TERRI AGNEW:	…ICANN Accountability Call, taking place on Friday, 31st of July 20 15 at 18:00 UTC. On the call today we have Seun Ojedeji, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Remmy Nweke, Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Sébastian BAchollet. On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto. We show apologies from Leon Sanchez. 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 names before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our Spanish interpreters. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much Terri. Have we missed anyone in the roll call, or has anyone joined whilst we were running the roll call? Hearing no one, the roll call is complete, and now we have to adopt the Agenda. Today I think we'll go very quickly through the announcement of the ICG for the first of its public consultations. There's very few news on the IANA front, on CWG IANA, but the majority of the work today will be about the CCWG Accountability; an enormous amount of discussion in the past week, and of course, as you know, the face-to-face meeting in Paris.

We'll do the majority of our discussions on that. Are there any amendments or additions to the Agenda? Okay, so the Agenda is adopted as-is. I'd like you to review the AIs from the last meeting. There was only one, which was the Doodle, so that's done. That takes us to Agenda Item #3 - the review of the IANA Coordination Group process. |

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.

Alan, I see, has put his hand up. Maybe I've been a little too fast in going through Agenda Item #2. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, actually you were a little fast in answering my hand. Once you'd finished the introduction into #3 I had something to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So you wanted to queue up very quickly. Well, just as far as #3 is concerned, the ICG has now sent a request for public comments. I believe it's a 40-day PCP. It spans most of the month of August and a little more, and it closes on the 8th of September 2015. On the Agenda you'll find links that go to our ALAC policy development page, and that's where the ALAC, I believe, if it wishes to comment, will be building its comment. I invite you all to take part in this very important process.

I also hope we'll be able to speak to our colleagues on the ALAC and have more than just the Members of this Working Group contributing and have a wider number of people. This whole process of ICG is very important. Alan, you're first in the queue and you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier. I guess it's rather unfortunate that we don't have anyone from the ICG here, because the first question I would have asked is were there any substantive changes made that we should be aware of, or places where they had to do something to cause the various individual proposals to be melded together. That certainly is one of the more interesting things. One of the questions we're going to have

to ask ourselves - and do that pretty quickly - is are we going to make a comment on this? We certainly don't have to.

I don't have any idea whatsoever right now if we're going to have significant problems with something they're saying, simply want to say, "Yeah, you did a great job," or something in-between. I think those who have been following the processes moderately closely are going to have to do a… I won't say a quick read, because I think it was about 300 pages long, and decide, "Is there something substantive we have to say? Are we just doing a cheerleader statement?" or whatever.

But I think we need to come to closure moderately quickly on that, and we need to come up with a process of how we come to closure on that one pretty quickly. It is 40 days, but that goes pretty quickly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Hear, hear, is all I can say. I see Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier. I agree with Alan completely. I would like to suggest that whatever we want to say, we say something. One of the reasons is that as we are not dealing with names, it gives us the opportunity to talk about other topics, that it's under our purview and I think it's important. Even if it's to say we are happy that we have finally one proposal for all the three IANA issues or work or whatever. I think it's politically important and it's a pity we don't have anyone from the ICG. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We do have someone from the ICG. Mohamed has joined the call. I'm going to be very brief and then we'll turn it over to Mohamed, but perhaps I'll restate what I said earlier, before he joined. I tend to agree with Sébastian. I try as Chair not to lead the group and force the direction, but I think it's politically appropriate for us to make a comment also, even if it's just, "We support it," and, "Thank you for all the hard work." But I would really would like to understand to what extent the ICG believes they've simply melded the reports together, or the proposals together, and to what extent these adjustments have to be made.

Certainly I know they didn't come back to the CWG with any real substantive issues, other than perhaps the IANA trademark and domain name, but I guess I'd like to understand to what extent was it an easy job melding the proposals, and to what extent it was problematic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Mohamed is indeed online. Mohamed, have you been able to hear Alan's question, and will you be able to speak right now?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I'm sorry, but I'm on leave and traveling. I'm trying to log in from a place with limited Internet access.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're very faint, Mohamed. I understand that you're currently on leave and with very limited Internet access. That's what I've heard.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes. I will try to use the chat. Is it better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you, not well, but I'll try to repeat what you're saying if you can give us a quick summary?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Basically I can provide you with a quick summary. I'm sure, as you know, that the news is now that ICG has already created its proposal for public comments, ending September 8th. There is no major compatibility issues on the assessment of the CWG Report compared to the two previously received proposals. The only issues that… The current issue of the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we're getting breaking up as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Mohamed, you seem to have disappeared.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: …Trademarks…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Started well, but Mohamed you're now breaking up in addition to these things. I think we've lost Mohamed altogether.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: …I can say the proposals are compatible for the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Piecing together a couple of words.

ALAN GREENBERG: Mohamed, you seem to have broken up. I think the gist of what I caught in any case was to a large extent the proposals were compatible with each other, so there were no significant problems to be solved. I did hear a reference to the trademark and IANA issue, so I guess we'll have to read and see just what was put in the overall proposal to address what could be conceived as differences between some of them - although the CWG one, I know, we at one point clarified that we hadn't really made a proposal, so we were amenable to other things. That's about all I got out of what Mohamed said. Olivier, did you get anything more?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, that's it. I got exactly the same. I know that Mohamed is coordinating with staff to have a dial-out. If this takes a little time, can I just open the floor? I know Mohamed is hearing us. Can I open the floor

for any questions from participants here that Mohamed can listen to? Then when he finally has access he can respond. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. Sorry, I'm not on Adobe today because my connection is acting up, so I won't be coming into the AC. I just want to ask a quick one to Mohamed: I have checked the actual call, the URL for the [circumstance 00:13:26] already, but is there an intention to actually have a summary? I don't think the [other] pages would be very interesting for someone who actually wants to understand what is happening.

Is there an intention to have a summary of the key aspects of this proposal, which would perhaps give a newbie, or someone who is just joining the process, an understanding or overview of what the ICG is proposing for the transition? Is there an intention to have that, or is it just a webinar alone that will address that? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Seun, let's bank this question for the time-being until Mohamed gets on the telephone. Are there any other questions in addition to Seun's question? We have Alan and then Sébastian. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's not a question, just a comment that I suspect that if there is anything substantive that's available it would have been pointed to within the announcement, so other than perhaps an Executive

Summary, which I presume is part of the overall proposal, I suspect there is nothing, if it wasn't actually pointed to. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I agree with Seun that it might be helpful if there is some kind of summary done by the Chairs or the Co Chairs of the ICG, because originally when one looked at the Paris Meeting, for example, that took place in the CCWG Accountability, there was a statement made by the Chairs. I have not seen such a statement with a quick summary of points that might have been changed, or issues that remain to be resolved. I guess that might be helpful. Let's put this on the side. Indeed, as Cheryl says, it might be something that might be in the slide deck that we'll see for the webinar. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would like to know if the ICG discussed a question of any link between the proposal that ICG will send and what is done by the CCWG on Accountability. I know there are links between the CWG on IANA Stewardship, but to the ICG as a global group, is there any need from the CCWG?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastian. Now I understand that staff is dialing out to Mohamed. Are there any further questions for him that we can bank and ask him in one go? Mohamed has joined audio. Fantastic. Welcome. I gather you have heard the two questions that were put to you?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hi Olivier. Are you able to hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well. Welcome Mohamed. It's sometimes very hard with technology, but it's good to have you on the call. Were you able to hear the questions which were asked whilst we were trying to get hold of you via the mobile?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think I heard the second question from Suen about the summary. I'm not sure about the first question. I think we missed that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's ask the one that Suen asked, and that's about the Executive Summary. Is the ICG Leadership planning to put together an Executive Summary and perhaps point out any discrepancies that might have been encountered between the three different proposals that were received?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Yes, there is a summary. You can see it, I think it's posted online. There is also some sort of details about the assessment, and individually how the proposals were assessed. There's a criteria that's been done by the ICG, and there is also an assessment of the three proposals, and that's already on the document release. There will be a slide deck, and that will be shared, and it will be the basis of the webinars on the 6th and

7th of August, and those slide decks will include the Executive Summary, or more details about the assessment and a review of the proposals from the community. I hope that answers your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. Indeed, I think we're looking forward to this webinar, which is likely to then answer our question. The second question that was asked, and this one was from Sébastian, was whether there was any work done, or is there anything that shows at the moment the link between the proposal by the ICG and the work of the CCWG on Accountability? We know there's been a link between the CWG IANA and the CCWG Accountability. We know there's also obviously the proposal of the CWG IANA in the ICG proposal. But is there some link between CCWG Accountability and the ICG?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Olivier and thank you Sébastian. This is a very important question. The final proposal will not be submitted without accountability requirements, which is currently ongoing work. So the ICG will revert back to the CWG after the CCWG has completed its work, or at least have a clear product in terms of in our hand. The ICG will request CWG to confirm if there's any update to their proposals regarding accountability, or the CCWG has confirmed their requirement in their proposal for the accountability. So there's an inter-link between the CCWG work and the CWG work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this. Sébastian, does this answer your question? We may have lost Sébastian. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just an observation that although the CWG formally link their report to the CCWG, fulfilling the accountability requirement, there is an implicit link from the IETF and the RIR proposal as well, since both of them are presuming ICANN, or perhaps an ICANN affiliate, is doing the actual work. From an NTIA point of view, the accountability measures matter for them as well. They may not have put that explicit link in, but from an NTIA point of view it's not just the CWG, but all three proposals that presume ICANN is trustworthy. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes. I agree with you, Alan. Both of the two proposals, yes, there is inter-links and dependencies, definitely, but the CWG is a more elaborate proposal in terms of the requirements of the accountability and the work dependent on the CCWG, for sure. It clearly describes the requirements of accountability that the CWG requires, more extensively than the IETF or the RIR proposal. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to agree with Mohamed, that yes, we did complicate things significantly, but noting we have complicated them significantly for the

other two groups as well, so we've done a really good job! Just a little bit of humor in this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I agree completely with Alan. The CWG proposal is… I don't want to say the most complicated, but it's a comprehensive piece of work, and there are a lot of dependencies. We hope that things will go well without any issues here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Are there any other questions for Mohamed?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Thank you Mohamed for the responses. I just want to ask a quick one. I just want to understand the mechanism with regard to using processes in the governance. If I [unclear 00:24:34] once the comment you receive, if there are issues from them, you'll go back to your [professional] communities, right? Is that correct? Or do you try to resolve it at the level of the ICG alone? If there are comments from the proposal that does not actually agree with a particular section of the proposal, how do you intend to handle it? Is it a manner of going back to the [professional] community, or do you judge the process as one single proposal? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Seun. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks Seun.   Basically, now we have a complete proposal, if the question is raised regarding components of the community proposals, they will know that because everything will be public. But [there is a process 00:25:48] as well were in the comment period earlier. So the ICG presumes that we're going to look seriously into the comments that focus on the overall three proposals and how they integrate, and how they combine, and the comments on the combined proposal itself. I think we passed the stage of comments on individual proposals.

I think now the focus will be on the interoperability between the three proposals, or any issues in terms of the final proposal - in summary, how the pieces are working together. But still, yes, I think the door is open to refer back to the community if anything emerges, but I don't foresee that. The focus is on individual proposal comments. Even if you see in the list of the questions perhaps on the comment page, you can see it's all focusing on assessing the comments and the submissions of the combined proposals:

How you see it fit together' any issues in terms of accountability' overall comments on the consistency of the proposal; if there are issues on the final proposal operationally or from a security point of view. So the focus will be on the overall, combined proposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Mohamed. If I understand correctly, there is no opportunity to reopen the individual proposals for discussion at this point. Is that correct?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes, that's my understanding, because those proposals went through rigorous comment reviews, and comments have been submitted. But I don't want to close the door unless there are issues raised that require communities to review any changes that come in. I don't foresee ICG retaining individual issues on the proposals at this stage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Seeing no one else with their hand up, I had one last question for you. As you mentioned earlier, the CWG IANA proposal was a lot larger than the one received from the RIRs or the IETF. There was a significant component part into creation of new organizations and how contracts were to be transferred to this new organization, the post-transition IANA new organization - without going into details, as we all know. That introduces perhaps some differences and amendments to contracts for the other two operational communities.

Has this been discussed? Is there any process by which the other operational communities will specify this in their proposal? I do note that at the moment there is no specific indication at all on how any transition of stewardship might take place, with the other two proposals.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:	Thanks Olivier. Yes, this issue has been raised in a couple of discussions in ICG, and I think you're referring to the current "agreements" between the IETF and RIRs, with ICANN. Both communities have responded that they don't see issues in contracting with ICANN, and the ICANN back-to-back manage a new separated organization; so that will mean managing the IANA function - or according to the CCWG proposal. So they didn't really raise issues about those agreements; dealing directly with ICANN or directly with post-transition IANA.
	So that was not a major issue for that entity, the subsidiary of ICANN, so it's a back-to-back agreement design with them. Their preference, if I recall, in response of my [CF 00:30:56] and having meetings, is that the preference is maybe from ICANN, but it's the back-to-back arrangement. They will use that as a contractual discussion, but they don't have an issue about those agreements directly with ICANN. That's the preference, and that could be back-to-back arrangements between ICANN and the new operating entity.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you very much for this. I'm glad to hear that the other two operational communities, apart from ICANN, have no problem in amending the contracts accordingly, as to allow for sub-contracting from ICANN to post-transition IANA. I know time is ticking at the moment. One last question, I gather, is whether you'd be able to assist any penholders or whether you might wish to be the penholder for the ALAC statement on this topic, if there is the need for such a statement.

I'd guess as the Vice Chair of the ICG you might be in a position where perhaps you might not be able to assume any drafting position, but perhaps Jean-Jacques - who may be listening to this recording - may wish to help with the drafting of something. We'll probably have to follow up in the next couple of days to make a first decision on whether the ALAC wishes to comment, and then afterwards put some lines together. From what I hear at the moment, it doesn't look like there's anything that seems to be really sticking out.

Perhaps the copyright issue is one we still need to work out, but the rest, I'm glad, and it looks like colleagues here are glad, to hear there hasn't been any particularly sticky issue with putting those three proposals together. Perhaps some encouragement might come in order; encouragement from a community that will greatly benefit from a smooth transition, since that would mean a stable Internet. We'll take it form there, I guess. Maybe in the next couple of days, if you can come back to us with... We'll see after the webinar perhaps, and see where we go from here. Are there any more comments on this topic before we move on in our Agenda? Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Olivier. I'm happy to contribute in the review and if there's any submission from ALAC, I'll be resuming, or at least be back on August 7th. By the way, I'm currently in the countryside in Austria. I expected the Internet to be much better than in my country, but it seems the countryside everywhere has its own issues. I'm happy to contribute, definitely.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did you say countryside in Australia?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Austria. I'm outside Strasbourg area.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. If you'd have said Australia, I'd have said, "Please say hi to Cheryl when you see her," since we all know the countryside in Australia, everyone can see everyone else. That's fine. Seun, you had something to say?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. I just wanted to add to your final comment to Mohamed. Mohamed, if you think there is something that, because perhaps yourself and Jean-Jacques are the most involved in the ICG, if you think there is something that we need to pay attention to, I think it would be good for you to raise it so that we can actually also determine whether there is a need to make comment on that. Thank you.

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

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Seun. I think the common discussion will be about submission fo the final proposal, reviewing of comments. I think the

issue about accountability will be crucial, and the importance of the bylaw changes to be written and ready for the transition, I think that's what our focus will be. I don't foresee really major issues in terms of comments received from the final proposal, but let's see how that goes. I think maybe ALAC needs to think about the process itself, the transition itself now, and how that can be done and how ALAC could be actively contributing in that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Mohamed. I guess we can now let you go back to your family and relax a little bit after all this work that I know you had to do in the past few weeks, in putting those proposals together. Let's move onto Agenda Item #4. We've already spent 35 minutes on this call. In fact, unlikely as it may seem #4 is about CWG IANA, and we might cover it in a minute if there is no substantive issue that anyone wishes to bring forward. I certainly have monitored the mailing list. There's been very little traffic. I think most people have been very active on the accountability mailing list, rather than the IANA mailing list. Does anyone wish to add anything with regards to the CWG Stewardship, as they call it now?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. It was just to add that yes, it's good news that at least we have less traffic from the CWG list at least. That's a good indication that we are fine with the aspects of the CWG. However, I want to mention about the trademark issue, which is still [unclear 00:38:04]. I note that some time ago, I think on one of the calls, Alan did mention that it's not really

EN

a major issue for At-Large, but I think it is. I think we should try as much as possible to follow it up and make sure it's actually what we want - that what's decided is something we can agree with. It's a minor issue, but we should be part of the conversation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Seun. Yes, there were a couple of points that were discussed on the list. Indeed, the trademark issue is still pending. There is a forwarded email from Richard Hill on the IANA trademark, and Richard Hill, for those that don't know him, is an ex-ITU employee still involved in Internet governance. I do wonder sometimes why the staff actually sends specific, or forward individual people's emails to the CWG Stewardship, but that evades me.

That said, the issue apparently is still unresolved, and the last I heard was that Sidley, the legal counsel, was looking at this. I beg to be told whether that's correct or not, but that's my understanding at the moment. Alan, do you have a different understanding than this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no understanding, and to be honest, at this point I don't care. The ICG has done something. We need to look at what it is they're recommending, and maybe we need to agree, disagree, comment, or maybe some action needs to be taken. But at this point, they've seen fit to somehow issue a proposal. If either we, as ALAC, or ICANN in general, disagrees with it, then we'll hear that. But I don't think there's anything we need to do until at least we read what they've written.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Alan. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much Alan. Actually, like I said, I haven't read the ICG proposal, so actually I didn't know the ICG has actually proposed something for the trademark. If they indeed have, I would be surprised, especially since the trademark issue, the CWG has not actually indicated their own view about the trademark issue. I guess I should agree with Alan. Let's look at the ICG's proposal. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Seun. In light of this, I think we should probably move onto the CCWG Accountability, since there's nothing else to report at the moment on CWG IANA, and the focus has now gone on the ICG. Handing the floor over to Alan, from here onwards you can take us through with regards to the second draft development. I, for one, have been flooded with emails on the accountability mailing list. A number of questions on the number of votes, and the number of votes allocated to the ALAC in the case of wishing to spill the Board, or in case a vote was needed and so on.

The whole thing looks more like a battlefield sometimes than an actual friendly forum where people discuss things and try and reach consensus. But I'll hand it over to you. I just wanted to preamble this handover and thank you and your colleagues who are in this Working Group for being able to sustain the level of punishment that you have been sustaining

the past couple of days, if not the past handful of days. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I think "punishment" often is the correct word. It goes along with the old saying of "no good deed should go unpunished" and I think it's been done in spades at the moment. All right, where we are today: the CCWG is planning to issue a new proposal. I've lost track of exactly whether it's going out tomorrow or today. I'm pretty sure it wasn't yesterday. Actually, I believe it's going out sometime around Monday, with the weekend being taken up with people furiously drafting and proofreading and trying to integrate the various sections.

What you'll see on the screen right now, and it's pointed to in the Agenda as the document repository - and there's a pointer to both the web version and a PDF of it - that contains the 20-odd sections that were split up to allow various working groups - and I use the term with lower case W and G, because they took on various forms and sub-divided into little groups of people that did a lot of drafting - and now they all have to be put together. Each of them have gone through more iterations than I can count.

There are a couple of people that have done unbelievable amounts of work to get this pulled together. Certainly I have worked hard, and many others have worked hard. I suspect I can say with impunity that Jordan Carter from .nz has done an unbelievable amount of work in trying to pull things together, integrate them all, and do most of the final drafts himself. He has my respect for that. We can disagree on

substance, but the amount of work he's put into it is quite unbelievable. There are a number of issues that were, when I started drawing up the Agenda, unresolved.

There were two of them at that point. One of them now seems to have almost finished, although there's still some discussion going on. The first two issues were, first of all, an issue of human rights. There is a general consensus in the Working Group, perhaps unanimous, that the bylaws should include a reference to human rights. There is a difference of opinion whether it should be something put in in Work Stream 1, in other words for the transition, or past the transition. There's a general agreement that it should be in Work Stream 1.

The wording, a number of different proposals have been made. We could not reach closure on any of them. Each has significant support, but not really something that could be called consensus. There is also a concern among some people - and I count myself among them - that although it's quite clear we need a reference to human rights, we really need to understand what it means in the context of ICANN before we put the words in.

Specifically, we don't want to put something in the bylaws and then have it interpreted by various people in our community to mean radically different things. That will likely happen anyway, but I think that we need to know what we're heading into, and have an understanding of where the disagreements will be, where the contentious issues are going to be, as we draft the actual words. So there is, at this point, a way going forward. You could look at the document that came out this morning as a recommendation from the Co Chairs.

I believe some people are suggesting a modification of it, which may well happen or not. But it looks like we're pretty well determined to put something into Work Stream 1, and we're effectively asking the community in this comment period to weigh in on exactly how we should proceed. The Co Chairs had really wanted not to ask any questions, but give a full proposal and let it be commented on. This one, we have effectively reverted back, at least saying it is an unresolved issue and we're soliciting input.

The second thing that's somewhat contentious - and I admit I got lost towards the end of the discussion - is there's a stress test, which we've been told is going to be required by the NTIA, and the substance of the issue is the following: currently - and Cheryl says yes, it's stress test 18 - currently the bylaws say that if the GAC gives advice and the Board does not follow it, they will enter into discussions to try to find common ground. The change in the wording adds a preamble to that sentence that says with respect to GAC advice, that is supported by consensus - in other words, the only advice where the Board has to enter into negotiations; they can do whatever they want in general - but it's mandatory to enter into negotiations, if the advice was determined by a consensus of the GAC.

Currently, and for its recent history, consensus in the GAC means it's proposed by somebody - perhaps multiple somebodys - and there's nobody who objects to it. Some people view that as a very strong form of consensus. Some people view it as very weak, because it could be proposed by only one person. No one else really cares, but no one cares enough to object. On the other hand, the fact that no one cares enough to object forms a strong form of consensus. It's a form that's used

between governments as quite common. The GAC is free to change how it defines consensus.

All the bylaw is suggesting is that by whatever definition of consensus, the GAC must say, "This is a consensus call," and not use some ad-hoc process to determine the advice. For various reasons, many GAC Members have objected to that, because they believe that is essentially meddling in GAC affairs. The people on the other side say it's not meddling in GAC affairs, it's simply saying how the Board reacts to the GAC, not what the GAC has to do.

I'm not sure I know exactly where we are right now. Cheryl, who's more closely involved, may have a better idea, but there are still comments coming from GAC Members, almost as we speak, so I'm not 100 per cent. Cheryl, do you have any wisdom to add to that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan. I'm not sure it's wisdom. High levels of frustration may be a good way of describing it. Stress test 18 is, according to NTIA, a not negotiable, along with core value 11. There is in fact a duo of [unclear 00:50:55] here, but we have, in recent times, seemed to be talking particularly about stress test 18. It's a not negotiable because NTIA, and the department in fact - and dare I say I suspect several members of Congress - maintain that by looking at stress test 18, the primary mechanism by which we can check if one of the defining principles for a successful IANA transition proposal is actually going to be able to be check-listed off.

EN

That is, is in fact whatever proposal - and here it's a matter of accountability that's wrapped around the IANA transition proposal - that means that what is being proposed does not give more power to any government.   Now, that's any jointly or [separately 00:52:09] government. So the intent of stress test 18 is to test whether or not by codifying more clearly in the bylaws, how the ICANN Board is required to act in the circumstance where advice from the GAC is advice that is consensus, as however as you correctly outlined, GAC defines that, is to happen.

Thereby ensuring that what is indeed in the bylaws now is, for want of a better word, clearer.   Now, the problem is that there are some governments who do not believe that that very high bar of response, or how one must try and find a mutually agreeable solution, in other words GAC and Board has to sit down if the Board does not agree to take wholesale GAC advice. There is a requirement for them literally meet and try and work out a mutually acceptable solution. They can then still not take the advice after going through that particular step, but they do have to do that step.

There is a group in the GAC who believe that if the GAC says it, regardless of how much consensus, or how much that degree of consensus is measured, that that should always be a step, so that that extremely high level of responsiveness should always be a matter, regardless of whether it's a sub-set of the GAC's Advice/advice, or whatever. That itself is not consensus view in the GAC. [laughs] So we've got a few people very strongly, [helpfully 00:54:39] who are bringing forward into our work at the moment their strongly held beliefs.

That is affecting some of the dynamics. It is actually 110 per cent up to the GAC to sort out. They have to come to their own view, and that's got absolutely nothing to do with us, and hopefully they'll further that, coming up to Dublin and in Dublin. However, the GAC is a chartering organization of the Accountability Working Group, and some, if not even more of those with strongly held beliefs on this matter, regardless of whether it's for or against it, are unsure at this stage on whether or not the GAC will be able to agree to sign off as a chartering organization on the Accountability Final Report, should stress test 18 still be there.

So we have a real risk, and it's a real risk that if the NTIA and US Government do still require complete consensus of all the chartering organizations, that at least one of the chartering organization will perhaps not sign off. If that is the case, I certainly don't have my crystal ball polished up enough to know exactly what that will mean for transition. Perhaps the US Government will decide that GAC is not required as a chartering organization, should it choose not to sign off.

Most of the chartering organizations will do, as opposed to all of the chartering organizations [needing 00:56:42]. So we just have a potential risk, and we're doing our best to try and manage it, but coming back to it, there is no choice. Stress test 18 stays.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. I'll point out, the situation is really messy in that all we're saying is the GAC must reach consensus. They can change their definition of consensus, should they choose. Moreover, the rules they use to change the definition are a different rule than the consensus they

do on advice. It is a confusing situation, but we're going to have to watch it unfold. As Cheryl said, there's not much we can do to predict. We're running really short on time, and we haven't gotten onto the substantive issues yet, so I think we need to move on.

SEUN OJEDEJI: My hand is up, when you're ready.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: My hand has been up as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the GAC or something else?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Mine is on the GAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Could you make it really brief? I have a hard stop at the end of the half-hour, and we really need to talk about some of the other substance.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, thank you Alan. I'll try to be as brief as possible. I'm just trying to understand this stress test 18. I really don't see a difference between whether you put a consensus requirement or you don't, because it's consensus within the GAC anyway, so it's their view. My concern mostly is that the NTIA requires that no sector of the community should have

more power. So the question is, is it saying more powers than what already exist right now? Or more powers… I think we need to clarify, because obviously the current arrangement is an indication that the GAC has more powers right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can explain that, Seun. The quick answer is right now, if you think of GAC Advice, we've often used the term uppercase A or lowercase A. Real GAC Advice, which the Board is bound to consider under the terms in the bylaws, has been viewed until now generally as something the GAC has reached consensus on, based on their rules. They also issue other statements where they've not reached consensus, and the "gentlemen's or gentlewomen's agreement" is that the Board uses a different set of terms, of rules, to handle the lowercase A advice.

Stress test 18 recommends that we put it in the bylaws to make it really clear how we're handling the Advice and the advice. That's essentially what it comes down to, as I understand things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: It really is establishing in the bylaws the practice that we now have.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, and the question for NTIA will be does the practice that we now have, currently reflect that the GAC has more powers than the other communities. Because that's what they're going to check. They're going to check whether…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course it does. Seun, the bylaws already give that; specifically more power on formal GAC advice, and all we want to do is maintain that as it is now.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, so it means that we just hope that NTIA will [close the eye 01:00:48] of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no. NTIA understands that, and that's been part of ICANN since the very beginning. We're simply trying to make sure that the GAC cannot try to exercise its powers without using a formal process to come to advice. The GAC, on occasion, issues things in its communicae that are not Advice, but they may be the wish of one GAC Member. But we do not want that power to require the Board to negotiate. That's all it comes down to.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Maybe I should refer to an example.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, can we put this onto something else? We don't have time to go into it in any more detail right now. Olivier, do you have a comment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I just wanted to put to the record that I'm feeling increasingly nervous about curbing GAC powers, curbing ALAC powers, curbing the public interest, and not curbing anything to do with the GNSO. I'm very nervous about this stuff. I'm seeing a concerted push by contracted parties in this thing. I know that they've been complaining that the GAC acts and breaks the bottom-up multistakeholder model, which in my mind is absolutely yes.

I'm getting increasingly concerned that we're now starting to really make the life very hard for the GAC to operate in, and thus giving a big green light for the fly-by-night-cowboys of this world to take over. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In my mind, that is indeed a potential problem that I think we have to watch. I don't have anything else other to say other than yes, as Co Chair. The other issue, which is technically resolved, but has been raised repeatedly, largely by one person with support of a few others, is that the SOs should have significantly more power in any voting scheme than ACs, and particularly since the ALAC is the only AC that has officially said, "We will participate in a voting method," - the GAC is still considering it, and the SSAC and RSSAC are considering it as well - the impact is directly on us.

I believe if the SOs for instance are giving five votes each, and we are given less than five votes - and I think the current proposal is four and two - from my point of view I'd strongly recommend that the ALAC not ratify the report. I'm putting my personal stake in the ground. I don't think I'd have a lot of objection from other people within ALAC and At-Large. That proposal has been pushed by a small number of people. I dot believe it will have traction. The report is going out with 5x5 - that is for the three SOs, the GAC and the ALAC, and two each for the SSAC and RSSAC, on the theory that they are Board-appointed Committees, and they don't represent At-Large communities but represent a very small community of experts.

They may weigh and say they don't think that's fair. They may say it's acceptable. We don't know what's going to happen on their side. But the last comment the ALAC made said, "We are willing to accept the two each, for SSAC and RSSAC, if they agree." We'll decide what we say in our future comment. That's something that's on the backburner. It continually is raised by, as I said, a small number of people, but vocal people, and so far it's not going into the report as an option, but of course it may be raised as comments that go into it. There may be a minority report issued that's attached to the proposal that will make that case. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have followed this discussion very closely with other Members of the same constituency as the people that are making that proposal of reducing the AC or specifically the ALAC's votes from five to two. There is no other consensus in that other community, and it's by belief that the

individuals who are in the Working Group are being currently instrumented by the contracted party, and we are in such a situation. I would take the same stance as what you said - basically say we will not ratify this as a red line for us.

I would even go further as to ask at that point not to ratify, or indeed any of the ACs, because ultimately, the ACs are there to go and deal with something that's much wider than what each of the SOs are doing. We're seeing a real struggle on this one, and we need to stand our ground.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out that the current proposal actually from that group, I don't believe they're doing it on behalf of contracted parties. I think they're doing it…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a lot going on in the background.

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no, I understand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know full well. I've heard.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll just point out the current proposal is to do is inline with Board seats - that is four votes each for the three SOs, two votes for the ALAC, and no votes for the GAC. I think that's going to have so little traction that I don't even worry about it, but we'll go to the speaker list. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to say that I agree 100 per cent with should, in the unlikely circumstance - and I do believe it's unlikely that this alternate view will get traction in the PCP - but it means that we have to, in our response in public comment, be very firmly supportive of the 5x5 and 2x2. But should it get some traction in the PCP for this alternate, I do think probably it will be there as a minority report - it isn't a recommendation of the report. This needs to be dealt with extremely efficiently and effectively in preparation of the final document.

Should, in the even more unlikely event that it come to pass that we do not have the 5x5 or 2x2 rule, or all fives, that there is a downside and risk to the all fives. So my personal preference is 5x5 and 2x2, that we not ratify, and that as Olivier said, we encourage all other ACs to not ratify as well. It's a firm line in the sand for me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I don't think we disagree at all. I have been cautioned by people I respect not to make public threats on this, but I have made private threats on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to continue to make public threats.

ALAN GREENBERG: I had an agreement with a boss once that, if appropriate, he could blame me if it was the appropriate thing to do, and vice versa. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I don't think that anybody is thinking that we could accept something less than five. I don't think that even if you say it publicly, Alan, that it will change anything in the understanding of the situation. I think it's interesting that it's a very big battle between some members of NCUC, NSGS, whatever, and ALAC, and it must ring some bells on what we need to do in the future - not just for this topic but in more general points of view. I just wanted to express that my feeling or wishes were to have 5x7, and I understand the people who say that two of the ACs are dominated by the Board - the SSAC and RSSAC.

But I think a way to deal with that is to say that they have two, but as soon as they are organized not to be designated by the Board by other means, they will get five, it would have been a good way to go to include them at the same level as the others, and to have them working on some more independence from the Board, and it will be better for the global accountability of the organization. I didn't put that into the discussion on the CCWG yesterday, because I saw it was already too painful, this full day of discussion. I just wanted to share with you my feeling and my thinking about that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier? Same topic?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On the same topic, and another thing you've already mentioned.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, on the voting weights, and we'll come back to the other issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me quickly jump onto this; with what Sébastian said, that it was the NCSG. Actually, specific Members of the NCSG. I have heard other points of view from other Members of the NCSG, who are quite upset about this, and I gather we probably need to leave this over for the NCSG to work out by itself. On something that you mentioned earlier Alan, which was to do with the… Now it's come out of my head. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll come back to you. On the voting weights, you're right, it is selected people. There are other people within the same group that differ radically. This is going to have to play out, and we'll see where it goes. With regard to what Sébastian said, there are two issues. One is that they're Board-appointed, and that's relatively easy to fix, should they choose to do it. I don't think there would be a lot of pushback from the Board saying that they are self-appointed or whatever without Board approval.

The other issue, which is probably a more substantive one, is that in both cases they do not represent a large community in the background. They don't have At-Large, they don't have governments. They are 13

Members representing the 13 root servers, and that's it - one from each one - and SSAC is a group of experts but without a larger community behind them. That rationale has a little bit more weight in my mind than the Board-appointed, but we're going to have to let that one play out and see where it goes. Olivier, did you remember what you were going to say?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did. Thank you Alan. It was to do with the human rights issue, which you mentioned earlier. I believe we should support this. I have had a long discussion with Avri Doria, who I believe is the main proposer for this. Providing there is some good wording for this that limits this to the ICANN mission, it would be a good thing to do, especially when it comes down to end users.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, Olivier, there's no chance that we're not going to do it. The only question is how do we come to closure on the words. There are a small number of people - Tijani is one them - who believe strongly that it should be deferred completely until Work Stream 2, and not associated with the transition. But there's a very large majority who believe it should be done by the transition.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or at least the commitment to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the commitment, but some people have problems with putting in bylaws promises that we're going to look at something. Anyway, we have ten minutes left and we haven't really talked about any of the other issues. I can spend five or six of reading off the names of the topics. I'm going to open it up to a general free-for-all. Does anyone have any questions about things that you would like to understand how it came out? There were many points of contention along the way, most of which have been resolved.

For instance, one of the issues was can ACs and SOs remove their own directors? The answer is yes. They now have to involve the community in a discussion, prior to making the decisions, but the decision is solely the AC or SO, or in the case of the GNSO, the house that does the appointment. That I think is one of the more contentious issues. The Interim Board, if the Board is removed, was one of the other ones that there was a lot of discussion on.

The final solution says that if there is a vote to remove the whole Board, each group that appoints Board Members either have an obligation, with exception of the NomCom, to aim an Interim Member - or perhaps up to two Members, I don't remember - so that if the Board is removed there is an immediate group of people who become the Interim Board, and then an expedited process to replace those Interim Directors with longer-term Directors, who could be the Interim Members, or in fact could be the old Members, depending on the individual group doing the appointment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I've dropped out of the AC, but I have my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Olivier and Cheryl, either to address what I just mentioned, or to ask or comment on any of the other issues that are relevant. I remind you we only have eight minutes, so be short. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just quickly commenting on the two things - removal of individual Board Members, terrible idea. You're basically turning Board Members into politicians - well done. That's not going to get ICANN anywhere. Secondly, having standby Board Members won't fly either. What kind of an idea is this! You're basically going at a moment's notice to tell someone to completely drop their job, or whatever it is they're doing, and actually jump onto the ICANN Board?

Or are you effectively saying, "No, stop for the next three years, for the life of the other Board Member that you're a seconder to. Stop all work, don't earn anything, and wait until we call you in case something goes wrong"? It just won't fly. There are many other ways for an Interim Board to be appointed. It could either be trusted people that could be appointed, or a caretaker Board that could be appointed. We don't need to have these backup Board Members, and I have no idea how this is going to fly with the NomCom.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, two things. First of all, this is not the opportunity to write our comment to the report. Let's talk about giving information right now

and not commenting on whether we think it's good or bad. Second of all, they are not recommending a standby Board. That is not what was…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Quite the opposite.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Cheryl next and then Sébastian again. Remember the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Olivier, as Alan said, certainly your concern with the Interim Board is heard and was heard in the Paris Meeting, with the voices of many. Before that Paris Meeting, of course we asked the legal advisors to come up with a robust method, which means that there was no risk of standby Board, et cetera. It's a very unlikely thing that there will be a Board spill. In that very unlikely thing, there's a whole lot of reasons why you do want somebody to step in, and the mechanism that's out for public comment is actually workable, and has not got the risks that you are rightly concerned about.

I think you will be happy when we get to talk about all of that in greater detail. Why I put my hand up is I actually wanted to comment and make sure that our community understood the great help, assistance and use that some of the timely and very short notice legal opinion has given the group in our deliberations, particularly the face-to-face, but also the very regular Working Group calls.

Yes, it is expensive to have this external counsel - in fact, I'd dare say it's horrendously expensive to have this external counsel! - but on things like this requirement that we felt we needed to have an interim power model for Board, should a Board spill every be enacted, is a good example of how extremely useful they've been. I'm quite happy that what's going out, with the exception of the couple of things we've talked about today in the public comment two document are robust, are in general supportable and happy to put my name to it, that's for sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Alan. I think your reaction, from what Olivier says, is a bit too hard. I have the feeling that we have, after tomorrow, a morning to write some part of the document, if we wish - an agreement or… We are not yet waiting to have the document done and to have our comments of the full document. I think that the issue raised by Olivier rang a bell. As you know, I think both are not a good idea. One, because I don't think that moving a single Board Member by this community will be very efficient, and will give some good things at the end, but with the new caveat that it could be done only once, it may be acceptable.

But I really think that the proposal I made, or made by AFRALO also, for the removal of more Board Members could have been a good way to go. Because I think we're talking about something that will never happen, and if we don't want it, let's do it, but why spend so much time? If we need a real tool, then we have a real tool. A proposal by AFRALO or

mine are better tools, because it allows to remove part of the Board, and enough of a part to have it change its mind and its position on anything, if we want.

I'm still struggling with myself. Tonight I'll write something again on that, but I wanted to comment that we still have a few hours to do that. thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sébastian. Yes, certainly anyone can write a minority report, if they can get it done quick enough. I don't think the ALAC is going to come to closure on anything sufficiently to do that, nor am I seeing a lot of volunteers to do it, but individuals certainly can. Olivier, just in terms of your comments, I tend to agree on a lot of these things. The direction of the CCWG has been driven by a moderately small number of very vocal people, and all we can do at this point is try to make sure that we moderate the powers such that they can only be used in circumstances that are truly dire.

I think our comment is going to have to focus to a large extent on that. I'm not sure we can change the overall direction, but we can try to make sure that powers don't get used frivolously. As has been discussed within the group, the budget veto powers, for instance, there is a potential for all the SOs ganging up on ALAC, for instance, or in the other direction. I think we need to moderate those powers to make sure that cannot happen. We have some work to do, and we're going to have to do it intelligently. Sébastian?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Just to say very quickly that I am very happy with the way to go with the Membership. It's something we changed from the first report to this one, and I hope that we took the good decision. It's not a hope, because I am afraid, but we will see how it will work really. But I think it was a good way to go, and I hope it will be the final of this document, in this way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Sébastian. We have ended on a positive note. I thank you all for attending. I suspect we're going to have to schedule some long meetings to address these issues point-by-point, if we're going to come up with a statement within the allowed amount of time, and I think some of us are going to have to discuss exactly how we structure the discussion to try to make sure it remains focused, and that we can actually come to closure on specific issues and not just wander around. So there is some work to be done. Thank you all for attending, have a good weekend.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's still AOB.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there AOB?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's for me to do!

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm tired.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know, Alan, and as I said earlier in the call, well done to all of you who were on those calls the past few days - it's been really a lot of work. Just as a next steps thing, next week's, we need a Doodle for what would be the preferred date.   The early part of later part of the week for everyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Neither?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we need to give people - and I think we have to forcefully say this in email - give people time to read the documents. We have two documents that in total have about 500 pages in them. We need to give people some time, and I think also those of us who've been heavily involved in the process, and heavily involved in drafting the other statements that we've done, need to think a little bit about how we organize the work, because we don't have unanimity on things, so we are going to have to think carefully about how we write things.

If we write a report that says, "Some people think this, and some people think this, and some people think this," we're not going to be able to really influence anything. To the extent possible we need to try to come to closure on at least some of the major issues. I think we're going to have to think about how to do that. My preference, in any case, is to not do a Doodle right now, but spend some time at the beginning of next week thinking about how we go forward, and making some recommendations. That's certainly my preference.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Look at how many people you've actually got on today's call, for heaven's sake! You're running an exhaustion team. I think at least a week to read it, but I'd strongly suggest we go through it section-by-section, at least from the accountability paper. We can probably do two sections a call, and in some cases possibly three. We need to do it in bite-sized pieces rather than a grab-bag as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl, and thank you for this Alan. What we'll probably do then, no call next week. There are webinars that are taking place next week. I gather that you will all be on the webinars, and we can all follow up by email. What I would suggest in the meantime is that as soon as we have an idea, identify the issues, which we will be seeing on the ICG webinars, for example.

Identify the issues, immediately circulate them on the mailing list, and then have a call during the week after that. So next week, no call, but in the week of the 10th of August we'll have a call. Perhaps we can already

EN

send a Doodle now for that week, because it will be very important for a lot of people to be on that call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think we may be in a mode of two calls a week if we're going to get through this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We might need to do so, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we talk the beginning of next week, and Olivier, as soon as we adjourn this call you and I will meet on Skype? Because the ALT has asked us to close off the GNSO comment, which has to be submitted in a few hours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes. We'll do that. Thanks. That's fine. Okay. Doodle for two different times during the week of the 10th of August.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're killing me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They will be 90-minute calls. We might go through things faster. I think we'll spend 90 per cent of the time on the accountability track, but we

definitely need to push on this and have something ready sooner rather than later. I thank you all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is it possible that some of them don't happen between midnight and 4:00 AM, just occasionally. It will be a shocking and horrifying thing if it actually happens out of the Doodle.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before Terri sends out the Doodle request, we will be discussing this. Thank you all for attending.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks everyone. This call is now adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]