
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have a number of things to discuss. And we might as well start.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin at this time then.

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 Monday the 1st of February 2016 at 15:30 UTC.

On the call today we have Seun Ojedeji, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Sébastien Bachollet, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Harold Arcos.

Joining us a little later in the call will be Tijani Ben Jemaa.

We have apologies listed from León Sanchez and Loris Taylor.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters today are Sabrina and Veronica.

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. I'll now turn it back over to you Olivier.

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier speaking. Have we missed anybody in our role call?

Okay, looks like everybody is here. So today the majority of our call will be, yet again, the [inaudible] matters of CCWG accountability. And seen very little movement in the IANA stewardship side of things. And you will notice we also don't have any update on ICG, but I will ask Jean-Jacques Subrenat who has joined us if there is any ICG IANA coordination group update when we are dealing with CWG IANA stewardship.

Are there any other amendments or additions to the agenda?

I don't see anybody putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as is. There was a, as far as the action items are concerned from last week, there was just one about a Doodle, that's been done. So we pretty much have an idea of where we are going to have calls next week. And so let's move swiftly to cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition.

And I'll ask [inaudible] turn over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat to provide us with any update from the IANA coordination group, if there are any, since our last call. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques speaking. No. As I put on the chat, there has been, to my knowledge, nothing new to report on the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. Now with regards to IANA stewardship transition is concerned, there isn't much either on this occasion. I certainly haven't noticed any specific discussions that go further than what we provided an update about last week, I open the floor for anybody else on that working group to let us know if they have found anything, perhaps in some of these sub working groups that have been working off the main mailing list.

Oh, it's Olivier speaking. It looks as though everyone is waiting for progress in CCWG accountability, and hence, we'll swiftly move to this. And for this part of the call, we have Alan Greenberg on the call, who will be able to take us through some of the questions that are arriving before us including, I'm told, it will be a very interesting way of doing this, a vote.

Alan will take you through this. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier. Yeah, we will get to that. Actually we'll get to that... Where is it? That's number two on our agenda. Number two on the sub-bullets of this agenda. The first item is just to report back, there was, we did finally have the discussion on... Let me give an overview, first of all, we seem to be making progress in a number of areas, both ones that are not controversial, we're ticking off items one by one.

And that looks like it may well continue. The Board has come back with some answers on things that may, not upset that a little bit, but may require a few things to be re-thought. But nothing that it seems to be

really crucial, at least of the ones I've read, and I must admit I haven't read all of them yet. On the first item though, GAC as a participant in the community mechanism, you will recall that a number of people specifically in the GNSO have objected to the GAC acting as a participant, which would mean they... We would be...

If they weren't, we would reduce the total number of ACs SOs to four, and that would have all sorts of implications. There has never been a huge groundswell of support for that, but it has come up on a regular basis. We did have a substantive discussion on it, and I believe the decision was made, I think a final decision, but I won't swear to that, that we will not go forward with it.

That will, of course, result in a, likely in a minority report from at least some people within the GNSO. And so, that seems to have been put to bed, which is a good thing from my perspective anyway. By the way, if anyone has, disagrees with what I'm saying or I've got it wrong, then let me know.

Olivier, I see your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And having spoken to several GNSO counselors, I think the concern has primarily come from many of the participants that come from the GNSO. And although you're saying the issue might have been put to bed in the CCWG, the question then becomes as to whether it is a redline issue for any of the GNSO stakeholder groups.

Have you had any feedback or indication of that being so?

ALAN GREENBERG:

My understanding is that the only stakeholder group that has made a formal statement on this is the NCSG. I presume that has not changed, and I presume they would vote against it, if a formal vote is taken on a recommendation by recommendation basis. I presume. That may or may not be the case.

That being said, I don't think there was sufficient support in other parts of the GNSO, so presuming the NomCom appointee on the non-contracted parties house does not support the NCSG, then the, a vote to reject that recommendation would not go forward. At least that's the way I read it.

Who is the NomCom appointee on the non-commercial side? Do we know what their position is?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Would it be Carlos Guiterez? Maybe? I can't remember.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If it's Carlos, than I presume he will not support the NCSG. It's something we may want to look into, but I don't think that is an issue. That's my presumption however.

Okay. Seeing no more hands. So that issue is, I think, put to bed from the CCWG's point of view. My gut feeling is even if the GNSO were to

vote against that one, it would not have a substantive impact. There is clearly no way that disenfranchising the GAC would work going forward. Now the NCSG is adamant that if, when this goes to Washington, giving the GAC the franchise, so to speak, will kill the proposal, kill the transition.

I don't believe that is the case, but clearly we will not know until the cards are all laid down. The next item on our agenda is the infamous recommendation 11 stress test 18... Yes, go ahead. Sorry, I see hands. My apologies. I'm not keeping an eye on that part of the screen. I don't know who was first, Olivier or Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Olivier can go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Eduardo and thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. I just wanted to correct myself from what I said earlier. Carlos Guiterez is GNSO council, NomCom appointee without a vote. The person in the non-contracted parties side is Joe [inaudible], one of the newly appointed NomCom appointees.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know nothing about him. Do you know his background?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Joe [inaudible] was the first and well known, in the past, to have put together the first anonymous service on the Internet, anon dot PE Net dot FI, it's from Finland. There was a story about this, back in the day. So yeah, I have no idea about his voting intentions...

ALAN GREENBERG: That would indicate some, not affiliation, but some similarity and views to at least some people on the NCSG. Well, interesting. I don't have a clue what that means, and I don't think I want to hypothesize in public. Eduardo, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Alan. I'm curious and [inaudible], you mention something about the GAC de-franchise versus franchise. Can you tell me what that is? Because I'm not really sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, right now the GAC is listed as one of the five ACs and SOs, that would be allowed to participate in the various community powers that we're talking about. And the proposal was that the GAC should not. That governments should not participate in the overall management of ICANN, and therefore they should not be a participant, as the three SOs and the ALAC presumably would be.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. So that's what I understood. Right now the Board bylaws is obligated to take GAC advice into account when they make a decision, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but we're not talking about that. That's the whole issue. The statement has been, the claim has been since the Board must preferentially look at GAC advice, they're not forced to take it, but they must use certain processes to address it, the GAC should not have additional powers of being able to act as a participant in the various community powers.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So actually we're onto the issue of GAC advice, and how that is handled. The proposal on the table, that is the one in the third draft that we have already said that we are largely silent on, but we will certainly agree with it, because well, the proposal says that in order for the GAC advice... Right now the bylaws say if the GAC gives advice, capital A advice so to speak, that if the Board chooses not to follow it, they will then take a certain path forward.

Essentially negotiation discussion with the GAC to see if they can find a common way forward before absolutely rejecting it. That is a process they're not required to take with the other advisory committees. The change that was claimed to have been required by the NTIA, and the

NTIA has confirmed this, is that in order for that advice to be accepted by the Board, the advice must be formulated based on the current GAC definition of consensus.

And that definition is a belief, the GAC making a decision in absence of formal objection to the decision. Now the term formal objection is not defined, but it has been, in the past, taken to mean if any participant and any government participating in the GAC says, "I do not agree that this should go forward as advice," then it doesn't.

Governments, on occasion, are silent, and are saying, I'm not objecting to it. I'm not supporting it either, but I'm not objecting, in which case it can go through as formal advice. So the requirement was that even though the GAC was allowed to change its definition of consensus, even if it changed the definition of consensus, the old definition would have to be used for giving advice.

The GAC has basically agreed to that, although initially... When this was initially discussed, it was, it appeared that they would not agree to it. This seems to be more inclination to agree to it now, it's not a formal decision of the GAC. If, for the Board to reject, there has to be a super majority of the Board objecting. Similar in, well identical in numbers and similar in concept to the Board rejecting recommendations from a GNSO, or ccNSO PDP.

That has been objectionable to a number of people on the working group, and specifically large parts of the GNSO have said they will not accept an increase in the threshold needed for the Board decision. Jean-Jacques, I see your hand. I just want to finish the description and

then I'll go to you. An objection was raised by the intellectual property constituency, that the wording of saying the Board must vote with a two-thirds majority, adds the requirement to vote.

Before it just said, the Board must come to a decision. Our lawyers have clarified that under Californian law, the only way that the Board can come to any decision is to vote. So hopefully that objection was killed. And there seems to have been, there has been a deadlock between those who said let's go forward and get those approved, and those that said the two-thirds majority is absolutely unacceptable.

That brings us to Thursday. And we had a long discussion, and it was quite clear, we were not going to come to closure on this. Since then, the co-chairs have decided to have a poll of members, and I'll note that in some of these issues, participants, those who are not formally representing chartering organizations, have been very vocal in this. A formal poll, this is the first time in the history of the CCWG and the CWG for that matter, that polls which are allowed under the charter might be taken.

That a poll will be taken whether we accept the wording in the third draft proposal or not. Now, there has been some discussion of whether a poll is a vote. My understanding is it's largely semantic, but if we called it a vote, it would be a binding decision, whereas a poll simply gives the co-chair some idea of the tone in the room.

Which is not necessarily as binding and does not commit them at the same level as if we called it a formal vote. So it's a subtle difference perhaps. Since then, the suggestion has been that instead of saying a

majority, or a super majority, 67, 66 and two-thirds percent, that we use the number 60%, which is sort of halfway between the two. For reasons I can't quite explain, this seems to have great support.

So this may be a way forward. In parallel with that, there was another recommendation made that the double dipping of the GAC, so to speak, be controlled by saying, if the Board chooses to not follow GAC advice, and there is a community action against the Board because of it, the GAC cannot participate.

So the GAC cannot over, try to override, or try to influence the outcome of a community decision that is attempting to override its recommendation. There is some logic to that, and I don't know how much traction there is. So those two ideas, perhaps in combination, may be a way out of the problem we're in within the GAC, the recommendation 11 on the GAC.

Now, that being said, it's still not clear that the GAC is in a position. The GAC is so divided on this, it's not clear the GAC would necessarily come up with a formal opinion on recommendation 11, even if we make these changes, but it may well remove the GNSO objection. And I for one don't see any problem with either of those changes.

And I'll go to the queue now. We have Jean-Jacques and then Olivier.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Alan. That was a very interesting expose. If I may just say a few words about the GAC aspect. Of course, I'm not a member of the GAC and I can't speak for it, but just to give some context. I think that,

as a group, as a body, the GAC will not change its national relations. I think that they will do their utmost to bring into the GAC common practices of the multilateral world, which we inter-governmental, and GAC is one of them.

So I think that when you say formal requests and formal opposition, that means that any one country or group of countries, has expressed its opposition to any [inaudible], and of course, then it's clear that the GAC cannot make that statement or cannot support that particular decision, if there is even only one member of the GAC opposing it.

The other point you raise which I think is very interesting is about the Board, the 60% or 62 point something percent, having been on the Board I can say that it's quite difficult to cut Board members into little pieces. And I suppose that 60% simply seems, among the voting members of the Board, mathematically a safer way to determine if that is that majority. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for clarity, we do understand what formal objection means, but as I said, it is not a defined term. So various people on the CCWG have said, the GAC could redefine the term formal to mean something else to mean at least five countries disagree and essentially turn everything back.

So that is an escape hatch should the GAC decide to it, they're not likely to, but I'm just pointing out that the use of the term formal, although understood, is not formally defined. With regard to the voting thresholds, if the full Board is voting, that is all 16 members, a majority

requires nine, because it is not 50% but more than 50%, a super majority requires two-thirds, which is 11, and the 60% happens to divide that in the middle, and it's 10.

Now the implications, if the Board size or the number of Board members voting is different, varies a little bit, but essentially, it divides the difference, and it seems that it is a compromise, that just because it is a compromise may sell, even though it's not clear that there is a substantive difference between the two. The Board has, in general, on things like this, acted almost always either with a, in unanimity or close to unanimity.

So it would not make any real difference, which is why I never objected to the change. But it looks like it may make a difference to some people. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. And perhaps you will be able to help me. I seem to be stuck in this everlasting repeating time continuum where issues just turn up yet again on the table. And I thought that we had discussed this a while ago. In fact, there was a topic consultation back in 2014, which was proposed bylaw changes regarding consideration of GAC advice.

15th of August it started, 14th of September it closed. And the ALAC did produce, on the 12th of September 2014, produced a statement to that matter. So in whatever decision we reach, I think that we need to be quite aware that we have already commented about this. The point that we made specifically on the idea of changing the votes to a two-

thirds majority, which was exactly what that consultation was about, and which, by the way, the staff report, it says report overdue. The report was due on the 5th of October 2014, and that obviously went through the window somehow.

But the position we took there was moreover the ALAC observes a trend in the Internet governance ecosystem, that tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice, would add to this trend, that we consider undesirable.

So that's the point that we had. I'll point a link over to that comment, because I think it's important for us to bear it in mind in our response. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. Yes indeed, that was a recommendation. That recommendation came out of the joint Board GAC committee that was set up as a result of ATRT recommendations. And that Board GAC committee did make that recommendation. The community reaction to it, the negative community reaction to it amongst some parts of the community, was such that the Board said, sorry, okay, we're not going to do it.

In fact, it went further than that in that Fadi Chehadé in talking to Congress was asked on the issue about it, and he said that proposal was dead. And that proposal is indeed dead and was dead. This is, although it is certainly the same number, it is not a single proposal, but is part of an overall package.

And essentially, it was saying that the GAC is willing to give up the flexibility of changing its definition of consensus for advice, in exchange for this. So yes, it is identical to the bylaw change that we were talking about, but it is in concert with other parts.

And for some people, and certainly I'm among those, that makes it a different animal. You'll recall even when we made that, when that advice came out, I was not among the people who felt strongly about it, because in reality, I did not believe, as I don't believe today, it would make one iota of a difference in any actual decision.

But indeed, we did revisit that before, but it was standalone and not as part of the package. So yes, it is revisiting that. And my personal take is it is a reasonable change. It's a reasonable change because we all have to compromise on this, and it's a quid pro quo for the GAC to give them something in exchange of what they're giving up.

What they're giving up, I think, is a much larger thing that what they're asking in exchange, that's a personal view. However, all of that being said, the ALAC did decide that we are supporting the recommendation 11 as we went forward. You will recall that we said our discussion was, we really want to stay out of this discussion.

But we do want to ensure that whatever comes out of it, it's not going to veto the transition, and the only part of it that seem to be able to veto the transition was allowing the GAC to redefine its definition of consensus, which this now stops. So we have taken a position that we are supporting this, at odds with our decision two years ago, or a year and a half ago, whatever it was.

And I haven't heard anything that says we should revisit that, if indeed you believe we should revisit that and there are people who say we may want to object to any of this, you better speak up quickly because the five members on the CCWG appointed by the ALAC will participate in the poll tonight.

And that's going on in approximately 14 hours from now. So we do indeed need something. Jean-Jacques, was that a new hand or an old one?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, I'll put you in the queue.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. So thanks for all of this background, which is quite impressive, done from memory. So the question really is, if you believe that this... I mean, is it a bartering or something? The GAC is giving away some, the ability to change their

way to reach consensus in the future for this two-thirds majority. That would be...

That's a definite ALAC shift in policy, since in two years ago, we said we didn't think this was a good idea. And I do think that we need to discuss this quite carefully and be absolutely about what we do here, and perhaps ask for the personal point of view also from each one of the people that are voting on this.

I, by the way, looking at this, I don't think it's the biggest issue out there. So I'm not particularly inclined towards one way or the other, but it would be interesting to hear from the individuals, and I also do believe that maybe we need to really know in advance which way we are going to go, there within our community. Because those become important.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I have two people in the queue, I will make one comment. You asked a question. Is this bartering? The answer is yes. This is bartering. In my personal opinion, the GAC is given up something of substance for something that really is a token, and that's not particularly surprising. You have... Face matters in this business, and if you're going to give up something, then you have to be able to claim to your various bosses you've got something back.

And I think that's what this is. And if I were to compare the two on a relative scale, they just don't compare. So I would say, if it's on the table, then accept it quickly before it goes off the table. Sébastien asked in the chat is, what is the GAC position? We don't know. As I said

before, there is a good chance that no matter what we put, there were only going to be somebody in the GAC who will object to it, and as we have clearly said, a single and formal objection kills anything.

So it may well be that the GAC is not in a position to accept or reject this recommendation when it comes down to a formal GAC decision, we'll see. Seun, you're next.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you Alan. This is Seun for the record. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I just wanted to understand what, when [inaudible] GAC [inaudible] something substantial, [inaudible] explain the substantial thing that they're giving up to [inaudible]...? And the other comment or question is in relation the [inaudible] of ALAC. [Inaudible] question that was said by the [inaudible] of CCWG, where they were looking to go to [inaudible] those who actually object to the current [inaudible] in the draft proposal.

So do the members, the five members of [ALAC?] intend to object, or do they intend to be silence? Because they, or they intend to access the, support the proposal. There are two, three different... [Inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you Seun. The first question you said, what are...? What is it that the GAC is getting of substance? Or rather is giving up of substance? What they are giving up of substance is right now, the bylaws say if the GAC gives advice, then the Board must follow a certain process to reject it.

Currently advice from the GAC is to find according to their own principles, as the decision to go forward on something with no formal objection. And that is, if an issue is raised within the GAC to give advice, and no country objects to it, it is given as advice. If any country can object, if any country does object, then it is no longer advice.

That is the current status. There are some countries that believe, we think, because this is not a public discussion, that the GAC should be able to give advice based on other definitions of consensus. One of the definitions of consensus could be a majority of GAC members, for instance, or a super majority of GAC members.

You know, you can come up with all sorts of other ways, the ALAC, for instance, gives advice based on a majority, that's it. We don't have any rule that if a single ALAC member objects, then it gets killed. Our definition of consensus is majority, for a decision on whether to give advice or not.

So the GAC's definition of consensus may change. They are allowed to change it just as we are, and their process for changing it is well-defined, and in fact, the process for changing their definition does not involve consensus. That decision is made by a majority. So if a majority of the GAC decided to change consensus, they could.

What they're giving up in this new proposal is, they can change the definition of consensus, but it doesn't matter. How the Board reacts to advice depends on how the consensus was created, not on the current definition of consensus. So that is what they're giving up, and it is a very substantial thing.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry. This is Seun again. Can you tell me, what is [inaudible] of consensus within the GAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just told you. It is a recommendation to do something with no objection. So if we, if the ALAC used that definition, if the ALAC decided to do something, go out for dinner tonight, and you, Seun, objected, we would not go out for dinner, because a single objection is enough to kill off any decision.

So that is what they are giving up. You asked a second question, I can't remember what it is.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. The second question was in relation to the... This is Seun for the record. Was in relation to the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, okay, it's the poll. I now remember, okay. The co-chairs are taking a poll. They have said that how they tend, are going to measure

consensus is how many objections they get. There has been some people in the group, in the CCWG, objecting to that methodology, and it will remain to be seen whether they use that, so whether they count yeses, whether they count objections, or what they count, it's not clear.

But they have said that. I believe that the five ALAC members should make it clear how they plan to act, and in the absence of any strong indication from ALAC, or this group for that matter, that we should do something else, I plan to support it.

That is, if I'm asked whether I support it, I will say I support it, because that is the decision the ALAC made in December on how we were responding to the proposal. If they asked, am I objecting? I'll say no, I'm not objecting, because I believe the two are synonymous. And we have Cheryl's hand up for a very long time. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Alan. Cheryl for the record. And I put my hand up specifically to respond to Olivier's question [inaudible], which is what I'm going to do now. But I wanted to preface that by saying as someone who worked extremely long and hard on 18 from the very moment which was [inaudible]... 22, I think they were 24 start with, we narrowed them down to 22, [inaudible]...

Through to the compromise, which was on November 31st after additional hours of meeting and negotiation between government advisory committee and members and participants of the CCWG, and not just the [inaudible] but anyone who had declared an interest in the topic, where this compromise came through. I am also not objecting to

it, and indeed would care, support if that was the way the poll question was [inaudible]. Just while I have the microphone, however, Alan, and thank you for your very detailed and absolutely accurate review of all of these points, I just wanted to mention that there is still a small chance, and unfortunately it's a small chance because of a hold up of one particular part of the GNSO, and that's the non-commercial stakeholders group, but should we get sufficient traction on the compromise on this 60% solution that Alan articulate, and indeed some aspects which Beck has put recently to the list.

That if we get enough retraction with those in GNSO, clearly not the non-commercial stakeholders group, but the rest of them, and the government advisory committee, we may not need to poll. But I do think it's important that the five members should [inaudible] and [inaudible]... our clear on how they will be voting. That's how I will be voting.

It fits with the longstanding support of what stress test 18 and is now specifically recommendation 11. It also respects the compromise, if the compromise is a 60% solution, that's absolutely fine with me too. I have no problem with that, but with the rec 11 aspect of it is very, very important as far as I'm concerned. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have indicated on the list that I personally support the 60% solution also, and I suspected that the ALAC would as well, although clearly, we don't have a formal decision on that. By the way, the 60% suggestion came from Kavouss, the Iranian representative

on the CCWG. It sort of disappeared into the morass of comments, and Greg [inaudible] brought it up again, and raised visibility to the extent that people actually paid some attention to it.

And that has what it caused it to get some traction. And by the way, if there are any Sherlock Holmes fans among you, I'm presuming his subject line, the 60% solution was not accidental. If you don't understand that, I'll explain it later. I see Olivier's hand up, then I would like to call on Tijani and Sébastien, as two of the other formal members of the CCWG for your thoughts on that. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. It's Olivier. And that's exactly what I was going to ask. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani's hand is up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. I put on the chat that I also support the 60%. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well the question is not the 60%. The question is if the poll is taken, with the current proposal that is in the third draft proposal, are you supporting or objecting to it? Or would you remain silent? Because that's what the poll may be taken of, on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. I remember that we discussed that before and we said everything related to the GAC, we tried to not express ourselves. If this is the position I would abstain. But if the position is not that, if we changed our mind, I would support the proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: As was pointed out, the chairs may ask us, "Are you objecting?" In which case, what we decided before was silence. But remember, we did not quite say silence. We said, we don't have strong opinions on this, but we do require something that the NTIA will accept. And the NTIA has said, in no uncertain terms, that the change of... That the definition of consensus for advice must be changed.

So in light of the current recommendation 11 supporting that NTIA statement, I believe we have a mandate from the ALAC to say that we would support the recommendation. We did explicitly say in our answer, we support recommendation 11. There was an un-categorical yes to that. So I believe we do have a mandate, even if they ask for, are we supporting it? To say yes.

Because we're just echoing what was said in our formal approved statement. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I don't know if you can hear me, but I am in a very noisy environment. I have trouble...

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a bit of noise, not as much as when you joined us, when it sounded like there was, you were underwater. We can hear you and you're quite clear. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I ask the question about the GAC because as Tijani said, we, do we need to answer into this discussion if we don't know what the GAC is waiting too, because if we want to have a compromise for the community, we need a compromise including the GAC. Then it's something I am still puzzled as to why we need to vote on something that first one concern. The GAC didn't tell us what they think about.

Maybe we will disagree with them or we agree with them, but we don't know really. That's one of my trouble today. My second trouble is that we are taking one point and discuss it with this point in depth. And when we talk about win-win position, we, I have the impression that win-win, it's when GNSO and GAC, but we are a little bit outside of all of these game.

From a long time, I think ALAC advice needs to have much better consideration by the Board then it is today, and if we agree with that changes in the bylaw, we need to have some [tack?] for us too, and when I say us, I may say all of the ACs in addition to the GAC. But now regarding what I will say, the question is that, did you [inaudible] will say no?

If it's to agree, I don't think it's... Yeah, I will agree and I want us to, I have one caveat on that, look into the composition of the Board since few years now, whatever 60, 65, 70%. If there is objection, it's one, often it was me or another French. It's why the French are not [inaudible], or it's two people.

But it's not much more than that. And it's, they're not... In fact, there is no trouble with whatever percentage we take to have decision taken regarding the Board. I hope it was clear what I say. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Sébastien. A couple of quick comments. As chairing the meeting, I don't like to make comments on everyone, but I think a couple of the things you said have to be, just have to be enlarged upon. In terms of voting, I agree with you. Virtually all votes are either unanimous or close to unanimous on this kind of thing.

So I don't think it makes any substantive change, which is one of the reasons why I do not object to it. I agree that we should be in a different position with ALAC advice, but there is just no way to open that discussion at this point. It's just not on the table, and I think we're going to have to look to ATRTs to fix that problem.

In terms of the GAC position, the GAC in its statement, which they issues a week or so ago, was very clear. It said, it didn't say the GAC hasn't decided whether we're for or against recommendation 18, it said the GAC has not decided whether they are going to answer and state a position, and I believe that's because regardless of what

recommendation 18 says, recommendation 11 says, there are going to be some people on the GAC who will object to it. And as we know, the current definition of consensus in the GAC, is if anyone objects, they cannot say anything.

So I think if someone proposes to approve recommendation 11, someone will object. If the propose to reject recommendation 11, someone will object. So I think they're going to have to be silent on it. That's my take anyway. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Hopefully my audio is a little better for the interpreters now as well. Cheryl for the record. Just to respond a little bit additionally to what you just say, Alan, to the question Sébastien raised about what the GAC opinion was. In addition to what you just say about the remaining silence, which is an important theme when the GAC remains silent under the current definitions, is this, the GAC communique in Dublin, however, is very clear that it articulated the GAC desire for the two-thirds.

So that compromise had come, I think, from a fairly strong, if not unanimous, groundswell within the GAC and the situation that if we don't get away with the 60% compromise and [inaudible], if it goes to line, we're going to have a choice between, you know, a GNSO unhappy or a GAC unhappy.

Now maybe it will be, but the GNSO of course will be in a position to specifically on a recommendation by recommendation, line by line, support or lack of support system, not support rec 11, and it would be

more likely rather than not support rec 11, the GAC would be silent on it. So that's where we may be if the poll goes through and rec 11 is supported with the two-thirds being in it, and the GNSO won't be happy. It will go through without the two-thirds in it, then the GAC won't be happy.

But somebody [inaudible] 60% compromise as an obstruction. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. Two quick comments. The 60% idea came from Kavouss, and he's not a formal representative of the GAC, saying this is a GAC decision. It was just an idea that he tossed out, but it does seem to be getting some traction. That's number one.

Number two, in business and in our personal lives, it would be nice if we can make all decisions with full knowledge of how everyone else thinks and what the results are going to be because of it. Rarely do we have that ability. We are almost always making decisions where we don't have access to all knowledge associated with the issue.

And that's just like it is here. Have we closed this one? What I think I've heard... We've heard from everyone except León, and I'm pretty sure I know how León will react, that it sounds like at this point, short of someone giving us very strong feelings at the counter, that all five members would say do not object, if they were asked if they would object.

And if they are explicitly asked if they support, all five, I believe, would say they support. And that is exactly in line with the formal decision the ALAC took when voting on the response to the recommendation.

Seeing no more hands, hearing no voices, then we'll go onto the next item. The next item is indemnification of Board member removal. And this is the issue of, will there be a waiver? That is, Board members signing saying they promise not to sue anyone, if I am removed. Or the ICANN paying for indemnification that says, if we are sued, that we will not have to pay the cost personally.

The Board has said very clearly they would not accept a waiver, that is that would open things too much for people to say slanderous, libelous things with impunity, knowing that they, no one could object to it. But they were considering indemnification. The issue is on the agenda for tonight. I have not seen a response from the Board, a current response from the Board on that.

There may have been one. If the other people who are reading the mailing list more carefully than I am, knows there has been a formal response to the Board, perhaps you can fill us in. I haven't seen anything that I remember seeing. Nobody? All right. Then we'll see what happens tonight.

For me it's not a showstopper because it simply means that if there is no indemnification, that I can never imagine that an ALAC presided over by me would take any action, any action to remove a Board member. So it simply invalidates the power. We were never great supporters of the powers at the beginning, so saying the powers can't be used, I don't

think is going to cause us to reject the overall accountability proposal. It does, however, it may be a showstopper for other people. I don't know.

But we'll have to wait to see how that one unfolds at this point. Comments anyone? Questions? Seeing none, all right. Go ahead... Sébastien and Olivier. I'm not sure the order, go ahead, somebody.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I will start. Sébastien. Thank you Olivier. Just I agree with that we have to be very careful sometimes we, and when I say we, one of us or a few others, but we will have the possibility to remove the Board, or a member of the working group saying that, then we need to fix the power without being able to use the ultimate one, that is removing Board members.

And if we do so, then I think we will in better position for the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm sorry Sébastien. I didn't quite understand what you were saying.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

If we have a power, we can't take their side. And the one about the Board member, it's one of them, and it's viewed as nuclear power. The ultimate one we can use. It's not working sometime, people in the working group say, oh yes we will have the possibility to fix that in having a new Board.

And that's a loop where I hope we will not answer, because if we can't take now something, if not tomorrow we will fix it by having a new Board. I hope this is more clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Remember this applies to removing individual Board members as well as the whole Board. It's both powers.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And my question is, whether this issue might end up in the poll? Or is the whole working group pretty much okay with it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the working group is pretty much united. It's the Board that is objecting. I don't think there were any objections raised in the public comment to the requirement to either have a waiver or indemnification. Only a small number of people raised it, but all of those who raised it, agreed with us that said something was necessary. And the discussion within the ALAC, within the CCWG is such that I don't believe that anyone is objecting to it other than the Board.

Does that, Olivier does that address what you were asking?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So as I said, it's not a showstopper for me, but I believe it's a showstopper from using the power. And I'm assuming the Board will come through with indemnification of the committees or counsels that are going to participate in the process. And they had volunteered that already, that they would indemnify them for the statements they made in the written rationale for the removal.

It was pointed out that you can't have an active discussion on it in the community forum, as is required, if they are not going to indemnify those comments as well. So the last we heard is that they went back and consider it. I'm assuming they will agree, but we don't know for sure. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. At the beginning I was convinced that the waiver was a very good thing. But after the comments of the Board, I now understand why they are objecting, because if we do the waiver, they have real defamation. Real defamation, that the Board member that will be removed, will not have any court. So I think I understand their fear, but we need to find other things.

If they are ready to, they said they can [inaudible] or something [inaudible]. But it is not only about money. We may have a lot of problem. More than money. So I don't know how we will start it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. [Inaudible] the waiver, the waiver is dead at this point. So I tend to agree with you that a waiver might have opened things up too much, but it is dead, so any discussion over it is not useful. You're correct. Now indemnification says, they will cover costs. That does not necessarily say you don't get hauled into court and have time to put into it.

So I don't think we can address that. They can't... If you can be sued, there is no way anyone can cover your own personal time. They can compensate you for it, but that's about as much, as far as it goes. So I think we're stuck with that level of support. And of course, at any time in the future, should we decide to use the power, the people involved at the time will have to decide, is it worth the risk that is associated with it?

So that's part of the equation that would have to be taken at that point. Anyway, we'll see how it unfolds. I'm presuming the Board will provide indemnification and I'm presuming it will go ahead like that. And that's as far as we can do on that one.

The last item on the agenda is mission. And there are a number of issues that are currently open with the mission. The first one is the wording, the wording that was attempting to limit ICANN's ability to go into content and to exceed its scope, the scope of its mission.

The Board, we objected to specific terms within it. The Board objected to it on a more general case, that we shouldn't be trying to fine tune this and put too many words in it. The lawyers supported that, our lawyers supported the Board's position to a large extent. They didn't

quite say it in those words, but they essentially said if we tried to put very specific controls in, it will be difficult to write, it will be difficult to understand, and there will be loopholes. And people will be able to get around things, and they are more likely to get around things that way than if we have general terms.

So there seems to be some level of agreement, that we should put general terms in and obviously the Board, and later on an IRP or a court could interpret those terms. And that's the way you normally do it in a country's constitution or laws, that you put things in general and then interpret them.

I don't believe, and again I'm asking for correction if someone else can tell me. I don't believe we've seen actual proposed wording to do that, however. But I may have missed it. So I think that is still pending, but again, if I'm wrong, please point it out.

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I'm assuming that I'm not way behind the level of that one. The next item in the mission is the one we have raised on where feasible and practical, using, making decisions regarding competition.

Becky Burr's analysis was, we and one or two other people, objected strongly to the rule, of the where feasible phrase. Most people in the group don't seem to really care, and she was the only who really felt strongly that it had to be removed. Her current proposal is that in light of that, we put the phrase back but add some language in the description, talking about the fact that ICANN...

Those phrases allow us to ask questions, and to refer things to external authorities, but they do not necessarily put us in a position to make strong decisions regarding antitrust and competition. There has been some discussion on the list as to whether those specific words are appropriate.

Greg in particular claiming that we cannot say we don't have the ability, we don't have the skills to do things when it's something that only governments legally are allowed to do. And my comment on the list was to thank Becky for her flexibility, we would likely, I certainly and the ALAC would likely accept what she is proposing, and we'll let the lawyers and other people with more expertise on competition issues refine the words of the caveats of the additional statements.

So I think that's perfect, from my perspective. We did identify one more problem in looking at this, that in the next core value said that any place where we need to intervene in the market, that we should do it through a bottom up, multistakeholder policy development process.

As Cheryl recommended in our last meeting, last IANA issues meeting, I'm going to suggest that we eliminate the phrase policy development, and simply say a multistakeholder bottom up process. That is aligned with, for instance, how the interventions in the African strategy were developed. Certainly it wasn't through a GNSO policy development process, but it was through a bottom up multistakeholder process.

So I don't think there will be a strong objection to that. I hope there won't. And if there is, I know Cheryl and hopefully other people on this list will support me and I won't be standing all by myself. And that's all I

have to say on mission at this point. The floor is open to Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. It was just to thank you for the documents you sent after our last call to the CCWG list. It was very good and with all the arguments we discussed, and I would not be able to do such a good document, and it's also my reflection. And I fully agree. And I thank you again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well thank you Sébastien, and thank you and others for coming up with some of the ideas that I hadn't thought about at all, because it turns out there is actually benefit in people working together, and not everyone trying to do things all by themselves. So I was glad to write it up, and I thank everyone who contributed the ideas.

So sometimes this does work. And I think indeed, it was the thing that changed Becky's position, because some of the arguments we put in there were in fact pretty strong. And they were stronger than the ones we originally had raised in our formal comment, during the comment period.

So sometimes things work out. I have nothing else on my list of things to discuss on this particular, on accountability. There is a meeting at 6 AM UTC, 1 AM my time, only two hours this time, thank the gods of meeting length. And we'll see how that goes. I open the floor to

anyone else with any thoughts on accountability before turning it back to Olivier. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, thank you. My question now is, what is our feeling about timeline and the agenda? Because we are finished with two meeting a week of three hours, and we are starting again to have one meeting a week of two hours. That means that it may take some time to go to some conclusion. And what is our feeling?

Do you think that we will be done by Marrakesh? What is the current state on that? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I actually thought there was a meeting Thursday morning, but you're right, there doesn't seem to be. I thought one had been scheduled. The comment that somebody made, I can't remember if it was Thomas or someone else, was that if we are going to have approval in Marrakesh, we really need to publish... Marrakesh is the beginning of March, you'll remember.

We really need to publish pretty well near the middle of February, which gives us two weeks. I think we're witting away at most of the points, and we may actually get there. Remember, as we've been doing this, we are refining the language in the proposal.

So there is some editing to do to make sure that in general, we're changing the annex, the core document and the executive summary needs to be changed to correspond to it, but some editing work to be

done there. But to a large extent, when we finish the decisions, we finish the document also. So I think we may well be, it may well be possible to do it in that timeframe.

I thought there were two meetings a week, and I'm a little bit perturbed that there is only one. That's going to make it harder, but I may have a different feeling at the end of today's meeting, or tomorrow's meeting...

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Seun. I'll put you in the queue. Tijani is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I'd like to express my satisfaction with the last wording of the human rights commitments. That took into consideration all the comments I made by mail the last time. So now, I think we have something that may fly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Can you remind us where we are? Because I really don't remember what the last outcome was.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It was more or less, the one before with... They removed a single SO or AC or one or more SO or ACs, will formed the new CCWG, etc. Something... Now they are speaking only about CCWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. My recollection, however, is the Board is still objecting to any inclusion in the current bylaws, prior to the work stream two work completing. So that may not be fully settled yet. We may have decided, but the Board may be refusing to implement.

Now, we really don't know how the NTIA will handle a CCWG recommendation with a Board caveat saying we're not going to implement it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I am not sure it is the final position of the Board, because if you remember, Bruce said that when they took the decision to reject, or to say, no mention in work stream one was done a small group of the Board members, and he said that he will bring those discussions to the Board.

And they will have a meeting in Singapore soon. So I think it will change, because what we have now, if it is legally correct, I think it's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The concern of the Board, at least some members of the Board, is such that there is a worry that although the IRP may not be able to do

anything, courts could. And that was a concern. The meeting in Singapore is going on as we speak, or maybe almost over by now. So if we haven't heard yet, we probably will hear soon. Cheryl go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. It's Cheryl for the record. Regarding the Board's position, I've articulated before, the Board members I've been talking to are concerned about support [inaudible] if it is in the bylaws, I do believe that we should raise some hope that out of the Singapore meeting, the Board will come up with something that might be actually coming out of left of field.

That will be a solution. Note I'm not claiming a compromise. Note I'm not saying agreement. I'm saying a solution to the concerns of [inaudible] human rights to where many people believe it needs to be, but to not having it in the bylaws. So let's see what may or may not come out of the Singapore meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Seun, I believe you are in the queue.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you Alan. I just wanted to get your view about, is there any chance that some of the modifications that has been proposed, will warrant [inaudible] for public comment? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The question is, is there going to be a need for another public comment? There are some people who are saying the changes are substantial enough that they require public comment. In general, I hate to attribute motive when I'm just having to guess at it, but in general those are people who are objecting strenuously to some of the changes.

The position of the co-chairs and I think the majority of the CCWG at this point, is that according to the charter, we are not required to go out for public comment at this point. Obviously, we do need to accept input from the chartering organizations, and there may in fact be a short period where we have a window to do that, prior to a formal vote, but at this point, there is, the intent is not to have a public comment.

Will that change? It's conceivable. If we require a public comment, then the transition is gone. The window we have right now for transition is barely open, if it's open at all. We don't know if it's open. The NTIA, I believe has agreed to start the evaluation of the proposal while the proposal is still changing.

So their three month window, I'm presuming, is already opening to start the evaluation, even though we do not have a formal proposal. So that says there may still be an opportunity to do the transition this year. But if we have to go for a public comment, it's absolutely, definitely killed. So your guess is as good as mine as how it would really unfold, however.

Anything else before we turn it back to Olivier? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we have a hand from Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I was going to just alert you to the fact that apparently there is an intersessional, a GNSO intersessional that will take place, when is it? Next week or two weeks' time in Los Angeles. Were you aware of this?

ALAN GREENBERG: For the whole GNSO?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, this was a question...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought it was just for non-commercial stakeholder group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could it be the non-commercial? Maybe it was the non-commercial stakeholders group [CROSSTALK]. Everyone says it's GNSO intersessional...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier? This is Heidi. It is this week, and it is the non-commercial.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, all right. Thank you. That's all I needed.

ALAN GREENBERG: An interesting topic for a different discussion. All right, hearing nothing else, Olivier, I turn it back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And we are a little ahead with our timing today. We are now at number five, any other business. And the first question is, do we need another call this week? Now Terri has let me know that according to the Doodle, the most, the one with the most number of people would be Wednesday the 3rd of February at 20:00 UTC.

We wouldn't have Spanish interpreters because they are unavailable due to maintenance on their equipment. So that would be without interpreters, but this is only in 48 hours' time, or just over 48 hours' time. We need another call then, or can we wait until next week?

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

Tijani, you're muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much Olivier. I think that we have to avoid the meeting in 48 hours, because we are not, there is no pressure. Since we will have only one call of the CCWG during the week, which will be

tomorrow morning, I think that we may schedule it at the end of the week, by Thursday or by, I don't know, that's better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to ask a question to Cheryl, who is more tied into the co-chairs. Is it absolutely sure there is not a second call, there is not going to be a second call this week?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then I don't mind doing this Thursday, I prefer to avoid Friday. Friday is Saturday for some people, but Thursday is fine for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, why would you worry about having meetings on Saturdays? You have them at one, and two, and three in the morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I suggest the next meeting is on next Tuesday. I think it's quite good to have this meeting like Monday, just before and we know we can discuss what we will take positions the next day. And why not to wait for next Monday? Suggestion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can live with that also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm going to turn to Terri. I haven't got the Doodle in front of me, and Terri would know what options we had put on our calling schedules.

TERRI AGNEW: Olivier, this is Terri. The last Doodle we sent out was for a call today, the 1st, and the call on the 3rd. So if you would like a call other than Monday the 1st or Wednesday the 3rd, we'll have to send out a new Doodle for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's Olivier speaking. So there were no options for Thursday and Friday this week.

TERRI AGNEW: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well then perhaps if we can have options for this, this Thursday, this Friday, and next Monday, and then one can choose which one of the three days would be better. I certainly am very flexible with either of these dates, although I do recognize Monday, next week, will probably be the best time.

I don't know. Let's have a look. More hands in the queue. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. I don't have any difference between Thursday and Monday. So I can give either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You don't have...? Sorry. We didn't hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: He doesn't care about whether it's Thursday or Monday.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, now we can hear you, yes. You don't care whether it's Thursday or Monday. Okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I actually do care. Sébastien's comment was good. Monday is better. Things do happen on the list, and that will allow us to get feedback on the things. If we had had this meeting last Thursday or Friday, we wouldn't have talked about the 60% solution. So I would suggest Monday, with Thursday as a fall back if Monday proves absolutely impossible. Let's avoid Friday.

So let's do Thursday and Monday, but really try to have it on Monday if at all possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect Alan. Thank you. Sébastien Bachollet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, just for your information. I have a Board meeting of AfriNIC on Thursday, so I will not be available at all Thursday. But you don't need me, if it's on Monday, I will be there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Sébastien. So Terri, let's have a Doodle then for sparkling of... What am I saying? A sparkling, it's not a sparkling. A set of times on Thursday and also a set of times on Monday the 8th of February. And let's have the Doodle ASAP, so that we, you know, the Doodle closes on Wednesday, let's say.

But I gather with some people not being able to make it on Thursday, let's hopefully, we've got a few more timings for the Monday date. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just the information, the meeting of the nine of the CCWG, it's at 12 UTC on the 9th, on Tuesday the 9th.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Sébastien. Okay, are we all set Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: We are set. Thank you Olivier and group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. So ladies and gentlemen, seeing no more hands, I would like to thank you all for being on this call. It has been very productive, I think. Thanks to our interpreters, Sabrina and David. And as far as the polling is concerned in the call tomorrow, or something, then you know, good luck on this and see where this goes.

And that's really much it for today. So thank you and this call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]