
TERRI AGNEW: ...Ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability call, taking place on Thursday the 23rd of July, 2015 at 15:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Carlos Vera, Gordon Chillcott, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mohamed El Bashir, Olivier Créplin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Yasuichi Kitamura, and Alan Greenberg.

On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.

We show apologies from Seun Ojedeji.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. It's Olivier speaking. I wonder if, do we now have Tijani on the line, or do we have Tijani's recording on the line?

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani's recording is perfectly good enough for the interim.

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 CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Alan for this. Welcome everyone. Have we missed anybody in the roll call by any chance?

I don't hear any speak up so everyone has been accounted for. So far, we have some time today for an update on the IANA coordination group progress. Mohamed El Bashir will be providing us with such an update. Afterwards, we'll have a very short segment of the call dealing with an update on the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition.

And the bulk of the call will be on all of the work that has recently been achieved by the cross community working group on accountability, that met in Paris.

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. We'll get it muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: That's indeed a recording, yes. Okay. So any other business to add to this agenda please, or any amendments to add to the agenda? Speak up now.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. It's not a change, I just wanted to let you know that I'm going to be on audio only during the call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay Eduardo. Thank you very much for this, your presence has been recorded. And if you wish to speak up, please just say your name, and I'll put you in the queue at the time.

I don't see anyone wishing to make any amendments, so let's then look at our last set of action items from the 13th of July call, and they were basically just a few action items to prepare for this call now, and also to have the right links added to the agenda of our last call. So these are all done, and therefore we can move to agenda item number three, and that's the review of the IANA coordination group progress.

As I mentioned just a moment ago, Mohamed El Bashir is on the line. We also have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, if you wish to add anything after Mohamed, you're absolutely welcome to do so. But then let's now hear from Mohamed El Bashir, you have the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much Olivier. Just wanted to confirm if you can hear me very well.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Very well indeed, Mohamed. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Just as well, I would like to provide a brief update about the current status of the ICG finalizing its combined proposal. Currently, I'm sure as you know that RCG has announced that the [inaudible] has already started on 31st of July and it will end the 8th of September. So, a

[inaudible] for RCG members have [asked for volunteers] to evaluate the CWG proposal, and compare it with the two other proposals received by the IETF, and [inaudible] proposals.

I would like to mention two issues that had [inaudible] in the comparison of the proposals. Those are the [inaudible] issues currently being discussed, and currently [inaudible] are compatibility issues between the three proposals. [Inaudible] that there is now many differences, although the CWG proposal is focused highly on the separation of the IANA organization from ICANN, but there are other proposals are not suggesting that.

So the first issue that we can see a difference between the three proposals is the issue of the intellectual property of the IANA trademark, and the domain name IANA dot org. And RCG has sent to the CWG, requesting [At-Large position] about this, their position for this issue, because the IETF are suggesting that IETF trust to be the entity holding the copyright, and domain name of IANA in the future, not ICANN.

So to my knowledge, I see that the ICG has requested legal support, and will reply back to the RCG with a response regarding, or a position, regarding that IANA trademark and the domain name IANA dot org. At the same time, the ICG asked the Board through its liaison within ICG, to [inaudible] further position of this of the trademark and the domain name.

And the Board Chair, and the Board, have submitted a statement, which is basically they're saying that this is a complex issue. ICANN is, will hold

the trademark and the domain name, and they don't think there will be issues on that. And if there are changes in the future to any other operator, those rights will be transferred to that new operator.

So but this is one of the hubs, let's say, hotly debated issue currently, and one of the main differences between the three proposals. So that is something to give you a heads up, because as we said, the CWG led all the [inaudible] discussion about how to go around that. Also there will be a discussion within the community about, if the community agreed on something and ICANN have different views on this issue.

So this is one, let's say, the most talked about issues between the three proposals. And there is no other major differences between the three proposals. I can say fairly they are compatible, and the final proposal is currently being finalized. There is a slight difference in terms of other contractual relationship between IETF and RIRs, and then the PTI on the [inaudible] proposal, which is [inaudible] the situation from ICANN.

So the IETF and RIRs did not raise an issue from their side, they confirmed that. They find to have a relationship that [inaudible] ICANN, or back to back relationship with the PTI, and this is not a major issue for them. So those are the two, let's say [inaudible] issues from the comparison of the proposals. Other than that, if we received CWG response regarding the [inaudible] on time, I think we will be able to publish the final combined proposal on time for the public comments.

If you have anything to add, please jump in.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Mohamed. And I was going to ask if Jean-Jacques Subrenat has anything to add.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I didn't hear about half of what Mohamed said, so I won't add anything.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. And I open the floor for questions from everyone on the call.

We have Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking for the record. Olivier, what is the rationale for changing IANA at this time? I mean, I don't really understand it. Why is it that we need to change it? It is actually under IANA, and I don't really see the reason why we should change this.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this question Alberto. I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat has put his hand up. Maybe he... Jean-Jacques, are you wishing to answer this question specifically?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. [Inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: First of all, sorry for the noise around me. I'm in a café with trucks going by. So, in order to answer Alberto's question, I think [inaudible] one of them is... [Inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier. Could you speak slightly closer to the mic please, because we actually do hear a lot of background noise, and your voice seems to be a bit far away from the microphone.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right. The microphone is actually in my mouth. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. We can hear you much better.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay. I may need to have surgery afterwards [inaudible]. So in answer to Alberto's point, I was saying that there is no immediate, technical reason to change the current IANA functions [inaudible], but I would like to answer by point out two geo-strategic reasons.

One is that over the years, from [inaudible] some countries have been saying that the whole Internet system [inaudible]...

The other thing is that, because of the [inaudible]...

...to bring about so change. So [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. I'm afraid the second part of your explanation has somehow been swallowed up by some background noise. I wonder if your computer [inaudible]. But yeah. Not exactly quite sure what you said in the second part of your sentence, of your explanation.

The recent Snowden revelations. Okay, thank you for this Jean-Jacques. And that accelerated the call for a change. Alan Greenberg asks in the chat, asks Alberto, when asking about... Were you asking about IANA, Alberto, or were you asking about the IANA trademark and domain name issue?

I understood the IANA trademark and domain name. Is that what you were referring to Alberto Soto?

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Yes, I actually referred to both of them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Well, regarding the IANA itself, I think Jean-Jacques did explain. With regards to the IANA trademark, there is some suspicion from some members of the working group, that's my understanding that there is some suspicion from some members of the working group that if the IANA functions are, there is a decision that is

given to another IANA functions operator, then there might be a problem with the transfer of those trademarks.

ICANN might not wish to transfer those trademarks of the IANA dot org domain elsewhere, and therefore the push is for this to be transferred to a third party, a third party that is trusted and in that case, I think the IETF trust is the one third party that was trusted by the different communities.

And I think that the point was actually originally raised on the IETF mailing list. So it's not a question that arose within the names community to start with, at least that's my understanding of the chronology. I personally think that, and I did mention this last week, I somehow think that we're really making a mountain out of a small mole hill. But some currently seem to feel very strongly about this.

And in fact, we will be discussing this shortly and explaining what's happened on the cross community working group naming group part, on the...

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Olivier, it's Mohamed, if I might add something?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Yes Mohamed. Please go ahead.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Yeah, thank you. Just from my observations, I think it's also the issue is historical. There are some people in the IETF with strong views about the role of the IETF and the role of IANA, and where IETF has the differences of IANN, pre-dating ICANN existence, [inaudible]... I think there is history about the issue, and that's why sometimes we see people becoming very emotional.

I have seen people from the protocol community becoming very emotional about the issue. And it seems in the RCG, there are, this is one of the, could be one of the main issues unless we have a breakthrough, because IETF and their position [inaudible] is that, [inaudible]...

...the trademark and the domain name. [Inaudible]... differences to the term IANA, and there [inaudible]... before ICANN exists. And the response from the Board, I think, I don't want to say [is encouraging] the situation, but I think this is basically ICANN is saying that they don't think that there is any need for change, and they give assurance of if there is any transference of the IANA function to a third party, they will [inaudible], and [inaudible]...

But there seems to be historical background to this. I hope that we can find a breakthrough. And one of the options is [inaudible] supporting the IETF proposal, and now we have the community, suggesting hoping that it's there as well. [A proposal] suggesting that IETF to be the trusted party to hold the trademark and the domain name.

So if that happens, that ICANN will have to, I think, go with the community proposal, and they could submit comments on the timing proposal to [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A question for Mohamed. Do we have, do you have like a commitment from the IETF trust that they are willing and able to defend the trademark? I understand about the domain name, but I have a significant problem if the trademark is held in a way that they will not be monitoring its use and defending it, because if they don't, aren't prepared to do that, then the trademark can be lost, period.

And that, I think, is more crucial than who owns it. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed here. Yeah, thanks Alan. Yes, there are obligations that come with it, [inaudible] on the trademark in terms of ensuring that registration continues insuring that, it's also the rights are [inaudible] and there is really, I mean, expensive, legal expenses regarding monitoring even at a [inaudible] level. That there are no violations and [inaudible] trademark. I guess the IETF and ISOC [inaudible] also is the organization behind IETF and supporting [inaudible] I'm sure.

There are aware of that, and [inaudible] about the technicalities, the details, have not been discussed. Operationally, in terms of what needs

to be done for the protection, it's a very valid point. The entity that need to hold the trademark and the domain name needs to be able to protect it.

But I'm assuming that they, the IETF and ISOC [inaudible] they will also put their resources that's needed, but the technical details have not been discussed in the RCG, and it's not mentioned in the IETF proposal as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may have a follow-up Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Mohamed. I guess my concern is the IETF trust, or ISOC, which was not mentioned at all, and they're two separate organizations completely, two legal organizations, two separate legal organizations, are third parties to this whole thing. The IETF, I don't think is able to make a commitment on behalf of the IETF trust, or on behalf of ISOC, so I think it is really crucial that the ICG has to reach out to them, to make sure that they are willing and able to do this.

This is not something that we can leave to trust. So just a comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Olivier speaking. And very interesting discussion, indeed. I think that we can move to our next agenda item, if we have no more questions on the IANA coordination group.

Okay. So there are no more questions. And so the main work of the CWG IANA is actually being, as we just mentioned, specifically on this discussion, and recently, I think it was yesterday, the group received a link to the instructions to our legal counsel, on this specific issue, the IPR issue. There was a question as to how much this was going to cost. So a quote was received, and the client committee has received the quote, and proposes to instruct [Sydney] to commence with the work as soon as possible.

I haven't seen any follow-up on that, so I believe that this is now moving forward. And the questions that were asked... And by the way, if you are interested in finding out, finding the email, rather than searching your mailbox, I can put it into the chat.

There it is in the chat. The questions that were asked were as follows. The first one is regarding the Internet trouble topics issues, ITR issues, to consult, to conduct a stress test approach regarding the IANA IPR issue. This would include four aspects. First [Sydney] shall consult with ICANN legal in order to obtain further insight and background to the IPR issue. And this can be...

So IPR is the International Property Rights. This can be done with the involvement of other members, other CWG [inaudible] for example. There appears to be three possible scenarios. IANA's IPR [inaudible] sticks with ICANN, or goes to PTI, or goes into a trust. And thirdly then,

what [roots] exist with each approach from a CWG stewardship perspective, and these need to be evaluated in view of ICANN's position and the proposal from the other communities, to determine what is optimal and/or acceptable.

And the fourth aspect is the three trademarks involved. So we've got the IANA Internet address members authority, the IANA logo, and the sort of stylized logo as such. And of course, the question I raise, how important is this, and I guess, obviously, there are so many references to IANA in many of the, not only documentation but in fact some of the [inaudible] that runs out there, that it is important that we know what happens to this, if there is a transfer to another operator.

Secondly, the CWG is asking [Sydney] for a matrix of the ICANN bylaws. Now, that's the intellectual property issue pushed to one side. The next thing is to basically look at all of the bylaws, or bylaw changes, that would be needed in relation to the CWG proposal. And of course, that's already a step forward to find out what bylaws need to be redrafted, and obviously we would have to have the CWG work on the new bylaws, and we'd have to... Sorry.

There is a link between the CCWG, so the accountability track and the stewardship track, and what they're basically asking is for that list of all of the bylaws that are going to be worked on. I think to some extent, this really is for, this work to take place once rather than being duplicated across the different cross community working groups.

And at the same time, we also need to know where we stand and how much work there is going to be with regards to rewriting the bylaws as

the accountability track was making its decision as to which half to take. I think that's the bulk of the work, of the new CWG stewardship. And I open the floor to everyone, if they wish to comment or questions, or have anything else to add.

I don't see anyone put their hand up. And it looks like... So there isn't everything else that we can discuss on this topic. I think that it will help to have the response from [Sydney] regarding the intellectual property rights issues, and that might actually help with the current, I would say, lack of consensus that we appear to have as to where the IPR is going to go.

We've spent an enormous amount of time on this. I'm just surprised that we didn't have [inaudible] about that. But I guess there were concerns about the costs of the legal advice, and now we know exactly what we want, and so we hopefully will get an answer pretty soon on this point.

Seeing no one put their hand up or wishing to comment any further, there is nothing else, really, that has happened in the CWG IANA. The next call, in fact, that was supposed to happen later on today was canceled, so we don't have anything to prepare for, really at the moment. So I guess we will have more as we get more feedback from [Sydney] and more feedback from the ICG, and of course, the accountability track next to this.

There is just one note that I have noticed, and there is some coordination between the accountability track and the stewardship track with Johnathon Robinson, the chair of the stewardship track,

keeping a close eye on the work of the accountability working group. And obviously, there needs to be a good linkage between the two groups, and at the moment this seems to be working okay.

So with this, we can move then to the CCWG accountability. And for this we have Alan Greenberg and León Sanchez on the call. Now that group has an enormous amount of work, even since the face to face meeting in Buenos Aires. It doesn't stop. And they had a meeting in Paris last week. And well, let's ask the people who were there. León, Alan, who is going to take us through this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll do a brief intro. You didn't say what I was expecting you to say, in fact, we've had an immense amount of work since the Paris meeting. The amount of redrafting and work that has been done, just in the last, I guess, three days or something like that, I've lost track of how many days it is right now. But certainly in the last few days is quite immense.

There is work going on. We're making a lot of progress. I'm not sure if León is in a position to present anything, I'm certainly not I'm afraid. I can certainly, I can highlight a number of the changes since Paris. I don't recall when we last met and how close to Paris it was. Certainly the two days in Paris allowed us to completely change the model that we were planning, which I guess has not yet been discussed in this group, so we need to talk about that.

That's a moderately easy one to talk about. And there is a lot of the details that have changed as well. Let me try to describe the model, and I'm winging it, I don't have anything in front of me. And then I'll turn it

over to León, and then perhaps come back in with some of the specific changes that have occurred since then.

We went into Paris looking at the empowered membership model, the empowered designator model. Empowered in both cases means that you get quasi-legal status by making a declaration that you wish it. There seem to be stronger support for the designator, although there were still a number of people that were pushing for the model.

The lawyers had been charged with fleshing out what they called a single member model. A single member model is, we end up with one legal structure, an unincorporated association, which has the ability to act as the member. So it has all the member rights, but it takes its instructions directly from the ACs and SOs, so the member will act if certain threshold of decisions are made or votes are cast by the ACs and SOs that are involved.

To a large extent, it removes all of the problems of the members dissolving the organization, unless all of the ACs and SOs decide to, or at least the vast majority. It removes the problem of certain kinds of lawsuits that members can take. And it doesn't require any change at all in the ACs and SOs. Not even by, you know, making a specific motion. And the group ended up deciding that this is the model to go with.

The SSAC has said definitively they do not want to participate in this process. We believe the RSSAC has said the same thing, but that needs to be verified. And the GAC certainly is not able to in the short term. So we're ending up with the three SOs, the ccNSO, the GNSO, and

presumably the ASO, although they have not formally confirmed, and the ALAC, as the participants in the sole member.

There will be another group that, I think we are currently calling the ICANN community assembly, given that the word assembly is not currently used in the ICANN lingo, and that will be made up of all ACs and SOs, and will be purely a discussion group, but the place where one can raise issues and try to get support from the other groups, and get input from the ACs that are not participating in the formal mechanism.

And that's pretty well where we stand right now. There are some details to be fleshed out, some things we haven't even discussed yet, which have to be clarified and finalized in the next week. But we're getting moderately close on that. And with that, I'll turn it over to León for any other talk about the community model, and I'm not quite sure how we go over the other things.

As I said, I can identify a couple of the crucial points of contention, which have been resolved at this point, but I'm not it would be an exhaustive list, but I can certainly give a few of them. León?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Alan. This is León. Yes, as you've rightly pointed, I think [inaudible] present something concrete at this point. And we are all, as I said in the chat room, in an avalanche of work going on right now. There has been a lot of calls. We have the past meeting, and we haven't yet [inaudible] home, and we were already into new calls, so it has been quite hectic.

So as you said, I think that we can do at this point is just to highlight some important topics under discussion. As you rightly pointed, we have had as a result of a deeper analysis and discussion over the different models, we have had a new model proposed for our document that will be released for public comment period by the end of this month. On this new model which you have explained, so membership model.

And I think the details have been already highlighted by Alan, so I won't go into that again. But the outstanding issues that are currently under discussion, are the power of removing the individual members from the Board. We just have our call from the working group an hour ago, and this was a topic that was really discussed, it took a lot of time during the call.

And while I think that the issue might not be closed just yet, I think there was some progress at this. We also discussed the Board recall, [inaudible] difference with the Board removal was that, the Board recall refers to the whole Board members. And this, of course, is different in that the first one refers to individual members. And here we also had a very fruitful discussion, I think.

And we still need to iron out some details with regards to the NomCom appointees, I believe. This was something that was very controversial in the beginning, and I think that, as we have been going through the discussions, it has begun to settle. And we have taken care of the discussion of the care taker board also, what happens if we remove the whole Board, who is going to take care of the decisions that must

continue to happen within the Board. Who is going to occupy those seats? How are we going to designate those seats?

Should we have diversity criteria incorporated into designating these interim members that will be the care taker board, members, well there are lots of issues, as I said. I think it's hard to come with conclusions at this point, but the results were not something that was discussed. Another issue that was discussed in our call today was with regards to the power of the veto.

Here we have some concerns presented by many participants with regards to the dependencies that we have with the CWG and the requirements for, of course, having the power of vetoing or reviewing the budget that the Board at some point will present to the community with regards to the IANA functions manager.

And in this sense, there was agreement in the group that we should treat the ICANN general budget independently from the IANA functions manager subject. And what we came up to in this call is to, as I said, to treat it differently, or not differently but independently. And in the worst case scenario what would happen is if the budget was vetoed and returned to the Board for review and, of course, for having the Board come back to the community with a revised budget, then the time came that it was just essential to continue with the IANA functions with some budget, then this budget would be the one from the prior year.

So in this sense, we also had agreement. And we agreed to have a term for reviewing the budget by the community for 50 days, during the public comment, after the public comment period on the budget. And

then another 50 days for the Board to come back at us with a revised budget. And I see Alan's hand is up. Would you like to make a comment on that Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a number of general comments, but I'll wait for you to be finished and then I'll chime in. Or maybe you are finished, I'm not sure.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Okay. I'll just go to the next topic which is, the discussion on fundamental values and, I mean core values and definition. This point has arisen a new subject, well a relatively new subject, which is the discussion over having a reference to human rights in the ICANN bylaws. This has been a debate that has come from maybe the last week or so, and we began the discussion in Paris, I think.

And there are, of course, those who want to see the ICANN bylaws modified, so there is a direct reference that ICANN needs to carry out its mission in compliance with the normativity of human rights. And there are also those who say that the reference to international law already addresses this issue, and that it should part of the work stream two plan to further discuss and how this could be reinforced.

But this members or participants that are having this discussion, are of the idea that there should be no direct reference under the bylaws to human rights. So I think that would be all for me, and I'll turn back to Olivier to handle the queue, or do you want me to handle the queue?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this León, it's Olivier speaking. And if you can certainly handle the queue, I think you know how to do so. So it's over to you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. Well with that, I'll go to Alan, next person in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of small points on some of these. On the removal of AC SO directors, we now do have agreement that it will be done by the AC SO and not require ratification by the community in general. That was a contentious point with some. The issue that I think was resolved at this point, but not to everyone's satisfaction, is the whole issue of cause.

And the need to draft what potential causes are, and the opportunity for a director not to defend themselves, but to answer the issue. Certainly if we're talking about the removal of the, of a NomCom director, we're going to have to find some reason, because if the idea comes from one or two ACs and SOs, and wants the support of the others, then there certainly is a need to communicate why.

The current draft allows for the community assembly to discuss the issue before it goes either to the community, to the community member for a decision in the case of NomCom, or back to the AC SO in the case of an AC SO director. So it looks we will have causes that, in my

mind, that can be potentially harmful in, sorry. I'm getting ahead of myself.

One of the examples of a bad removal of a director, would be if an AC or SO would remove a director purely because that director did not vote the way the AC SO wanted on some financial matter, did not approve an expense, or approved an expense which the AC SO thought should not be approved. So that's considered a bad way to act. On the other hand, the concept of removal of individual directors, as an alternative to removing the whole Board, if the Board is not addressing overall ICANN budget matters, is deemed to be a good thing.

So you know, removing a director because they didn't vote on a budget matter is either a good thing or a bad thing, depending on how you look at it. So qualifying valid reasons maybe difficult, but I believe we're now agreed that we can have reasons, but there is no opportunity for appeal and ultimately the member can remove any Board member without any cause.

So I think that's come to a good point on that. In terms of the care taker board for whole Board removal, there is still some question about how the NomCom might participate in that, but at this point, we're saying that each AC and SO, when they have to for or against removing the entire Board, and regardless of which way they're going to vote, they have to provide a backup member, a replacement member for the interim Board.

So that gives you a small Board take over immediately, and I think that can work. On the human rights issue, the linkage to IANA is that the US

as a signatory to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, through NTIA, does have some clout. And with that removed, there is a belief among some, that we need an explicit reference to human rights. There are others who are really concerned that we need to think this through carefully, especially since ICANN operates in multiple countries, some of whom have many different views on what the definition of human rights are, that we can end up with a really difficult situation in cases like that, unless we understand all of the implications ahead of time.

And lastly, I have a question on this group, for people who were paying attention on the CWG, which I thought I was, but there is something that I'm not sure. I believed that in the CWG there was a provision that one year's budget, one year IANA budget, PTI budget, be held in escrow, should funding from ICANN not materialize for whatever reason, be it budget dispute, or bankruptcy, or whatever.

And I thought we had agreed on that, but I can't find it on the CWG report. So I'm just curious if anyone else knows what happened. Thank you.

León, over to you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This Is Eduardo.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. I'm sorry, I just had it on mute. So next on the queue, well I mean, we do have to listen to an answer to Alan's questions. I don't

know, Olivier if you will be able to, or maybe Jean-Jacques, either of you be able to [CROSSTALK]...

Okay. So I think next in the queue was Jean-Jacques, then Tijani, then Olivier. I'm not sure in the order...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: León, there is also Eduardo after me.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, so we'll go to Jean-Jacques, Tijani, Olivier, and then Eduardo. Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you León. This is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me? I hope so. [CROSSTALK]

Yes, thank you. In the single member model, this requires simple an addition in the bylaws of ICANN, or would it require the incorporation of a fictitious entity of individuals to be [inaudible]...

That is my question. [Inaudible] a few comments on human rights [inaudible]. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Jean-Jacques. If I understood your question, the question is, whether the sole membership model would require to incorporate some kind of legal entity and put this into the bylaws? The answer is

that this would fit under the figure of an unincorporated association, and of course, some bylaw changes would need to be in place for this to be implemented.

And I hope that answers your question. And next in the queue, I have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much León. Tijani speaking. For the [inaudible] Board member comment, [inaudible]...

It's also because of the creation of this forum, of this community forum, that Alan wants to call, ICANN Community Assembly, which is a forum of discussion on this, for this. And reach in the [inaudible] before removing the Board member, the SO or AC who wants to remove it, they have to propose that for the community in this forum that Alan is called now and that it [inaudible], ICANN Community Assembly.

The discussion [inaudible] that we now call [inaudible]... for the Board members. But [inaudible]... work stream two, not work stream one. But [inaudible] when the Board member votes, let's not [inaudible] with those standard actions, this is one major [inaudible]. But it can be another [cause] [inaudible], it is not a list of causes, but if you want, the discussion inside this forum would be [inaudible].

And so [inaudible]... the discussion inside the forum, and it is an open discussion, a public discussion, in which participate all SOs and ACs, even those that are not participating in the decision making, so we are not part of the [inaudible] member. And so this discussion, this public

discussion will a bit hard for a SO or a AC to recall a member just because they don't want him, or just because there is acting in the interest of the public interest, and for the interest of the whole community, and not for the [inaudible] interest this special or issue.

So this is, I think this is a good advancement that we have. And I believe, by the way there is another objection, another push back about that, and I really don't understand it. I try to understand, but I don't understand it. I already don't understand that people [inaudible]... just because they don't like it. They don't like him. This is for me [inaudible]... at all.

But now, this discussion inside of the community, and publically, most [inaudible] contact of action, that will be the [inaudible] of the discussion, I think this will make it better. This will give more... And yes, there is another point. The concern [inaudible] would have the right to explain his case, is that, if for example, ALAC wanted to remove Rinalia, in this forum, Rinalia would have the right to come and say, because ALAC will say, I want to remove Rinalia because she is [inaudible] or she will do that.

Rinalia will have the right to come to this forum, and to explain her case, to explain why she did that or perhaps why ALAC is wrong and she will do that. So this is also a good thing. And we are far from having the SO or AC deciding that way, to remove Rinalia. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Tijani. These are very important highlights and comments on the discussion. And I appreciate that you add this to the

call. And certainly this is something that needs to be further discussed within the CCWG, but I think, as you said, we are making big progress on the track. So next I will go to Olivier and then Eduardo.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you León, can you hear me?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes we do.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Oliver speaking. I wanted to reply Alan's question with regards to looking at, reading the CWG transition proposal, and trying to find out some details about the IANA budget and recommendations on this. And I also was in a similar thought that there was something in there that said that there should be, the budget for IANA should be, in fact I think it would be several years of budget for IANA, should be out in escrow, and this sort of thing.

I can't say it either. I'm not quite sure where this has gone. And I do note that there is an appendix in the document which actually just shows the contribution over to the budget for the IANA budget and operations public comment that took place. I wonder if the work is not ongoing on this, and somehow some of it has been dropped. I'm a little confused too. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. Next in the queue would be Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you León. I was going to also refer to the question about the [inaudible] and the escrow. I remember we had that conversation and I don't know really what happened. So to me, it fell into a crack somewhere, and... Because I didn't see it in the final report either. Now I cannot pinpoint out this, but I read somewhere that in the case that the ICANN Board does not approve the actual, you know, whatever budget is in place at a certain time, then automatically the previous budget from the previous year will be used.

Now I don't know if that's related to this question or not, but I believe that it will include the IANA budget. Thank you. That's my comment.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Eduardo. Next in the queue I have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My recollection of the final thing we discussed, was I believe there would be two years' budget held in reserve, one year of it in escrow. And that was being done not only for ICANN not approving the budget, but if ICANN had to file for bankruptcy, and that money would be protected because it wasn't owned at that point by ICANN anymore. So I'm somewhat concerned, I think I will be writing to the CWG list to try to identify what happened on that.

One last comment on the removal of individual directors and the ICANN community assembly. And by the way, although I support that name, I didn't coin it. It came out of a document written by Bernie and Grace, I believe, or at least updated by Bernie and Grace.

But I support the name because it's not a word we use anywhere else. So there is no confusion with other things. Just to point out that the community assembly doesn't have any power, so although having to bring it to the community assembly does make it a lot more difficult for an AC or SO to remove someone, for frivolous reasons, because they have to do it in the open, and you know, it's both embarrassing and more difficult to defend, the community assembly doesn't actually have the power to stop it, but it does require that it be openly discussed. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. Next in the queue I have Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much. When it comes to the member removal, I do understand that the discussion must be open, but this topic was also mentioned. And we also have to address the causes of that, the grounds for that, and is there going to be any procedure.

In the case of the grounds for removal, there are certain grounds that are mentioned. This is not a criminal code, or a law, but of course, there are certain grounds that should be taken into account, that it

would be provable ground, and if those grounds do not exist, then removal may not proceed. So perhaps this is a very dedicated, very important issue to take into account.

So perhaps we can deal with it, but we have to see the way in which we will be dealing with this issue. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alberto. We have a discussion on this today, and maybe Alan will add to what I have to say. So far I remember that, we were discussing whether, or developed as part of our work stream two work, a set of expectations that the Board members would need to meet. And if they didn't meet these expectations, then there will be grounds to begin a removal procedure.

And then at some point, it was discussed that there should be two sets of standards, let's say. And that mostly came up to having each SO and AC define its own rules, as to removing their appointed directors, which would have course have the problem that this would apply to the NomCom appointees. So this is why we would be looking at maybe, and when I say maybe, I like to emphasize this hasn't reached any conclusions yet in the CCWG.

So we continue to discuss this issue, but we are pretty much on the same page, that there should be some guidelines at least, to have the community develop the process, or each SO AC to begin the process. I think Alan might want to add something to that, and I see his hand is up already, so Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you very much. Just a few comments. Under, in a membership organization, it is very clear that the members, member or members, can remove a director. Period. There does not need to be any explicit cause, so you know, that's a matter of law.

Ultimately we're talking about judgment calls here. So although yes, we will, in work stream two be drafting, I think the word we're using is guidelines right now, ultimately it is judgment call of those who are making the decision, whether it's the AC SO or the overall community in the case of NomCom, as to whether the criteria is met or not. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. Next in the queue I have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much León. Alberto, I do agree with you 100%, but we have in our community a lot of people who disagree, strongly disagree with the fact that we remove [inaudible] because something. They said no, they have to remove the director even if he is very well, but if they want to remove him, they have to remove him.

And the reason was given, as Alan just said, it was because the California law say that, say that the appointing body, the member, has the right to recall the Board member [inaudible]. This was the case when it was membership model, when it was [inaudible], but now we have single model, single member model. And for your information the

one who appointed the Board director, is the single member, and the one who removed them, is the single member.

This is [inaudible] aspects of the [inaudible]. But even [inaudible] is like this now, is that normally the whole community, inside the sole member of the organization, will remove the Board directors. Our community members, including Alan, want to be, wanted to ask to make provisions in the bylaws so that the sole number, if you want, the CSM, will not have any power to change a decision of a SO or AC who wants to recall the member, without any reason.

You see the reality. So I fail to understand the rationale behind it. I try to not, it is months now that we speak for that, but I couldn't understand. There is no real rationale. It is, until Paris it was because the law said that. Now the law is on the other side, and then we need to other things, other acrobatics to make the SO or AC to recall the member, when they want, without any reason.

This is [inaudible]. So to remain to that, to find a solution, it was [inaudible] who found the idea of having the [inaudible] of the Board. This is a good idea. So if we define work stream two under the actions. And if we accept to make those introductions, there is [inaudible] inside the assembly. It would be, in my point of view, an advancement. It is not what I want, but it is an advancement.

So we are obliged to find a consensus, it's an advancement. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Tijani. And I see Olivier's hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Old hand.

LEON SANCHEZ: ...skip it on the queue. If I did skip, I apologize.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Old hand.

LEON SANCHEZ: Old hand Olivier? Okay. So I think we so covered what we've been up to in the CCWG. Hopefully by our next call we will be able to present you with some advancements in a more concrete way. We are still working on finalizing of our next insertions of our report for the second public comment period. And we are also waiting for some graphics from our friends from [Ex Plane], which will of course, aid us in explaining us in a more easier and understandable way.

And with this, I think, I see Tijani's hand up again, so before I turn to Olivier, I'll turn to Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much León. Sorry for asking for the floor again. It is say two words about the higher [inaudible], independent panel. The

[independent review?] panel. As we draft this for the first public comment, I was very happy, and I think if you would remember, I was one of the supporters of this change in the hierarchy.

But we have an example, a very bad example, which was one about [inaudible]. This example showed that some, how to say, some, [inaudible] be careful. The first [inaudible] that was very [inaudible] again, it said how it would be [inaudible] with a few people that you select, or other people select, more than the Board members who you select, and who are from your community.

And this is very valuable as a remark. We don't have to give the panel all of the power, because I believe we said it would be binding to the Board, so it will be the final decision. I understand that, especially because this case of [North Africa], and they gave a report that you can discuss, very easy, because a lot of things [inaudible] in this report, but I will not discuss that, but I say that now, with this experience, we need to be careful. And I said that in the CCWG.

We need first to limit the period of consideration to a certain period. And the panel does not have to exceed this period, except in the case of big things such as the death of one of the members of the panel, and in this case, it will be extended by the same period, and not more. Because and the example I am speaking about, normally it is three months extendable to six months. It's not 20 months and [inaudible]. This is not normal.

Because when you put [inaudible], you will [inaudible] for [inaudible], especially because there is a lot of money in those, how to say, district.

There is a lot of money. And people, perhaps, are ready to do everything to win. So the first thing is the period of consideration. The second thing the decision, or the report of the IRP should be available, should be [inaudible], should be accessible at one level, not more, because we'll enter endless appeal.

So one level of appeal, will be good, so that when they are wrong, and they may be wrong, they are few people, they may be wrong. So when they are wrong, they can, we can correct that decision or that report. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Tijani. And yes, the IRP working methods are still a work in progress. And I do agree with you that resolution shouldn't take that much time because time is money in the end, and if we want to have a IRP that is accessible to as many people as possible, then we should definitely look into how the process with regards to timing impacts the cost.

So yes, this is something that needs to be ironed out by the working party that's taken of this. And I have Alan's hand up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Thank you for bringing up the IRP Tijani. It's certainly something that I have some significant problems with, and I'm not sure there is an easy way to address them. We're looking at IRPs because we believe that there are going to be times when the Board, in its wisdom, does something wrong.

And there are certainly some examples of that, depending on your point of view, that may have been the case on dot Africa or not. On the other hand, we also have, especially with the new gTLD process, examples of independent reviewers who have made some really stupid decisions. And the question of why do we trust this panel more than we trust our own members, in some cases seems to be quite valid.

So how do you balance this need to have a check and balance on the Board, but at the same time understand that there may be situations where the panel makes the wrong decisions. And as Tijani pointed out, there is a lot of money involved here, and people are going to push very hard for decisions that are in their favor.

So I don't know how we're going to fix that. I'm not sure how we balance the two needs, and try to have something which is fail safe. If we make the decision of the panel binding, then we are trusting them to always make the right decision. If we don't make it binding, then we're trusting the Board to make the right decision ultimately, something the community does not feel really inclined to do at this point.

So I'm somewhat troubled about how we're going to get to the end of this one. That should be interesting. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. And yes it will be difficult [inaudible] the balance, and an interesting discussion in between. But I see Tijani's hand is up again. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much León. One of the possible solutions Alan, is that we say that the decision of the panel is [binding] to the Board, in the sense of the rejection of the decision of the Board. But the final decision remains in the hands of the Board. So the Board after going through the IRT, and after having this rejections from, to reconsider, we reconsider its decision, and perhaps they would say, no the rationale that was given by the panel was wrong, because that, this, this, etc.

So this is the way because some people inside of our group is thinking in this way. The binding aspect is of the rejection of the decision of the Board, but it is not, they are not deciding instead of the Board. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Tijani. I see Alan's hand is up again, Oliver then. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Yeah, Tijani, I understand that, but there are other people who say binding is binding and the Board cannot simply make a new decision that reverses that. So it's going to be interesting. As I said, we don't all agree on what binding means, or whether the Board ultimately has the responsibility and the right with its fiduciary responsibility to make the decision against how it was decided the first time.

So I'm not playing a large part in this, because I'm not really an expert on these things, but I do have some concerns. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. Next on the queue is Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much León. Olivier speaking. And I just had a question with regards to the review panel, the timeline. Has anyone thought of the timeline of this independent review? Because the concern that I have here is that these are all sorts of decisions that are being taken, and often things have to be, decisions have to be taken fast.

And now we have an independent review panel that might take, if we look at the history of it, months to come back with a review of a decision that was made, and I wonder if this could not be used as a tool to delay ICANN in its tracks, by just launching some futile reviews of decisions that ICANN makes.

Is there any such danger?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Olivier for bringing this up. If you want to answer Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: In answer, sure there is that danger. Court cases and judgments like this are often used as a delaying tactic, hoping to wear someone else down or use up all of their money, or use up all of yours, or simply delay because delay is in your favor. Yes, that's a danger. There has been a

belief that we need to setup a process that has a finite time associated with it, that is not years.

On the other hand, if you look at the dot Africa, part of the reason for the delay was that someone died. And you can't litigate that. So, you know, who knows exactly how it's going to go ahead. But yes, there is certainly a possibility and almost a guarantee that it will be used as a delaying tactic by some, at some point.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I [inaudible] what Alan said, and it is really, and it is used for that. Yes, it is used for that. [Inaudible] that we are trying to make use of the ALT, IRP, instead of going to the court, because suppose we are, have a real problem with the Board. Suppose the Board does want to, how to say, apply the power that the community had, how will you solve that? If we go directly to the courts, it will be a problem because I personally, and my community at AFRALO, and also a lot of the CCWG, think that we don't have to make the [inaudible] of ICANN [inaudible] in the courts.

That's why the best is to go to the independent review process, and it's after that, there is no solution, perhaps we will, in a very, very extreme case, go to the court. So this is the problem. The problem is to make use of the [inaudible] because it is better than going to the court, and

we have to be careful that this IRP is not used to gain the system. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Tijani. I hope that answers your question Olivier, and I see you have your hand up. So please, could you take the floor?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you León. Olivier speaking. And I am just going to comment personally on having a problem with ICANN's Board actions. Of course, we're always saying, what if the Board does this, what if the Board does that? I have some real concerns that we are having, we're putting all sorts of things in place to try and overturn decisions of the Board, and we're not putting anything in place to try and overturn decisions of the community, because we believe that the community is just so clean and so great at making decisions.

I personally have had more concerns about some segments of the community than some segments of the Board. And just as a tongue in cheek comment, joke, why wouldn't the Board be able to go to an independent review panel to basically look at a decision of the GNSO, for example, and ask for a review of that?

It's just, it's very bizarre. I have real concern, at the moment, about capture. I don't know how that would come through, how that capture would come through, but I so far have seen the Board act in the best interest of ICANN on many occasions, and sometimes it has not been

something that we've agreed with, but there are a number of occasions where it was.

And yeah, I'm just not feeling too right about this. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Olivier. You've raised a very valid point. Actually it was straight in the first public comment period. We received many comments with regards to how we are trying to, or how we are trying to address the issue on SO and AC accountability. And not only censure our work with regards to Board and staff accountability.

And this is something that we're trying to take care of in working party three, which is a newly created working party within the CCWG. And I don't think that so far we have considered the IRP to be also applicable to community actions or inactions in this case. But we are in fact, considering or recommending that the structural reviews that are already performed, include the review on accountability for each SO and AC, upon their respective constituencies and community members.

And of course, we are also considering evaluating what we called the cross community accountability roundtable. And this would be fleshed out as part of our work stream two, but the main principle under which this roundtable, the mutual accountability roundtable would work, is to have a kind of a public forum, in which the different SOs and ACs would discuss with the [inaudible] that they feel that need to have some kind of accountability, whether to their respective constituencies, or maybe to their fellow SOs and ACs.

So I see Alan's hand is up. Would you like to add something to this Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you. First of all, just to address the specific points Olivier mentioned. The Board doesn't have to use the RFP to take the, against the GNSO. They can simply refuse to accept a recommendation. And the same with advice from an AC. So there is no need for the IRP, if that, in that sense.

However, accountability of ACs and SOs is a very real issue, and it's not so much that they're accountable, it's that certain parts of it may not have as much stake in the game as others, and therefore the AC SO can be captured by certain very vocal people, or people with more stamina, or more money. It's an issue the ALAC has raised repeatedly, the GNSO has raised, current GNSO review is raising it in spades, pointing out that those with not as much money in the game, are not in a position to defend their positions, and therefore, you end up effectively having the council captured by those who do have more stamina, and more money, and more people.

So it's a real issue. It's not clear how we're going to make it better, but it's a real issue and it is certainly one we've been talking about for a very long time. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Alan. Olivier, is that a new hand or an old hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks León. Olivier speaking. It is a new hand, and I do realize time is ticking, but I was just going to say. Indeed, the ICANN Board can choose to ignore GNSO advice. If the ICANN Board was to go to an independent review panel, and that would overturn GNSO advice. I don't know what the strength of that overturn would be like, but it would be an interesting thing.

Because one could say, well, we basically gotten now an independent panel to overturn your advice, rather than us deciding we're not going to take your advice. It's a detail between the two. I don't know. I just have concerns. We're not just dealing with so many review panels, and getting people that are completely external to ICANN to make potentially decisions on so many of ICANN's business, and ultimately as well, with a review panel you also have to, present a case so long and so on.

It's just going to be doing a lot [inaudible], and very little for the public interest, because it's just going to become so complex. It's a risk, and I really don't have an answer at the moment, and I hope that you guys who are really deeply into this, you have an answer. Maybe that will be that magical moment that will take place. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you...

EDUARDO DIAZ: León I'm not on the computer. Can I get in the queue please?

LEON SANCHEZ: You're next.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's be honest, at least one of the people who has pushed for the IRP, and the IRP to be binding and strong, is someone who has openly said that they want an IRP so they can take the ICANN Board, essentially disagree with something the ICANN Board has done on behalf of their clients, you know, this is a lawyer.

And they want to be able to make sure that their clients are satisfied if they don't agree with what the ICANN Board has done. So there is money involved here. That's the motivation in many cases. It's not just, you know, fairness on behalf of all of us players. So that is part of what we're looking at, and I don't know the answer. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. So I'm out of time. We've reached the [inaudible]... The half hour for our call. And I would like to turn it back to Olivier. So Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks León. Actually León under your chairmanship of this section, it's Olivier speaking, I still have one response.

LEON SANCHEZ: Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Ah, thanks. It was just, we have to be very careful about what tools we are creating here, that might be tools that are used on behalf of clients, as Alan said, to either coax ICANN into something it doesn't want to do, or to destroy ICANN one way or other. And keep that one in mind. That's all. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. And with this, I'll hand it over back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this León. We have one minute to go, not even one minute to go. And we have any other business. The floor is open for any other business.

I don't see anyone having put their hand up. So it has been a very good call, I think. Next week, as you know, there are so many calls on the accountability thread, that it would probably be very helpful to have a call next week. I turn to León and Alan. Would you prefer the early part of the week or the later part of the week? Early as in before Wednesday or after Wednesday?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. If it's to be able to report what's going on, it should be later in the week.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Later in the week. Okay. So let's have a... All right, thanks. Let's have a little poll for the last part of the week, and try to have rotation as well. I'm mindful of people that live in other parts of the world as well. We won't necessarily take the most popular time. We'll take one that we haven't taken before, and that we're, that we'll have enough people, of course, on the call or in responding to the Doodle poll, please be flexible because I do realize there are some people who are constantly [inaudible].

And the sharp end of the stick, shall I say, in using very anti-social hours. If we can change a little bit on this occasion, that will be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Olivier, if I may make one more comment. By having it at the end of the week, there will be decisions being made between now and then. If issues have come up in this call, where you have strong feels, and they haven't already been decided. There is no point in reopening things that have been argued out and we've come to closure on, but if there are issues where you feel that there are things that you need to say, and want to provide guidance to the people who are working in these groups, then provide them an email sooner rather than later.

That doesn't mean you get your way, but at least make your positions known. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Very good point Alan. Thank you very much. And with this, I thank you all for this 90 minutes of exciting discussions. And we certainly are moving forward and continuing our work for the support of our members and participants in both the stewardship and accountability working groups.

And of course, those in the ICG, who have still a large amount of work in front of them. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the interpreters Veronica and David, and our staff Heidi and Terri, and adjourn the call. Thank you and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]