TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin at this time. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on IANA Transition & ICANN Accountability, taking place on Thursday, the 3rd of September, 2015, at 17:30 UTC. On the English bridge, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, and Sebastien Bachollet.

Currently, at this time, no one has joined on the Spanish channel. We have apologies from Leon Sanchez and Alberto Soto. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew. It looks like Louis Houle just joined us, as well.

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 transcription purposes, but also for interpretation. Thank you very much and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Terri. This is going to be an interesting meeting. The first – well, hold on. I was jumping right into my part and I forgot I am Olivier for the moment. The action items, I don't believe there were any or, perhaps, to schedule this meeting. And is there any comments or suggested changes to the agenda? Not seeing anything.

We'll say the agenda is adopted and immediately jumped into section three, and I'll turn the floor over to Alan Greenberg now. I am now taking off my Olivier hat. By the way, I will be chairing the call for the

---

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.

first hour, or roughly hour. Olivier will be taking over after that. I'll be staying on the bridge but will not be on Adobe Connect. Olivier is not on Adobe Connect now, but is on the bridge.

Today's meeting will be interesting. The first part is to review the changes that have been added into the draft statement. Hopefully, that will go very quickly and I don't think much of it is controversial. And to the extent that people would like to see it changed, I ask people to be exceedingly brief in stating what they would like to see because we have a much more substantive part of the meeting to go on to after that, and that is to discuss the three-hour meeting between the CCWG and the Board yesterday, which radically changed the landscape, I think, is the right expression.

So if we can look at the statement, the first change is a preamble I put into the section on principles, which basically explains why the principles are important. The principles and core values and such will be used by IRPs to determine if ICANN is within its operating, is following its own bylaws.

To the extent that these statements in Article 1 of the bylaws are vague or subject to interpretation, we may end up with IRPs interpreting them in ways that, perhaps, we did not envision. So it's exceedingly important that they be precise and say exactly what we believe they should mean, not be vague statements, which can be interpreted in multiple ways.

The first one is a section that we didn't have a particularly good statement on last time. It, essentially… The intent of the statement is to

say ICANN cannot control the content of websites or other Internet vehicles that use domain names.

The wording, however, I find a little bit problematic in that there are some people within ICANN who claim the domain name itself is content. If you accept that interpretation, then that says ICANN has no right to control what TLDs are dispensed, are put into the Internet. It implies that even the confusingly simple, which is the security and stability issue, might be subject to interpretation that we can't do, and I find that not acceptable.

I believe the statement on restricting content would be acceptable if it explicitly excludes the identifiers that ICANN has control over and, specifically, the gTLD top-level domains. Any comments on that? No? Okay.

The next changes are typos and such, and won't go into those in any great detail. The next substantive change is at the bottom of page 2, beginning of page 3, and is talking about the core value 5, which is about the competitive domain market. There had been a sentence in about consumer trust. It was removed. Our statement, essentially, says that the AOC had a statement about ICANN's responsibility to ensure consumer trust in the domain name system, and specifically with the gTLDs, obviously. Somebody, I think Tijani, asked that the statement be clarified, that it was talking about all TLDs and not just the new ones, and I added a qualification.

The next change is a minor one, where we're saying that there was a new statement put in saying ICANN must balance the needs of the

various stakeholders, and we are saying that that must be subject to the overriding core values and requirements of public interest, security, and stability.

And, Christopher, you have your hand up. Can't hear you, Christopher. If staff can work with Christopher Wilkinson and try to figure out what the problem is, he doesn't seem to be able to speak at the moment.

The next change in the document is in relation to 6.1, the SO/AC membership model, and I had added a statement saying that if there are less than three SO/ACs participating, then it can't work. And there was a suggestion that we explicitly say that this is contingent on the current number of SO/ACs. If that number were to change, then obviously, the number three might have to change, as well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Have you mentioned that we are speaking about three existing SOs and ACs?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I just said that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible]. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Your concern, if I remember correctly, was a minimum of three AC/SOs participating is presuming we have the current number of seven total. That if that number changed, then three must change. Yes, that is what I've put into the document, and I just mentioned that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not only that. We may have a change, for example, as Sebastien gave an example, a very good example. He said they can speak, for example, I don't know the NCSG and four SOs, and there are any other, if you want, SO [inaudible] can be [inaudible] in several SOs. And in this case, you may have three SOs from the same family. So we are speaking about the SOs and ACs as they are [inaudible] now.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you can propose some alternate words, what I said is if the number of ACs and SOs changes – and that would be the case, as you're talking about – then the number participating may have to be reviewed, and there may be some other rules put on to it that you must have at least 12 SOs from a certain sector.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, and we may have some ACs that disappear. So it will be really something different. So that's why it is important to say we are speaking about the actual consideration of SOs and ACs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So how about if we say if the number and mix of SOs and AC changes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. And I don't believe there were any other substantive changes in the document. So not seeing any more hands, hearing anything, I'm going to presume that this document is now done to the extent that it is subject to the next discussion that we're going to be having, which is a very substantive discussion, and certainly will impact our document.

   Because even though the document is, in theory, a comment on the proposed draft, I don't think we can avoid talking about what has happened since then.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Why didn't you include your proposal of contemplating the single designator model?

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay. Good point. Sorry. I should have mentioned that. I think that's been overtaken by events, and we can go back to that at the end of the meeting, if you wish.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know, but if we are commenting on the document, [inaudible] document, we may say that this model is not the perfect one, and then the other, the evolution now, which is happening now, it is a confirmation that it wasn't a perfect one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can certainly do that. Personally, I think that's a gratuitous comment at this point because I really don't think it adds any value, but I have no problem putting that in. So consider that done and I'll do that in version seven. Any other comments on this document before we go on to the meeting yesterday?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is still me, Alan. I'm sorry, but I wrote a mail to you, to the list, and I thought it was [inaudible] on next to the last IANA issue meeting, but I realize now that it was [inaudible] in my [inaudible] docs and I'm really

sorry. I commented on all the documents and [inaudible], for example, give the language that was that the sole representative of the civil society could be understood as [inaudible] and they are not [inaudible] other comments, but now it is too late. I am sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. It's not too late. If you want to be considerate, then send the e-mail and put a pointer to the e-mail on the archive in the Wiki and I'll find it. Exactly when I'm going to do the update is not clear at this point. I'm supposed to be leaving on vacation tomorrow and I have rather large number of things I have to do before then, but I'll certainly look at it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Are we finished with the document? Last call. Okay. There was a three-hour – and that's rather unprecedented length – meeting yesterday evening my time between the CCWG Accountability and the ICANN Board. This was, essentially, an opportunity for the Board to provide its first substantive feedback on where the CCWG is right now.

There have been significant discussions within the Board. The Board, apparently, has been meeting for a large number of hours in discussing this and reviewing the document. There also were, apparently, meetings in Washington a week or two ago between a number of Board members and various people, so I'm presuming that is also factored in.

If you remember the reason that I mentioned the community model as a single designator was my concern shared by this group that the current model, aside from the fact that it doesn't meet our particular needs. There is so much that is unspecified at this point, that we were not sure it could be completed in the timeframe we're looking at with enough detail to provide the people in Washington with conviction that what we are proposing was workable, was not subject to takeover and capture, and was actually implementable.

That's not a trivial issue. Larry Strickling had made very clear in Buenos Aires that they were looking for something which was complete, and complete ready to be implemented. Comments that, for instance, one of the co-chairs, Thomas, made saying, "Well, all we have to do is lay out the plan, and we have the next few months to fill in the details," was very trouble to some people. Certainly was troubling to me because that isn't what I thought we were going to be doing post-Dublin.

The Board, apparently, has similar concerns. The overall introduction – and there's a document from Steve Crocker that, essentially, gives the notes of his introduction, and they're in the pod right now and linked to in the agenda. Essentially saying, "We support the intent, we do not support some of the specifics of how it is done, and we want to work together to flesh this out."

The meeting was then turned over to Chis Disspain, who went over the specific details. And if we can have that in the pod, I'd appreciate it. And I'll go over his points one by one very quickly. I won't try to read it. The first one is on the fundamental bylaws and the process for modification. They're essentially saying that they're agreeing with what we're doing

but have not looked at the details. So questions that came up later of do you agree with all the core values, in our statement, we have objected to a number of those. The answer was we really haven't looked at them, and that has to be forthcoming.

The overall intent was, let me try to phrase this properly, is to put into the bylaws the ability to have the community have the powers that it wants but without a membership model or a designator model, for that matter. The enforcement would be – and I'm not going in order. The enforcement would be through the bylaws and binding arbitration.

The IRP changes they have – and I think this one is probably quite troubling to many people – is they're saying they will roll back the change they put in a couple of years ago which parts of the community they have objected to, and will commit to changing the rest, but not actually do anything about it right now. That certainly simplifies a huge amount of work, but I suspect that is going to be close to unacceptable to a number of parties.

They're talking about not using the IRP… Using the IRP for, essentially, external disputes, as it was originally envisioned. But the IRP was also modified, and incompletely, to address disputes between the community and the Board, and to reconcile external panel decisions that are not compatible with each other. In both of those cases, the mechanism of how it would be rectified was not described in the current proposal. Those are sections that were missing.

They're suggesting that the IRP is probably the not the right mechanism to use to address those issues, and are looking at a form of binding

arbitration. The bylaw changes, I think they're talking about something that is not dissimilar, but again, without the absolute enforceability. The budget process they're talking about, obviously, without the membership model, you don't have a veto, but putting into the bylaws more process to ensure the community does have a part to play in the decisions.

Removal and recall, there was significant pushback on being able to do that without cause. And they wanted to see a very specific and well-defined set of causes, and essentially, in my mind, takes out the ability to do it because of disagreements as opposed to the director violating some core principle.

The incorporation of the Affiliation of Commitments I think there was general agreement on. The other things I don't think were contentious, but I haven't looked at them in any great detail. There has been significant pushback for a number of reasons, and some of them I think relatively valid. Among them are why wasn't all of this proposed when we were developing proposals as opposed to now?

There were attempted statements made saying, "This is not a new proposal. We are not changing the proposal. We're just giving some different implementations." I think that is patently false. I think they are giving a new proposal, one that may well have merit, but it is being introduced as significant changes to what the community has suggested.

There is significant pushback. This is no longer a bottom-up process that is dearly viewed by many in the group, and there's also concern over

the timeline. How can we get approval for these items in the timeframe we need for the transition?

So I think there are answers to some of those. The largest problem to transition, I think, is the ccNSO, which has previously said they can only make a decision at a face-to-face meeting. So if it's not Dublin, it has to Marrakech, which, obviously, is too late. If they are willing to be more flexible, then we have a month or two that we can slip and probably still make the transition that we're looking at.

So timing I don't think is potentially a major problem. Acceptance by the community is going to be very significant. Sebastien, I see your hand up. I'll be finished in just a moment. There is a lot of pushback that we no longer have real enforceability. We only have arbitration. I find this a little bit curious because the proponents of enforceability have said, "It's not really the enforceability that we're looking for, it's the mechanism by which we can be part of the process. We don't ever plan to use the enforceability."

And if that is, indeed, the case, then the pushback on arbitration shouldn't be quite as large if you're not planning to use it anyway. But there are some subtleties that knowing there is enforceability may change how the Board reacts, and that has to be factored in.

I'll open up the floor now to other people who are on the meeting, if you'd like to correct anything I said or add something to it. And, perhaps, we can go around the table first with the people who did actively participate in the meeting, and then open it up to other comments. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. And, Olivier, you will be on the queue, I guess. Yeah, I thank you for your summary and I have nothing against your summary. Well done. Just, I wanted to give my feeling and I will say it's about as usual, and unfortunately, I didn't [plan]. And that will create big trouble.

And one of the reason I say that it's, of course, you already say that I come late with this proposal, even if it's not a new proposal, as I want to try to tell us, but it's a new proposal. And the second, it's people who talk. We are really… It's a [problem] that it's not the Board talking; it's just two people. I like those people but I think, at one moment, we need to have the multiple voice of the Board.

And, if not, I am not at all confident that it's really all Board position and decision. We will never know because we are not inside, but my knowledge of how the Board is working gives me the [sensation] that it's a majority but maybe not whole Board with the same position. And a lot may be also coming from their lawyers and it's coming from the [lawyer] as the one who build ICANN. The only one who knows how ICANN was built because there are very few people, there's no people in the Board, no people in staff, and very few people in the community who was at beginning and participate in the discussion. One of them may be Becky. It's why it's quite interesting to see how this is [working].

And the second part I wanted to say that you talk about the timing. I say that in the chat yesterday. If I remember well, in 2002, where we were discussing about the ICANN proposal, very last minute additional meeting was set up in December in Amsterdam. It was at [People]

Airport, just [tell other] people to come to the meeting, it was two days, I guess, and to leave. And it was not a huge meeting. At that time, there were 800 participants and there were [inaudible] them, but it was a time where final decision was taken with the voice of all the community. Then it's still possible to do such a thing.

And my last point is that some of the reaction are epidemic, not done here, not built here, and the reverse is true. But what strike me more is the reaction of Steve DelBianco, who say, "Okay, then you disagree," talking about the Board disagree that we must have… I don't remember the wording, but ICANN must be in one specific area and we want to reinforce that and with your proposal, we will not be able to do that. And that thing must be done [inaudible] that.

I feel that it's a [straight] summary of what all this work is about, but I think it's quite interesting. And I am all against that because ICANN needs to be able to evolve, I already say that few times. I will stop here, but I think it was also very interesting meeting yesterday because, from my point of view, it was not a good image of the Board, and that's trouble because this organization is led by the Board and we need a good Board, whatever we want to do in the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Olivier, I have you in the queue. One thing I left out, which is a critical issue, there was a lot of pushback that, if we're going to have something like arbitration, then the bodies within ICANN, as a whole or the individual bodies, need some level of legal persona.

We've talked about unincorporated associations' empowerment. Now the single, the mechanism model.

All of those were ways of getting legal personas. So there was a huge amount pushback saying, "But you can't exercise the arbitration rule unless you have a legal persona." Our lawyers have come up with now about four or five different ways of getting legal personas. So I didn't see that as a real problem. Other people seem to think it was a major problem.

I tend to agree with Sebastien that the fact that everything was presented by Chris and, sadly, he didn't do a really great job of it. He made a number of actual mistakes, and when combined with Fadi's interventions where he was claiming this is not a new proposal, I think that hurt the credibility of the proposal significantly. So that's a problem.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Just a couple of points, which I think need to be made on the discussion that we had yesterday. First, as you just said, I think that the whole announcement and the presentation was received with much, I would say, surprise by a lot of people who were present at the call, and they just didn't see this coming. They felt, I think, a lot more that the Board was very much more in line with their point of view, with what was presented than what the Board came back with.

Now, I was today on the just a bit earlier on the GNSO Council call, and there was an update about the meeting or the call that took place last night, so a few hours ago. And, certainly, there appeared to be several concerns permeating out of the call. The first one is certain amount of delay that might be induced by this.

Some are saying that it's such a significantly different proposal. It's radically different, and therefore, if that proposal from the Board was to be followed, there would need to be a new public comment period. Such is the difference with this. So we're basically just throwing the deadline of Dublin completely out of the window at that moment, and certainly, it looks increasingly unlikely – or at least, the general feeling is that increasingly unlikely – that there will be consensus found and agreement done with the Board.

Now, there is, and I have sent it in an e-mail to the IANA Issues mailing list, there is the possibility of a face-to-face meeting taking place in Los Angeles, but some in the GNSO already saying, "Well, hang on, what we don't want is to have a face-to-face negotiation between the Board and the Cross-Community Working Group because that's not how things are done. There needs to be consensus policy done, not negotiations."

And so we're in this position at the moment where I would say the majority of the people in the GNSO are just waiting for the details of what was presented in very short form by Chris Disspain. They would like to see more details and take more time to study this before actually coming up with immediate feedback on this.

I personally, my own thoughts are – I guess, some will be quite upset about this, but I think I'm certainly not upset about the proposal that the Board is making. In fact, I expressed my concern, certainly, about this whole issue of capturability of the processes and so on with all of the things that the Accountability group had designed and, therefore, seeing the fact that the Board is now coming with another set of recommendations or proposals, I certainly see it's probably more likely to bring less possibility of capture than what's been proposed by the community.

And last, because I don't want to ramble on, there is, of course, the big elephant in the room being everybody actually already talks about it. It's out there. It's all about control and who ends up with the final word. Is it community-controlled? Is ICANN going to be Board-controlled or community-controlled? And that's the bottom line, I think.

And the Board wants to retain ICANN being Board-controlled with all sorts of safeguards and so on to make sure that the Board is accountable, but the community wants to have a system where the Board is accountable because the control is actually in the hands of the community. I think that's where we are in a real one-way street, and I'm not quite sure how we're going to get out of this one. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put myself in the queue and I have Eduardo. Is that Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes. Perhaps, I would like speak before I have another call at 7:00, at 6:00, in fact, and it is already past, if I can say two words.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes, please go ahead.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you. First of all, I am not sure that what the Board proposed is the sole opinion of some Board members because, for example, I know that our representative, Renalia, is absolutely in the loop. I know, also, other members of the Board who are in the loop. So I don't know, Sebastien knows better than me the ambience inside the Board, but for this case, I think there is a lot of agreement inside the Board. And, perhaps, [inaudible] inside the Board. It is [inaudible].

The second – the main point is that I think that the problem for us is the problem of lawyers. They have lawyers that said if you don't have a legal personality, you cannot enforce anything. You cannot go through [inaudible]. The Board says you can, and I ask them, "How you say that? Our lawyers said no." They said, "We'll give you the details." So I am really looking for the details.

And if we are right, if [inaudible] is right, that means that our lawyers that we are paying are absolutely wrong, and we lost a lot of time with them because [inaudible] membership model, and then we [inaudible] the [inaudible] model, and then another, I don't know, a community-enforced, a community-empowered model or something like that [inaudible] say why not [inaudible] a single-member model. And the [inaudible] that very [inaudible]. And now, if there is another possibility to enforce the power without legal personalities, it will be really a problem with those lawyers. This is the first point.

Second point. [inaudible] my feeling. My feeling is that I am much better than two days ago. Because, now, at least it is not the control of the company [inaudible]. My fear that I felt is that we are changing the stewardship of the government of America by the stewardship of the company, and I do prefer the stewardship of US government much better than the stewardship of the company.

They did everything to control everything. [inaudible] the revolution, and you know after some period of [inaudible], people [inaudible] that they are [free] now. And now they go to the [inaudible] say, no, [inaudible] change his mind because he doesn't anything to do. People [inaudible] cannot move.

And this is, perhaps, something similar to what will happen because what will happen is that the community and I know that we have the [inaudible] that will prevent abuse of the powers, but if you have the budget exactly, specifically, if you have the budget [inaudible], it will be a real problem for ICANN. And people don't understand that but [inaudible] budget last year. It is [inaudible].

So I feel better because now, at least [inaudible] perhaps discuss better, discuss more. Perhaps, we'll find other ways. We will avoid any [inaudible] so that we have the community powered but not controlling everything. But because the community is everyone… Everyone, for example, in our working group, we were members and participants. At the end, we finished by a huge number of people every time we want to decide anything, we come all together and we [impose] their point of view because they are majority. Even if the charter don't allow that, but the Chair decided it so. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. More than two words. The next in the queue is Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Alan. I have a question from what Olivier said. Maybe you can answer that. [inaudible] that at the end of the process, the CCWG will come out with XYZ, whatever. Now, whatever it comes out with, does the Board have to approve that or just goes directly to the [ICG]?

ALAN GREENBERG: The Board does not have to approve it, but the Board will provide a transmittal letter, as it were, or some sort of comments on it, and both of those go not to the ICG, I don't think, but go to the NTIA. But regardless, whether it goes, because the ICG only goes through the Board. So it goes to the NTIA.

My take is even if the community, even if the proposal was very acceptable to the NTIA, if the Board had strong reservations, I think that would have a very significant effect on what the decision would be. Obviously, I'm not the expert on that, but it will get transmitted unaltered, but with comments.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is that it or do you want any follow-on statements?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. Just, I wanted to know. Just to [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's my understanding. Now the agreed-to process is the first step would be if the Board cannot accept it, then I believe the first step is they have to go back to the CCWG and tell them why, and see if we can resolve the problems. Now, to some extent, you could presume that what we're doing now is, indeed, that step taken a little bit early. But that part, that step is, I believe, in the agreed-to process.

Just a couple of comments. The issue of legal, not approval, but legal opinions is very important. If our lawyers, the CCWG lawyers, come back and say what Jones Day and the ICANN Board are proposing is not implementable, then we have a real problem. If they say, "Yes, we don't like it, but yes, it would work," then that's a different [situation] altogether.

I personally was willing to accept the community mechanism as a single member, but I have very strong concerns, as was exhibited in some of the comments I made, over whether this will really reflect the community when it comes down to voting and comes down to decisions. I think it's going to reflect [a very] small part of the community.

And although I am nominally a supporter of the bottom-up process, when I look at things that the CWG was willing to accept and propose,

and when I look at some of the interim models that the CCWG, in its wisdom, was willing to propose, it really worries me that these groups end up being controlled by a very small number of very vocal people. And the will of the overall group becomes very much the will of the small number of people who speak longest and loudest. And so I have a real concern with the process as it is right now. So Cheryl, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And, yes, I think you will have heard me say a number of times that all groups, large or small, tend to get dominated by the [inaudible]. I'm just pleased I'm usually one of them. And that's simply fine, to be honest, if you'd all just do what me and three others ways, [inaudible] fine [inaudible], but that is actually, party, a joke, for the record. Note the term partly.

Okay. Tongue out of cheek, then. Oh, gee, I wasn't surprised with yesterday. I was far from surprised. I also wasn't particularly surprised with the quite normally human reactions to challenge and change that was unforeseen and unpredicted by people who've put hundreds of man hours each and thousands and thousands of man hours as a group into processes.

People get highly invested in things and, of course, they don't want to see the offering of constructive criticism, and I believe it was constructive criticism, as clearly as people who are more open to change may be. And I think that Sebastien's point of suggesting the Board is not putting in good light, I want to disagree with on the record. I think it was not a polished and stellar presentation performance, and I

think, at the stage they are at in the considered and considerable deliberations, ruminations, and discussions on all of this, as they put their public comments together, and this is that part of that process, I think that's okay.

I think they've done the CCWG and the community at-large, that's lowercase A and lowercase L, a great credit of bringing those out from the "closeting" and discussing it with [inaudible] preemptive exercise. I think we should thank them for that. I think that it would have been equally valid for this to have just been written and sent. And that would have put us even further behind in terms of timeline and with the likelihood of getting further along coming up to and through Dublin.

May switch timeline, perhaps, at the Marrakesh, well, yes, it may, indeed. But there you go. Because I personally believe that a proposal from the CCWG and, remember, like all public comments, the Board inputs needs to be considered, discussed, and responded to, and this [inaudible] supported and worthy incorporated into a final draft or any changes, and that's the context we should keep in our minds. That's kind of what we're doing here, and not negotiating with the Board as such.

And any face-to-face meeting and, to quote Steve Crocker, would be our meeting, not the Board's. I would have thought would have been an opportunity for the CCWG and wider community, Board members included, should they so desire, to chew on all of this and discuss all of this further along with other public comments that would be in by then.

So that said, my personal point of view is I do not find much to be discomforted in what the Board is suggesting, is a model that if it is a proven and legally robust one means that with minimal change to existing structures and functional aspects of the ICANN we currently know and work with. We can have most, if not all, of our desired powers.

I personally don't give a damn as to whether the Board has ultimate and final control as a layer of icing on top of the community cake or there's a sprinkling of community glitter on top of that, which is, to me, the only difference between what we have now, what, in some cases, is being proposed, what the Board is suggesting. In other words, make what we've got work better, more accountably and more transparently and robustly to meet the needs without [winding our] processes, or whether we change the model and they are wholesale and significant changes to create something new, which is the fully version 3.0 evolved community master model.

Should we go down the pathway of the community master model, quite probably it will probably take three or four more years or, perhaps, two, conservatively. It would mean that it is in no way, shape, or form meeting NTIA's needs, and it could very well put transition at risk. And I think that's always been a risk.

Do I think NTIA would accept an uncompleted proposal, which is what we have and what we would still have in Dublin and, indeed, could very well still have by Marrakesh going down the pathway we are currently going with what we keep stuffing into Work Stream 2. No, I don't think

they will, because like Alan and many of you, that's not what I heard out of Larry.

And so I think what the Board's done is throw us a lifesaver, not an anchor. But there's a lot to think about. There's a lot to work on. Will it all come together? I don't know. Is it worthwhile doing diligently and doing well and looking at seriously? Absolutely, but we've got to also let the lawyers on all sides look at this now and really give it a true galvanizing [inaudible].

I'm not critical of our lawyers, as others have been, Tijani included, because certainly our lawyers, the CCWG external counsel, has responded more to models we have put together and answered questions from our designs. They have not, as far as I can ascertain at any point in time, been asked, "What would you do?" We didn't actually take legal counsel; we took specific advice on our own partly cooked, fully cooked, and sometimes overcooked ideas.

So now this is another idea for them to look at. I hope it works. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I guess I agree with much of what you said. My criticism of Chris's presentation, indeed, could be rephrased as not as polished and done under duress, I think, is the only expression given what I know are the hours that the Board has met in the recent couple of days. I'm going to have to start drafting something, so I'm looking for if people can be short and provide some level of clarity for do they think

this is something that is good and we can largely support with, perhaps, some tweaks? Or is this an abomination that we should vote down?

I'm very much in the former category. I could live with almost everything they're proposing because we started off saying we don't want enforceability, and I think we stood by that all the way along. I would like to see a couple of things that they're proposing changing, but as a base to go forward, I am much more supportive of what we're talking about now than the general attitude in the CCWG, and I think this base has a better chance than the current document proposal of being something that will pass muster for the transition by a large amount.

I think the current model is missing a lot of details, and regardless of the details, is missing any large amount of confidence that it's really going to work. So I have significant problem with it, and we have a speaker queue and I'm going to have to turn over the chairmanship in a few minutes, but I'll continue for the moment. Next, we have Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you very much, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can. Yes, we can hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Good. I think a lot has been said. I agree with most of what has been said, especially based on, I mean, what you just asked us to what

are this is something to consider. I just want to also strike a point of question. What we have right now, it's not really a proposal. It's just [escalator thing] and while it looks interesting just within the one or two pages, I think the devil of the details is what is the most important factor that should actually help us also determine whether this should be supported or not.

I think there may be a need to actually [ask] the Board as fast as possible, provide for the details without this. If we could channel that through Board representative, perhaps, if the chair could write in that regard, I think it may be good. We need to have concrete details, but [inaudible] the complete proposal but it's something that [inaudible] also be [inaudible]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, you're breaking up badly. We can only hear one out of every five words.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Seun. You're pretty well—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hello? Okay. We'll go on to Olivier next.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you, Olivier.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we're [inaudible].

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. I'm back at my computer so I can take over from you whenever you wish to hand the baton over. Just on this issue, what Cheryl mentioned regarding the legal and getting the lawyers to talk to each other I think is a vital thing.

I guess, as I said earlier, I actually quite like the outlines that the Board or the Board's thinking, if you want, and the way that they're going. I would say maybe I don't like it, but I prefer it to some of the other proposals that were made by the CWG. I am concerned about the fact that now we're dealing with a top-down Board, basically going against a seemingly bottom-up multi-stakeholder Cross-Community Working Group, but then, exactly as what was said, regarding the legal advice that we got, we asked our legal advisors specific questions and they answered the specific questions.

There is one part, which I am a little concerned about, which is to do with the legal enforceability and with the fact that we were told, repeatedly, that the only way to have legal enforceability was the route that we then ended up going down, out of a number of routes, and now we're told by the Board that, actually, no, there are other ways to do it, and the legal advisors of the Board – and, I believe, it was came from the legal advisors, and I guess we can name them here.

I believe it's Jones Day that no, no, you can do it a different way. But then, also, Jones Day did come up with a number of things saying, "Well, the budget veto, for example. You cannot have a board of a company that proceeds forward voting a budget and then being overruled by a community that is not made up of Board members and that does not take any liability, like the Board members do. Board members have a fiduciary liability of their actions.

So it's a big muddle at the moment, I think, and the more information we'll get for a more complete proposal from the Board on the one side, and some digesting of it and getting those lawyers to talk to each other,

the more likely it is that we'll be able to make sense and to be able to make a good decision out of this.

I am concerned about political dimension and the response that I've heard this afternoon of the GNSO Council call were not at all conducive to saying, "Oh, yes. We're going to take the Board's input and we're going to discuss this and find a solution with the Board." It went more into the, "Oh, can we not just get this information from the Board to be advice that comes in during the public comment period, and then we can reject it later on?"

I just don't see this as being conductive to coming up with a solution at the end that will satisfy everyone. But one thing I am convinced about, though, is that it's certainly going to delay, this whole process is going to be delayed now. I just don't see an end in time, and I gather this is pure speculation for me, that the Board would not have engaged this road if it hadn't already consulted with the Department of Commerce. Just pure speculation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. Before we go to Sebastien, just a couple of words, and then I'm going to switch phones and give you online. On the issue of the timing, as I said, if we can resolve the issue of the ccNSO making a decision, and the GAC to some extent, that they be more flexible, then we do have a bit of time, and we probably could go out for another public comment, if it was done quickly.

I'm not as worried about the time. Clearly, legal people have to come back and say, "Yes, this will work," regardless of what they said before.

Remember, our legal counsel, at one point, told us that you had to have unincorporated associations, and they said, "Oh, well. We could just have you issue a statement and it's done." And then the sole model came up.

We've changed gears so many times that the fact that we're changing gears again is not particularly onerous to me. And, lastly, saying we don't care what the Board says, they're just another part of the community, as you just described, was perhaps said at the GNSO, is akin to the CWG saying we don't care what the NTIA thinks, that we're going to come up with as a bottom-up model, we're going to come up with a plan we think is right.

What the NTIA thinks does matter, did matter because they were the ones on the making the decisions. So I think the arrogance that goes along with bottom up, sometimes, says that we are the kings, but there are other parties in this process. I'll turn it over to Sebastien right now, and then I'm going to be going on to my mobile, so I'll be listening and I'll yell out if I really want to get in. Otherwise, Olivier, it's your meeting now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very, Alan. Okay. Over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: thank you. Yeah. I have mixed feeling and your comments, Olivier, about the GNSO, it's interesting. Anyhow, the end of the public comment period, it's in less than ten days. And whatever we do, if we incorporate the Board in the public comment and they [intended] to do so, is one of the comments. But is one important piece of the comment.

Board is part of this organization and is leading this organization, then whatever we decide, if it's within the public comment or [which side], it's important that we answer and we discuss with them. It's why I think we need to figure out when the CCWG will meet, and I heard people telling me that, "Hey, guys. The CWG didn't meet face-to-face after the second comment period."

We are not in the same position, and I really hope that everybody will understand that we need face-to-face meeting of this group, of the CCWG Working Group, and part time with the full Board to have an in-depth discussion. Because whatever we do, this is, and that's different from the ICG. ICG, it's outside ICANN, if I can say it like that, CCWG is inside ICANN, and the way to go outside is to go to the Board, and the Board can, of course, send the letter with, but they can also decide not to send it. It will create trouble but they have the right because we are still under ICANN bylaw and if they disagree, they disagree.

Now on the content. I think what we need to say is that we are very interested and agree that there are still a lot of points to be discussed, and the input of the Board, it's interesting. One, because it's open doors to different vision of solutions, not just implementation, but also solution, and we need to have this discussion together as soon as possible. And, once again, just remember we know all that but we elect

the Board directly or indirectly through the NomCom. We select the Board member and it's part of us and it's part of this organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I have a little question here. Had we been a few years down the line and had the measure of the community being able to dismiss the complete Board, would this be one of those moments when the community would have discussed about dismissing the whole Board? And I'm asking this not just for a laugh, but as in the severity of the fact the Board has come back now and is not agreeing with the community, is this something which we might face in the future, and the community deciding, "Oh, well, let's dismiss the Board. They don't agree with us."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Look, it may be one of those times when a few irritable, cranky, old minds might have tried to petition, but I don't think it would have got wholesale or sufficient for triggering support across the ICANN community. My answer is no.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Cheryl. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Interesting what Cheryl said because, in fact, if so it's true, and I agree with her that, in fact, the voice, the people who voice more on the majority, and therefore there is no consensus of what we are doing, that's an interesting point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. Alan, let me just turn back to you whilst you're on audio, and ask you what do you need now as next steps? Because we've had this discussion here and we really are, I guess, on the one hand, still awaiting to have more information from the Board and that will be sent shortly, I guess, so that they expand on their proposals. But on the other hand, you mentioned or you asked a question on whether we want to include any comment in our comment in the public comment period that addresses the Board proposals here.

Very much in the same way as when there used to be a public comment and a reply period, one could reply to the comments that were made by others.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. We can hear you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Be very quick. I'm about to go off, even off the [inaudible] I'm on the phone listening for a few minutes. At this point, if I could summarize what I've heard, the ALAC is very receptive to the Board's comments. We obviously need more details and confirmation that what we're talking about is legal, and we'll meet the community's needs but we view it very positively and we are far more interested in a good outcome and an ICANN that is secure from capture than we are in exact process that we followed.

I know some people will object strenuously to that latter statement, but I think the outcome is what we're targeted at, not solely the process. So [inaudible] more than that, other than we are looking positively at this. At least that's what I think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, very much. Thanks, Alan. And since we are on the call here, I'd like to ask if there is anyone on the call who has a different view to this. I mean, we've heard, so far, of some support or some seeing this in a positive light. Does anyone actually have a different view? Certainly, as I said earlier, in the GNSO, I've heard quite a different story of participants being actually rather annoyed and worried about the process to the same level as they were about the outcome.

And some of them even more so about the process, saying, "Well, look, we've gone down this road now for X number of months, and this is was bottom up, and now we might have to change this. Never should we accept something like this." So strongly the wordings were. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Not that I have a different view at all, and I wanted to support what Alan was proposing in terms of text. But I can't resist to say [inaudible] situation normal within the GNSO [inaudible]. That sounds to me. I hope to see it mature and change. It would be unpredictable then, or perhaps more efficient. And, yes, I know this is in public transcript record world.

Look. There are also a whole bunch of people, particularly within industry, who would be very happy [inaudible]IANA transition to happen or their own status quos to continue on absolutely unchanged, and their own, dare I use the word capture? No, probably not, because it's [inaudible]. Their own significant influence, control, and power eroded by what largely would be a wider community empowerment system.

So let's not think that everything [inaudible] is necessarily wrapped up in any of the sectors of ICANN that is engaged in this activity because, believe me, if I was playing [to the long] game, all sorts of [inaudible] emotions we could be assuming here, and I think by not changing the structure function but by making it more accountable, effective, and transparent, we're probably making sure that we can manage those, dare I call it, shell game activities, more successfully. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I note in the chat, also, a note from Christopher Wilkinson, where he broadly supports what Alan has said, as well. And at the moment, I don't see anyone wishing to speak against Alan moving forward with this. The question just being whether this

should be in the ALAC statement or whether this should be just a response on the mailing list, on the CCWG mailing list, or a line to take on the CCWG mailing list. Are there any thoughts on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In our statement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. In the statement. Okay. Right. Well I think that we've pretty much gone around the block on this one. Not much else to say. As soon as there is movement in the CCWG mailing list, I'll make sure to, or whoever reads this first, can copy it over to the IANA Issues, our own working group mailing list and continue the discussion in our group.

I don't know if we still have Alan on the call. Alan, are you okay with those? You know what to do on this, then.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan has disconnected from audio, but I believe he'll be joining back shortly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He'll be joining back shortly. Okay. well, since he will be joining back, if you can just please let me know when he's back, then we can ask him whether he's confident enough to move forward, then, on the statement. We have 15 minutes to go on this call and I know that the

interpreters a bit tight for time today. So we have to move to CWG IANA. There is another statement going there at the moment, and we have just… What am I saying? Not CWG, the ICG, IANA Coordination Group. Starting to get lost with those acronyms after nine hours of calls, I think, today.

Final draft is up to now for review. We've had it a number of times and we've made a large number of modifications and amendments. These are just responses to questions, which were asked by the Working Group in a – sorry, by the Coordination Group in a template form. This is just really the last call now on this call. Last call for amendments.

I have asked, in the last call that we had a couple of days ago, I have asked whether we should include some text by AFRALO, which went a bit further than the responses that we had. I haven't had any response from anyone on the call or in the e-mail afterwards to tell me that they wanted to move forward and insisted on having this text duplicated or added to the ALAC statement.

I'm not sure whether any of the other RALOs are drafting a statement, as well. But, certainly, the statement from AFRALO was very much in line with the ALAC statement, so there's no conflicting advice in there. And as a result, we're just ending up with the current text that we have on the screen. I'll give you a few minutes to read through it. In the meantime, I'll give the floor to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to comment on that question. I think that the statement on the screen is fine. I don't think we need to echo

the AFRALO statement in this additional detail, as you say. There is enough similarity and lack of conflict is what's said between the two things. If we start emulating the RALO statement [inaudible] or even by cross referencing, it somewhat, in my view, dilutes the power and importance of RALOs putting in their own statements.

So if there's points of conflict or contradiction, then we may need to address then of our statements, but in the lack of that, it simply [inaudible] detail in depth in some points, so leave well enough alone and congratulations to AFRALO for taking the time and energy and putting in the effort. But we don't need to be [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, can I get in?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. I agree with Cheryl. And I made the same statement on the CCWG statement that just because the AFRALO says something, if we're not disagreeing with it, I don't think we need to echo everything. In fact, I think it's important that RALOs make statements that are not identical. So I'm happy with your statement the way it is as it stands right now.

One more comment. I tried to speak before when you asked should we put something on the CCWG and the Board proposal. Should we put

something in the comment or just the mailing list? The Board has said they will put their whole process, or whatever they're calling it, in the public comment. So I think it is appropriate for us to respond there, as well as anywhere else. So, I mean, we may well post something on the list saying where we are today.

And I think as the Board proposal evolves over the next few days, we may well want to update the statement to include a little bit more specificity. Okay. That's it for me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sounds great. Thank you very much, Alan. And just one last question for you, though, on the statement that you're drafting. You're okay now, you've got your marching orders. You know what to do next, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't recall what I said a few minutes ago, but I know it was roughly an hour into the meeting, and I'll listen to the recording as soon as it's posted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's fantastic. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I guess, as the penholder on the statement for the ICG, I also have my marching orders, then, to go with what we have on the screen at the moment. I think it's also extremely important that AFRALO in fact, if other RALOs have drafted a statement for the RALOs to file their statements, too, with the consultation process. It's important. Quality is one thing and it's very important, but quantity, I think, will also weigh in, especially as far as diversity is concerned.

And if we can show that our regional At-Large organizations are equally as involved as the ALAC itself, then we can really show the adherence to those points that are being made by the community and not just by a 15-member committee, which we are sometimes accused of being, which, of course, we don't agree. But that's, I think, the bottom line is to show that this has not just been part of a very small number of part, but a large process with a lot of people involved in them.

So I don't know whether… I note Tijani is not on the call anymore but Seun, you are on the call. If you can please make sure that AFRALO does send that statement through, and perhaps even confirm with us that the statement has been sent and we'll also process forward now with a vote on statement that's on the screen here.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is Tijani said that both AFRALO statements were already submitted. I haven't checked, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know there was work going on in LACRALO. I don't know if they're anywhere at a stage of actually having something drafted, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. I don't notice anyone from LACRALO on the call, unfortunately, but maybe we can ask Leon next time we have him online or something whether how the LACRALO process is moving forward. Or, perhaps, we could ask staff and find out if there is any progress and LACRALO is looking at having a statement there, as well. I mean, that's probably easier. Staff to follow up with Leon or, indeed, I don't know who the penholders are for the LACRALO proposed statement. But I'm sure they'll find out.

Okay. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course, those have been a very regular engaged person in this work group, and I would think he's [inaudible] within the RALO. Perhaps, get action items to him. Perhaps, with Leon, as well, but Leon is on leave now. Perhaps, reach out to our [inaudible] might be even more effective and efficient.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Yes, in the notes, the action item says, "Staff to follow up with Leon and/or LACRALO leaders." Perhaps if Leon is on leave, then let's just give him a few days of a break and just check with

LACRALO leaders and, therefore, Alberto Soto being the person to contact. And you're quite correct. Thank you for reminding me that it's Alberto who's been very active in this working group here, and has attended all, if not most, of the conference calls, as well. So that's been great.

Good involvement from everyone. Right. I think the second thing that we needed to look at. The third one was the CWG IANA stewardship transition. The IANA Service Level Expectations document. Now, that's a document which has been sent to the mailing list not so long ago. It is rather long, 27 pages. What the update that I heard a couple of hours earlier on the GNSO Council update that came from Paul Kane was that they were still in discussions to dot some Is and cross a few Ts as far as the document was concerned.

This is the sort of nearly the end document. It's a negotiated document which has involved ICANN staff, IANA staff, and also involved several registry operators and members of the working group. And having just read through this document, it looks very professional, and I'm comforted by the fact that this was actually negotiated with IANA staff. It's not just a document that members of the working group have decided to draft, and then throw across the wall and say, "Well, deal with this now." This looks like a consensus document, and so after having briefly read through this document, I have no qualms about it or no concerns about it overstepping in any direction.

I certainly wouldn't have a noticed anything specific. I don't know if anybody else has read it yet, or anybody has any comments to make on the document itself. That will form an integral part, of course, of the

service level expectations once the transition takes place. So it's particularly important that it is right because that really will determine the quality by which the services will need to gauge themselves against.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so it looks like there is not much to discuss on this occasion, then. And I note Seun speaking about the previous agenda item that there is still the AFRALO statement will be submitted by the weekend. We need to make sure that happens.

Excellent. Okay. So that's less than five minutes. We've gone through that and, therefore, we are at any other business. Whilst Terri tries to find the beeping. Beeping once, beeping twice. Oh, well. We're not going to wait for that third beep. Ladies and gentlemen, thanks very much for this call. I think we've made some very good progress, and let's follow up on the mailing lists.

The action items, staff to follow up with Leon. Next week, should we have one call or two calls again? I know that two calls is a little onerous on people's times, but obviously, we've moved so much on this. Alan, perhaps, as you might need some help on this. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Am I still on?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You are still on, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. The phone has been dropping as I walked along. My inclination is to try to schedule two. This is a changing scene at this point. I'm on vacation next week and I really don't want to do a lot of work, but I don't see how we can avoid it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Alan. Thanks very much. Any other thoughts on this? One or two. Would anyone want to say we need only one call? Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I would say one call and except if there are additional developments with the CCWG and Board discussions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Eduardo. Let's go for this, then. Let's do a first call at the beginning of the week, which I believe is usually is it on a Tuesday that we have that call? And let's have the Doodle, also, for the second call, but let's then decide on whether we need that second call or not during the first call. So at least we'll have the slots that will be ready for us in the second call. Is that possible, Terri? Or Heidi, indeed, because I know that there's always a question regarding the interpreters being available for the other calls. And, obviously, we don't want to book them and then unbook them at very short notice.

TERRI AGNEW:	Hi Olivier. It's actually better to book them in advance than try to scramble them and get them as a last minute. That is possible. We'll try to set up two calls next week.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thanks very much for this, Terri. We set up two calls, but the second one will be optional on whether we decide during the first call. That will be, I guess, one of the agenda items in AOB. Do we need that call two days from now? And I see green ticks from Eduardo and from Seun on this.
	And with this, I'd like to thank you all. Thanks, Veronica and David, for the first time in a long time we're not late, but that's all because Alan has run a significant part of the call and he's way more efficient than I am. So thank you very much, Alan, for this. Alan, I hope you enjoy your holiday next week, although I'm sure we'll speak, and, hopefully, we won't be speaking as a group more than you speak to your family.
ALAN GREENBERG:	At least that week.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Ladies and gentlemen, thanks very much. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Gracias, bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. This meeting has been adjourned. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]