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 Friday, the 6th of November, 2015, at 12:00 UTC.
	On the English channel, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Gordon Chillcot, Sebastien Bachollet, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Leon Sanchez, and Seun Ojedeji. Also joining us on the English channel is Glenn McKnight.
	Currently no one is listed on the Spanish channel.
	We have apologies from Christopher Wilkinson and Heidi Ullrich.
	From staff, we have myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anybody in our roll call? If we haven't, we need to adopt the agenda. Again, today, an update on CCWG accountability with Alan Greenberg and Leon Sanchez. Plenty of work has happened in the past week, and indeed during the Dublin meeting as well. That will be the bulk of our call.

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.

After that, a quick update. I think probably a one-minute update from the IANA Coordination Group. If we have Mohamed El Bashir or Jean-Jacques Subrenat, we'll find out if there's anything else to cover, but as far as I'm concerned, it's a pretty straightforward update.

Then we'll have a couple of things to quickly discuss or alert you to in the CWG IANA Stewardship.

Are there any other business items to add to this agenda? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted.

Item number 2 is to review the action items from our 17 and 20th of October meetings in Dublin. There were none listed. I appeal to anyone who does remember Dublin whether there was… If they do remember of any action items that we might have missed in our listing. No one is putting their hand up, so that's also done then.

I guess we can then move to agenda item 3, and that's the CCWG Accountability. For this, we have Alan Greenberg and Leon Sanchez. I'm not sure who will lead on this, but I'll hand the floor to both of you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll let Leon give the summary and then I'll talk a little bit about some of my concerns. Then we also have the overall timeline that's been posted. Posted to this agenda, that is. Leon, why don't you try to summarize the overall?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, I will. Thank you. From Dublin to where we are, a lot of things have happened. I think that in Dublin we had major steps forward. As you know, being the most relevant, the change in the model. We were at a stage in which we were proposing the membership model. Now we're at a stage in which the [referral] model is the designator model. And while of course that changes some things in the scene for the way we will need to handle some issues – for example, one of the topics that has been widely discussed among the group is the transparency issues and the [inaudible] information issues.

But while there is some discomfort on some of the members in the group about how the different models work and the apparent lack of power from the designator to access some information in the designator model, we've been clear that all the powers that the member can have under the membership model in regards to access to information can also be built into the designator into the bylaws. So I think that we're also moving forward in there.

There has also been a discussion on human rights, a wide discussion. At points we've been close to having consensus in the group. Then we give a little bit step back or big steps back, so it's a difficult issue to handle. But I think we're almost there and we will be able to actually handle the proposal for this document that we're building.

Of course the eyes of the world are on us. If you might have seen, the ICG published some kind of a blog post in which they said that they were finished and they were only waiting for the CCWG to finish their work. As I said, no pressure at all on the CCWG.

We will also be having some informal gatherings at the IGF, as you may see in the agenda. I will be speaking a little bit more on that after Alan gives us his part of the update. But I'm pretty sure that many on this call will be at the IGF, so I would definitely encourage you to join these meetings if you can. As I said, they will be informal meetings. No decisions will be made on them. It will be just like [inaudible] speak about CCWG.

With that, I think we have an overall update on what the CCWG has been up to. I think that when we [come on] the timeline, there will also be a couple of [features] worth commenting on. Now I'll turn it back to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. As Leon said, we have now gone to what was called the single designator. Leon, have we had success in replacing the name? Which I think it's one of the critical things that have to be done.

LEON SANCHEZ: I don't think we have been successful on actually replacing the name, but I think that what matters is of course the notion on [inaudible]. Just to be practical, I would think that [inaudible] designator model could still be useful for this audience.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, for this audience, yes. But when we publish the report… Given that we're talking about powers that apply to a wider community than our designators, than our effective designators, those who appoint

board members, I think it's really important that we stop using the name designator as the overall body. That's something I think we really need to do. It just generates confusion without any real benefit.

In terms of the perhaps more critical part of the model – that is, decision-making – we now seem to have close to closure with a few very strong objections. But the chairs have indicated they will be recorded as dissenting opinions and will not alter the model.

That is each AC and SO, in order to come up – rather, in order to submit a petition or to support a petition or to support going on to the community forum, must make a decision as a whole using whatever mechanism it uses. That hasn't changed at all from any of the models.

What has changed in this one is that in actually coming to an ultimate decision on whether the community powers exercised or not, the AC and SO must again come to a decision supporting or objecting to the action. So we're no longer talking about essentially subdividing votes, subdividing participation that an AC can say, "I'm two-third here and one-third there." That's a very large change – a good one, I think. Because ultimately, if decisions are being made by the ACs and SOs, then they should be made by the ACs and SOs as opposed to the constituent parts of it which then make the… Sort of devolve down to a lower level of who is it that comprises the voices of ICANN. So I think that's an important change.

I have a number of concerns right now, and part of it is because I've been somewhat out of touch and haven't read all the documents. But part of it I think is a real concern.

There has been a lot of discussion on one particular change to the bylaws that restricts in some very specific language the content that can be used – the content and services that may be provided via the Internet. Essentially we're saying ICANN should not control those services on the Internet. We allocate domain names.

There has been a lot of concern expressed that those words might make invalid terms that are in contracts. That is specifically some contracts have restrictions on how a domain can be used. Dot-museum can only be used by museums for certain applications. Some of the new TLDs have restrictions put into their PICs.

The rationale that has been used at this point is that if something is in a contract, the mission cannot override it. Essentially we're setting the mission of ICANN by what is in contracts. I find that really backwards, because unless I'm misreading something, if some organization at a future time decides that it doesn't like what's in the contract, it can initiate an IRP. And we can be… ICANN, through the IRP, can be told, "You are violating your mission," and the contract has to change. Moreover, that ruling of an IRP can be used precedentially for future rulings of IRPs.

So I don't understand how what is in a contract today or we may write into a contract later on overrides the mission. So I see a real problem there.

The second problem… Not the second problem. The second issue that I haven't seen, we made in our comments – in our comments to the last report – a significant number of comments on the mission and core

values. In particular, on two of them, we had a large problem with the removal of discretion in certain issues. We said we're feasible and practical… Or the original word said, "When feasible and practical, ICANN shall…" And those words were taken out. They were taken out with respect to following the guidance, the recommendations, of policy organizations inside and outside of ICANN and in one other area.

And I haven't seen language yet, but it may be buried in some documents I haven't seen that fixes those problems. The compounding of the problem is there's a November 15th deadline for effectively freezing what we're talking about, the proposal. Many of us are going to be at IGF until the 14th.

So we have to make sure… We ALAC and At-Large have to make sure that somebody is diligently going through this document and making sure – or at least identifying any areas where the comments that ALAC made have not been… Things have not been adjusted, so that we can make a conscious decision very quickly as to whether we have a problem or not.

And that's all I have to say at the moment. Olivier? Do we still have Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. I thought that you were running this part of the call, so I thought maybe if people had any questions [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Sorry. In that case, I'll do that. Tijani?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani was the first one, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're speaking, we can't hear you. Now we hear a lot of noise.

TERRI AGNEW: We're muting that line. It [inaudible] from Tijani's line, so we'll go ahead and disconnect and dial back out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. All right, Olivier, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Several points on which you said. I, too, have been reading the discussions and the most recent proposals, specifically the ones that [Dawn Austin] has I think shared with everyone. I also am feeling rather nervous about a number of points and I think you very clearly laid them out.

My understanding with regards to bylaws is that if something is in a contract, the bylaws cannot override them because… I'm not sure how that would work because you cannot – well, if the bylaws come first, then something will not be in the contract, because a contract cannot be established against the bylaws. So when one says that you can then overrule what's in a contract – sorry, you can overrule the bylaws in a

contract, that doesn't sound right to me, because effectively the organization is acting outside its bylaws.

So if one starts to change bylaws and saying, "Well, we're not going to deal with content and the words that you've mentioned there very explicitly," I have a real concern. The working group is now starting to go into mission creep. And going into, again, trying for ICANN 3.0 where it's changing the mission of ICANN, it wants to restrict the mission for just one small purpose – and these are all business related – that would be very detrimental to end users. I think that the bylaws of ICANN as they are today, the mission of ICANN was defined very clearly when ICANN was created, and there is no need to have such deep changes to it. Some of the bylaws were drafted as they were drafted because that's how ICANN can act in the public interest. I don't see any points that would support the public interest in restricting missions specifically by basically freezing ICANN into a state where it would be unable to act on its contracts and act on contracts that already exist and future contracts.

If we are to have any kind of public interest commitments – and this is now looking at the view I have regarding the ALAC point of view – any public interest commitments would fall completely outside because you could just accuse them of having to do with content, and that's it.

The next thing is, "Well, the bylaws are against that. Sorry." So what we're ending up is a Wild Wild West. That was one thing.

I also agree with you with "where feasible and practical" being taken out. It's another headache that is going to cause because there will

indeed be times when this thing is not feasible or practical, something is not feasible or practical, and you'll end up with a big problem on this.

My third question is one to Leon, and that was to do with the CCWG discussions in Brazil. I mentioned they're not sessions because I believe they're just discussions. The question was whether they will be open to all. Will they be announced and open to everyone to participate or will they be closed to just members, or members and participants? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier.

LEON SANCHEZ: May I respond?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks. Definitely the issue on the contract and the mission needs to be carefully reviewed. As you may be aware – and I think you are – the IAB is the one that is actually pushing very hard to update the bylaw on the mission and have been some back and forths within the working parties that are taking care of that, and I don't think we have reached actually conclusion on whether we should go into changing the mission in a certain way or another. So I think that's still a work in progress. But it is

really good to hear this concern so we can, of course, take a deeper look at maybe the unintended consequences that this change in the mission as proposed by the IAB could have on our day-to-day operations.

I will definitely take back these concerns not only to the co-chair level, but also to the working party level. Of course if you could also [write] these in the public list, that would be very useful.

In regard to the CCWG meetings or gatherings, or whatever you want to call them, in the IGF, there are two slots that have been arranged by the local government, by the government of Brazil, for November the 9th from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM, and then another slot on November 13th from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM. These gatherings, as I said, will be open to everyone. Well, I haven't said that, but I'm clarifying. It would be open to anyone that wants to join. As I said, this will be informal discussions to try and iron out details that otherwise would be difficult to actually move forward when we are in a remote position.

For example, I am aware that there will be some discussions in regards to stress test 18. Many governments or GAC representatives will be at the IGF. Steve DelBianco has been tasked to actually approach them and to have conversations with them in order to find a way forward and to finally have acceptable solution for stress test 18. This is one of the things that actually will be happening in the IGF. I'm not sure if that will happen in one of these gatherings, or if it will happen just all along the IGF as [inaudible] into the many GAC representatives that will be at the IGF.

The sessions will be announced in the list, of course, not in the public IGF schedule as this is not an IGF-related event. But this will be announced on the CCWG mailing list. They have already been announced, although the first slot has moved because the regional one was proposed for November the 10th and now has changed for November the 9th.

And the place for these gatherings to happen is the press room. The press room in the convention center, that is where the government of Brazil has kindly arranged for us to actually have that space in those time slots, so we can go there and actually have these discussions within the CCWG people, and of course a larger community that actually wants to join in.

I hope that clarifies and answers at least two of your questions, Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon. Olivier, do you have a follow-up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Alan. Just a quick follow-up. I understand the position of the IAB (the Internet Architecture Board) where they would just like to correct a discrepancy on what they see as being the coordinator of the Internet's identifiers. They believe that the IAB is the coordinator for the numbers – sorry, for the protocols – and that ICANN I guess is just some kind of a registry, just an operator, but they're not the actual coordinator themselves.

I understand their view on this. The concern I have is that they've opened a can of worms now, and it's effectively been seen as, "Ah, if this is going to change, then that's excellent. We can slot in a whole number of new things and really [restrict] ICANN's mission."

That goes way beyond what the IAB had wanted. Thank you. At least what I had perceived the IAB had wanted. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of comments. First of all, the mission statement that I'm concerned about are not the IAB ones, to be clear. They are ones that we had been working on since the very beginning. I understand the question about the IAB mission and I personally have not a lot of input on that. Clearly we have to make sure that the mission statement with regarding the names function is not watered down because we're watering down the other ones. I can live with that either way, as long as the names one stays robust and removing what has been called the [inaudible], the single statement about all of the registries, and replacing it with something individual I think can do that. But I have no strong feeling whether that should be done at this point or not. It is certainly mission creep, but the other ones are actually mission creep also. The other ones were added by people who have this continual fear that ICANN is going to mission creep into all sorts of other areas and was trying to put iron shackles around ICANN, and I believe perhaps may have put shackles in a way that's not appropriate.

I can accept the fact that if we change the bylaws, that cannot invalidate an existing contract. Contract law may be such that we have committed

to that, and if we change our bylaws, all and well good, but we cannot walk away from a contractual clause because we voluntarily changed our bylaws. That makes complete sense.

However, that doesn't say we can enter into a new contract in those same terms. And that's my real worry. My real worry is a new contract might well be invalidated. Then we have un-level playing fields and we have all sorts of potential problems because one of the bylaws, one of the core missions, says we must have level playing fields. We have to treat people fairly.

I think the whole thing gets us into a real mess and I have a real worry about that. The content – the type of content regulation that we do, first of all, treating the… Making sure that the names themselves can be regulated. And second of all, making sure that voluntary regulation is something that's enforceable is crucial to how the generic names are allocated and used. I have real worries on that.

On the "where feasible and practical" I have raised the issue and I don't think I've seen an answer on that. Becky's well aware of the ALAC requirement, but I don't believe it has been addressed but I might have missed that.

In any case, I think we really need someone who's not going to the IGF to take some level of responsibility and go down to the gritty details of the ALAC statement and make sure that whatever's being proposed as we get closer to the 15th is indeed on target, or at least we understand what isn't.

And that's all I have. Is Tijani back?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, my hand is up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I hear you on what you're saying regarding the change of contracts and a need for a level playing field. I guess that really goes into a deeper… It's not even a philosophical argument. It's actually a deeper issue that has happened in the GNSO and that's of course with regards to the next round of new gTLDs. I believe that the whole idea of the level playing field is the straw man that gets – should we even call it a red herring? I'm not even sure. That gets taken out of the closer whenever it's convenient.

So we're saying some arguing, but the next round of new gTLDs should be following exactly the same road that the previous round, even though we were well aware that there were a lot of broken things in the previous round. That's part of a wider argument and I think we should resist this and say that ICANN will evolve and contracts will evolve, and we need to make sure that contracts are able to evolve.

If we put ICANN in a very tight straight jacket today, the only thing we're going to be able to do as a community is to ultimately make ICANN completely irrelevant in the future. I'm quite concerned about this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I take your point about the level playing field, but the issue behind it I think is a substantive one. We don't want to be in a position because we changed the bylaws that we can't enter into the kind of contract that we want in the future and that we have done before. Yes, un-level playing field may be the result and people use that in varying ways. But the fact is that if there are terms in the contract that we right now believe are necessary, we don't want this particular change to make them illegal, essentially, in the future. So that's really a problem.

Becky keeps on saying if it's in spec 1 or spec 3 of the RAA, then it's okay. But that's only for existing contracts, not necessarily for new ones.

Anyway, those are the issues that I will raise. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Wonderful. I do agree with your concern, Alan, regarding the mission statement. I think that [inaudible] of the IETF brought more problems now because, as you said, it is now open for other problems.

I think that work party 2 will have a lot of work to do now. But also, work party 1 did very good work and I think it's very well advanced. The

problem is that we have stronger position from the [NCSG], especially because with the consensus system, there is no wait of the voice of each SO and AC. And this is something that they don't accept. They say that the SO has the power. They must have the power. And now they are losing their power for the ACs. And this is something that they don't accept.

I don't really understand this from this from the NCSG. I [only] understand it from the [contracted] parties, the [inaudible] house. But from the NCSG, it is a bit [inaudible], as French people said.

Anyway, the co-chairs said that it will be a minority view. I hope it will remain like this until the end, because they are very committed. Our chance… We are lucky because we have Avri who is from the NCSG and who don't agree with them, which is something very good I think.

As Alan said several times, the ALAC will not ratify the CWG proposal if it comes to make the voice of ALAC less than the voice of any SO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The good thing is there are other people who are supporting our position, so I don't think the NCSG alone – remember, Avri is not on council, so she ultimately does not have a vote. I don't think the NCSG alone can kill it, but they can come close. All they really need is one other vote from the commercial side and that may well be able to kill it. We do have a potential problem there. I'm not quite sure how to resolve that one, but I don't think it's within our ability to do that. As I said, I don't know how to go forward.

The problem I see that we really have at this point is the timing. Several of us who are very active will be at the IGF and it's not at all clear how we're going to handle the changes that are coming out and the signoffs that are needed over the next week.

Olivier, is that a new hand? Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I have another question relating to work stream 1 and work stream 2. I have noticed a discussion which I've prevented myself from answering, just thinking, oh God, another one of these arguments that monopolizes 150 e-mails and fills up the mail box and so on about it's [not in] work stream 1. It appears that…

Sorry, let me rephrase this. It appears… Some people appear to be saying or thinking that if it doesn't go into work stream 1, then it's going to be in work stream 2 and ICANN is not committed to proceeding forward with anything from work stream 2. Some are even saying that if it goes in work stream 2, it's just not going to happen.

What's the feeling from our members and participants on that group regarding this? Because I was very surprised on that. And to me, it just shows the level of distrust which is going to a level I think of conspiracy theories at that point. That's the feeling I got. I might be wrong.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me answer before Leon gives the definitive answer. The whole premise of all the stuff we have dumped into work stream 1, which is not at all related to the transition – and there is a lot – was to give us

the powers to make sure we got work stream 2. We have ultimately ability if the community feels very strongly that something in work stream 2 is mandatory, we have the ability to replace the board, period.

So yes, this board has suggested that maybe we don't need a work stream 2. Maybe it should be handled through ATRT 7 or whatever or other mechanisms.

As Leon will say, the co-chairs have asked a very strong question in my mind to say, "What is the intent of the current board?" But ultimately we went through all this trouble in work stream 1 to give us the ability to force issues. And now we're saying, "But they don't count anymore. We don't believe we're going to be able to use them." So why are we wasting all of our time? Thank you. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Olivier. I couldn't agree more with Olivier's sentiment. I think that we are going down a spiral of evil here in which conspiracy theory... I mean, [inaudible] a way.

I do see them, too, as conspiracy theories. As Alan has clearly stated, all the effort in work stream 1 is to actually ensure that work stream 2 will happen.

I believe that some conspiracy theories or some of this mistrust on that work stream 2 might not happen at all. It's based on some [inaudible] claims by some board members that it would be better if we put some of work stream 2 issues into the regular reviews or the periodic reviews

that are carried out anyway by ICANN. I think that has actually fueled these conspiracy theories.

So in order to clear that out the co-chairs have asked [inaudible] questions to the board on how they see work stream 2 happening and whether the board would actually be honoring all of the commitments and all of the work that needs to be done as part of [inaudible] of work stream 2 by the CCWG.

We have received a [inaudible] by Bruce who is our liaison with the board, and of course they will be coming back to the larger CCWG in order to clarify this question on work stream 2.

But to me, it should be very clear that if they come with any other answer but a yes, we will absolutely commit, then I think this is going to be very problematic and would actually put the transition in danger, I think. So that is what I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon. I'll add one more thing. I think the translation of the fears is from those people who are sufficiently vocal that they have managed to control a lot of our agenda. And they believe they can push something through now. But it came down to the community actually taking action. There would not be strong enough view in the community to take action.

We used the term leverage at the start of this transition, that the transition gives us leverage to force things. I think they have the leverage to force the CCWG to go in a direction which the CCWG

otherwise might not go and the community might not go, and that's what they're losing. That perhaps is a somewhat cynical view of this, but that is how I see that right now.

We're out of hands at this point, in which case, Olivier, I'll turn it back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I invite you all to also read the comments made by Seun in the chat who was in a noisy place and he is just about to catch a flight I believe.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, I am not on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're not on there? Okay. So I've got Leon Sanchez at the moment with his hand up, so I'll turn the floor to Leon and then to Sebastien Bachollet afterwards. Leon Sanchez, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. This is a question on other topics, related of course to the CCWG. I commented on this in the small group so far, I think. But we will need to be actually assessing whether we need a face-to-face meeting for us to review and of course vote on the final proposal by the CCWG.

I know that is not part of this agenda, but anyway I would like to raise, or at least feel the temperature on whether we would be looking to have a face-to-face meeting in order to review and vote on the third proposal. I would very much welcome your feedback and your thoughts, because as you know, we need to start planning if this is going to happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. Alan, did you want to respond to this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I guess I'll make the same statement I made in Dublin. It is conceivable that the ALAC… We certainly have the mechanism to take a vote without there being a face-to-face meeting. My gut feeling, however, is if other groups are meeting – and particularly if the GAC is meeting – I believe the opportunity to have discussions with them may well be beneficial, not only to us but in trying to move the GAC in a way that we can ensure that there is a transition and there is agreement. Not that we have all that much power over that, but we have worked well together and there has been opportunity for discussion before.

I believe it would be really good to be able to have the ALAC meeting both within our own processes to make sure that we have everyone and board and everyone understands. We've had a problem before that the people who are not very heavily involved – and sometimes the people who are heavily involved – don't quite understand the substance. And I think this is a really important thing that we need to make sure we have closure on. But more important, if other groups are meeting, then I

think it will be important that we have the opportunity to both meet face-to-face and meet with them face-to-face.

That's what I answered when I was formally asked. That's what we said in Dublin. Clearly once we see the proposal and we find out whether other groups feel they need to meet or not, that position can change. We can always cancel. But at this point, I believe we should presume that the 15-member ALAC will in fact meet if there are other groups, in particular the GAC, meeting. I'm willing to be told that's crazy and we should change that position, but that's what I've said to date.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Sorry to be late, but it's difficult to answer to a discussion when you are not in a [inaudible] room.

I wanted to say a few things about the CCWG where we are. But first of all, the meeting. One of the reasons I think we need to have a face-to-face is at the time we are going to this review of the third version of the document, we will try to be inside our groups and [for me] inside ALAC to pursue for any change we want. And at the end, we need to go to some sort of consensus, and we will be able to build it I guess easily or easier if we are face-to-face and if we try to do that by mail.

From now on, I think it's important that we take into ALAC the same position and to try to see where we are going and not to have this discussion anymore outside, because we need to [inaudible] one

position for ALAC. It's the right time to change gear. [inaudible] from my point of view needs to be less public and more inside our groups. That's the first thing.

Second, I agree with some of the comments about the change of the bylaw, the mission statement [of] ICANN. I don't think it's the right time to change it. If we need to change it, it must be, I would say, a separate discussion. Because if we do that now, I am sure that in three years we would have members who will say, "We have a [narrow]. You are not anymore coordinating. Just leave us to do that. You need just to do some consultation with us and that will be enough." And then we will [inaudible] to be just the [names].

And if that's the case, then all the discussion about having an IANA function coordination saying [one thing] [inaudible] out of any [inaudible] anymore.

Then we will lose our opportunity to be the voice of end user [across] topics and the end user will lose a lot and the stakeholders will lose a lot.

I really feel that what [IAB], but also topics like Alan said are very important and can be discussed just now because we are talking about IANA stewardship transition.

That's the main point for the other. I agree with you. I will not be in Brazil. I would like not to be the only one to commit to [inaudible] the documents. I will be one, but not the only one hopefully. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Alan, if we are all [inaudible], if we don't have a measure of disagreement in our position as ALAC members, it is not a problem. We can make our decision online, if you want, through [inaudible] or something like this or using wiki or something like this.

But if we have strong difference between our position, I think that – the experience of the last time when we discussed through e-mail, I felt that people more or less – people who are not really involved don't even read the content because they think that since they didn't follow, they will not understand or they will not contribute. So I didn't feel like the whole ALAC members were involved in the decision-making, and the face-to-face session that we had I think makes people more involved and makes people express themselves because they were obliged to do so.

I think that a decision by ALAC, if we have strong disagreement, needs to be face-to-face. But if we are all in line – and I hope we will this time – in this case, yes, we may do it virtually without having a face-to-face meeting.

I think that the more we have participation inside ALAC for the decision-making, the best it is. Because, yes, we are a few people who are following very closely. Yes, we are a few people who have strong positions, but I think that the other members of ALAC should have a minimum of involvement so that they can express themselves and

express the point of view of their community, of their region. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tijani. Alan is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I agree with what Tijani is saying. At this point, I think we have to presume that unless everyone else is saying… We don't want to be the ones that trigger the meeting, to be quite candid. This is going to be an expensive venture and disruptive in all of our lives. No matter where it is, it's going to be a long haul for somebody. The rumors I hear is it's going to be a long haul for almost everyone.

I really believe that we, in theory, can make the decision, but this is a really seminal decision for ICANN and I do want to make sure that we have real buy-in and not just, "Yeah, yeah, if John says it, I'll say yes, too."

We'll try our best. If it looks like there is a meeting on and we do not have absolutely clear clarity that everyone understands what they're agreeing to, then certainly I would press for attendance.

One of the things we don't know is if we have a face-to-face meeting, how many of the ALAC members will attend? We may well have a significant number of them saying, "I can't make it." And that will be a problem we'll have to address at the time.

I think that's about as much as we can talk about right now. Leon, or perhaps me if you wish, we should spend at least a couple of minutes looking at the proposed timeline. It is a unique timeline in that there is overlap there that we normally do not do.

So it's probably worth going through for a minute or two. Leon, do you feel comfortable in trying to take it or should I? I've looked at it briefly, but not really well.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I've been reviewing this timeline and I would like to go through it with you if you want. [inaudible] go through it. Maybe you could complement anything that I might be missing. Are you okay with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm certainly okay with it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can it be sent by mail that I will try to follow on? Because I have no Adobe Connect.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's linked to in the agenda. Click on the item and you'll get it.

TERRI AGNEW: I can send it to you in an e-mail.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Terri.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. As you see, we have three lines here. The blue line, which is in regards to the global community process; the second one, the ICANN review process in green; and then the US government process in purple. I would talk to the blue line first and then see how this plays out with the rest of the timeline.

The first one is mainly on the CCWG activity as you can see. The first item we have is a deadline on November 15 in which the CCWG would actually launch the third proposal for public comment and we would be holding a 35-day public comment.

So this third proposal to be published on November the 15th would be a summarized proposal, and then we would be publishing the full detailed proposal on November the 30th. So what we would have on November 15th would be of course an outline of the highlights of what's been changed between our second proposal and our third proposal. Because actually, this public comment period would be open in a way to encourage comments only on those aspects that we actually need input. This would mean that, of course, some sections of our document that have [proved] agreement from the community in previous public comment periods would not be open to public comments at this time. So we would like to narrow down the scope of this public comment period in order to have the feedback only in those areas that we are actually needing comments on.

This public comment period would last until December the 21ˢᵗ and after that, we would be of course reviewing the comments and assessing whether they are substantial and very important comments that would actually need to take into account into the proposal. And if so, then we would be issuing a supplementary document. But we wouldn't be going back to the working group and modifying the whole proposal and then [putting it] through a fourth public comment period.

The intent is to actually look at the comments, and if they are not substantial, well we will address them in the best way that we can. And if they are substantial, then we will be looking at having a complementary document that of course complements the third proposal.

Then you can see that we have [tentative] charting organization face-to-face meeting, which would be happening, if it happens of course, in mid-January. In this meeting, it would be expected to have the proposal not only reviewed but also voted and hopefully supported by the chartering organizations.

Now, after our charter, I believe that we only need four chartering organizations to support the proposal in order to be feasible to forward it to ICANN's board. So I need to check back in our charter to have this data accurate, but I do believe that we only need four chartering organizations in order to move forward and to send this proposal to the ICANN board.

So at this point, as Alan said, if we actually submit our final work stream 1 recommendations to the board, it overlaps with ICG because ICG would submit also its final report to the ICANN board.

From there, we would be looking into beginning work stream 2. The scoping says here in this slide, but we would actually be fleshing out the details on work stream 2, because work stream 2 has already been scoped so far. We have a list of issues that actually belong to work stream 2, so it wouldn't be quite scoping work stream 2, but actually begin working on fleshing out the details on work stream 2.

So at this point I would like to pause and open the floor for any comments or questions in regards to the blue timeline, which is the timeline that concerns or relate to the CCWG work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa?

ALAN GREENBERG: It may be an old hand.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Tijani. Thank you. Thanks for this update, Leon. I don't see any hands up or any questions. It seems quite a clear way forward.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Alan, would you like to… Did I miss anything or would you like to add something?

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I can tell, you've covered anything.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have just one question.

ALAN GREENBERG: One thing to make clear. The intent at this point is that there not be a fourth draft report. The charter makes it clear that the working group following the overall process has the discretion to make decisions and the working group and, therefore, then the chartering organizations. The final decision will be made by the chartering organization weighing in all the comments that come into the third report. But there is no intent to go out to a fourth report, even if there are some changes that need to be made because of the comments. That's my understanding of the process planned.

LEON SANCHEZ: And that is correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan; and thank you, Leon. A question from Sebastien Bachollet now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. What will be the role of the SOs and ACs during the comment period? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Sebastien. May I respond, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks. So the role of the SOs and ACs during the public comment period will be to review the third proposal of course, and if they don't have any substantial comments, we would be asking them to actually see this, as Alan said, the final version of our proposal and to begin assessing whether they will be supporting the proposal or whether they would be filing some [substantive] comments that could in any way modify what we have put in the third proposal in order for the CCWG then to build a complementary document. I hope that answers your question, Sebastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: It doesn't quite answer my question, the question that I will raise, the complementary one. In the past, a number of At-Large and ALAC people have essentially insisted that every issue that we are not happy with be identified in our comments, or certainly any substantial ones, even if it's a minority position.

My hope is at this point that, yes, we identify things that we believe need to change if we think there is a critical mass, but just to restate a statement that has not received any support in the past, I think we want to keep this one as clean as possible. We certainly want to identify any showstoppers, any red lines which predict that we will not accept the report.

On top of that, we may want to identify some other things. But I think we want to keep this one as lean as possible. I don't know whether there's a general agreement with that, and obviously I'm only one voice. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I agree with you, Alan. We need this time. If we don't want to have a fourth comment period, we need to make our comments as efficient as possible, and I agree with your approach.

I have another thing to say. Don't forget that the CCWG will be obliged to take the comments into account. So if there is a huge number of people who are saying, "No, we don't accept the SOs are losing their power for the ACs, I think that the CCWG doesn't have any other way to do other than taking this into account and perhaps modify the proposal."

What can we do to avoid that? I think we have to comment heavily. We have to comment as ALAC. We have to comment as RALOs. We have to comment as end users. And we have to make a large campaign to make people comment and to comment on this particular point. We have to support and say clearly that the consensus is the only way acceptable as it is mentioned in the report, in the [third] report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I agree, Tijani. I think this follows the same model as we used for public comments. We always say if we don't have anything substantive say, we shouldn't bother saying anything. But if we expect substantial opposition to something that we support, then we do comment. And I think this is the same area.

In terms of the waiting model, as it were, even though it's not voting now, I think that is something that we will support. And I think it's important that we do that.

The other thing that I see there may be some controversy for, particularly from parts of the GNSO, is the fact that the AC/SO must act in unison as a whole. I think the arguments from the GNSO that their

voting model doesn't allow them to express their interest, maybe their voting needs to change. That's an internal GNSO issue.

We may get some pushback from some RALOs on that, that the RALO wants to be able to voice their own opinion and have it go all the way out.

I think this whole decision process, as they said, the ACs and SOs – when we had members, they were going to be the effective members until we went to a single member model. All along we have said that the ACs and SOs are the building blocks on which ICANN has built. I think the position we're in today where the ACs and SOs have to make a decision is indeed the right one. It's not a position I pushed for at one point. I disagreed with that. But I now believe that from the perspective of the outside world, the ACs and SOs have to act as a block in order to make these decisions. I think that's about all I have.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't think it's the right way to go. I agree with you on the content, but I disagree with the way to go. I think this [inaudible] needs to be a single voice of ALAC. You know I disagree for the [inaudible]. I disagree with the fact that ALAC will have just one voice.

But if we are going to this model, we need to apply that to this time. If we want to have a strong voice, we need to have just one single position set up by ALAC on behalf of all the end users. That's it.

We are not in a voting process. We are not in… We will not… If the comment period is to count how many people are saying A or B, it's not a comment. It's a voting period. We don't want to answer in that. We don't want to [compete] to know if there will be more support for our position or more support for the NCSG position. We really need to be united.

I really feel – and it's contrary to my position on how we need to vote at the end, but it's for me very important that we keep that in mind and not to try to have as much as possible comments. Just one important [weighted] comment from ALAC will be enough to contradict hundreds of others. We are a strong body. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. From what I just heard you say, I think you're not disagreeing. You are strongly agreeing with what Tijani and I said.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, because… Sorry. Tijani says that we will [ask] the RALOs, the ALSes, the number to say something. No. We need to have just one single comment. One single comment coming from ALAC will be the voice of everybody. It's where I really…

It's not the time to go and try to have our 200 ALSes make a comment. It's time to be united.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I may have misunderstood Tijani. I thought he was saying more comments are good. But I was presuming they were the same comments and not at odds with the ALAC statement. If they're at odds with the ALAC statement, then we do have a problem.

Tijani's hand is up. Let's let him speak for himself.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Alan, you are right. My comment was that we need every one of us repeat the same comments, our comments. Means the comments of ALAC. Means we all wanted to be a consensus system, not a voting system. We all don't want to have different weight of the voice of the ACs and SOs. This is the message that everyone – end users, RALOs, ALAC, etc. – need to make in the public comment. Because in the public comment [inaudible] is saying that we have X number of comments saying that and zero number of comments disagreeing with it. So she concluded that people want it like this.

That's why I said we have to have… The more comments we will have with the same voice, the best is. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In fact, that's an easy one, because if she files a minority statement, as she will, then it does merit explicit comments on that statement. So that may be an easy one to address.

I had a question and it's now left me, so I'm not quite sure what it is. Olivier, I'll turn it back to you until I—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have one comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say I really think that we… Even if it's to repeat the same thing, it's the wrong way to use the comment period. If we want to have, I will say, a kind of compromise, then at the end of the ALAC comment, we may ask every of our ALSes or RALOs to ratify it and to add it to the same comment and we will just send one letter, not hundreds of letters, for comments.

It's not because [Robin] fall into the ways [I think], "Hey, because there are five people against and five people for, it's a balance." We need to [inaudible] each comments. It's not votes.

Really, I would like you to think about the best way to show our unity and strongness. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I have a question for Leon. There was discussion at one point when we were talking in work stream 1 on the decision process that we were talking about ACs and SOs for or objecting to a given

power, exercising the power. At one point, there was language there implying that advice for or against was counted as a for or an objection. Do you know what the current language says?

LEON SANCHEZ: I think it's still a work in progress, Alan. The last version that I recall was that, for example, in regards to the SSAC and the RSSAC, if they chose to actually abstain or not take part of the decision-making process but only provide advice, it wouldn't alter the thresholds, whatever that means. So I have to [confess] that I don't have it clear at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you think strong advice against would be advice to the SOs and ACs that are participating but not be counted as an objection.

LEON SANCHEZ: I don't have it clear, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Time check. We have 10 minutes until the official end of this call. We might have a few minutes extension with or interpreters. I see Tijani has still got his hand up, but I would suggest that we move on. Tijani, anything else that you wish to add?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes, yes. Responding to the question of Alan. Kavouss raised again this issue of advice for – no, advice approving or advice against. The chair of the work party 1 said, yes, you are right and we will try to reflect that in the drafting. And since we didn't start drafting the language, I think it will be reflected. I think that each advice would be counted. Because the ACs have only the right to advice. They don't have the right to propose or to decide, especially the GAC.

That's why I think it would be written like this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one comment back, and then I agree with Olivier, we should move on. Right now ACs only have the right to advice, but we are talking about a new power all together. So that does not necessarily follow in the future power. It's a decision we have to make.

My concern is Kavouss has said strongly that negative GAC advice should be treated as an objection. The SSAC has said, "We do not want or negative advice to be treated as an objection." So we have a conflict there and that's potentially a worry. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But SSAC said that they don't want to participate in the decision-making at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. But they may give advice. But they don't want that advice to count as a for or against. The GAC seems to be saying the opposite. That is my concern.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you are right. But what I understood is that each SO or AC who decides not to participate will not be counted. Only those who decide to participate will be counted. That's why I believe that advice of the SSAC, if they don't want to participate, their advice will not be counted.

At the contrary, if the GAC decides to participate in the decision-making, their advice would be taken into account. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tijani. Clearly there are a lot of issues that we've covered today, so I thank you all for taking part of this discussion on CCWG accountability.

Now we have two more points on our agenda. First, the ICG. A quick update. The ICG IANA Coordination Group has sent an e-mail to various parties letting them know that they have completed their work, pointing to the fact that any implementation follow-up should be done by the respective communities. I think the discussion that took place in CWG IANA was to do with whether it would be the CWG IANA that would be following up on implementation. It looks like this is going to be the case based on discussions that were held in the last CWG IANA call.

Are there any other points that anyone wishes to raise with regards to the IANA Coordination Group?

Certainly having seen the schedule which Leon has provided, it looks like the work of the ICG – well, the ICG is still somehow… Sorry, let me start again.

The ICG itself is still around because it is mentioned there, and of course the updates with the accountability work will go to the ICG, etc. But it doesn't look as though there will be any specific work undertaken by the IANA Coordination Group or more face-to-face meetings, etc.

Are there any comments are questions on the ICG? I wish we had on the call either Mohamed or Jean-Jacques, but both appear to have been unable to make it today.

I don't see any hands up, so that's just the update on the ICG. Now, with regards to the cross-community working group, CWG IANA stewardship, a couple of things have taken place.

First there was a meeting – another meeting – of design team 0. That's the one which deals with anything related to budget. It was a very productive meeting with Xavier Calvez sharing with us the current idea for the fiscal year 17 planning process. Here we go.

The graphic which was shared with everyone was this one showing the critical path to transition and how the budgeting would work. As you know, the fiscal year from July the 1st from to the end of June. There was some discussion with regards to forecasting the costings.

At the moment, the cost of the transition are taken care of by special item in the budget. There is likely to be an additional special item in the budget for next year.

At the moment, we are in fiscal year 16. That will end in June. It is unknown on whether the transition will have completely taken place by then or not, by the end of the year. So a lot of unknown unknowns what the department is looking at doing. The ICANN finance is looking at doing is to prepare a budget to be ready by the 15th of January. That will have a number of placeholders.

So ballpark figures effectively that will both include the costs of the transition and any other identified costs, but also that will start looking at post-transition IANA as a separate organization, so a separate budget, if you want, that will drill into some detail for this.

However, it will not go to the granularity, as Xavier explained – the granularity of looking at each and every case of costs, because it's simply impossible to have today. It's simply impossible to evaluate them considering we have so many different moving goal posts and moving targets at the moment.

I know that Cheryl was on the call as well. I'm not sure whether I've summarized this well, or is there anything else to add? Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. No. I think you've done an admirable job. I just think it's really important that we all understand that more detail in this

granularity will also be forthcoming later on in the process. So by the time we start deliberating for the FY 16 draft… Let me start that sentence again – draft budget to be published, and once it gets closed to budget approval, greater detail will also be known and unpacked. So this is going to be something which those who want to have very specific [handle] on the costs of running, including the shared costs, that are contributed – things like actual building space and IT services and insurance and stuff. All of those sorts of things will become more and more evident. I'm quite comfortable with where this is heading. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, Cheryl. Back on the PowerPoint presentation on your screen, it says, "Keep things simple." That probably is the way forward for the time being.

The concern is that there might be some pushback among the working groups, both on the CWG IANA and the CCWG Accountability. From some whom say, "No, we need to have absolutely everything cast in stone." So we really have to make sure that they understand that at this moment it would be an absolute waste of time to be counting the pencils and pens on everyone's desk, going into something a little bit more of a helicopter view.

Are there any questions or comments from anyone?

The last thing, of course, would be with regards to the FY 17 planning, the suggested option. Option #2 I think is what the group decided to propose to the CWG IANA. So looking at a base scenario where PTI is implemented and where there are no actual changes to the separation

of the IANA functions, the staff processes and shared infrastructure overhead so that the separation doesn't take place.

Now that the costings are taken – for the base scenario, the costings are listed out as follows. Any other comments? No? Okay. Oh, I see Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Separation here is not meant to be separation of the functions [inaudible]. It means separation of the operational budget of the PTI. The finance department don't know yet if PTI will have their own, for example, council, they will have their own everything. In this case, the budget will be different if they share all those functions or all those services with the whole ICANN.

This is why this issue of separation is here in the budget. It is not about separation of the function as we spoke about it in the CWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tijani. I didn't realize I had committed that sin. Yes, it's the, of course, budget separation as such. Okay, so that's one thing that we had to look at.

The other thing that we had to look at is to do with the last meeting. Just a quick review. The IANA CWG met yesterday. I believe it was yesterday. There was a discussion of the CWG role and implementation and it was agreed with the few people that were on the call. It was not very well-attended, unfortunately. So this will have to be repeated

during the next call. There was the expectation that the CWG itself will be dealing with the follow-up or the stewarding of the implementation.

Of course we discussed [DTO's] work. There was also a discussion on the intellectual property. Greg Shatan I think proposed himself as leading on this. Then there was update on the service level expectations. Bearing in mind that the IETF has now – or the other operational communities are now also negotiating directly with ICANN, so with ICANN staff, on what their service level expectations and service level agreements are going to be. So that's all progressing well.

The last discussion was to do with the bylaws, but I think that was skimmed very quickly since there's a lot of discussion going on at the moment in the CCWG Accountability.

For those who were on the call yesterday, have I missed anything in this summary?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope. That's pretty well [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So thank you. Finally, one last thing I was going to point you to, and that's to do with the post-Dublin activities presentation toolkit. ICANN staff has – and you can download this toolkit from the agenda page. ICANN staff has produced a pretty sizeable PowerPoint presentation, which is good because it's [inaudible] PowerPoint. It's got a lot of information in there for anybody who has to put together some presentation on any aspect of IANA stewardship and ICANN

accountability, how things fit together. Various diagrams and so on. I thought I would just put this in the agenda and point you to it, so you'd be able to have a good look and use it in your presentations if you have to.

I was going to jump to the last item in this presentation. It's quite far down. Unfortunately, you can't really jump down, can you? Oh, here we go. That's the one.

That's just to show you the end of the tunnel, or the end of one tunnel at least. Phase one, phase two, phase three. Where are we now?

Some elements of this presentation are going to be used by the cross-community working group on Internet governance who have a slot at the Internet Governance Forum next week in Brazil. And what we will be doing is look at the process and explain the process to everyone in Brazil. So some of the slides will have been taken from this presentation. But as I said, this presentation is for you to make use of in your local communities if you need to present where we are now.

I don't think staff has sent this slideshow around. I think staff have shared it with the CWG by e-mail or they've pointed us to it. I can't remember how it landed on my desk, but it was shared. Anyway, you now have a link to it in the agenda that you can download.

Are there any questions or comments on any of the CWG IANA stewardship transition topics? Okay, I don't see any hands up.

Glenn, yes, you may indeed use it. And if you're going to use it on the NARALO meeting, that's quite fantastic. You don't see the link? Okay.

Terri, if you could please put the link to the agenda… The [link] to the agenda meeting page is on the chat, Glenn. If you scroll down, you'll see Post Dublin Activities Presentation Toolkit. On the right-hand side, it says "PPTS" which is the PowerPoint itself.

Okay, and with this, I think we can move then to any other business. I don't see any hands up. The only item of business I guess s to find out when we are going to have our next call. Next week, as Alan Greenberg mentioned, several people will be in [inaudible], which is in Northern Brazil. I think it might be difficult to have a call that week. I would suggest that we might have a call in two weeks' time. Are there any preferences or objections?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I tend to agree. I don't see how we're going to have a call, but on the other hand, in the beginning of the following week, we'll be past the 15th. So I think we have to have a call somewhere near there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah! That's a very good point you make. Oh yes, it is. Goodness. Time is flying. So we will need a call next week. We're going to have to have a Doodle, I guess. I'm already crossing fingers that Internet connectivity will be good in that part of the world. In the past we have had some serious issues with Internet connectivity at Internet Governance Forum meetings.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm assuming we will have reasonable at the meetings. At the hotels, I don't think we can presume that. Timing will be interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's been the opposite, actually, in the past, Alan. The hotels have had good connectivity, and the meetings were terrible. I can remember at least a couple of instances where… The big joke going around was, "What's the difference between people at the IGF and people following remotely? People following remotely have Internet. People at the IGF don't have Internet." Anyway…

Hopefully this will have been remedied. I know that CGI, one of the main hosts, are very, very good at networking and Brazil has shown to have been a fantastic host already to the NETmundial discussions in the past. Hopefully we'll have no problem.

Let's do a Doodle for next week, then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, it's probably wise to make sure that it's after the scheduled calls for CCWG and CWG. It won't be very useful to have them before those meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. That's a very good point. Terri, could you please check, then? The CWG and CCWG calls next week. I know that the CWG

calls are usually on a Wednesday – or is it Thursday? Thursday, sorry. We can then make sure we have this call maybe on a Thursday or Friday probably.

Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that must've been an old hand or an accident.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. The CCWG has a call programmed on 13.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: On Friday, the 13th, we do indeed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It will only be at that call, Tijani, but we have a good handle on documents and everything. So it would be silly to have our call before that call on Friday, the 13th.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I also said the same. I sent an e-mail saying the same thing. But I didn't see any e-mail saying that it is not the case, it will not happen.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Let me just get this right. Are you saying that we need to have a call before Friday, the 13th, or after Friday, the 13th?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Cheryl is saying after, which means the evening of the 13th.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Correct.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, UTC evening. That's fine, then. Terri, I hope you're taking notes. Terri Agnew might be muted.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Folks, we're already almost 15 minutes over this call. We really have to end it.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, I'll follow-up with Terri after this call. I'd like to thank you all for attending this call and I'd like to thank our interpreters, Veronica and David, who spent the extra 15 minutes on the call. And with this, the call is adjourned. Thank you and goodbye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, bye-bye.

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 TRANSCRIPT]