
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, let's start the call then. Let's start the recording and start the call.

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 and ICANN Accountability taking place on Tuesday, the 8th of September, 2015, at 13:30 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Gordon Chillcott, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Sebastien Bachollet, Yrjo Lansipuro, and Loris Taylor. On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto. We have apologies from Mohamed El Bashir and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

From staff, we have myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreter today will be Veronica. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpretation. Thank you very much and back over to you, Oliver.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anyone in the roll call, by any chance? I don't hear anyone shout their name out so the roll call is complete. Please note that today we only have one interpreter, so we're going to have to be very tight on timing, and kind also to our interpreter for now speaking too fast, so as for her to be able to keep up.

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.

Now, we have an agenda that essentially is going to look at the CCWG Accountability, and only about a handful, just over a handful, of minutes for the IANA Coordination Group and for the CWG IANA. So are there any amendments to the agenda? Are there any points to add to part four? Anything to add to the IANA Coordination Group or the CWG IANA part? I don't see anyone put their hand up, so the agenda is adopted.

And the action items last week, agenda item number two, were relating to this meeting. One was about the Doodle. The other one was to find out the status of the LACRALO statement on the CCWG proposal. The feedback that we received was that the LACRALO statement did not end up being drafted or completed. So the only statement that has been drafted were those from AFRALO both on the ICG statement and also the CCWG statement.

We have had some links to them in previous agendas, so let's go without any further ado to agenda number three, and that's the CCWG Accountability, and I hand the floor over for the draft ALAC statement that is currently still in its final hours before vote starts. And for this, the penholder is Alan Greenberg. And, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. All right. You should have a revised version either on the pod or you've downloaded yourself. The version numbers, Version [7] revision 2. And there are a lot of changes and most of them are cosmetic, and I won't be going over those today. But there are a fair number of substantive changes, and it shouldn't take anywhere near the allotted time to do that, but we'll see where this goes.

The first change is in the first paragraph. There are several changes there. The major one is the inclusion of the community mechanism as a single designator and the explanation for that. The explanation is that we were looking for something lighter weight, less complexity, and something that we could – and we had a problem with the lack of detail in the existing ones.

By decreasing the number of moving parts, the proposal would have been, we believed, more viable. That proposal, of course, is completely dead at this point, but this goes into a little bit of understanding as to why we did, which ends up supporting the section at the end on the Board. And the last sentence of the paragraph says, in summary, that we look favorably on the new Board proposal and we'll address it later. And I'll take questions as we go along, if there are any comments or thoughts on this.

Okay. Seeing nothing. On to the second page at the very top of the page. This was a section that had been omitted in previous versions that it was never filled in, and we're giving the rationale for why we believe that we don't want to use the term civil society as the global label for At-Large. And the sentence now reads, "At-Large is increasingly..." And there's a typo there. Should not have an "is". "At-Large increasingly includes unaffiliated individuals as well as consumer groups, groups supporting software methodology, such as open source, and groups supporting user training and development, particularly in developing regions. None of whom consider themselves civil society." Are people happy with that? We have a couple of check marks, no hands, no one calling out. We'll go on to the next section.

The next section with substantive change in it is on page 3. I note, at the beginning of Section 5 near the bottom of page 3, that the following subsections are out of order. I didn't have the patience last night to try to put them back in order and make sure nothing got broken along the way, so I did a note to myself to reorder the sections in paragraph order. There had been a numbering error, which caused them to be out of order.

And on to page 4. This was a statement that added a minimum number of ACs or SOs to allow the CMSM to work. And someone last time suggested a clarification that as to – I think it was Tijani – not only that the number, but if the nature of the SOs changed. And his example was if the GNSO split up into what is now stakeholder groups, but each of them became an SO. That, I don't think, really made sense. They couldn't be SOs in their own right but you could, for instance, divide the GNSO among different classes of gTLDs just as the DNSO split into the GNSO and ccNSO. So this sentence uses that as a rationale.

Again, if there's any comments, please intercede as you go along. The next change, which I didn't make. By the way, these changes comprise changes that I made following our last meeting, a number that Sebastien made, and also a number of small edits that a number of other people made and a large number of grammatical edits that Ariel suggested.

Towards just past the middle of page 4, paragraph 348 and 356, there was a reference that Sebastien said. There's a reference in the community forum saying, "It will be open to members of the public." And he suggested we define "members of the public." I really don't see

the need for that. I think it's been used in this most generic sense and it's essentially anyone who is not part of the formal communities within ICANN. But I may be misunderstanding that.

So I didn't see the need to define it. But Sebastien, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. Yeah. It was not to us to define that, but it's a question to the document because I think open to member of the public. We tried to have everybody on board, and then as soon as you become part of an SO/AC or whatever, part of ICANN, you are not anymore the public. It's strange for me and it's not the goal of ICANN to have everybody in our – maybe a little bit suspicious and we need outside people.

So goal is to [have] everybody into the Board and not outside. Then it's why I was asking that the writer of the document explain what it's member of the public. Because if not, we will end up with three people from the people because they are not participating regularly to ICANN or because they are not member of any part of ICANN. And so I am the public and then I have the right to say something and to decide something. That's strange for me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sebastien. Yes, I did understand. Perhaps it wasn't clear that you weren't [inaudible] we define this, but that is defined in the statement. Let me read the context. I'll just kind of find it right now. If

you know exactly which paragraph it's in, if you could point to it, but I think I can find it. Okay. "This sort of form would have no standing and would make no decisions." This is paragraph 354, for those of you who have the document open.

"This sort of form would have no standing and would make no decisions. It would be open to participation from the full diversity of the ICANN community. It should be open to members of the public. Certainly, to observe all of its proceedings and probably to particular, as well." I read this relatively clearly as in any members who are not part of the community already, who are not part of the ICANN community.

Is there a feeling that we need to define it further? I think it's relatively clear.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay, Alan. Go ahead. No worries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. By the way, the mobile phone I'm on has just beeped at me telling me its battery is low, and it started off fully charged about ten minutes ago. So if I drop out, I'm going to switch to my mobile phone, but it'll take a minute or so for me to dial back. All right. The next change – maybe we can finish everything before then.

The next change is the beginning of page 5, Removal of Individual Direct [inaudible] and Sebastien suggested that we add a global statement at the top saying the At-Large community supports the need for the power allowing the removal of Board Directors but is divided on the way to do

that. I'm not sure it really needs to be said because we say that in detail or on for the individual directors, but I don't think it hurts so I'm happy to leave it there. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I put it before section relating to the removal of individual director and recalling of the entire Board. Because the question, it's not just for one or the other. It was on top of all that. But, of course, we talk about removal and then the recalling, but the idea was to have...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien, if I can interrupt before my phone dies, I put that in the wrong place. I understood where it should have gone. So it should be moved up to a more general place with an appropriate heading.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I have no objection to it being there, and sorry for misplacing it. The next change is paragraph 424. And I'm trying to see what change was. Yeah.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I help you, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'll tell you what the problem I had. Your comment said it would be okay in relation to spilling the overall Board, but this is a paragraph only about the overall Board.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but my point was we don't need to put people if we split the whole Board. The interim Board doesn't need to fill seats because we will have less people and we don't care if they fill the seat 1, 2, 3, or 15. We need that for the new Board, full new Board, and it's why I was writing that we don't need it for the interim Board. But that's not a big deal. I just consider mathematically you take another point of view, but I think there is no need for interim Board to belong to one seat or another.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. My understanding is the 120-day limit is to create a brand-new replacement Board.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but it's written in the document that the interim Board must fulfill the term of the people who are already seated. The interim Board will not need that because it will work—

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Now I see what you're saying. I read that paragraph completely differently. Let me see. Am I still on?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Hold on. Sorry. I'm working on a small laptop here and I have to [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And yes, Alan. Interesting we read the same thing and we don't understand or we don't understand the same thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if that's the case, we obviously do have a problem. Paragraph 424. Okay. The bylaws shall provide the interim Board will be in place only so long as required for the selection or election process for the replacement Board, and in no event longer than 120 days. So it says the interim Board will just be there until it's replaced. But [inaudible] 120 days. And my original comment saying I don't think all of the ACs and SOs may make that deadline. I now see it's also unclear that it's not clear if the new directors come in one by one or they wait for all of them to be named.

So I'm not quite sure what the problem was you're referring to. Try saying it again now that I have the paragraph in front of me.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am trying to go through the paragraph myself also like that. It's written that on page 62 for my... You have the bylaws shall provide at the top of the page and you have in selecting a replacement Board and then the directors select for the interim Board. Later, those [selected] for the replacement Board will step into the term that were vacated by the recalled directors.

We don't need that for the interim Board, but that's all. Because the interim Board will not step into the terms. They will do their job and the new Board will step into the term of the previous Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Now I see what you're saying. It's the step into the terms... The interim Board stepping into the terms that you see. Okay. Now I see what the problem is. I'll try to put some words into it. I don't think it's a particularly major issue but it's one of those thousand details that the Board is complaining aren't complete. Yes, okay. Got it.

And my phone is continuing to beep. Let's see if we can get finished before it completely dies. The last major change is, in fact, the new section on the Board proposal. What I have is the following: "At the time this statement is being the drafted, the 7th of September, details of the Board proposal have not yet been released. Based on what was said at the meeting and in the distributed notes, the ALAC is generally supportive of the proposal. In particular, we believe that by reverting to the written specification of Work Stream 1..." This was not in what we discussed the other day, but I believe is relevant.

“By reverting to the written specification of Work Stream 1 in the CCWG Charter, focusing on the issues that are mandatory to affect the IANA transition, we may have a more manageable task to facilitate in the IANA transition. While it will be far preferable to have seen some of these ideas earlier in the process, it is better late than never and we believe necessary updates can be done on the merit of the proposal.”

“It is clear that we need further directors, further details, and an evaluation from CCWG legal counsel. But pending those, the ALAC believes the new proposal must be fully evaluated and cautiously offers its support.”

Sebastien and Olivier, I don't know whose hand was up, but does either of you know?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien's was up first.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I think it's a fair statement. Maybe we can add as the [word] changes and the [inaudible] say that if there is no merit with the proposal by the Board, then they will support the single member. I don't know how we can say that because we came with the not single member, but single delegation model, and that's maybe. Okay. No. I think it's a good way you write that and it can go ahead like that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I mean, Bruce's statement is a bit glib that they will accept the model if theirs proves not to work. That would still presume mean we have to fill in the details because the NTIA is going to accept it without details. So we have an interesting issue there.

Now in a message, Jordan said, "Well, once we write the bylaws, all the details will be complete." And I think he's wrong there. I think there are many details that will not be complete just by the bylaws.

Olivier, while you're talking, I'm going to try to dial in on my mobile phone and replace it with that, but Olivier, go ahead. I may be out of touch when you finish.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. I like the text that is drafted here. It needs a little bit of cleaning up in a few places. I think that one of the concerns is after the third paragraph. "It is clear that we need further details and evaluation from the CCWG legal counsel." And then you start the sentence with, "But pending those." And I'm not sure it's great to start with by "But pending," with a "But." Maybe, "Start pending those the ALAC released the new proposal, it should be evaluated and [inaudible] offers support."

Because then I have here is, "Offers its support for what?" Does the ALAC offer its support for the process to evaluate this? Its support for the Board proposal? Its support for the – I'm not quite sure how that is, so we might need to change this a little bit on this. And secondly, in the first... Just trying to reread it. No. that's fine for the time being. And I

believe that Alan must be offline in the meantime. So Alan is offline, we can have Cheryl Langdon-Orr next [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan is online, but I had to wait for the operators to say all the things about muting and unmuting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. So back to you, Alan. Did you manage to hear what I had to say?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I heard everything. Has anyone ever, by the way, seen the pressing pound sign and other times silencing the operator? It would be a really nice feature. Yeah. I got you. Remove the “but”, put “pending” and say what it is we’re supporting. I think we’re supporting two things. I think we’re supporting the further evaluation and the concept of simplification and that we don’t need every [inaudible] that go back to the Work Stream 1 charter.

Now, the Board was smart not to have said that because that would have elicited comments from a number of people that would have seared our ears off even more than previous. But I personally think our major strategic problem was accepting that concept from the first meeting in Frankfurt that we change without going back to the chartering bodies, change the definition of what Work Stream 1 was.

But what’s done is done. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Very happy with the way this text is turning up. I think I'd like to, when we're looking at what it is we're supporting, just have the minimal change. How you do that language, I'm not fussed about, but the essence of bolting on mechanism to the existing structure rather than going through a full ICANN 3.0 attempt, which we're not going to get fully fleshed out without huge gaps, holes, and risks in the structure that we can do in a given amount of time would be something I'd like to say in that what we are supporting assuming that the proposals the Board has put forward do have the necessary legal endorsement and strengths to give the community powers and mechanisms.

So yeah, something in that what we support that says that it is back to our very early, and I think almost continual, desire from our community for minimal change to do as we need. So I just would like that sort of language. How that sentence pans out, I'm not fussed, but you speak English and I don't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, essentially, saying what it is we're supporting, some reference to – and I won't use these words – bolted on to the existing structure, and we're going to have to look at it as it's fleshed out by the Board. So I'll try to do something in as few words as possible, look at it critically. I don't know, Olivier, are we having another meeting this week or is this the last meeting that finalizes the statement subject to a final review for grammar and such?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. We have a choice. I would think that we haven't got very much more to discuss in a full-length meeting. If you would like, if we need another call, we could have a very short call, if that's your wish. I don't know. Your call.

ALAN GREENBERG: There have been a few enough comments on this and few enough changes that my inclination would be I do want further edit, we get staff to look at it one more time for grammar and such, and freeze it at that point. The deadline, if I remember correctly, is the 12th or something like that, which is a few days from now. So that will give people a couple of days to look at it, and I will specify.

By the way, Sebastien had asked for a Word format to make some changes. I somewhat foolishly sent that out to the list and a half dozen other people made changes. It took me hours and hours to incorporate those back into the original document yesterday, so I will ask for different methodology this time going forward.

But I don't think we need an extra meeting at this point, based on the lack of substantive change requests on this meeting. But we have a queue and I think it was Cheryl, Olivier, and Sebastien, in that order. Cheryl may already have finished.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I haven't. Thank you. It's a new hand. I wanted to note down, because I know you're sort of juggling things on less-than-optimal

equipment setup, Loris Taylor put some language into the chat that's likely to be useful, as well.

In terms of additional information, I just wanted to share with the group that at the rapporteur and leadership meeting that we had in preparation for the CCWG call coming up in the next 24 hours, I did feel it's necessary, for a whole lot of strategic reasons, to preempt the fact that I was confident that the public comment from our community was going to have, in addition to some constructive criticism on a number of points within the draft for our analysis, a subject to ratification generic support for exploration and probable support to what the Board was proposing.

That was important because the leadership – and Leon was not at that meeting. So the leadership in the absence of our co-chair was tending, and there I mean and the leadership and the rapporteurs was tending to think that the Board was [inaudible] out of step on the sidelines as opposed to that the AC and SO support they had predicted for the – so the draft was not necessarily a fait accompli.

So it is important that we follow through with words like this. And I want to thank you, Alan, for putting a huge amount of time into doing this drafting, especially when you've done something like [inaudible] tidy up all the word input that's come from hearing people on dotting Is and crossing Ts. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Cheryl, I think I actually implied that at the last meeting with the Board with my intervention.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They were sitting under a desk coming loudly with their eyes closed and fingers stuck in their ears at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. One of the things that really irks me about that meeting is especially on the chat. The subject kept on coming up but without being a member, we have no legal persona, and these people have completely forgotten the history of how we got here. Our lawyers have come up with a half a dozen ways of getting legal personas, many of them not requiring membership.

People are also saying things like we have been talking about community mechanism as a single member for so long and now they come up. The “so long” is simply the power is fading. Even Buenos Aires, we hadn’t talked about it. We’ve been talking about it for about a month and a half and people’s revisionist memory seems to think this is the only thing we’ve ever mentioned. They completely forget that there are—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Welcome to working with community and consensus building. That’s right.

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s right. And all we have to do is each AC and SO says, “I want to use my powers as a person,” and you got it. So very, very frustrating when

people keep on saying the same thing over and over again after they've been corrected. However, yes, that is where we are. And I should tell you my wife is looking at me saying, "So why do you think your organization should be different from every other one?"

Okay. Sorry to forget the hand. We have Olivier and then Sebastien, I think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. So, two things. An early intervention from Cheryl was describing the potential for putting text or suggesting putting text that we need to clearly indicate the ALAC's unwillingness to go for full ICANN 3.0 and indicate our preference for amending current processes and structures to improve ICANN, just as one step at a time.

And Cheryl, correct me if I'm wrong, but that's how I understood what you suggested we put in there. I just wanted to raise the point that this is a significant point to make. I agree with it, by the way, but we will be up against some significant pushback from many parts of the community, including significant parts of the GNSO that are saying, "This is our chance, our only chance, to move ICANN into ICANN 3.0," and now we're in this situation where it doesn't look that great to go into 3.0 due to the short amount of time that is there.

So we need to be absolutely clear on this call and on our working group that we are indeed indicating that we would prefer not going for a full ICANN 3.0. That was one thing I wanted to raise on this call and make sure we are all okay with this. I note Seun and Cheryl are agreeing, so that's clear. If anybody else objects, please raise your voice now

because it's important. And it will bring some significant tension as other parts of the community are going to now either dig their heels in and say, "No, we want ICANN 3.0," or they will say, "Okay, fine, let's soften our attitude and let's move for what the Board wants to do."

I just want to remind everyone here that during the GNSO counsel call that I attended last week, I heard expressions of shock and horror and some disbelief from some members having heard the board. So we're not there yet. That's the first thing.

The second thing is to do with the deadline for the submission of the comment itself. Alan, the deadline for the submission of the comment is the 12th of September, and in the calendar that we have, the policy calendar, the comments – our own comments – should have closed by the 3rd, and we should be in the middle of a vote. Are you intending to have the ALAC vote after we submit this comment? Because we only have three days or four days left now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yep. Thank you, Olivier. To address the first part, we have been odd man out throughout this whole process and the IANA process. Even in the Accountability, we have been dragged along. Some of us dragged more than others and particularly Sebastien. But all of us, to a large extent, have been expressing reluctance to jump into this the way everyone else has.

We have been expressing concern that the community mechanism is subject to capture, or if they're not subject to capture, it, in fact, is likely to be completely dysfunctional because there won't be enough people

to use any of the powers. It's one of the two that I'm afraid and we've been saying that from day one. People haven't listened, as Cheryl pointed out, when you say something that people disagree with, they simply go on to the next comment.

So I'm not particularly worried about this. I think there's a moderately good chance that if the community pushes ahead with the direction it's going in and simply issues the paper despite any Board comments, that the Board is going to say something moderately negative and to the extent that the NTIA cares about what the Board thinks, or the NTIA has similar feelings, then I think it's going to be interesting.

I really wish the NTIA would come out and say something now, but they're not going to. So we're stuck until the end of the comment period.

In terms of the timing, the decision we made at an ALAC meeting, I believe – it may have been an ALT meeting – was that we would vote after the fact. The official comments closed on the 3rd or the 4th, and I said we would keep it open for final revisions and changes by the ALAC and the IANA Issues Groups. And so we're following that plan.

We didn't know about Board proposal, which would cause a major perturbation within that same timeframe. But we're right on the timeline we originally planned and it will be a vote after the fact. But given the amount of consultation we've done, I don't have a lot of concern about that, and that was a formal decision that was made.

Sebastien. Olivier, do you want to get back in?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Alan. You mentioned wishing that the NTIA would get into the game and say something. I must say, I'm not quite sure how that would play out. First, of course, the NTIA getting involved directly into the discussions but, secondly, if you do recall in its last intervention, Larry Strickling and I believe it was... Well, I think within Buenos Aires. I can't remember now. It's all a big time continuum.

At one of the recent ICANN meetings, Larry Strickling did make some points, and especially points, for example, about the dismissal of the Board, etc. And you would have thought that the community would have listened to this, and yet they haven't. So I'm not quite sure that even the NTIA saying something would make such a difference with some of the views in the group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Larry's comments are designed to be somewhat cryptic, and people who choose to ignore them, choose to ignore them. That's all I'll say. We've gone through this process with the CWG and he was making very clear statements from our perspective. They were not clear from other people's perspectives. That's all. I don't think I want to elaborate anymore.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Two points. The first one is to come back to the discussion about ICANN 3.0. I don't think, even with those big changes,

we will have ICANN 3.0. We will have something I will say that will need still a lot of improvement on the organization of the community, for example. We didn't achieve that at all. The Work Stream 2 needs to be fulfilled to eventually discuss about 3.0.

But if you write a sentence on that, and I have no problem, but just to be sure that we don't write, we don't want ICANN 3.0. It's not a good time for that and it's not with this type of work that we will build this new organization or this 3.0. In fact, we are building something called by some as a new organization because new membership model will come in, but the rest is not changed so much and it's not for me yet, 3.0.

Once again, I just want to be sure that we say we did agree that it must happen now. It will take time to build this new organization or this new phase of the organization.

And the second point about the document, my suggestion is that you take care of the last cleaning and you publish it as soon as possible. My rationale is that if we wait to the end, it will be with 10, 20, 30, I don't know, at the same time. First point.

The second is that what we are saying about the Board, I would prefer to publish it before even they publish their proposal in detail. Because, if not, we will have to jump in and say, "Okay, but you got it. Why you didn't discuss of it?" And so on. And I would suggest that you publish it as soon as possible and then ALAC will vote on and I hope that it will not be any difficulty with the ALAC member. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sebastien. Two points. I have actually no intention in the world of mentioning ICANN 3.0. I think that kind of buzzword playing has no meaning whatsoever. 3.0 may be the new management structure, 3.0 perhaps should be a new AC/SO structure or something else completely. I really have no interest in using buzzwords like that. And I will take an awful lot of convincing to get me to put one into a draft. So I don't want to play that game at all.

I hope what we will have made it clear that we are looking for simplicity and we're looking for the transition at this point. And we're looking for the intent for further change.

In terms of the timing, how much time do you want for how long following my publication of the revised version is not going to get done an hour after this meeting, but it will, perhaps, get done sometime today or early tomorrow.

How much time do people want? 24 hours? Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Alan, I guess we are done. You do the best and it will be okay. With me, it will be okay. I don't need to read it again. I trust you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anyone else have any thoughts? Cheryl says agreed, so I'll do it, get staff to do a quick cleanup, if necessary, and publish. Any objections on that? Alberto agrees. I hear no objections. It is a done deal. Thank you. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And that was very efficient. Thank you. And very pleased to see that this process is moving forward and looking forward to the final draft or, in fact... Yeah, the final draft to be voted on.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have to move to the next part of our agenda, which is going to be very short indeed. First, the IANA Coordination Group. Not aware if there were any calls ever since our last meeting last week. Looking at our list of attendees, we neither have Mohamed Al-Bashir nor do we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, I believe. Do we have Jean-Jacques? I don't see an apology. No. Let's not jump back into this.

TERRI AGNEW: We do not have—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thank you. So neither of them are there. What we do have is a public comment period. The statement that we have drafted in the past few calls is now finalized, is going through the votes. The vote will end... I believe, it has either ended last night or will end in a few hours, and it will be submitting to the IANA Coordination Group public comment process at the moment. If you see in the agenda page, there are 63 submissions.

Needless to say, I've had no time whatsoever to read them all but I'm glad to note, though, that within those submissions, submission number

35 was from Aziz Hilali from AFRALO. So that has now been submitted in the process. So we will have two submissions coming in the process.

Unfortunately, the submission that we had heard was coming from LACRALO on the matter did not come to consensus, so there's only an AFRALO and an ALAC submission in this process. Are there any questions or concerns on any of this?

Yes indeed, a note from Seun mentioning there are 62 submissions. Yes, there are quite a few. The few that have quickly looked at, I mean, I've obviously looked at the ones that came from the other operational communities. There is broad support from those submissions, there are a few points being raised here and there. I'm also aware of the Internet Society having sent a submission over. So there's quite a few points of view there. Only a handful of submissions are openly criticizing the process and saying the process was closed, was not bottom-up, was not open for everyone to take part in, and was completely flawed and therefore the result is completely flawed.

Well, I'm not quite sure what one needs to do to convince those people that the process was open, but I'm certainly very pleased with the way that this has gone so far. Now, that's one thing, so any comments or questions on the ICG? No comments? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So we can move, then, to the CWG IANA Stewardship Transition. That's agenda item number five with the IANA service level expectations document that was the last document that was sent to the mailing list.

I haven't seen, since that time, any other changes. As you recall, we had a brief look at the document last week, and no one raised any specific points. I think that everyone agreed that it was a good document since it was negotiated with current IANA staff. So that looks quite good. There isn't really anything else that I've seen ever since on the mailing list of the CWG IANA. There's still questions about the usual questions of what are we going to do with the follow-up on the intellectual property issue.

But as you recall in a previous call, we had said we're not going to comment any further on this since it seems to be in hand. We just have to see what the implementation was going to be like. Are there any comments or questions on the CWG IANA work at the moment?

I note that there is a call later this week. Yes, there is a call later this week. There was one last week, which was just a quick update on a few things, and I'm not quite sure of the agenda this week. But it will show if the call might not be actually canceled. There is not very much to discuss.

Okay. No comments from anybody here. So yes, thank you. Next call of the CWG IANA will be on the 10th of September. We'll see, hopefully, later on today or tomorrow, we will get a confirmation from the CWG chairs.

Now since I don't see anyone putting their hand up for CWG IANA, we have reached very much ahead of schedule our any other business section. And Sebastien Bachollet has raised the question about the scheduling for our next face-to-face meeting that will take place in

Dublin. Sebastien, do you wish to say a few words on this? Because, I must say, I'm not quite sure where we are on the schedule and we haven't got Gisella and Gisella usually takes this or works on this, not only Gisella, but Leon, as well. And we haven't got Leon on the call, either.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm really sorry, but my question was not Dublin. It was LA meeting. And the question with possible meeting between the CCWG and the Board regarding the output of the CCWG and the input of the Board. And I wanted that we discuss what At-Large thinks about do we need this meeting? If yes, how we can push to really have it. I can give you my point of view, but that was my suggestion of items to be discussed today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I must apologize for having completely misunderstood you. So that's now making the clear. The floor is open for discussion. I see hands up from Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alan Greenberg. So Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. None of you on the meeting – and I have previously been supportive of having a face-to-face meeting assuming that the agenda was merited. It is a matter for discussion at the CCWG meeting in the next 24 hours, so the CCWG will come to a decision during that meeting as to whether [inaudible] or not. But because we haven't had

details fleshed out since the intervention call from the Board, and we haven't received legal advice or a memo based on what ICANN legal and CCWG legal counsel may or may not have managed to react to from the proposal that was [inaudible] etc.

I had said to the leadership that I believe that it seems to me that the CCWG should treat whatever comes in from the Board exactly the same way as it treats all the other input from the call for public comment. And therefore, the risk of a meeting in Los Angeles looking like a meeting that was preference to a CCWG/Board interaction rather than a CCWG meeting to facilitate how it deals with all of the public comment input probably wasn't now worthwhile.

So my personal proposal is that we don't do a September meeting. We do the hard yards as best as we can between now and Dublin as we would under normal circumstances in the absence of any suggestion that we have another face-to-face meeting squeezed in, that obviously we have our Friday pre-ICANN meeting and that we may indeed need to do a face-to-face meeting after Dublin. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Next is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you might be muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I was. I didn't think I was, but I was. I have just the opposite position. If the Board comes out with something substantive and useful in the next while, it will be an interesting meeting with the Board. If the

Board doesn't come out with that, then thank you very much for providing the funding for a face-to-face meeting. I think it will be exceedingly useful to help finalize the analysis of the comments. I find the intense weekends that we plan absolutely killing because half of them end up being completely overnight. I don't think people are going to use that time effectively, and I think the meeting can be well used regardless of what stage we're at, and we need to make it clear that, depending on the stage of what we get from the Board, the legal counsel, it may vary. But I actually think it will be a useful event regardless. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Interesting. My point of view is that I support we have a meeting in September in Los Angeles and I hope that the Board will not come with too much already-cooked point of view. My reasoning is that I know that the comment period [inaudible] that well, but if they are all already briefed by legal what they are able to say, what they're not able to say, it will be more difficult to have them change point of view. It's why I think if we can do it quite quickly, and before the end of September, it will be a good move. And yes, it will be, like Alan say, very useful for the whole group to meet before Dublin. It's why I support we have this meeting and we will do further working group. It will be useful, and if Board doesn't take and they don't use that for good

purposes, so be it. But I am not sure that they have understood what happened at the phone call and that they will not come again like that.

It was a terrible call not because it was, I think, not enough prepare. I would have preferred to have each and every Board member saying what they are feeling about, but it's not the way the Board is working. And if we have them face-to-face, it will be harder to tell them to tell us that they all agree on everything that and the legal team or legal advisor will tell them to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. I guess my bias against holding the meeting is also fueled by looking at the Doodle results for CCWG members and participants who can actually make the trip in the available dates in September. And whilst we, including myself, will make ourselves available for this meeting, should it be held, there are whole blocks of the membership, for example, ccNSO would be only able to be represented by Jordan. No other person, including Mathieu can attend.

There are a vast number of people who just cannot make any of the dates. And the preferred dates are specifically with the planned Board workshop. So Sebastien, the likelihood of anybody other than Bruce being able to [inaudible] is very, very small. So I guess my view has been tinted considerably by looking at how in fact would even be able to turn up to such a face-to-face meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Back to Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Cheryl, for your input. My feeling is that there are some people, including the ccNSO, who are not saying that they can't be there but they don't want to have this face-to-face meeting, and that's another question. The Doodle was to find the people available. It was not to have people saying that I don't want to have this meeting. That's a pity because it was useful by some at least.

My feeling is that the Board can postpone the face-to-face meeting, and if we do the weekend with the CCWG, they will have the Monday and the Tuesday to have their meeting. If we do the Tuesday and the Monday and the Tuesday, then they will have their Board meeting on Saturday and Sunday.

That's, for me, a no-brainer. If they want to have meeting with us, they must be available, and they must be available when we, the community, or the member, or participants of the CCWG can. We are not playing on the same [field here]. Then my understanding is that they will be available during the meeting, and if they need more time for the Board workshop, they can do that after. Or they can do that before. Because they offer days before, then they can come before anyhow. I don't think it's a crucial point, this one, but I get your input. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I've heard words saying the Board will not change their workshop. As far as I'm concerned, if a Doodle was sent out with these days as an option, and the Board is asking for a meeting with the Board between the Board and the CCWG or the CCWG with the Board participating, if they then boycott it, they've sealed their fate. You get what you deserve some days.

So I'm assuming that if the meeting is scheduled regardless of the days, the Board will participate to a large extent. If that's not the case, then all bets are off on pretty much everything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Any further questions or comments? Have we answered your question, Sebastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] I decided I won't waste time. Alan, let me be clear about the Doodle. The Doodle was driven solely by the CCWG leadership and staff was instructed specifically to ignore a blackout date that had been indicated by the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: How interesting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. My comment still sort of stands anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, everyone. We're going to this way down. I'm sure we can talk about it ad infinitum, but ultimately, it will interesting to see what decision is made. I gather it is the chairs, the co-chairs of the working group that will make the decision, isn't it? Based on the results of the Doodle. And since the Doodle is so terrible at the moment, it might well be that this face-to-face meeting is not going to take place. I have a queue at the moment with...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, it's an agenda item for this week's call so it's not just the leadership. It will be discussed at the meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. So we'll probably have to look for the – well, get involved in the call and see what it's like. What I do see here is that there appears to be support for the face-to-face meeting. Some in the group are saying support only if the Board is ready with more discussion and more things in their hands. Others are saying, "Well, let's meet face-to-face anyway to be able to go through the comments." On the whole, I would say there is some support to have the face-to-face meeting.

We have Christopher Wilkinson in the queue and then Alan Greenberg. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. Just to add to this discussion that, if I'm not mistaken, the CCWG calls tonight, it's 19:00 UTC. On the CCWG mailing list, most of the comment has been negative for reasons which have already been evoked in this conversation. And particularly there are members of the CCWG who do not want to appear to be negotiating with the Board behind the back of the other interested parties.

As I've indicated on the Doodle, obviously, I can't go, and I have an interest if the meeting takes place as to know whether or not there will be remote participation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. Just to be sure, would you support the face-to-face meeting? Do you think it should take place? Irrespective of the fact that there's been a lot of negative feedback on this on the mailing list.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: On balance, I would say no, not least because I don't believe that the participation will be representative. The people in the CCWG who have the time and the money to drive this process and driving it along a very narrow agenda to their own economic and business interests, which by and large I do not share, and which exclude, to a large extent, the interests of the rest of the world. I think it will be easier to deal with

face-to-face situations in Dublin but, on balance, I'm not convinced of the advantages of this event.

I can hear Alan saying just any opportunities to meet anybody on the face-to-face is better than no opportunity. I'm just saying on balance.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Christopher. Alan Greenberg, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things. I've heard words from Board members saying, "This is not a negotiation. It's an opportunity to meet and talk to each other." And I think there is a not-so-subtle difference between the two. I think the fact that no one wants it to be a negotiation I think is well held. I suspect but I don't know for sure the Board is looking at this as an opportunity to explore and, perhaps, try to convince people but not haggle.

So I personally still think it is a useful thing, if it can be orchestrated of the days that look like most positive one of them is going to make it very hard for me to be there. I tried but I could be late. And we'll see.

Now the other thing I want to raise is there was an implication in the Board suggesting this meeting that there could be travel funding for other people other than members. The implication was that, perhaps, some number of people from AC/SOs other than members could attend.

I don't know whether that was indeed a correct interpretation or how it will play out, but I think we need a methodology to select additional people should we end up having travel funding for them. And I would suggest that it be done, the selection be done by the five formal members and using active activity and participation in the process as the measure. I guess I'm looking for comments on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. I think we've touched on this now completely. I see more hands going up so let's have Sebastien. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Yeah. My point of view – and I know that there are pushback on that – is that if we have all the member of the working group in a face-to-face meeting open to everybody who can come but not participating this time would be a good way to go because I really think that it's time for discussion between the member of the CCWG and the Board and it can be webcast, we can be in a ring somewhere if people want, but I think it must not be hundreds of people in front discussing with 20 Board member.

It must be a balanced discussion and the balanced discussion, the 20-something CCWG members and the 20 Board members. That's my feeling and wish for this meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I get back in, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. You're next. And then we'll have Cheryl after.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. I don't think there's any chance of it happening. The chairs and the overall intent of the meeting, of the group, was that participants be equal members, equal participants other than for voting. So I think the chances of what you're suggesting is not particularly large. But the question I ask is if we have extra people to send, how do we choose them? And I don't think we're going to have a lot of time to play that game. So I was asking for the if.

The answer may be we don't send anyone else, but I was looking for input. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Next is Cheryl. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. Alan, I think, should – and I didn't interpret that it was going to be likely for any other than funded member travel to this meeting. But should that be the case, then yes, I think a fast track methodology that allows the existing members from the ALAC based on participation [inaudible] to put forward names for travel opportunity make sense. But I just wanted to be very clear that whilst I support that methodology, I didn't have the same interpretation as you did.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm pretty sure I heard that and I do have independent confirmation that was something that was implied, so we'll wait to see how it plays out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan, Obviously, there is going to be a call of the CCWG later on this week so that much more will be known by then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Later on today, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, it's later on today. Great. Super. Enjoy. Now, one more thing that we need to discuss, so in the AOB, is what I originally started with, and that's going to be just a short discussion, and that's about our slots in Dublin. We have two slots that Gisella has very kindly put forward. She has just sent them over to me. At the moment, I've just put them on the chat, so the following slots.

We've got Saturday, the 17th of October, from 17:30 to 18:30. And when she asked, this was just a one-hour slot. I felt maybe a 90-minute slot would be better. And then we have Tuesday from 17:45 to 18:45. At the moment, it's only 60 minutes. Would one wish to have... And I'm fully aware that there's an ISOC meeting taking place on the very same evening some people will be leaving and there might be some clash.

But with all this in mind, do we wish to add another 30 minutes to the second 60-minute slot? The reason for two meetings is, obviously, that we might be – not sure, but we might be – in a position where we need to ratify this proposal, this CCWG proposal, at some point, and Alan has repeatedly said he doesn't want to be the ALAC to be the last to ratify this.

But I hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg for this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd actually like to hear what Cheryl is saying no to first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was saying no to any additional time that [inaudible]. I think adding additional time for the Saturday slot makes sense, but if we're ratifying, then we should be able to ratify in 60 minutes. We shouldn't need 90 minutes. If we're still [inaudible] about 90 minutes on Tuesday, then we're not going to probably be settling [inaudible] end of the Dublin meeting. Indeed possibly not until even after the Dublin meeting. That's what I was saying no to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I tend to agree. Last time for the CWG, we were haggling until the very last moment. I really don't want that to happen again. People are going to have to be more organized than that, raising what they believe are show-stopping issues at the very last moment. There's no excuse for that.

I'm happy to leave what we have today with the full understanding that as things evolve with or without a Los Angeles meeting based on what happens on the Friday, there may be no need for any meetings at all or they may be need for a lot more and we may have to juggle schedules to allow something on Sunday as well.

So I think we're going to have to play this one by ear. I know staff cringes when I say that, but I don't see any way forward other than to do something arbitrary. And this arbitrary is as good as any for me.

Now, the overlap with the ISOC event, if there is indeed overlap in the plan meeting starting with it going to 6:45 PM, and please someone let us know. But other than that, I see no problem. And we will adjust as necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. I have gotten in touch with ISOC leadership and they will hopefully come back to me later on today and let us know when the ISOC event is starting on Tuesday evening. It might be that there might just be a 15-minute overlap which isn't much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Tuesday is also the ccNSO evening, so to that end, it's usually a cocktail event and it's usually early and it's usually off-site.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Cheryl. Usually by early, do you mean 18:30 or 18:00 or 19:00?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Usually 18:30 to certainly no later than 19:00, but off site at 19:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If anyone knows of an event which will take away a substantial number of ALAC people, then let us know. Other than that, the world will unfold.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. Thanks, Cheryl. Last question is do we need a second call this week?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we decided we didn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. So Terri, next call, which you have very kindly put as being 19:00 UTC at 8th September, in a few hours' time, no I don't think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, that's the CCWG meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the CCWG. Okay, sorry. All right. So CCWG, that's fine. That's in a few hours' time, but we can [inaudible] issue the note that we are

cancelling the second call this week. We'll follow up by e-mail. Then our next call will be next week. Next week we will probably be able to reflect on the discussions that have taken place regarding the Los Angeles meeting. We will also be able to perhaps start addressing, if we have time, the At-Large Summit recommendations which were sent to this group. Perhaps not addressing them, but at least reading through them with a little bit of explanation and background. I don't expect this to take more than 15 minutes on this next week. The majority of the work will of course still be focused on CWG, CCGW, and ICG.

Any other business? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I'd like to thank everybody on this call. In particular, Veronica, our lonely and only Spanish interpreter today. Unfortunately others were unable to make it due to illness. But Veronica has lasted nearly 90 minutes. We're going to give her nine minutes off to be able to have a nice, relaxing drink now.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you all. This call is adjourned. Goodbye, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, everybody. Thanks, Veronica.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]