

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good afternoon and good evening, everybody, and welcome to the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability on the 27<sup>th</sup> of November, 2015. On the English channel today we have Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Sebastien Bachollet, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Gordon Chillcott.

We have no moment for the moment on the Spanish channel. We received apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Heidi Ullrich, and Terri Agnew. From staff, we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Our interpreters today are Veronica and Sabrina.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names clearly for transcription purposes and equally to remember to speak slowly and loud for the interpreters to be able to do their jobs. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nathalie. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? Okay. So today, we have our usual mix of CWG IANA and CCWG Accountability work. We'll start with a discussion on the draft proposal documents in CCWG Accountability and follow up with whatever little news we might have in the IANA Coordination Group for the activities of the CWG IANA. First, we have to adopt the agenda. Is there any other business to add to this?

---

*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.*

---

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so we can move swiftly to agenda item two. There was only one action item and was a Doodle, which means that's done and we're in number three. That's the CCWG Accountability and for this, I hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg, I believe. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There's not an awful lot to report. There's been a huge amount of work over the last week or so, it's all focused on addressing issues that have been raised by a number of people to the draft proposal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] , Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible], Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, in general, on the non-mission part, most of the issues raised were simply typos and minor clarifications. On the mission part, I did not do a no-vote review of the whole document, but I simply went through our comments on the second draft and identified the things

---

that weren't addressed. That's what Cheryl is referring to as the really annoying part of Greenberg comments.

Some of those were pet peeves of the ALAC and they may or may not have been addressed. Other ones were just blatant omissions that have to be fixed or have to be addressed somehow. Again, I don't know to what extent they have now been addressed. The only real news to report at this point is there appears to have been a breakthrough on stress test 18, at least accepted by the GAC members who were on the call yesterday to participate in it. To what extent the wording that has been now been proposed is going to be acceptable to all, it remains to be seen, but people are being optimistic.

My candid assessment is the combination of the NTIA statement with its clarity made it pretty clear that something had to move on the GAC side and it would appear that at least some of the people are willing to move at this point. But it hasn't passed the test of time yet and many of the people who would have been people to object to it were not on the call yesterday. So we'll see where that goes.

On the other issues, I really don't have a lot to report. There is a new document, which is the nominal final draft of proposal three. We still have three days that I'm assuming people can catch typos and other things like in it.

What I would really like to achieve today is to agree on a way forward for the comments that the ALAC will ultimately put forward on the third draft. And to that end, I'd like to make a proposal but I see Cheryl and

---

Olivier have their hand up. So I'll stop talking and I don't know what order the hands went up. Whoever put it up first, start talking.

Olivier first and then Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I was just going to comment on the stress test 18 discussions. I've read the proposed new breakthrough text as given their – I've also read the point that the NTIA has forwarded to the working group, the NTIA's statement on stress test 18. I personally have not seen any movement at all. The statement that they've given is the same as the points which they've explained to me in Dublin. And I can certainly let you know that I've also heard that there is huge opposition from some others on the GAC about this, so I'm not sure. I think it's pretty much the same.

Either that or I've completely misunderstood the discussion here. When it says any GAC advice approved by full GAC consensus understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objections, that effectively is the full consensus of the GAC as it is today and doesn't allow the GAC to determine what its consensus is going to be in the future, which is exactly the point of discord that we had seen in Dublin. So good luck to the GAC in working this one out.

On other matters – oh yeah, and the reason why I'm saying let's not get involved in this and so on is that I think it's just that the GAC to work this one out and I have no idea whether they will at the end or not.

---

Someone will have to let go of their point and stop being entrenched in their position.

On other points, certainly, the discussion between the Board and the group are of concern to me because of the tone of discussion and the fact that the Board is going to be the ultimate decider of whether this moves forward or not, and the tone of some of the people in the working group in responding to the Board and effectively responding to every question an accusation are something and not responding to the question itself, is a thing of concern to me because I'm not sure whether the Board will move forward at the end and say, "Yes, we're okay with it."

Seeing the extraordinary display of immaturity shown by a self-appointed set of people, I remind you all, and I wanted to put this on record, but the biggest voices and loudest voices are not members of the working group, they're participants. And if we have this in the future, I'm very concerned about that. These are the two points for the time being. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I'm going take bad form as chairing the session and comment on both of those before going to Cheryl. The difference on the GAC side is that a number of GAC members on the meeting are supporting the current wording. There is still some wiggle room in defining what formal means, by the way, but the difference is there are GAC members, including ones who did not accept it in Dublin who are accepting it now. So that's the [inaudible].

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, may I ask? Is Brazil one of them? Is France another one of them?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I'm not going to debate the chances of it succeeding. I'm saying the current proposal was accepted by a number of GAC members, who were not accepting in Dublin. That's all I'm saying.

In terms of the response of the Board, there are a significant number of people, including some members, who have always said the Board is just another member of the community. Who are they to dictate things? In response to my continual comments saying they're the ones who actually have to approve the bylaws. There's always been silence.

So we're in the same position we are. The saving grace is the Board has used some strong words in its comments, but then backed down somewhat in terms of dismissing directions for cause. Well, we didn't really mean it we had [inaudible] cause. We just want some causes to give an example, then you can ignore them. So there may be some compromises there. I won't comment on your description of the attitude of some of our participants and perhaps members. I tend to agree with you. Cheryl. Is Cheryl still with us?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am. I was just still muted. I'm just trying to remember why I put my hand up in the first place in what order because I do want to respond to some of what Olivier has said, as well.

---

Going back to the original reason for putting up my hand, the copy of the document on the wiki is, as you say, where the current draft status is. We won't be looking forward, and you can use that in inverted commas if you so desire, to people dotting Is, crossing Ts, and saying we missed an apostrophe it is because we don't want people doing that. The final document will be coming out, as we believe, unless there are major hiccups as advertised on our date of the 30<sup>th</sup>.

I'm just going to quote to you the update that happened to the leadership team when we had when the document was updated on the wiki. The leadership team will document in our field and sent for translation, formatting, and final proof. This means any changes from this point on are going to be painful and the magnitude of these, if any, may impact delivery date, which is a nice way of saying that someone is going to die in a ditch over something. We're not going to be making any changes that should not be at this stage.

And then we go on to talk about how we deal with some of the lawyer edits that came in late and whatever. So we're not asking the community to dot the Is and cross the Ts, we've got the professional proofreaders dotting Is and crossing Ts, and hopefully those people who are in a situation of being the forest and not just the tree, will also pick up obvious issues and omissions.

So let's keep some of our powder dry in terms of energy and effort for the final document. Do we require the document be 110% perfect? Possibly not, probably not, and quite unlikely. We may have missed, as Alan has said, one or two things that were arguably agreed or not disagreed to be changed in [inaudible] in some way altered during

---

various meetings and conversations. That, in response to the final document, is something that we need to do.

My guess is it's probably going to be needing to be done, Alan, as a subset of those of us who've been entrenched in it, because we'd really be the only ones who know what we've agreed to, disagreed to, or generally got support or otherwise.

In terms of stress test 18, it is, in fact, a fairly important step forward, and I can assure you that representatives of the French government and Brazil along with Argentina and a number of the other governments who have raised concerns in the past over the apparent limitation on the autonomy and ability of the GAC to organize its own meetings of consensus, much of which is born out of a concern about a small number of governments, one being the smallest member here, able to stymie something to act as a chilling effect on the capital GAC, capital A Advice.

That is very much what the NTIA said GAC has to sort out, and it is, or should be, in the document – and I'm surprised [inaudible] the language that Olivier was referring to. It should be that there is a clear picked explaining based on language put together by Keith Drazek that this is no way to limit the GAC's ability to define its own consensus and indeed change or otherwise re-ascertain what the meaning is within operational principle number 47.

So it is a possibility, I'm not saying it's a guarantee, but it is a possibility that it is a way forward. Should we get involved later on? Yes, I think we should if it all falls apart over a small number of GAC members



---

[inaudible]. If it's 14, that's still a small number of GAC members. If it's seven, it's an even smaller number of GAC members who are arguing that stress test 18 should not exist as opposed to that the wording in the bylaw changes that is being proposed to the way it is at the moment. So there's always two different approaches and we need to note that ALAC has supported, along with many governments, the concept of stress test 18. The actual wording of the bylaws, however, has only just come to an in-principle agreement that, of course, now bylaw drafters have to write.

What we put in the final document is not here you are, community. Board, approve this, thank you for the [inaudible], and then it goes into a bylaw approval process. It is a concept for bylaws that should then be professionally drafted. So we still have plenty of opportunity for the GAC to be more satisfied with its specific language.

If it came to GAC not approving or not being able to, as a chartering organization, support the document, those documents just as a [inaudible], then I'll be arguing strongly that we do get involved on stress test 18.

If staff or someone could put my hand down, I'd appreciate it, because for some reason, I've been trying to and I cannot. And regarding commentary on the matter of members and participants, which is not lost, we have come incredibly close on a number of situations, I can't imagine how many I could tally [inaudible] if I wanted to, but it has been quite a number of situations that we have come to a hair's width from actually taking not the temperature of the room with the CCWG, inclusive of participants, but a poll or vote from members.

---

---

We haven't, as yet, and I'm rather pleased with the fact that we have worked with a broad open-end arguably very high level of interaction and consensus building, but from now on with the final document out, if we need to, just the same as the chartering organizations are the ones whose opinions we are now seeking, we will certainly revert to member polling and member voting, if need be, on some of the changes.

So we're sort of where the rubber hits the road now and part of that is limited by our own charter. I think that's all I was going to say but then maybe something that comes back to me. And I'm sorry for a longwinded answer, but it has been a marathon, just with what everyone's done face-to-face in the meetings, but working on the dotting of the Is and crossing of the Ts and I was only in good jest referring to the Greenberg intervention, but Alan has done a great job of keeping the text honest, I can assure you, and I do want to actually compliment him as one of the probably past dozen or maybe eight to ten people who have really committed an enormous amount into feedback on the drafting process for what is only describable as a heroic effort. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. And given your headache, it's doubly appreciated. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Alan. The remark, which builds [inaudible] on what Leon Sanchez has written in our chat, and also on a remark made by Olivier a few minutes ago about the fact that some of the main difficulties or

---

dissent was coming not from members but from people who are present in the meeting.

So that was my first question to Olivier, actually. Shouldn't the co-chair in that case spell out the rules of the game more clearly [inaudible] whereas we are here to listen to the input from everyone? When it really comes to the last straw and that there must be a sensible rule or reason to vote than it is on the members.

Then I have another remark but could you take that on first, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah. Thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. I'm not one of the co-chairs, so I can't tell you what the rules of engagement are for them. But ultimately, I think that Cheryl explained it quite well how things might move if there is a disagreement, but at the same time, I would probably say that one of the problems is that the members have not been as active as maybe they should have been, and that's why we're seeing the emptiness being filled by participants that are there because they are relaying personal views rather than actually the views of points of their respective SOs and ACs, which does make it a little bit harder.

That's my analysis of it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Let me comment. Although it is the chartering organizations that are going to have to make a decision, and although the rules of engagement saying if there is a vote, it is members who vote, the overall constraint we're working at is an exit by the NTIA a year and a

---

half is that this proposal has to have the acceptance of the community in a lower case c, much wider.

So to the extent that we can avoid invoking the rules during the discussion, the better we are. The less we're going to be subject to claims that we stifled the community voice to just have an ICANN-centric position going forward. So from that perspective, the less we can invoke the rules, the better, and I think the leadership has done a superb job of doing that. Given that in some of the critical discussions, we didn't hear certain people.

I have to presume that there may have been quiet things said in the background, I don't know. But at this point, certainly on the mailing list, there are some people who are exceedingly vocal and exceedingly arrogant about their positions, but perhaps that's one of the things we have to live with.

One further comment on stress test 18, there was at least one person on the call yesterday who was accepting the new proposal who, in the past has been vehemently opposed to what was being proposed, so the world may have changed slightly as we go forward.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Alan, can I [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alan. Yes, well, Alan, I don't suppose that things are equivalent but in the ICG, for instance, we have the impression that we took very great account of public comments simply that we were not done at the same time as the overall discussion. The ICG met and all our meetings, as you know, were open in listening mode to the public worldwide.

And then during the public comment period, of course, anyone could write in [inaudible] comment and we took that into account. So I think that was, if not for this time, perhaps for later meetings at Accountability or any other group, that's one way of avoiding complete overload or disorder if it's done in two stages rather than [inaudible]. That is a brief remark.

My second point is about the GAC, actually, and I read, of course, the comment of the statement by NTIA regarding the GAC, and I can't see how it's possible for someone in the GAC to express on behalf of whom a consensus, if there is no consensus. Now, the problem of the GAC, of course, is very often that you have a few member states who are part of the discussion and the majority of you, which doesn't care or can't follow or is thinking about something else.

So if there has to be a vote, it can only be on consensus basis, so do you really think that the GAC will accept to change its rule to the extent that it will no longer be full consensus-based? The earlier question is not only to you, Alan, but to anyone on this call.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Two things on that, Jean-Jacques. With regard to the ICG, the ICG had different rules of engagement. There are no participants where the group as a whole decides ahead of time that the participants would be given equal voice to members. Those are the rules of engagement that we decided on for the CCWG, so they're two very different beasts. Going forward to the next working group, we'll worry about that one when it comes.

With regard to the GAC, no. There's a general perception that the GAC will not change, but the principles of the GAC can be changed by a majority of the GAC. The consensus rule is not used to change the principles. So in theory, if 2/3 of the GAC decided that from now on, consensus is majority, then it is, barring diplomatic efforts to stop it from happening because it has to be decided at two consecutive meetings. So in theory, it could change, and that is the real issue.

Now my hope is, since the decision on whether to accept or object to support, object, or be silent on the draft proposal or the sections of the draft proposal, should it be broken down that way, is going to be decided by GAC consensus because that the rule of the day. Therefore, a single member can object today and it would not be approved.

I am hoping that the GAC will choose, in that case, to either be silent or to break it down and say we accept recommendations 1 through 18, accept for this one, and we are being silent on that one, or maybe even objecting to that one. That will make life a lot easier but none of us have any real control over that.

Olivier, go ahead.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And I wanted to come back to something again on stress test 18, that Cheryl said. She said she didn't see the same text as the one that I quoted, so I'm a little, I wouldn't say, confused, but I'm not sure which of the text. I'm reading the text that was sent recruited by Steve DelBianco in his message on the 26<sup>th</sup>, yesterday, at 18:04 UTC, where it goes the full text of Article 6, Section 2, Item 1 would be, and it says small [inaudible] is that the one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] if I may?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Steve was quoting the specific language for the exemplar of bylaw language. In the document, the intention is to have, and I cannot now tell you whether it is immediately before or immediately after that text, a set of words, which basically are plagiarized shamelessly from something Keith Drazek said, which [inaudible] that it's in no way influences or affects the GAC's ability to make its own rules, etc.

So you are simply, I believe, reacting to a minor modification to proposed language from Denmark, the modifications to the proposed language from Denmark. Correct me if I'm wrong, Leon, simply made it a little bit clear by how one parsed and analyzed a sentence or two

---

sentences that you don't have the problem that many in the GNSO had, and that was that any future definition of GAC consensus could be anything other than what would be a community or internationally-recognized definition of consensus.

At the moment, Operation Principle Number 47 is drawn specifically out of the UN definition of what is consensus, and therefore in the absence of formal objection. And yes, there's wiggle room for what it means by formal, and that's okay. I don't have a problem with that.

But you're only looking at part of the text, so please, when you get into what is recommendation 12 in the document, make sure that with fresh eyes, Olivier, the two paragraphs that should be there do make sense together, because that's the intention. Leon, have I got that terribly wrong?

[inaudible] on audio.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, he's typing [inaudible]. No, he's just definitions of consensus. But yes, anyway, that is the intent, Olivier, so it is important because what we have was robbing Peter to pay Paul situation. Should the stress test 18 resulting bylaw language had ended up one way, then we would have had the GAC objecting to the final document. If the stress test 18 language and bylaw draft language had gone the other way, we would



---

have had, by the numbers that we could crunch, the GNSO unable to support it.

So we're going to leave the chartering organization one way or the other without a compromise and we believe we've got at least possibilities of an acceptable compromise now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I put myself in the queue. Yesterday was Thanksgiving in the US, and along with Thanksgiving in the US, along with people stuffing themselves, we have people sitting watching football on television. There's an expression, the expression is armchair quarterback. Armchair quarterback are people who, watching TV, decide that they know better than the coaches and the referees and everyone as to how the game should be played.

At this point, we're being armchair quarterbacks. Something is cast in concrete right now, at least for this draft. It is now up to the GAC to reject it categorically, to figure out how to get their colleagues to accept it, or whatever. Us debating it at this point adds nothing, as far as I'm concerned. So I would suggest we go onto other things. Thank you.

Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, this is a new hand.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Is it talking about stress test 18?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to close stress test 18 and move on. I was actually going to mention exactly that. We don't need to spend more time on it...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] there's not been any movement but we'll see. And we'll leave the GAC to deal with the GAC members. Thanks.

I wondered now what are our steps here with regards to this? I understand we're going to have that draft in front of us. What do we do next? And the questions I was asking myself, I wanted to share with you and see if we should ask ourselves other questions whilst reading this draft.

The first one was...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: You did turn the chair over to me a while ago, and before we went off on a tangent on stress test 18, I was about to suggest the way forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you'd like to do it first, go ahead. I

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well I just have no – I don't have any forward. I just have three questions that I was going to ask. And I don't know how you want to structure this, whether you want to have a preamble first and let us know what's the proposed way forward, and then I can ask these questions, whether I ask the questions first.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not in a position to dictate, but I did draft a previous comment, so I do have some thoughts on it. Why don't you ask your questions first?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. My questions were as follows. The first one, could any of these measures that are being introduced affect end users negatively? If so, what is the likelihood of this happening? It's a bit of a risk and a likelihood of that risk happening. Secondly, do the

---

bylaw changes strengthen the multi-stakeholder model? Because I think that, ultimately, the whole thing of the whole process was about strengthening the multi-stakeholder model. And the third question I was asking myself was, are there any redlines for the ALAC that have not been addressed and that we wish to keep as redlines? These were my three questions. Thanks. And then over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Let me address those one by one. Clearly, we have to identify any redlines. In terms of strengthening the multi-stakeholder model, it may well strengthen it so much that ICANN is not functioning anymore. So I'm not, in my mind, strengthening the multi-stakeholder model is not the ultimate criteria, as it is for some other people who have been very active in the overall process.

And your first one, is this good for end users or not? I think at this point, we're past that. I think we need to look at it is this good for ICANN? Is this good for the Internet community? End users may be one of the parts we're looking at, but from my perspective, if this is really bad for registries, I think it's bad for end users because it's bad for the Internet ecosystem.

So yes, we may be the only ones looking at end users and we should certainly focus on it, but for instance, if as I was worried along the way, and that worry may or may not still be there, if the new bylaws would allow an IRP to gut our existing registry and registrar contracts, that's bad for users. It's also bad for registries and it's bad for registrars because although a particular registry or registrar may get what they

---

want, it creates exceedingly unstable bases on which to do business. It also may take away ICANN's ability to non-regulate the industry. I mean regulate, but we don't use the term.

I think we're not just looking at end users, I think at this point, we have to step back and see is this good or is this bad? That goes to what I'm going to suggest. I think we need input from multiple people, and I think we need the input in a uniform way so it can be categorized and can be summarized properly. And I'm suggesting, and I'll do it in writing, but let me try to visualize it here.

I would suggest that we need a significant number of people, that's more than one, who are willing to go through the report and it annexes with a fine tooth comb, and identify, and I have three different things, three different categories of things to identify. One are things that are known to be or believed to be ALAC redlines.

Each person may make the judgment incorrectly, but that's something which they will identify. Number two, conflicts and problems with the report. That is, it simply doesn't make sense because in part A, they say X, in part B, they say Y, and the two can't coincide. So are there simply errors which have to be identified?

And number three, issues that a person believes are really significant and should be ALAC redlines but haven't been raised before. Now those are very different from personal positions, where the person just doesn't agree, but the decision has been made and there's general agreement. So most of us know the things that were our personal hot points but didn't get any traction. Those should be omitted.

---

And I'm going to suggest that it be done in the form of a spreadsheet, identifying the page number where the issue comes up, and identifying which category the issue is in, and then describing it. That will allow us to collect inputs from multiple people, sort them, and then try to assimilate a single document. In my mind, we really do not want to identify in this document things that are pet peeves. We never want to say, "The ALAC is divided on something." There's no point at this point.

It's either something where we are likely to say we will reject the document or part of it because of it, or things where we see a problem that hasn't been identified that's not our preference, but simply problem. So that, I think, has to be our final endpoint, identifying real problems and those, I think, we should be raising in the group as we go along because I'm presuming there will be CCWG and working party meetings, with which we'll be looking at things that people identify as just errors.

And ultimately, all we should have in our final document is errors which haven't been addressed or real redline things, ones that we may choose to reject the document because of. So that's where I'd like to see us going, and I'll document that in writing if there's general agreement that's a good way forward. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I'm all in agreement with what you've said, apart from one point that you raised, which was number three. Issues that a person believes are really significant and should be ALAC redlines, and have not been raised before. I'm really concerned about the

---

reception of the ALAC raising an issue that has not been raised before at this late stage. How unlikely are we to get any kind of bulleted response to these issues that have not been raised before given the late time and given what Cheryl had told us earlier?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well my answer to that is there's an awful lot has changed in this report from the previous one. And if every one of the reviewer raises an issue, then it becomes an ALAC redline. If 1 person out of 12 raises it, it dies in the ditch. That's how I see it.

Is there an in between case where we'll have to make a judgment call?  
Sure, that's why we have these calls.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

But is the ALAC able to raise any issue now that has not been raised before?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl and I [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

How likely are there to be major changes on this? Cheryl earlier said, "Unless it's a drop dead down, whatever it is, sort of life-threatening situation, things are quite unlikely to be changed in that report." Raising a brand new issue sounds like something [inaudible] that would not work. Maybe I misunderstood.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you misunderstood. Olivier, Cheryl was talking about between now and the 30<sup>th</sup>.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will be responding to the final document on the 30<sup>th</sup>, and on the 30<sup>th</sup>, you should find that the middle category that Alan has said, the things don't make sense at the beginning of [inaudible] and then it doesn't say the same thing later on. They should be minimal if evidence is full because of having professional proofread and go through it all, and also that it has been professionally written, as well. So hopefully, there won't be many of those to catch.

In terms of brand spanking new things, though, Olivier, I think you still raise a fairly important point. For a chartering organization to come up with a whole new thing at this late stage would be a hard sell for it to be a no-go. If a new thing came up that was a no-go for an organization, it'd mean that the chartering organization could not endorse, then that would, I would suggest, be extraordinarily damaging in terms of the process.

Because we've [78] meetings now where, really, no holds have been barred, so everything should have been shaken out. Yes, there is a lot of new stuff in this third and final report, but then you'd expect there to be



---

some new stuff, otherwise, it would have been published six months ago.

ALAN GREENBERG:

At the beginning of the meeting, perhaps, before it officially started, I don't remember, Cheryl and I were talking about an issue, which may or may not be in this report, and if it is in this report, is something that I certainly will raise. Whether it gets traction with the ALAC or remains to be seen. But it may not be there, but if it's there, then I'll probably raise it, so that's the kind of thing we're talking about. It's something that was introduced officially in a meeting yesterday, I think. Maybe two days ago.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

But it's not new.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well. Sorry. Are you saying it's not new or it is new?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It won't be new because it's been discussed in meetings, like my response to you on how much traction may or may not be there for the single or multiple-use of participants, etc. Was discussed. I didn't have to go back to the chat record, and I can see what the meeting was, members of the meeting, and participants of the meeting were saying during [inaudible] so that is not new business [inaudible] has been discussed in our, to date, 70 minutes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. When I said new, I meant new from the discussion of the ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's not I heard it, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My apologies. I meant new that we have not discussed and decided it is a redline.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: God. That's why we're having these interminable bloody meetings every [inaudible] of the week, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd sure like to have less. I will put this in writing. I will try to explain it as best as I can, and if people disagree, then we will deal with it. The point I'm making is I believe this must be the work of more than one person. If we're going to put it forward as the ALAC final view, it's got to be something which is a group activity. I'm hoping there will not be a huge number of issues on it.

Because, heavens, if we have a 30-item list of redlines right now, we're up something's creek. Anyway, that's how I see going forward. Cheryl, your hand is up.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I think in my last and, perhaps, far too long intervention, no, the one before last, did say I thought that we will need to rely on the members and participants from the ALAC and At-Large community that have been engaged and involved with the activities to do, I would have thought, at least the first filter of work through this final document.

And then has that prepped material, and I'm happy to run with a spreadsheet, that's fine, come back to our meetings here? Because that is the smart way forward for us to be transparent and accountable to our community. But only those of us who've been in all of the meetings, for example, or as many of the meetings as possible, and have been engaged with discussions and deliberations, would know, for example, should there be a dual use of the term participant in relation to the decision making model, that oh, we just go back to meeting number 70 and indeed number 69, and we can find, as it is to show that it's done in this way rather than that.

So I think we need sort of two run through. I wouldn't suggest just going through the document debate and in these meetings was the only way to do it. I think we should probably have some, sadly, specific meetings of people who've been entrenched in all of this work to go through the document in addition to coming back to this Ad-Hoc Working Group, as well, or take it with longer time to go through at greater detail in these meetings, but remember that you'll need to weigh the input and information from the people who've participated more heavily than those who [inaudible] almost reading a [inaudible] document. Don't mind which way we do it, but we certainly don't need to have just a single draft or penholder on it.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. My gut feeling is we're only going to have, at most, six people who will take the time to go over the document with a fine tooth comb and have the perspective to do it. Certainly, people who haven't read it before, it will be an interesting experience, but I'm not sure we'll have a lot of those to the extent that anyone is willing to, fine.

But I don't think we're talking about a huge number of people and I was envisioning giving people a week or so to create their comments and then I or someone will collate them, and then have a meeting to discuss those. That's certainly how I envisioned. It's maybe not the only way to do it. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I don't have a preference with regards to one method or another. I was just going to ask whether you were also going to ask of the ALAC, the wider ALAC, to contribute to reading through this rather than just the people on this working group, bearing in mind there are new members on the ALAC who might be interested in casting a fresh eye.

Or is there a danger that these people, having not known any of the history and the reason why we are here, might actually introduce more questions rather than answers? What's your thought on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: My thought is yes, we should ask them, and yes, we should make the people who have followed this through for the last year plus available as

---

resources so we can get the questions answered separately from identifying it as a problem. And your hand is still up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I put it down a while ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: It just went down right here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It seems to be a [inaudible] I must have put my hand up and down several times every time I get it down or up. I just also want to say now I've got the microphone, Alan, I am quite supportive of the questions approach that Olivier suggested, as well. I think the useful questions to ask ourselves as we go through with whatever methodology works. I'm not committed to one methodology over the other. And maybe asking those questions is some advice we need to give the ALAC as the ALAC individual members [inaudible] go through it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I mean, certainly, we can expand the categories identified, and one of them is question. And it's a way of someone identifying something they're not sure of, which may be a problem, but more likely just needs an explanation.

---

To the extent there are strong questions, of course, it identifies a lacking in the paper. And that also is something we may want to be identifying. Clarity in the paper is going to be something that's really important, and although good technical, good editors should have illuminated some of those, I've certainly dealt with technical editors and nontechnical editors, for that matter, that some of which are superb and some of which don't quite get it. So hopefully we have more of the former than the latter in this particular case.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The reason I was supportive of Olivier's questions, and I know it's Olivier's questions, which I understood were almost criteria checklists vanity points for use against all of the things [inaudible] as I understood it, he's proposed at least three things to ask ourselves jointly and severally as we go through [inaudible] you'll make decisions, then you should say, "Does it do harm to the multi-stakeholder model? Does it do this? Blah, blah, blah." Okay? That's how [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Good point. Thank you. I didn't catch that. Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I was going to take an issue of something you said a bit earlier. You said, “We need to look at this on whether it is good or bad or ICANN and itself,” and you gave the example of a registry being affected negatively by any matters that were introduced there.

I’m a little more cautious about this in that we are there to bring forward the point of view of the Internet end users and to look out, I guess, to look out for their interests, too. And one of the conflicting things that might be good for maybe not ICANN as a whole, but good for one stakeholder in ICANN but not that good for another stakeholder at ICANN is something that we should really look at, whether we can live with or not live with.

The example of the budget veto, for example, I know we’ve been through this, but that might, in some way, affect the ALAC negatively. If we’re okay with that and we think that the process by which the budget veto is now described is safe enough for it not to be used as a personal vendetta against ALAC, that’s something that then, at that point, we can say and give a green tick to.

Another example – you know the various examples that we might have there. Things, for example, in the bylaw changes that would unduly put a block on ICANN to be able to perform its compliance function in the way that we see as being the defense of the public interest rather than just enforcing contracts in the way that sometimes seen as registries or

---

contracted parties paying their dues, and they can't enforce anything else than that. That's the sort of question.

And finally, I wonder whether we can turn this discussion into less than AOC show, AOC not being the Affirmation of Commitments, but being the Alan, Olivier, and Cheryl Show, and wonder if anybody else on the call has any thoughts. And that was a joke. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well I'm sure we're going to get input from Seun, I'm sure we're going to get input from Sebastien, I'm sure we'll get input from a number of other people. So it will just not be the AOC. With regard to what I said about end users, yes, we are here for end users, and if we see something blatant that is going to be a bad omen for end users and how they will either be treated or issues related to end user and consumer trust, for instance, yes, we have to raise those.

But at this point, I think we're looking for other things, which will damage ICANN, also. I think we need a wider scope than just end users is what I was trying to say.

Do we want to identify something which is bad for registrars and good for end users? No. We want to identify that as something good. But to the extent that they may not all be in conflict, we're looking for something that will result in a good ICANN here, period. So I wasn't talking against end users, just saying our scope, our view of this should be somewhat wider than just end users.



---

I see a smile and a tick. Does that mean we can go home now? And just for the record – I see Sebastien’s hand. I will go on record as that I really, really would like Leon to participate in this process. We’ll keep his input confidential, if he wishes, but he does have an insight that I think is important. And he says he will.

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. I was [inaudible] your AOC discussion quite carefully and I have a question. We are generally the question is how we involve outside of ICANN participants. We are one of the organization where we which really far, I will say, in the Internet users and it’s inside ICANN, but at the edge really.

I have this feeling that may... It’s a question. Is it not the right time to try to have those edge involved in one way or another now that we have a final document and that it’s not just something we would change the next day? Yeah. That’s my question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Your question is, “Should we do this wider than the IANA Issues Group and the ALAC?” From my perspective, yes. Do I expect an awful lot of input from that wider perspective given the complexity and length of the documents and the lateness at which we’re going to have the translations? Honestly, I don’t expect a lot of input. But should we be going through that process? Without a doubt. Absolutely no question.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Your answer is [inaudible] within ALAC. My question is going to At-Large. For example, I think we need to ask the RALO if they have some inputs. And I know that is difficult. I understand that we will have hundreds of inputs at that time, but if one moment is important to the heads involved, I guess it's in this point, this document and discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien. I just said yes. I don't know how I can make it clearer. I think we need to go beyond. I said we certainly go to IANA issues and ALAC and we must go beyond, which implies the RALOs. So I don't think we're disagreeing. Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead, Cheryl, and then Olivier.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I was just typing it [inaudible] this is a response to Sebastien. I think what we need to do is make sure that the upcoming webinars are attended or we encourage the attendance of the RALO leadership and of the ALSes. I mean, that fits in the time course and that's going to be an ideal opportunity for them to get up to speed and also even put in their responses to things directly during this call, but it should also allow them to then get prompt and effective and efficiently [inaudible] to ALS and the IANA Issues Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I agree. And it's unfortunate we have such, it's a US holiday and we have so few staff on this call, but once the formal announcements are made, I know the dates are set, but I don't think there has been formal announcements of the webinars that will be done in the UN languages plus Portuguese. I think we have to do our best to announce those and something I have said a number of times before, we need to announce them to our community in e-mails that are not 14 pages long that no one reads. Thank you.

Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was going to raise one point with regards to our wider membership. I think it is indeed very important to get their feedback, if only because the what little uproar we've had raised by one individual or a couple of individuals on the At-Large list seem to be punting in the exact opposite direction than the line that we've heard from a lot of other people that we were working, and certainly the line

---

of all of the people on the ALAC, the one where it's saying that ICANN is an organization that needs to be controlled by the community and throttle one way or other.

I'm paraphrasing here but I'm basically saying seriously cutting down the Board's powers because ICANN has done so many evil things in the past type thing. And I'm a little concerned because you said we have to look at things that are good for ICANN and that are good for the communities, I guess, and what's good for ICANN is sometimes exactly opposite. They don't want something that's good for ICANN. They want something that's good for the communities to control ICANN.

There's some confusion there but how are we going to be able to weigh the balance between those inputs and others?

ALAN GREENBERG: Number one, I don't really know who you're talking about in terms of messages because I don't recall messages that have that tone on the At-Large list. Maybe privately.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Parmidur], that's one person, and we've had some others who have jumped on the bandwagon when [Parmidur] raised this on the At-Large list. I'm not saying it's wrong, I think it's great that he's raising these points because that certainly gets us to also look at ourselves and look at the points that we've been raising and discussing. And any dialogue and discussion is good if we can reach some kind of solution out of it, and certainly if it raises points that we might have forgotten about.

Yeah, I just wonder, you know? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me be blunt. The decision is going to be made by the ALAC. We will have to decide on which issues are go to the wall and which are not. I will give you an example within the ALAC alone, and Cheryl, correct me, but I believe the issue I identified that there is a reference to consumer trust in Section 3 of the AOC, it is not in reference to the new gTLDs, it's just in reference to consumer trust.

And I had us – it was referenced in, I think, the version one draft was withdrawn from the version two draft, and I believe the decision from Work Stream 2 or Work Party 2 was that it is a small point and should not be included in the next bylaws.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is certainly one person, and perhaps more than one person on the ALAC, who is going to object vehemently to that. Is that going to be a go to the wall issue that the ALAC will say, “We will reject,” based on? That’s a decision we’re going to have to make. So it’s not just the people in the peripheral community, there are going to be differences of opinion in the ALAC, and we will have to make some hard decisions.

One of the reasons that I’m pushing for if there is a face-to-face that we meet face-to-face. Yes. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, on that one, of course, it doesn’t remove the current level of deference and reference to [inaudible] competition trust and choice that is in the resisting bylaws. It simply is not moving absolutely everything in the affirmation of commitments one through nine across to bylaw language, but it is certainly taking the review teams on that matter across the bylaw language and, of course, the review team in a future point in time, can indeed make recommendations for future bylaw changes.

So that’s the type of conversation that should we get a minor, albeit more easy and vociferous, but minor in terms of total volume of ALAC being concerned that we need to have. And if the ALAC wants to go to the wall over something that can be got to from another way, then that does move badly for the multi-stakeholder model and ICANN and it deserves what it gets.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, yes. And on the other hand, it may well be something that we want to raise. I mean, the consumer trust is not something that shows in the bylaws right now as competition does. It is one of the things that was only added in the AOC. And I personally felt it should have gotten into the bylaws. That's an opinion.

It's something that I would say we won't – whether it's something that I would recommend not ratifying over, probably not. But it is probably something that we may want to raise in our comment. Again, I'm giving an off-the-top opinion, not having had any other input and not thinking about it a lot. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

yes, thank you. Sorry. I was [inaudible] somebody calling me just the last minute and I don't know what you said but I want to raise a point, but I understand why, Cheryl, like you are talking about the face-to-face meeting. I have the feeling that it will be very good anyhow what [inaudible] they are doing, but we have a face-to-face meeting.

My point is that we have new ALAC member, we have different opinion, and it will be better to have everybody embark in this discussion in that. And my point is that we need to try to say clearly that anything coming from ALAC At-Large participant must come through a comments or whatever way we want to send a message to the CCWG by ALAC, and that we think for people to go alone in the comment period.

Even if we add that minority statement within the ALAC, I know that you are willing to have a final decision with ALAC position with no objection unless possible objection. But I really think that in the first period with

---

the comment period, that we need to embark all the comments inside what ALAC would produce, and then second point, it's face-to-face meeting in general, I really feel that it will be useful for us.

I guess somebody else will ask for a face-to-face meeting, then the way you answer it, it's a good way also that I wanted to share my specific point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG:

okay. Thank you, Sebastien. Two points on that. I'm not sure we're in a position, as an example, AFRALO has diligently come up with statements. They have come up with a statement well before ALAC has finalized its ones, and has posted it to the comment period. I don't think we're in a position to say, "Don't do that."

I mean, individually, we can talk to people but I don't think we're in a position to stop anyone. So there may well be other comments. We can accept minority reports on ours if we have to, but I think it weakens it very significantly if we do.

With regard to the meeting, what the ALAC decided in Dublin and what I have reiterated both in writing and spoken now is that the ALAC will not demand a meeting if we are the only one, but if anyone else is meeting, we will meet. Now if indeed, Sebastien, you believe that we should meet, period, then please post a message to the ALAC list on that, you can use the ALAC internal list if you want to keep it to a smaller group, your call, but let's get some comments on that.



---

Because if the ALAC is going to change its position and say, “We want to meet, period,” even if we’re the only ones meeting, we need to say that very quickly. I believe the date of the 1<sup>st</sup> of December was set as the target, or the 30<sup>th</sup> of November, I’m not sure which. But in any case, that’s Monday or Tuesday.

So if you think we should change that position, then we need to say it very quickly, and I would suggest that you post something to that effect if you think it’s something we should even consider, even if you’re not advocating it strongly. But if you think it’s something that we should strongly consider, we really need to do that very quickly. The timeframe is very short on that.

Olivier, we are close to running out of time and I have a really hard stop.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I was just going to mention that it looks as though the GAC will need to meet anyway, in which case, the question is whether you consider the GAC as being enough of a trigger, saying, “Well, that’s another community meeting, so the ALAC will meet, as well.” The GAC usually has to meet for these things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, but the GAC has said that they may or may not, it’s not clear right now. My gut, if I had to put money on it, I said they will meet. But that’s not 100% clear, and all I’m saying is if we want to change our statement from we will meet if anyone else does, and the GAC is anyone else, then we need to say so and we need to say so quickly, and it should be more

---

than one person or two people saying it, so that's why I'm suggesting if it's something we should be considering over the next three days, and that's all we have, then we need to start considering it now.

And Sebastien says he will do it ASAP. I hope your ASAP is better than my ASAP, where I committed to doing something two days ago and haven't done it yet, with regret. Anything else? Then I turn it back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next in our agenda is the IANA Coordination Group. Are there any updates, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, on IANA Coordination Group matters?

And for some reason, Jean-Jacques' microphone is showing it speaking, but there's no actual sound being shared onto the line. Is that normal?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And now we can hear you, Jean-Jacques. Please proceed.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. So there is nothing to indicate specifically on the ICG. But personally, I would just say that, of course, the NTIA statement is being read and followed very carefully, but that's not in the realm of action of ICG itself, so we'll just wait and see. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. Has there been any response or follow-up by any of the other operational communities on any points that have gone through or are things pretty much very quiet on this front?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Olivier. As far as I'm aware, there has not been any movement. But I do stipulate that ICANN only rely on messages, which go through the thread of the overall ICG membership. If anything goes on on a lower scale, I cannot see. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for, this, Jean-Jacques. Are there any other points or questions that anyone knows about or would like to make about the IANA Coordination Group? Seeing no hands, then we can move to agenda item number five, that's the CWG IANA stewardship transition. Here again, there is very little that has taken place apart from one e-mail that has been received at the beginning of this call, an e-mail from Jonathan Robinson, one of the co-chairs of the working group.

Looking at the topic of CCWG on Accountability, insofar as it relates to the work of the CWG Working Group's work, and whether it meets the requirements of the CWG. Jonathan is proposing that Sidley, the advisors for the CWG, could review the previous CCWG proposal. Sorry, could review the CCWG proposal and assist in the same way as they did in the first instance.

---

Apart from that, nothing else to report, but Alan Greenberg has put his hand up, so Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just to comment that we only had one objection on the concept of accepting that the charter be deemed to be modified, so that's going ahead. I need to report that to the CWG.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay. Just a remark. So the working group is to going to ask Sidley at least once we propose a [inaudible]. I'm very struck by the fact that in the breakdown of expenditure, the fees for lawyers amounts for a gigantic proportion. I don't remember, it's something like 48% or 50% of total costs in preparing for the transition. Is that really the best way forward? Thanks.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. And I believe that the fee is not only for the CWG but also the CCWG, and that includes not only Sidley, but the other law firms. Plus, of course, the advice that ICANN has also asked from its own law firm, which came in addition to the usual retainer that they have with their own law firm. Are there any comments to this by anyone?

My personal comment would be that those lawyers are people that have a job as lawyers in real life, and that we're volunteers here, must be feeling pretty tired and pretty unhappy about the fact that others have gotten paid whilst they were doing their work pro bono, but then there you go. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: The lawyers in this group understand the rules of the game. In a different world, we should have done this very differently, we didn't. I don't have any interest in talking about it, to be honest. Yes, we've spent 8 million, 10 million, whatever it's going to be by the time we finished, 15 million, a lesson may have been learned, but we can't change the history at this point.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Yes, it's expensive, it was always going to be expensive. Yes, once the group had decided to go down this pathway, and I think we wouldn't have got progress and we wouldn't have been able to further

---

the work of the CWG at all, and certainly I doubt we'd be able to further the work of CCWG as far as we have been now, the independent external counsel.

So could it have been cheaper? Sure, if we trusted, and we don't. So a lack of trust, it was the best way forward. Olivier, you and I were in the meeting, I don't think Alan was available at the time. Right back at the budget for sort of almost this time last year, when the recognition of external counsel was going to be the way forward, and we said then, make the number at least 6 million, [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. And you're quite right. It certainly has reached those levels. Are there any other comments on this? I think ultimately, the part of the reason why the law firm costs are so high is because there really appears to have been no stone unturned by the participants and members of those working groups. And in a way, I guess it is a good thing. In another way, it's not such a good thing because there were quite a few stones that were turned over that really didn't, I mean, shouldn't have been turned to start with.

There you are, that's just the nature of the game of turning as many stones as possible, sometimes. Certainly, on the announcement or the proposal that is there for Sidley to review the CCWG proposal and provide the working group with input as to whether this meets the CWG requirements, I would say that's probably a good way forward on the part of the CWG because it certainly keeps the neutrality, although some might have said, "Well that neutral."

---

Certainly having professional advice on this would be helpful, will cost a little more, but I don't see any pushback on this, certainly, from our community. Is there any pushback on this from anyone here?

ALAN GREENBERG: What's the point?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The alternative, of course, would be that all of this assessment should be done by the CWG participants in their spare time, if they have so much spare time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, the die is cast at this point. Let's talk about things we can influence.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any other thoughts and any other topics to bring up regarding CWG IANA? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, which means we might end up on time today, and I know that Alan has a hard stop. Quick question regarding any other business. When do we have our next call? Should we have as early as next week or should we give it two weeks before our next call? Any thoughts on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we don't have a call next week, then I don't think we'll have enough time to start going through the final document. Even if it's a working

---

call, and that half dozen that I've alluded start going through the methodology, spreadsheeting, etc. then I think that would be worthwhile.

I'm saying this as the person who I believe without exception has had unreasonable timing for these calls. So, you know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Cheryl. So I take it that there is a need for a call next week. We can make it as a full working group call, but this could always transform itself as a call of those people, the core group, if there is such a thing as core group. I'd imagine that the core group of other people who are present on this call plus a couple of others to start with. But we'll have to have one next week, then.

And I did hear earlier a thought from Alan that we might need more than one call in the week. Does that mean that the week after we would need two calls? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't believe I said that. I've got to leave now. If there's a call next week, let's make it towards the end of the week to give people time to do some work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As late as possible [inaudible].



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm dropping off, I'll let you do the scheduling. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. So a call for next Friday.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leon says two weeks [inaudible] a note Leon saying two weeks in chat. That would be luxury but I just don't think it's practical, Leon. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Well let's have a call next Friday again, then, please. And let's have a Doodle for the Friday. That's as late as you can make it [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why bother Doodling? Pick a time between my midnight and my 3:00 AM and run the call, Olivier. You have every other time the last 15 months, so why change now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Cheryl. When is your midnight and your 3:00 AM? Or am I asking the wrong question?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right now, it's 3:30. All right? You started at my 2:00 AM. Previously you start by 1:00 AM and occasionally at my midnight, so pick one of those. You always do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll still have a Doodle because it does matter. I know that you're able to make any time of the day or night, but others are not, and I know that the hour before this hour here was not the same number of people as the hour afterwards, so we'll start a quick Doodle on this range of timings that are very suitable for you, Cheryl, and thank you. Note to start [inaudible] here and I just feel so bad.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's one minute past the top of the hour, Cheryl needs to get some sleep, others need to do other things in their lives. Perhaps, have breakfast, perhaps have lunch or dinner. So thanks for being on this call. Thanks to our interpreters, Veronica and Sabrina, and we will speak again next week.

And until then, please read that document, which is going to hit your mailboxes in the next 48 hours or pretty soon anyway. Take care. Goodbye. This call is adjourned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you everyone for joining. This call is now adjourned. Please stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**