, have you involved your community in these kinds of decisions? And it's interesting, as many of you know, we've spent a lot of years fighting wars like the ALAC and At-Large represent three billion Internet users, and people would immediately ask, you know, how do you contact them all?

And we now use the term, represent the interests of, and that's what they gave to us. So we're successful in that. And that's a good thing. But I did point out that we have been extensively consulting, and it has been a good process, that in many cases, view change because of the discussions. And I think that's a sign of maturity at some level, that people come into it with whatever their gut feel, and their own initial thoughts are, and often things, positions change as things become more in the open.

And I think that's a good sign. It still requires, at some level, that people understand that in any multistakeholder group, and the At-Large is a multistakeholder group in its own right, that not everyone gets everything they want. And I think somehow we still need to assimilate that concept and understand how to move forward that concept and understand how to move forward on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I see some green ticks from León Sanchez, agreement from some people on the floor. Any other points to bring forth? Wow. It looks like we're going a lot faster than expected today.

I gather we're all on the [inaudible] for the next few calls that will take place later this week. It's a fast changing environment. And we might think that this might change very much by next week. With no more things to discuss today, strangely enough, we're going to be less than an hour into this call.

Are there any other points to make?

I don't see anyone on the call, I see just a few applauses. León, you have raised your hand, so you have the floor.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. It's just a comment on the possible face to face meeting of the CCWG. It is thought to take place in July. There is a Doodle poll open at this point. So if you are part of the CCWG, and you haven't filled the poll, I would encourage you to please go and fill the poll, so we can have a better sense of which would be the best date to carry out this face to face meeting.

We haven't had, of course, a venue defined, but the most likely place to happen is in Europe. I've heard a couple of comments that could be maybe Prague, since the ICE is also developing in Prague. Or it might be somewhere else in Europe from Amsterdam, Pairs, or London. So I

would highly encourage you to go and fill the poll so we can we have a better sense of when this face to face meeting could take place. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this León. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And one last thing that we need is to just check whether we want to have another two hour call or not next week. Do you suspect that we would need two hours? What we can do is to table a two hour call and finish early, like we're doing today.

That does introduce a small problem with regards to the interpreters, because they're booked out for two hours rather than an hour, but it doesn't put the pressure on us to finish quickly in one hour, in case we have a lot of things that are coming up. So do you expect that we would need two hours next week?

And I guess I will turn also to León on the accountability thread.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I would schedule it and hope we don't need it.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's therefore have a Doodle for next week, I believe the early part of the week again. It's probably going to be the best, the best time. I see

there is some pre-ICANN 53 policy update webinars on the Thursday, so that would make it a very busy day. So let's do something on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday next week, 8,9, and 10 of June, already. Two hour call, a Doodle. Are we okay with that Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, that works.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. León, your hand is still up.

Okay. León has put his hand down. And I'd like to thank you all for this call. It has been swift. We have some work to do later on today, and that will, that spare hour will be given back to you for you be able to prepare for the next call. So thanks to all of you. Thanks to our sole, lonely interpreter today, Sabrina.

And we are therefore adjourning this call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]