| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW: | Good Morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability, taking place on Tuesday the 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2015 at 20:30 UTC. |

On the English channel, we have Siva Muthusamy, Yrjo Lansipuro, Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon—Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sébastien Bachollet, Glenn McKnight, Vanda Scartezini, and Alan Greenberg.

Currently we have no one listed on the Spanish channel, and no listed apologies.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters.

Thank you very much and I'll turn it back over to you Olivier.

| | |
|---|---|
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much Terri. Olivier speaking. Have we missed anyone in the roll call by any chance? |

---

I don't see anybody put their hand up or speak out, so the roll call is complete.  Today we have the majority of the call devoted to the cross community working group on accountability.  All 75 minutes of it.  We also have Rinalia Abdul Rahim with us.  The Board member that was selected by the At-Large community, and she will be able to share with us a summary of the recent Board comments.

And just prior to that, a very quick update on the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition meeting, which took place about an hour ago, or a couple of hours ago.  So are there any other business to add to this agenda?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is approved.  Thank you.   The action items from our last meeting were very straightforward.  It was all about setting up calls, webinars, and the call that we are on at the moment.  We'll be following up with this at the end of this call to remind everyone of webinars and so on.

So agenda item number three, and there was a call of the IANA cross community working group a couple of hours ago.  The working group spent most of its time reviewing first the cross community dependency, in other words the items of the cross community working group on accountability that were needed in the plan of their cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition.

And the working group is going to be submitting a document, I guess, with the points made on whether these dependencies are satisfied or not.  Then we also have a quick update on implementation, specifically on the intellectual property rights part of the implementation.  Who

holds the IANA dot org and IANA trademark. It was a little rushed, I must admit, and I'm not sure whether we were able to fully take this presentation into account, but there will be a follow up by email afterwards.

I haven't put anything in particular from this call, just a quick update. I know that others were on the call, maybe Alan Greenberg, or Seun Ojedeji, or others who were there. Is there anything else to add to this quick update?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Yes Cheryl, please go ahead. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you very much. Just with that last part with the IP briefing. I think it's important for us to realize that this was, the timing was shorter than we would have liked, but the dependencies conversation, CWG did indeed go on perhaps a little longer than the agenda had planned. But it was a first introduction of the paper.

So it was very much a run through to act as a first presentation, and the intention, of course, is for us to take it on as holiday reading, and to look to a more fulsome and I think quite important discussion, because I certainly have a couple of preferences for some of the alternatives that are put there, in that paper, over the holidays.

And on the January I believe, January 15, Terri can double check the timing on that and put it formally into the chat. It might be 16:00 UTC rather than January 15, but anyway second week of January [inaudible] CWG, it will be a major agenda item. So it's not that it hasn't been given sufficient time for what is a relatively detailed, one might suggest almost a minute, document.

I'm not sure how much implementation of these come from depending on what sources are made out of it. But it's a very thorough and fulsome paper with several [inaudible] we do need to look at. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Cheryl. Olivier speaking. There is a draft document to be sent to the cross community working group on ICANN accountability. There is a deadline for comments from within the CWG stewardship, which is Thursday 16:00 UTC. If you haven't got a copy of this paper, I believe, let me just have a look.

CWG comment letter, yeah. So if you go over to the link that is in your agenda, you will see further down the page documents, CWG comment letter PDF. Please comment on it ASAP before it gets sent to the CWG accountability. And other comments or questions on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier? Sorry me again, and I'm actually back at my computer now. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Just on that, I think it's important for our group to understand that it was that letter drafted after review by [inaudible],

and the particular requests and actions listed in that letter on all of the items, but particularly the ones on a couple of important matters like budget, that was the basis for our discussion at the CWG [inaudible].

So it's not as if we're asking for [dramatic importance?] things like this. This letter is what it is. But some of the feedback that has been requested, has of course been discussed in particular great detail today. So it's more akin that on from those highlighted pieces with the individual sections, which I think would be most valuable for us putting in the mixture, to put that out as possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this additional input Cheryl. My understanding of the document that is to be sent is that there is nothing that dramatically change anything or break anything, it's just a document that says well that satisfies it. I need to be tweaked a little bit to satisfy or request. I certainly have seen some or heard some concern from many members of the working group about the processes which were designed by the CCWG accountability, specifically for budget vetoes and the various community powers given their concerns about the amount of time that these community powers are going to take.

So it's well understood that none of these powers are easy to implement or to actually take up. But I don't think anybody had an answer to speed things up, because if you speed things up then you're not going to have the overall community approval in time for doing things. So that's the current status. I don't see any other hands up, so maybe we can move to the main meat of the day.

And for those of you who are vegetarian, perhaps the main course being fish or veg. Anyway, let's move on. CCWG accountability, certainly let's take these [inaudible], but we have León Sanchez and Alan Greenberg with us, we also have Rinalia Abdul Rahim from the Board with us. I gather ICANN four and five are pretty much going to be together. I hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you very much. I'd like to start with an overall target discussion of what we're trying to achieve, because there have been a number of emails and other discussions in the last day or so that have indicated that we may have not all be of a single mind. So I think we need to decide what we're trying to accomplish, and then we can go on to the specifics for this call.

And once we do the overall intro, I'm going to turn the floor over to Rinalia, who has 20, 25 minutes to go over the highpoints, I'm guessing, of the Board intervention which was recently sent in. Okay. In terms of our statement, and the work that we're doing right now is in preparation for submitting the public comment which is due on the 21st, next Monday.

And certainly my intent, and I believe decided at the previous meetings, was our target is to identify the issues that are effectively showstoppers for the ALAC. That is, if we cannot get them adjusted or be convinced why we're wrong, then these may well be reasons that the ALAC decides to not ratify the proposal.

I was specifically hoping that we not take this as an opportunity to again have individuals identify what their particular dissatisfaction is and put minority reports in, but only list the things that we believe are At-Large and ALAC issues which could stop the proposal from going forward with our support.

I've since had, in a number of emails, people believing that we should be pushing other points, things where, certainly in my opinion, and it's purely an opinion of mine, they have been discussed an infinitum in the working group. We are not likely to get a chance, and they have not been things in the past, the ALAC said are redline areas.

So I think we need some agreement on where we're going forward. The other thing I want to point out is this report, this statement should not be the place to identify things in the important which are badly worded or need clarification. We should be doing those. Each person could do that themselves, the ALAC could put it in a consolidated statement should we wish.

If we decide we want to do that, I'd like to have someone else draft it because I just don't have the bandwidth to do that in addition to the main statement. But again, I think the formal submission of the ALAC should be focusing on things that we believe to identify what we support in the proposal, and if we do not support it, I would be explicit to what we're looking for to enable us to support the proposal.

So that's where I'd like to settle before we turn it over to Rinalia. Do we have agreement on that's what we're doing? And I know, in particular, there were some comments from Seun, I don't know if he's on the call,

and Sébastien, that perhaps we should be taking a more forceful stand and going back and reopening things that have effectively been not discussed recently.

So I'd like to open the floor to anyone who would like to suggest how we move forward.

In the absence of anyone speaking, I'm going to assume we are… Who is that?

SEUN OJEDEJI:          This is Seun.  Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:       Yes, not very well though.

SEUN OJEDEJI:          Hello.  How about now?

ALAN GREENBERG:       We can hear you Seun, but not very clearly.

SEUN OJEDEJI:          Okay.  This is Seun.  I just going to be looking at, there is not going to be an opportunity to [inaudible] for both the modifications.  I think this was suggested [inaudible] move on with the recommendation.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't quite catch that. Can someone else, is there anyone else who heard that better, can repeat that?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Am I louder? [Inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, try it again then.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. So this is Seun. So what I was saying was that the fact that some of the comments that were made in [inaudible]… ALAC, at this point you cannot [inaudible], our [inaudible] would suggest that maybe just continue as recommended. But again, I'd like to keep the record that I think if we think that something needs to be adequate, then we should focus.

There really is no need for us to say, it is never too late to [inaudible] actually kind of in the contract, on the transition. So they didn't. I will go by your recommendations. [Inaudible], thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, to be clear, what I'm saying is I don't think we should be putting in things where one person says, "I didn't agree with that. I want to see a change." If we have a general feeling among the whole community here, that this is something which is important, than we should be

saying it.  But I don't think we should be having multiple opinions and divided opinions, is what I was trying to say.


SEUN OJEDEJI:          Okay.  All right.


ALAN GREENBERG:        Sébastien, please go ahead.


SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:   Thank you.  I am in very bad place to talk, but I will try…


ALAN GREENBERG:        Sébastien, we can really not hear you well.


SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:   Okay, then it's impossible.  I can't do better…


ALAN GREENBERG:        Right now, I can hear you.  I'm not sure about anyone else.


SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:   Okay.  If you can hear me, I just want to say a few words.  I really thing, I shouldn't just say it's never too late, and I am not totally agree with you, with the fact that we don't want to take onboard what eventually individual or minority report could be.  Because what I think is

important is that now all the At-Large people must come through our comments, and not going individually to the general public comment.

And therefore, we may accept those individuals. It's not to say that we need to add that people will have something to say, but if they have, they need to be allowed, because it's better to have onboard without them then to be outside in the public comment.

And the second point, I really think that we need to discuss about what are the gain for end user with this, all of this work about accountability. I see more we have done against the Board, because we don't trust the Board, because part of the community doesn't trust the Board, then a very good announcement for At-Large and for end user.

I have other things to say, but it's too difficult and I will stop here. That you hear me already in the EURALO discussion, and I will try to achieve that onboard to express my point of view up until the end. Thank you very much and sorry for the bad condition I am here tonight.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay. Thank you Sébastien. I'll try to repeat for those who might not have heard well enough some of the things, and I hope I caught most of them. Number one, you believe that people should not be submitting separate comments, and therefore we should provide an opportunity for minority statements.

All I'm saying today is what this meeting, this group decided several meetings ago, that is that we should be given a single statement and not minority or [inaudible]. If everyone believes that that was a wrong

decision and we want to recant it, go back on it and change it, that can be done. But that wasn't the intent when we started doing this process.

So again, I look for input from other people as to where do we want to go on this? The other thing that Sébastien said was he doesn't see a lot in this overall accountability for end users. He sees, you know, things that are trying to control the Board because people don't trust the Board.

He sees things in the mission which will enhance the ability of contracted parties to do things. I'm not sure he said all of those, but those are some of the issues. And I tend to agree. What I think end users get out of this is, if we're lucky, what we get out of it is an ICANN which is viable and will continue to give us a forum for us to present the issues of end users.

I don't think there is anything for end users in it, as such. I think what we get out of it is a viability of ICANN, if we've done it sufficiently well. I may have missed something, and I see Olivier has his hand up so I'm going to turn it over to Olivier and maybe you can catch anything that we missed.

I do note that it's almost on the hour when I said I would turn it over to Rinalia to give her some time to present the Board issues. So Olivier, it's yours right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And Sébastien has mentioned he doesn't see anything specific that will help end users and also I think,

I'm not sure he has mentioned in here, but I've heard him say earlier that he has concerns that we weren't working, or at least the accountability working group wasn't really working for things to enhance the public interest per se.

I have noticed one thing, perhaps, in the proposals which has been of concern to me, that would potentially effect the ALAC negatively, and that's the budget veto, that we are to make some requests for extra funding for an At-Large summit, for example, in the future. This might be vetoed by other supporting organizations and advisory committees, whilst in the past this would have been discussed at Board level, this was discussed at Board level, and it was felt by Board members that this was certainly helping ICANN the organization into spreading its word and to better involvement according to the bylaws of ICANN and the overall mission.

So that's one thing which I could see would directly affect us, or might directly affect the ALAC and At-Large community negatively. I haven't noticed anything else that would affect us directly negatively. With regards to the community powers, the ALAC would have the same power as every other supporting organization and advisory committee that would take part in this community power.

So I don't see us at a disadvantage per se on this. Yet, it's just one of the five different communities there, but you know, we can't expect to have more votes than others out there. And I'll stop right now because I know that we are very short on time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you Olivier.  Before we go to Rinalia, let me comment on your concern on the budget.  I don't have that concern and I'll tell you why.  Number one, the world is different now than when an At-Large summit was quietly and secretly debated by the Board and decided by the Board.

Right now, the overall budget process is one where there is lots of opportunities for people to input, and the only reason that people will be able to veto something is if indeed, they as a group, as the various groups object to it along the way.  Even without the veto, if indeed the majority of the ACs and SOs in ICANN said do not give extra money to the ALAC, it is a waste of money, I think it would be very hard for that kind of budget to be approved anyway in today's world.

Just like the bylaw that didn't succeed a number of months ago on changing the GAC approval threshold, that is when GAC advice had to be accepted, it didn't go through because there was a community outcry, and the Board listened to that.  I think we're in a world today where if everyone says, giving money to the ALAC is a waste of money, it is not how ICANN's money should be spent, there are more important things, even without the veto, I think the Board would be in a very difficult position in accepting that kind of thing.

So I don't think this changes it very much to be quite candid.  Is it conceivable it might?  Yes.  But I don't list it as high on my priority list of worries.  In any case, our Board member perhaps, can tell me I'm wrong.  Rinalia, I turn it over to you to talk about the Board comment or anything else you've heard right now, because your input is valuable to us.  Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you Alan. This is a sound check again. Can you hear me?


ALAN GREENBERG:     Very well.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Okay. Thank you for the opportunity. I'm not going to comment about your remarks about budget because I think I have quite a bit of material to get through today, and you may have questions after that. I will however, speak very frankly with you. And what I want to say at the beginning is speak a little bit of the context of the Board comments to the CCWG.

You would have noticed that on the 14th of December, the Board published and shared its comments on the CCWG accountability third draft proposal. What's really important to note is that the comments are directed at the SO ACs for consideration in their capacity as chartering organizations of the accountability initiatives, as well as the CCWG on accountability.

And what I want to emphasize is that the comments represent the consensus view of the Board, and I would say the full Board. This was discussed at a face to face meeting, the only person who was not present in the discussion was Thomas Schneider, but he was in the call when we had a chat with the co-chairs of the CCWG, to give the co-chairs a heads up that the comments are coming.

Now on the comments themselves, in general, I want to just do an overview before we go through the specific slides. The Board expresses support and agreement from nearly all of the recommendations, but we want to highlight that their remaining concerns, and these concerns are consistent with the concerns that we've had in the past.

In the comments, the Board has identified the concerns as well as the rationale for the concerns so that the community would have a better understanding about what we're having these issues. And we've also made suggestions and recommendations for addressing those concerns. And please note that the Board is open to alternative solutions as long as the concerns are addressed.

For concerns that are considered serious for the Board, and this is equivalent to what you said as show stoppers for the ALAC, Alan, and when we basically reviewed our comments, it was with the thought that these are our showstoppers. They are our red flags, and they are our serious concerns.

If they're not sufficiently addressed in the CCWG's final report, the Board would follow the principles and procedures laid out in its October 16th resolution. And there is a political implication of this, because if we end up with a situation, whether it's no agreement between the Board and the CCWG, there is the possibility that we may miss the political window for the transition.

So there is a serious risk here. So I want to convey my view about the Board's orientation. My view is that the Board wants to have a transition. It believes that it is good for ICANN, but the Board has duties

and responsibilities that require it to consider carefully the impact of the recommendations on ICANN before agreeing to proceed.

And in principle, consistently what I see that the Board is not able to agree to recommendations that, in its opinion and judgment, would endanger, weaken, or destabilize ICANN. In the CCWG list, there is always challenge on the Board, or second guessing about what is the Board's motivation, etc. And there is challenge about what will be the basis for you to judge this.

And in the October 16th resolution, we had identified that our yardstick would be the global public interest. And I'll explain how we link that to the global public interest and this is my thinking on it. With the third draft proposal, some recommendations are too broad and/or too vague. This opens the door for unintended consequences or exploitation, and it may imbalance or interrupt the operation of ICANN.

In principle, anything that creates open-ended obligations would destabilize ICANN would undermine ICANN's ability to do its job. A stable and functioning ICANN is actually a prerequisite for ICANN to do anything, and this is the yardstick for what is in the global public interest.

So in the comments itself there are, as I counted them, five areas of serious concerns. The first one is inspection rights. And under inspection rights, we agree to inspection rights, but we feel that it must be bounded, it must be well-defined otherwise it could be abused. And it's identified, how inspection rights quickly delivered, for what purpose, to ensure that, you know, it's not abused.

The second area of concern is the veto of the IANA budget. And on that, we believe that the operational communities should be given the right to do that as opposed to the large community, because of the state for the operational communities themselves.

There was the issue for contractual enforcement in the mission statement and we have provided two principles to deal with that in the comments. And regarding the insertion of human rights placeholder in the bylaws, we are concerned about this. We think we are open to human rights consideration. We believe that if it is appropriate within our mission, then we would consider it, but we think that work needs to be done.

First due diligence to figure out what is really the implication of agreeing to this text for ICANN. And once we are clear, then we can consider where it needs to go, whether it is in the bylaws or elsewhere, or specific to policy development. And until that work is done, placing a placeholder in our bylaws puts ICANN at risk, especially as we can be drawn into IRPs or courts over that language.

And finally the area of concerns the specifics of work stream two, basically we are committed to that, but we would treat it the same way as work stream one. So with that, I can go to the slides, but if you would like to have a discussion just said just now, that would be fine with me. What do you think Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have one very brief comment. You said some of the changes to the bylaws could have unintended consequences. I would suggest that

some of the changes could have intended consequences, the people that have proposed them simply haven't been honest about what their intentions are. So I think we have to be doubly careful.

Is there anyone else who would like to get in comments before Rinalia goes through her slides?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, it's all yours.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Did the slide change for you? Because I moved it to the introduction slide.


TERRI AGNEW:     This is Terri. Yes, it changed.


RIANLIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Okay. Thank you very much. So I think this introduction slide covered what I mentioned, that the Board expresses agreement for nearly all of the recommendations, that we have concerns, and we provide recommendations and suggestions for addressing the concerns in the areas where the specific concerns are.

This is under recommendation one for establishing an empowered community, for enforcing community powers. Just let me know if I'm going too fast. The Board supports the establishment of the empowered community, including the sole designator model with powers of Board appointment, removal, and enforcement.

The Board supports development of a definition for global public interest involving the full community, but feels that the Board should be included in that effort as well. The Board…

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia, do you want questions as we go along or hold them?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Possibly at the end. Otherwise we may not get through. The Board agrees to rationale for a well-defined inspection rights for specific documents related to the community powers. Also inspection rights not to be given to the designator, but to the community with enforcement power through the designator.

And the Board agrees to request for further clarity on how empowered community would reach a decision on which documents it wants to inspect, for what purpose, or how documents would be used once received.

The Board, this is recommendation number two, for empowering the community through consensus, engage, escalate, enforce. The Board is generally supportive of the engagement, escalation, and enforcement process. We support threshold as set out in the proposal, based on the current ICANN structure, but we feel very strongly that we should not allow any lowering of any of the thresholds to make sure there is stability.

And we recommend further defining the threshold for exercising community powers in the event that the total number of SOs and ACs

change, by ensuring their percentages in the thresholds. This is recommendation three on redefining ICANN's bylaws as standard bylaws and fundamental bylaws. We support the recommendation.

On recommendation four, on ensuring community engagement in ICANN decision making, there is seven new powers, and we support the seven areas of community powers in the engagement process. Which we focus on discussion and building consensus prior to community use of those powers. And here are the specific comments on those powers, on power number one, to reject ICANN's budget, or strategy, or operating plan.

Either ICANN CFO and individual members of the Board, in their individual capacity, have been actively engaged in discussions of this power. We feel that further defining of the caretaker budget approach is required. And prior discussions were not fully addressed in the proposals. The Board would favor a targeted as an alternative caretaker budget approach.

We recommend that the caretaker approach be embedded in the fundamental bylaws. We support inclusion of additional clarification of the role of operating communities, who are served by the IANA functions in acceptance or rejection of IANA functions budget. And to further defining this role in the implementation.

On the power to reject changes to ICANN's standard bylaws, we support community opportunity to weigh in on bylaw changes, and we've done this before but we welcome the opportunity to codify that in the bylaws itself, and that bylaw changes should not be implemented with

significant community objections. We support the principle of policy recommendations and bylaw changes, however, proposes specific changes to clarify the language in the proposal because there could be some vagueness to it and people may misunderstand.

On the power to remove individual ICANN Board members, the Board supports recommendation to remove individual Board members. We suggest specific for the further development of the process and use of rationale for removal. Specifically transparency around initiation of a community discussion on removal.

We suggest that process of engagement or escalation be the same for both SO AC and NomCom appointed directors, because currently as the process stands, if SO ACs have issues with their appointed directors, they would first approach the director to let them know that there are issues and to work it out. For NomCom directors, there were no such processes. So there is equivalent in there.

And also for the proposal to include the ICANN's Board chair or the vice-chair if the problem is the Board chair. And the process at the very beginning, before you start escalating higher. We stress the importance of independent judgment of directors and diversity and cultural background and experience of Board members.

On the power to recall the entire ICANN Board, we fully support the recommendation to remove the entire Board. We acknowledge that the removal process has addressed many of the Board's earlier concerns. We would stress the importance of clear high thresholds for removal of the entire Board, because this is a catastrophic event in our

view, and we would object to any attempt to lower the threshold for removal of the entire Board.

It has to be the full community who does it. And we suggest that measures be implemented in the bylaws to prevent any attempt to lower the threshold for the removal of the entire Board below four SO ACs, based on the current total of SO ACs.

On the power to approve changes to ICANN fundamental bylaws and articles of confederation, we fully support this recommendation. On the power to initiate a binding community, independent review, we support expanding the scope of the IRPs to be available for more general claims of violations of ICANN bylaws or articles of incorporation.

We suggest that protection to be built on the potential community bringing challenges against other parts of the community such as challenging Board action on policy recommendations, arriving out of appropriately run policy development processes. And we suggest a higher threshold should be required in these situations.

This is so that you don't quote/unquote re-litigate issues that had been agreed in policy development processes outside of that process. And essentially, pushing the community to actually participate in the policy development process if they have issues and concerns on those issues.

On the power to reject ICANN Board decisions related to reviews on IANA functions, including triggering of post-transition IANA separation, we support this recommendation and we understand that this is the dependency between the CWG stewardship recommendations and the CCWG accountability proposal. We suggest clarification about the

process of creating a separation, CCWG to be applicable only to the separation of the names community service of the IANA function.

If the scope is intended to be broader, any review process would have to include other operational communities which extends to us, should be encouraged. On the recommendation number five, changing aspects of ICANN's mission, commitments, and core values, we support modifying the mission statement with an emphasis on clear, concise language, and we've provided a suggestion for that.

We agree with the following two principles that serve as the basis for contract enforcement discussions. ICANN entering into an enforcement of registry and registrar contracts is an important component of ICANN's work, in coordination and allocation of names in the root zone of the DNS. And that ICANN is not a regulator and does not regulate content through these contracts.

We suggest separation of the ICANN's mission statement from scope of responsibilities, and we suggested text on that. On recommendation number six, reaffirming ICANN's commitment to respecting international recognition of human rights as it carries out its mission, we support upholding human rights as appropriate within its limited mission, within ICANN's limited mission and scope of responsibilities.

We require additional work on proposing human rights bylaws text before considering placement in the bylaws. We suggest that the inclusion of interim text to the bylaws risk unintended consequences including potential users of the IRP to test human rights issues that are not anticipated or not within scope.

And we suggest a clear path forward to allow meaningful expression rights consideration in ICANN, including working with the community to develop human rights statements. So essentially what we're saying is that we believe we're not ready to have text in the bylaws, but we will work with you to get to a point where we can decide whether or not placing it in the bylaws will be appropriate or not.

And if not appropriate, we will work with you to figure out other ways of addressing these concerns. And we suggest expanding work stream two to including consideration of where the human rights issues should be reflected in the bylaws or elsewhere, and how human rights should be considered or reflected within policy development.

So that's a concrete commitment, especially as we are committing ourselves to work stream two. Recommendation number seven, strengthening ICANN's independent review process. We support the recommendations on the IRP, but suggest enhancement to uphold the stated purpose of the IRP. We restate our concern that the IRP is not the venue to resolve disputes related to process specific experts determination.

We suggest disputes of this nature should be considered and addressed within the development of the process or program. So if you think of the new gTLD program for example, if there are concerns about expert determinations, it should be embedded in that program as we revise it moving forward, that's just an example of the other things.

We suggest that IRP panels should not be used for specific substantive operation decisions, including the IDP as these decisions would expand

the scope of the IDP on its intended purpose.  On recommendation number eight, improving ICANN's request for reconsideration process, we support the recommendation.

We suggest that further details will need to be addressed in the implementation.  On recommendation number nine, incorporating the affirmation of commitments through views and bylaws, we support the incorporation of the AOC reviews into the bylaws. We support that the operational standards for review remain outside of the bylaws as they should require community input and review to be changed.

We suggest adjustments to language regarding WHOIS, because we know WHOIS is going to change.  And we support development of the IANA functions review as a fundamental bylaw.  On recommendation number 10, enhancing the accountability of supporting organizations and advisory committee, we support that accountability is reviewed and strengthened among the community and not just focus on how the Board is accountable to the community.

This is along the lines of mutual accountability to relevant parties.  And recommendation 11, Board obligations with regards to the GAC advice. The Board supports the community solution that has been proposed on Board obligations with regards to GAC advice.

On recommendations 12, committing to further accountability work in work stream two, we support further accountability work and confirms commitment to how it would consider further recommendations.  We acknowledge Board commitments to consider work stream two recommendations under the same process that we evaluate work

stream one recommendations. People already know the process and it will be the same.

We suggest that the open ended scope of work stream two elements be defined and limited to align with the staff and voluntary resources available. And will not support inclusion of bylaw language that does not align with the previous two statements. And we suggest that all continuous improvement recommendations, work stream two or otherwise, meet the criteria set out for the IANA stewardship transition.

And I believe that is the last slide. Back to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Rinalia. I have a hand from Olivier and I put myself in the queue, and then we'll take anyone else. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I have an overarching question. I have three questions in total, but I have an overarching question with regards to all of the comments and the suggestions made by the Board. Are these redline issues for the Board?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I believe yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's one thing, thank you. And secondly, you mentioned, looking at recommendation number two, the community powers. And

you suggested, you as the Board suggested that there would be a percentage being used in case there are more or less supporting organizations and advisory committees.  At the moment, we based the community powers on five participants, but what if say the ASO decides not to participate.  That would bring it down to four participants.

How would those percentages work with four rather than five?  I gather with more participants of these workable but with four rather than five.  How does that work?  [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:    It's Alan.  I actually have the spreadsheet in front of me, so why don't we hold that until I give my comments?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.  Thanks.  Things by Alan Greenberg.  Third one, Olivier speaking.  Third one is the ATRT, is a question regarding the bylaw changes.  If the ATRT 3 was to request a bylaw change for something, would it need to go through the community?  Would the Board agree that the community would have to agree to that as well?

Because so far, the ATRT requesting bylaw changes are pretty much the Board has to implement them and it would make sense to refuse it.  So it's just a question, and it might be something that you might wish to answer later.  That's all.  Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:   I will try.  I will attempt now and answer because there may be further questions.  The way the ATRT review work, as I recall, is that their recommendations coming from the review team, they do go out to public comments where community provide their input, and then they go to the Board.  Right?  [CROSSTALK]…considers community input in their consideration of the approval, generally the Board has not disagreed with any of the recommendations and have accepted them.

And I know in the IANA issues working group list, Olivier you flagged a concern at the end of your long message about the bylaw changes that have been requested in the past.  I have actually looked into those issues, and flagged it for the Board's attention at the LA meeting this year, and essentially the text for bylaws for the Board to review and approve was scheduled for January next year, based on ATRT 2.

I know it took a long time, and I don't quite know why.  I'm still looking into that.  But their holding back, staff is holding back on that process because there is the interaction between the changes in the bylaws with what the CCWG is proposing.  And so we have to wait for what the bylaw text that are coming in from changes in accountability with what the ATRT 2 had been recommending.

And that's really unfortunate, but that's where we are now.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Thank you. I've got a couple of points that don't require comments on many of them, but you can choose to should you wish. But I'll go through them in a row. On the definition of global public interest, there was a really good session at the IGF, and the conclusion out of that session is, we probably do not want a formal definition.

We may want a process, but committing to a formal definition, which is what the CCWG report supports and what the Board comments support, I think is a really bad idea, to be quite candid. In terms of the thresholds on, you said you do not support lowering the thresholds, the ALAC actually has had a concern for quite a while that we are making something so rigid, that ICANN will not be able to evolve if it needs to.

And in fact, we support lowering the threshold for the fundamental bylaws. It is till different from a regular bylaw, in that it requires positive community action, but requiring a very hard threshold may well make it impossible to change ICANN when necessary.

So you might want to consider that. In terms of the counts that Olivier raised, the 16 80% do in fact work as we grow the number of ACs and SOs. At the CCWG accountability meeting last night, however, the representative from the ASO said the ASO was going to be meeting to talk about ratifying the report and whatever, and will decide whether the ASO is going to participate or not.

So it is still an open issue on whether they will or not, and in fact, your 60 and 80% do not work if we drop down to four. Because 80% of four is four, rounded up, which means it would require, any of the fours

require unanimity, which is against the standard principle. So you may want to reconsider that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Can I respond?

ALAN GREENBERG:     Sure. Well I've done three now, so why don't you respond to those? To the extent that you want to, and then I'll go on with my other three.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Okay. I personally think that those are valid concerns on the global public interest. The pressure has been so great from the community side to get to a definition of the public interest, or the global public interest, that the Board feels that if that's what the community wants, then we would go along with that, but we would want to be a part of that process. If you feel differently that it should not be defined, the global public interest itself, and that there should be more defined of a process, if you could get that through the community discussion and get an alignment on that, I think the Board will be more than happy to go along with it.

On thresholds, I think that's definitely an issue. I need to look into that again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. The Board in its comments made a reference to, for removal of individual directors, the chair of the appropriate AC and SO does take some sort of action, and for NomCom directors, the chair of the NomCom. I don't think that was well thought through. If the ALAC and At-Large is trying to remove you as a director, it makes complete sense to have me as the target representative putting the case forward.

If the community wants to remove a NomCom director, it makes absolutely no sense to put that upon the chair of the current NomCom, who may have had no responsibility in appointing that person, and in fact, whose job is to name people, and may have absolutely no reason to want to get rid of the person.

So I think using the chair of the NomCom is the wrong answer there.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Do you have a suggestion?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. One of the AC SO leaders who is trying to get rid of them. You know? Pick one. Whoever signs the first petition. In terms of the IRP and conflicting panel decisions, one of the ALAC has been, although we supported the concept, there is no outcome which goes along with it. The only outcome of an IRP can say, ICANN violated this bylaws.

In asking for it, the answer was, well if there is ever a future policy where there may be panels, that policy would have to set forward what kind of outcomes the IRP could give on that. So in other words, the IRP could only be used in some future policy where it is carefully defined

how conflicting panel decisions would be handled.  That really maps very close to what you're saying.

Except you're saying it shouldn't be the IRP, they're saying if it's the IRP, we better tell the IRP how to act.  So I think those two are actually very much in line with each other.   And lastly on the ATRT bylaw requirements saying that advisory committee advice had to be answered, because that's all it said, I really think it's a black mark on the Board that you set around for a year and a half and not doing it, and now say we have to wait for the CCWG.

The ATRT actually gave you bylaw words.   It could have been implemented right away once it was accepted.   So I think it's really shameful.  That's all.  I'm done.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:       Once the Board, sorry I'm going to comment on that.  So I think the ATRT 2 recommendations the Board approved and send it to staff to actually come back with a work plan for implementing it.  For some reason, it took quite a bit of time.  And while I was on the Board, this didn't really come up.  It wasn't, you know, there was a schedule in place, and everything in terms of progress was really on schedule.

It's on track for implementation.  I need to look into that, and we haven't had time to actually do that because of all of the CCWG stuff, but it's on my list Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it all comes back to the tracking and regular reporting on status of ATRT recommendations has been exceedingly poor. And this is just an easy example, because it's just got to have been the easiest ATRT recommendation that has ever been made to implement. [CROSSTALK] Olivier, your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I was going to just alert you that during its General Assembly in Dublin, EURALO has held a session discussing the paper on the [inaudible] public interest. It has decided to, just an hour ago, that it was going to now share this with the other regional At-Large organizations, with the aim of putting together some kind of a working group that will look at perhaps not defining the public interest, but certainly studying it and finding the definition is in the possible within the ICANN and At-Large context. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Alan, a thought just occurred to me. You might want… Well the ALAC and the At-Large would come up with its own response to the CCWG, you might also want to come up with a direct response to the Board's comments. You could do that either as a statement that you send, or a letter that you send directly to the Board.

And that will be an effective way of communicating your views and concerns.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Certainly I could do that, I'm not sure we have the bandwidth for the ALAC to do that.  In the past, I have on occasion said things to the ALAC then supported, it could happen that way.  I actually haven't read the Board documents completely yet.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Please do.  Some of the rationale is pretty good.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Anybody else?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     It has been a tough week.

ALAN GREENBERG:     No kidding.  Anyone else?  We've used up the half hour, actually we used up 30 of the 20 minutes we gave Rinalia.  I keep on saying Olivier for Rinalia and vice versa.  I don't know why, they are not at all alike.  Anybody else would like to comment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you.  I can imagine it's very confusing, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.  But both Rinalia and Olivier are [inaudible] in so many ways. That said, with humor in my voice, I think there is a significant proportion of the Board comments, Rinalia, that would fit comfortably with your community.

But there are one or two that those of us who have worked long and painfully hard in the CCWG whilst in our heart of hearts may be far more [inaudible] view than you'll ever realize, know damned well that if we give you that, we will lose, for example the GNSO as supporting it. And that does put the CCWG in a very difficult situation, but more disastrously in my view, purely and personally biased here.

I would suggest more importantly than even putting the transition in jeopardy, is what that will do to the multistakeholder model, and ICANN's processes.  And I want the Board to take that very, very seriously.  Because I can assure you, that those are the sort of work in hammer and tong on behalf of our At-Large community, within, even if we don't necessarily disagree and sing Kumbaya together.

We are moving in a singular direction and that's for the very good.  But we also are pragmatic and sensible enough to realize, when we are done with our deal.  And some of these points are over the line, and some are perilously close.  They may be tweaked back, we may find ways that are meeting the Board's terms and still not having sufficient [inaudible] going on in at least one of the support organizations.

To cause a lack of support, and in fact a rejection, not just a silence on it.  And to that end, Alan, I just wanted to bring this meeting's attention

recent correspondence on the non-commercial stakeholder group list where there is a serious call to have the GNSO vote against supporting the CCWG draft, final draft, and not support it as it goes forward.

And one of the crimes, of the, what I actually think is a very good draft document, is the daring of getting any form of an equivalent, as part of the community to [inaudible] advisory committee. And that's very close to some of the arguments and debates that some of us have held very strong, and very early on in our CCWG.

So we are about to enter some very slippery slope territory, and I just think that this group but more importantly the Board, also needs to be very aware of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Cheryl, can you comment on which of the items of the Board comments would jeopardize GNSO support?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     The veto of the budget issue, just off the top of my head. Having read that email with horror while I was on my 3 AM call this morning, that's one that sticks. But there are several points. Any effect of community power not being as [inaudible] and there was significant issue with the Board's approach to human rights.

Again, don't do anything until a little bit later, which some of us have absolutely no problem with at all, as long as the commitment is there for work stream two. But that is seen at least by more than significant, and these are not your usual rabble rousers, all right? These are not

your usual suspects names on the non-commercial stakeholder group as their redline.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you for the heads up and for the alert. I will relay that message and I will review the transcript of this call to make sure that I don't miss any of that.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Rinalia, Cheryl here. Of course, the list should be archived and staff should be able to give you access to that list discussion.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Just for the record. In general, the transcripts of these calls don't come out quick enough for you to do anything with it. You may actually note that we just had this discussion at… One hour and seven minutes into the call. Anybody else? Olivier is that a new hand or an old hand?


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And it's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Go right ahead.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you.  So on the topic of human rights, it is worth noting that a cross community working party has been in operation for the most of, I would say, mainly one year now.  And have been populated mostly by people in the non-contracted party, specifically in the non-commercial stakeholder group.

So it's quite fair to understand that this is a very strong issue.  I personally don't have any problem with the issue, as you [inaudible], and in fact I have taken part in some of the discussions.  But it is something that needs to be worded very clearly.  The only concern I have, and Alan has shared with us, is putting in the bylaws a deadline for the language, for specific language on human rights to be in the bylaws.

So if we miss the deadline, what happens then?  Particularly that ICANN is breaking its own bylaws.  A particularly serious problem if that was the case.  On the issue that Cheryl raised about the noise regarding advisory committee, I didn't quite understand what she said there maybe.  Your voice was a bit muddled Cheryl.

Did you say that there was concern about the advisory committee being on the level as the supportive organizations in the community powers group?  Is that what you meant.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Okay.  Well this is, it's Olivier speaking.  This is something which has been voiced a number of times by representatives from the non-commercial stakeholders group.  And it doesn't appear to have gained much traction elsewhere.  I'm not quite sure, because if it's a redline for them, I think we've also made it clear that it's a redline for us…

ALAN GREENBERG:      Olivier, let Cheryl speak please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Cheryl for the record.  What I suspect that some of the horse trading has been done, and those usual suspects who you and I are referring to as having raised these issues before, are now managing somehow to garner some not significant support including from people who, for example, admirably led some of the workshops break out activities of the CCWG dealing with the dismissal of the Board.

And so these are your usual suspects for now raising a redline complaint.

ALAN GREENBERG:      Cheryl, let's be blunt about this.  If they can get enough support for the whole GNSO to reject it, the ALAC will have no trouble us rejecting if we don't get parity.  And heaven knows what the GAC would say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    And I have absolutely no problem, as you know, we've always said that is a redline.   But we have significantly fewer redlines that we've declared throughout the process that being one of them.  There is, you know, over pile growing, we aware of it.


ALAN GREENBERG:    It becomes even more interesting if the ASO chooses to not participate, and then we have the two registry, and in effect, it will be business organizations, versus the ACs.

Let's just decide we threw away the last year and go on with our lives.  He said, not quite jokingly.

Anything else for Rinalia?

Thank you Rinalia.  You're welcome to stay with us if you like, or…


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    I'll stay with you.


ALAN GREENBERG:    Good.  All right, then the…  Yes Olivier.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    I still have a questions.  Thanks very much Alan for this.  So, I just have a question regarding this, because obviously the overall proposals have to go through the Board to then be sent over to NTIA.  Now, Rinalia has

mentioned that the suggestions which are made there, and mark a suggestions appear to be redlines from the Board, which means that if there is no acceptance by the CCWG, then we have a problem.

What's the anticipated process going forward from here? Because clearly the CCWG will take comments in. I've had trouble understanding the process of the CCWG in accepting comments and having enough time to incorporate them in the proposal. And if the, well, it's ultimately this redline from the Board is particularly important.

Is there a negotiation that is expected to take place between the Board and the CCWG? Is there any view as to how this can move forward while still respecting the deadlines that we have set? Remembering that the deadline is for mid-January, isn't it? Mid-January, things have to be sent out for approval by the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, and also, I guess, approval by the Board.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Okay. Can I respond Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:     Sure.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     So that was why the Board sent out its early response, in response to the 15th November summary, it sent out an alert, it sends out here is the area of concern, and then it followed up after the 30th November document, with detailed comments on here are the concerns, here is

why there are concerns, who are some suggestions in addressing those concerns. We're not wedded to those suggestions. We're open to alternative solutions, but the concerns need to be addressed.

And in the Board response, there is a cover letter from Steve Crocker that says that we are responding with a view, base now a resolution on, in October of 2014. And that resolution outlines the procedure and principle when considering the CCWG working group recommendations on enhancing accountability. And it entails basically…

Do you want me to go through the steps of that outline?

ALAN GREENBERG:            No, please…

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:       Okay. Essentially it involves the Board looking at the final report submitted by the CCWG, and then taking a vote to see whether or not it's fully endorsed or has issues. It requires a two-thirds majority of the Board to say that the recommendation is not in line with the global public interest, and then it has to initiate a dialogue with the CCWG to determine, you know, what needs to be done.

And essentially it needs to go back and forth until there is agreement. And what I was trying to flag earlier in my introductory comments is that this process could put the transition at risk, because of the timeline for the political window on acceptability with the US administration.

So have a look at the details of that resolution. It outlines the process, and it won't be pretty for everyone once we get there.


ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia, Steve's letter mentions that. In the actual text of your document, however, you invoke the 14th or whatever the date is, of October only in reference to a few things, not in every one of them. [CROSSTALK]


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: …areas of concern.


ALAN GREENBERG: Well, which implies those are the redlines, not everything.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: But we basically agreed to everything else.


ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. You have a lot of other, we'd like to see things change where you don't invoked that [inaudible]…


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Right, so basically there is a degree of seriousness, and the ones that I highlighted as the five are the real serious ones.

| | |
|---|---|
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Okay. Let me ask you another question since we don't have a lot of other hands up at this point, we still have a few more minutes. The ALAC has identified a number of other very specific problems with the mission. I mean, we have an overall concept, saying we think so many things are being changed that nobody can understand what the second order and the interactions are going to be between them, but we have some very specific ones. |
| | For instance, saying that ICANN must rely purely on market pressures, the market conditions and not have any discretion on these things. Is the Board saying all of the mission changes need to be rethought? Or is, and you're not approving them as, you don't agree to them as such? |
| | Because it wasn't clear from my very brief reading of the document, if you were referring only to the ones which talked about, you know, content and stuff or if you're talking about all of the other ones that are scattered with the mission and commitments. |
| RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: | I think in the Board comments, we provided language that we felt was appropriate. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | You provided language for one of them. |
| RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: | Yes, but on the, I agree that on the content regulation bits and the enforcement of contract bits, we only offered principles. So there is no |

specific language because the thinking is that this is going to go as guidance or instructions for the lawyers that will be doing the drafting.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay, but let me give you a specific example.  There is one thing right now which says that were feasible and appropriate, ICANN will let market pressures rule.  Or something akin to that.  Okay.  That were feasible and appropriate has been dropped.

When we asked why, the answer was because ICANN doesn't have the competency to make decisions on competition.  We simply refer things to outside agencies.  That was from Becky Burr.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Who responded?  Okay, that's ICANN.  That's…

ALAN GREENBERG:          No, when we asked the CCWG why they were removing the phrase, that was the answer we got.  I'm looking, and the answer continued saying, that if you look that the [R SEP] procedure, the procedure by which registries could get exemptions to their contract, it explicitly says we refer things to outside agencies.  That's the example which justifies the removal.

When I looked at the [R SEP] procedure, it's proceeded, sending outside entities is proceeded by three steps, where ICANN legal tries to decide is there a competition issue or not.  And if there is no competition issue, which is generally the case, it goes ahead.  But that indeed is saying

ICANN is making judgements on competition issues.  You know, if they think this is a serious problem, they refer it to somebody else.  But they make the first judgment call.

Those steps will probably be illegal and against the bylaws under the new bylaws.  And I worry that the Board doesn't seem to be concerned with some of those things.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Actually, it's not about being concerned, but our discussions have not gone into the specifics of that.  And if, and I think that it may be worthwhile for you to raise that.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Hey, I've sent copies to you, that's all I can do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    I've read it, but it has to go to the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Well [CROSSTALK]…  Consider this notice.  Okay.  We have 10 more minutes in the call, and I have another call, we have another call starting immediately after this one.  I still don't think I have resolution on the issue I raised at the beginning of the call, and that is, what should be in this ALAC statement to the public comment period?

I do not feel comfortable accepting emails and I, Alan Greenberg, have to judge how much support there is for this idea, should I put something

in or should I leave it out?  And tell whoever it is that commented, sorry you're the only one who feels that way, there are only two of you or only three of you feel this way, that's not enough of a critical mass.  I really don't feel comfortable.

This group did decide at one point, that this statement would be something that basically identified our redlines, not everything that people still had problems with.  And I really need direction from this group as to how to continue drafting this statement.  There is only so many hours in my day, and I'd like to use them effectively.  Does anyone here have any opinions?

Olivier you always have opinions.  Cheryl you always have opinions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:          You go first Olivier.  I let you do all that I'm going to say.  It's Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG:              The former chair has no opinion.  We yield to the former chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      I've got my hand up, I'm waiting to be given the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:              You were given the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, sorry, a misunderstanding.  Olivier speaking.  With regards to the process, I wonder whether we should have a poll maybe on the issues that people are raising, and people can say plus one or minus one on them, see if there really is much support.  The concern that I have is that it's only a very small subset of people now that are really understanding all of the issues because they followed this since the very beginning.

So getting lots of support, or lots of opposing points is going to be hard, at this stage, and you're really going to have to make the call yourself, I guess.  [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:     Let me give the group an example…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     …members of the working group that are here.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Let me give…  Well not everybody unfortunately.  Let me give an example.  The suggestion has been made that we demand that the threshold for removing the entire Board be increased so it requires unanimity.  That is we are no longer saying we will allow, essentially we will allow anyone to veto it, and it requires complete unanimity of the community.

I don't think that has a chance of being accepted by the CCWG.  That's an opinion.  Whether I think it's a good idea or not, and I did support

the idea at one point, I do not think it has a chance. Do we really want to put that in as one of our redlines?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Alan, it's Olivier speaking. We could. There are two ways to play this game, and if one is going to indulge in horse trading, that could be one of the horses.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:    Yeah. I agree with Olivier. We need to see what is our redline we want to write, and whether it's a redline we really want. And that's maybe two different things.

ALAN GREENBERG:    How do we determine a redline if one person says it and a new real redline?

That was a question for you Sébastien.

No, we have lost Sébastien, he has dropped off. Cheryl, your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you. Cheryl for the record. And I have a huge electrical storm over me, so I can do nothing about crackling or the background noise. Look, I think a poll is a wise way of going forward. We can, we started

off, we did some quick survey work with some other material earlier on in our process. I can't see why we can't do some quick survey work with what can be extracted as clear and enduring concerns, such as the equity in the community powers system of all of the ACs and SOs who are engaging in it, versus the, you know, I will come up with something tomorrow morning and throw it to the list one.

You could say that to get on to that poll, we would have to have support by at least one other person. But to be honest, you'll probably get people who will just do that pro forma for the sheer fact that they're nice, or democratic, or both. Me being neither, that doesn't bother me.

So I suppose you probably want to decide if you're going to poll, do this poll everything or do you say, here are the clear and absolutely unambiguous issues which we have discussed, agreed upon, and known all along as a majority, and here is a bunch of stuff that people, one or more, have put forward as concerns, vote them up or vote them down. Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:     My only problem that is that 24 hours from now, to the moment almost, we are starting our first webinar talking about what is in our statement. [CROSSTALK]

We don't have an awful lot of time to do polls.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     You're going to get engage people, then you know?

ALAN GREENBERG:     All right.  Maybe those webinars are where we ask the questions.  Okay, we have four minutes left in this meeting.  Cheryl your hand is still up, or is that a new one?


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Not a new hand, it is my inability to [inaudible] and manage the AC room at the same time.  I apologize.


ALAN GREENBERG:     Now you see here is my confusion.  Despite the fact that I have mastered world time, my birthday reminder said your birthday is tomorrow, forgetting that it is tomorrow for you.  Happy birthday Cheryl.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Aw, happy birthday Cheryl.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you all.


ALAN GREENBERG:     Someday I really will master this world clock.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     I've got to tell you that my caramel cake and my [inaudible] is not going to cook itself guys, so I've just got to get on with the job.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Can I be invited?  I love duck.  [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Let me just jump in.   Ladies and gentlemen, it's Olivier speaking.   I believe we've finished agenda items four and five.  I'm concerned about not the world clock, but the clock that is running for this call.  We've got three minutes until the end of it…

ALAN GREENBERG:     In that case, I'll turn the call back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I've noted that Sébastien has put his hand up, so let's have Sébastien and then we'll have to close the call.  Sébastien Bachollet.

I'm afraid we can't hear Sébastien now.

Unfortunately, Sébastien we're unable to hear you.   There must be connectivity problems or something.  I guess in the meantime, whilst we work out if we can have Sébastien speaking, I'd like to remind you of the webinars that are going to take place.

Terri is on the ball, she is putting the links to those webinars Wednesday, that means tomorrow for most of us, at 20:00 UTC.  There

is a webinar of the cross community working group on accountability, and then there are two more webinars. So the first one is organized on the cross community working group on accountability that will actually provide full details of the proposals.

The one that will take place a couple of hours later is an actual At-Large briefing on the ALAC response to the CCWG accountability proposal. And this webinar will be repeated, is it 12 hours later? 11 hours later, now 13 hours later on Thursday the 17th of December. And we'll hopefully be able to collect all of the input from the community.

Sébastien, are you able to speak?

I'm totally unable to hear Sébastien Bachollet. That problem on technical things. We have one minute until the end of this call, I'm not quite sure, it's going to be tough.

So I'm really sorry Sébastien, I'm going to have to end this call, but we do have those webinars and discussion briefings that will take place both on Wednesday and on Thursday. So thanks to everyone for [CROSSTALK]…

Or send an email as well prior to this, that would be a good point also. Send an email prior to that. Thanks to our Spanish interpreter. And with this, this call is now adjourned. Thanks very much.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**