EN

TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability call taking place on Wednesday, 10 February 2016 at 20:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gordon Chillcott, Kaili Kan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, and Avri Doria. I have no apologies listed for today's meeting. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Terri. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Have we missed anybody in the roll call by any chance? I don't see anyone shouting their name out, so the roll call is complete.
	Today's call is going to be dealing primarily with some more work in the CCWG Accountability. Prior to that, we'll have just a few minutes looking at the last call that took place on CWG IANA, and that's the call regarding the budget work and the progress on budget.
	That's the agenda for today. It's all listed out there. Are there any amendments or additions to the agenda? Okay, so the agenda is approved as listed.

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.

Next, we have a review of our action items from I was going to say last week, but it has only been barely 48 hours since our last call. The second action item is: "The IANA issue working group members are to submit a wish list of what to discuss during Marrakech. The wish list should be of clear expectations put on the table for CCWG Accountability to consider and take into account as the plan work for Work Stream 2." That's only a couple of days old. Just a kind of reminder. I don't think we will have any progress on this, but so far that's where we are. Now, any comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Olivier, it's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have progress on it. We have an agenda item on today's agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you for this, Alan. That's the first progress in a long list of progresses today. That's great to hear. And I thought we were not going to have any progress. There you go. Super. Any other comments on the progress? No further comments? Thank you.

Then let's move on to Agenda Item 3, and that is first looking at any updates on the IANA Coordination Group activity. I do not note either

Jean-Jacques Subrenat or Mohamed El Bashir on the call. I gather from what I've seen as an outsider of that coordination group that there haven't been any meetings since 48 hours ago. So that's pretty much the update on the IANA Coordination Group.

On the IANA Stewardship Transition, there was a call yesterday regarding the budget with some feedback from some participants asking primarily about the question of whether there should be a budget with additional years put in escrow or some kind of a way to save IANA operations for the time when the PTI is created (we're looking at PTI) so PTI naming operations being funded in case the budget is not voted, in case of all sorts of unknown unknowns regarding the budget.

That's what I took from that. There was a good discussion on this point. I guess I can let Alan Greenberg provide some of his feedback on what he saw yesterday on this topic. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't at the meeting, so I was waiting till you finished and was going to make a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, then I can certainly finish or complete this summary by saying that there was an action item that was taken. The conclusions of the call were that there should be a multiyear funding that would be taken up in the implementation effort. So really the CWG wouldn't have to make any significant changes to its proposal, but the implementation effort

would need to take into account the fact that there should be a multiyear funding, there should be some kind of a process for budget approval in relation to ICANN budget approval and with regards to having multiyear funding it's also suggested that the CWG and DT-O group – and DT-O is the sub Design Team within the CWG IANA that deals only with budget issues – it was suggested the DT-O group addresses the question of inclusion of IANA budgeting processes into the Bylaws. The discussion is ongoing. This is all now being passed on to the co-chairs of the CWG.

After the call, I have forwarded some details of discussions think about DT-O had nearly a year ago in June 2015, about this issue and that we might have lost something through the cracks and that DT-O did respond to some comments that were made by saying that it would recommend one year in escrow. So one year's IANA budget in escrow and maybe a second year also in some kind of a high value account of some sort. But this could all be taken up during accreditation phase.

Anyway, that's the summary. Now the floor is open for comments, questions, etc. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm just a bit fascinated by it. I happen to be the person who had originally suggested that we have multiyear funding and that it be held in escrow so that should there be some sort of problem, including bankruptcy, that the money is available. Should ICANN for whatever reason file for bankruptcy, all the good intentions in the world go out the door. But money that is held in escrow for PTI is, in fact, PTI's money

at that point. And I thought I had made a strong case for it, but it ended up being effectively rejected. I'm delighted it's back now. It's unfortunate if it's done as implementation, there's no requirement for a future Board to keep on doing it; whereas, if it had been part of the recommendation, it would have been a lot [solider.] But I'm glad it's at least being discussed again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. You mentioned that this concept, this idea had ended up being rejected. There were two things yesterday which I felt. The first one is that I had forgotten completely whether this had been rejected or not, but I certainly felt as if I was living a déjà vu because the discussions we were having were exactly the same as the discussions of DT-O about eight months earlier.

Tracing back the paperwork, it looked like there wasn't any rejection when the working group presenting it, so when DT-O presented it to the CWG. But then when was it rejected? I can't remember when. I asked everyone, and nobody remembered.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is I don't remember if the one year was rejected. I think I had suggested one or more years allocated and some put in escrow, which isolates it from ICANN during bankruptcy or things like that. I recall that I was told that it could not be more than one year because the amount was so high that allocating that amount out of ICANN's budget and putting it aside would do horrible things. Now, the numbers I had seen, there was no indication that $9 or $10 million or whatever

the number was going to be would be so outrageous, but that is what the answer is.

I honestly can't remember if the final recommendation even had the one year or not. So that one I can't remember, to be honest. But I know the overall concept was sort of poo-pooed and said, "It's far too high and, besides, we'll never have financial problems, so we don't care." That was certainly the message that I got back. I'm not saying that's verbatim, but pretty close.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this reminder, Alan. I can't quite comment. I don't know. As I said, the follow up was I sent something to DT-O. Chuck forwarded it to the co-chairs, so to Lisa and to Jonathan, and did mention that this was an important thing. And I haven't seen any follow up on that so far. I hope this doesn't get dropped again, because I have a feeling that this was dropped through the cracks to start with, which is a bit unfortunate.

We'll see. We'll follow up on that because at the moment what I do see from the minutes is that my intervention or my points were not put in the minutes. I think I'll just keep a watching brief on this over the next week to see if there is any movement on this front. If there isn't, I'll raise the point on the CWG mailing list rather than raising it on their DT-O mailing list, which I think just has four people on it, including you, Cheryl, and I, so that's three out of the four.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and I couldn't make the meeting yesterday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, we've spent enough time on this. Are there any other comments or questions on [path]? Clearly, the critical path now is CCWG Accountability, and that's I think what we're going to move into right now with Alan Greenberg. Agenda Item 4, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There are a number of issues that I have on the agenda. One is to review what happened at the meeting yesterday, and there are five bullets under that. You'll note on the agenda, if you actually scroll on the agenda, it's quite fascinating. Now this is really interesting. You'll note there are five bullets with a space between two of them, which Confluence insisted on putting in. When I look at the agenda, the fifth item doesn't have a bullet on it, but yours does. Why? I spent 30 minutes today, most of it fighting with the editor.

Anyway, that's just the fun part. Okay, indemnification of people who say things about Board members and what the implications of that are. If you pull up that document, the first one, I believe what is going to be on the screen is the black is what the Board proposed. The green and red I believe are what our lawyers suggested that it be modified to, and I don't think that was done. So if you undo those changes, I believe that is what we have.

The indemnification essentially says that the advisory committees and supporting organizations and their respective chairs and vice chairs –

hold on. That is not the final version. Okay, I don't know where the final version is. I believe the final version says the ACs and SOs and their representatives. The question was asked: "Who are the representatives?" and the answer that came back is: "Essentially, whoever we say are our representatives."

So that implies that should we ever enter into a Board removal action, we would have to decide who is it that is speaking on our behalf on the community forum – and it could be the whole ALAC, or it could be a subset – and identify them as our formal representatives for that particular task. I don't think that is particularly problematic, but the wording is sort of curious.

The other issue that came up on this is indemnification technically means you get paid back for it, which means if indeed a lawsuit shows up on your door, you're the one who has to pay for all the costs. And then if you can demonstrate that you did it in good faith, you can get repaid for it. I pointed out that certainly for the people involved in our group, that would be exceedingly problematic. Again, it would be a chilling effect saying, "If we're not sure that we're free from harm, then we're simply not going to do it." The answer was it should be considered, but certainly the current words do not talk anything about upfront payment. Although it was pointed out that was quite a common characteristic in such indemnification.

And that's where we stand. I'm not 100% comfortable with the wording we have. The Board, as you may recall, basically refused to accept any concept of a waiver. So where we stand right now is in theory we're indemnified, in practice it may not be very practical to go through that

process, which minimizes the chance that the ALAC would be participating in an actual activity to try to remove a director. That doesn't mean we couldn't use our power once the decision was made to go forward, but putting forward causes for it and, therefore, us initiating the process I think probably minimizes the chance we're ever going to do that.

We were never all that strong on the process anyway, so I'm not sure that's a reason for us to be overly concerned, but that is where we stand right now. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. You said you are not comfortable. Neither me, especially because it is not only about money. The reimbursement will be money only, so I am sure that the ALAC will not be initiating any petition to remove a member of the Board because we are not well covered. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Really, all that means is we've always said that it's not likely that these rules will ever be used, but the threat of them is the incentive for the individual directors of the Board as a whole to act differently. If the director can feel with some confidence that they would never have the nerve to do it anyway for whatever reason, be it the indemnification reasons or other reasons, that just removes the threat. We certainly had a fair number of people who said we shouldn't have the ability to remove our director anyway, so I don't think this changes our overall position to a great extent. Anyone else? No?

Alright, let's go on to the next item then.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, this is Terri. I don't know if you were just pausing or if you lost audio.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I didn't lose audio. I was actually responding to another message, and I lost track of where we are.

The next item we don't actually have a document for. Sorry. The next one is human rights. The recommendation that is in the final report is essentially what the Board requested. That is, there are some words that are changed to say instead of "it's in the mission," "it's in the core values." There was some wording where it said the CCWG or another similarly whatever – chartered – cross-community working group, the parenthetical has been removed.

However, that whole discussion was somewhat moot because in a bylaw, we are never going to refer to the name of a specific committee or working group which isn't defined within the Bylaws and certainly not within a subsection of it, a work stream. So the bylaw is going to have to be written in a more general way anyway, so a lot of that discussion I think was somewhat useless because in the long-term the actual reference to the CCWG just can't show up in a bylaw. It just doesn't make any sense.

But in any case, what we have is a commitment to proceed with a framework of interpretation, the theory being that until that time

happens, that for all intents and purposes, the bylaw has no impact other than to have sent out the message saying, "We care and we're working on it." Tijani, go ahead. Can't hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You don't hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You don't hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, now we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ah, okay. Thank you. I said two points. The first one, replacing "the mission" by "the core value" is a big problem for me because what was the fear? The fear was that some would try to make the human rights obligation applying to the contents, which is out of the mission of ICANN. That's why we said at the beginning that "within its mission." The Board wanted to change "mission" by "core value." I do accept the core value, but I cannot remove the mission. So for me it is a big problem to remove the mission because this may make ICANN committed to human rights in something which is not in its mission. This is the first point.

The second point, you mentioned that the mention of the CCWG is not correct in a bylaw at the long-term. But this is an interim bylaw. It will change when the Work Stream 2 will be finished. So it is only to be sure that the work will continue in Work Stream 2 and the CCWG. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Two comments. Number one, I don't have a problem at all regarding the mission versus core value, and I'll tell you why. There already are statements in the Bylaws saying, "We will adhere to our mission," so nothing can change that. And if you look at what we're talking about, a mission is why we are here. Well, we are not here to enforce human rights. We are here to do a number of things related to the domain name system and associated Internet parameters and Internet functions.

It is a core value, saying as we do that, we will adhere to human rights. So I believe it's rightfully in core value, and nothing in a core value overrides something that is actually part of the mission. So I don't have any real fear in that direction, and I think this puts it in the correct place.

In terms of the name, I'm not going to have a debate on legal issues. I'm not a lawyer, and I'm not going to pretend I am. I've done a lot of bylaw drafting and a lot of reading, and in general if you make reference to a group or a committee, it has to be defined and things like that within the bylaws. Otherwise, it has no specific meaning. I'm just presuming that the lawyers when they draft the bylaw are going to have to use some more general words as opposed to "Work Stream 2 of CCWG."

That's all. And it's my assumption, and it will turn out as it turns out, so I'm not really perturbed over it. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, the mission of ICANN is names and numbers. It's not the [contents]. This is why I say that the mission is very important. When we added the human rights as a [inaudible] for ICANN, we have to apply it to issues which are inside within each mission, which is different from the core values.

Leon answered me on the call saying, "Anyway there are other places where we say ICANN should stick to its mission." It is not the same thing. Here we are talking about obligation on human rights. There is a tendency, and my fear is there because there is this tendency, to try to apply the obligations to the [contents] and to say this string will not be delegated because it is applied for by someone who doesn't respect human rights. This is my fear. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can you please be clear though? Are you suggesting we not ratify this recommendation because of it? Because we're getting down to the point where all of us did not have the wording exactly as we wanted. The question is: Is this a redline issue with the ALAC or not? Do you believe it is, and does anyone else believe it is? No answer? Well, it's something to think about because if indeed it is an issue, then we have to bring it up and bring it to the ALAC and see how other people react. If it's not an issue at that level, then at some point we have to

move on. There's an item later on the agenda of "how do we go forward?" and that really becomes the question on those.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes? Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Alan, in any case I [inaudible] point of view about this point, but I consider this very important because we might apply the human rights obligation to something which is not [inaudible] the mission of ICANN, and this is very dangerous for me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess I don't see that. I see the mission as being defined and the statement saying, "We will stay within our mission everything," is in my mind an overriding statement. But clearly, we can all have different opinions. Anything further on the mission? On the human rights? Sorry. We haven't gotten to mission yet.

Alright, the next item is mission, and there is a document here. It is a big document. The summary of this is everything that we had identified in our statement on the third draft proposal has basically been addressed. We identified a number of concerns, and they literally have all been

addressed. We can go into them one-by-one if people want to, but we've gone over most of them in these calls earlier on.

The putting back "where feasible" in two clauses has gone back. The reference to the global DNS has been changed, not quite the way I believe it should have been but sufficiently. And there's still one minor change that might to into it, and that will make it just better.

The whole issue of contracting is not a concern at this point in my mind. The Board clearly also has in their agenda that we need to be able to enter into and enforce contract and have a level playing field. So the contracts that are going to be signed six months from now for the new gTLDs need to have similar provisions in it.

The Board did not like the term "grandfathering" to make sure that the provisions such as for PICs, even if they were found to be against the mission, must continue to be used. I have no problem with not using that word. They also made it clear that the worry we had which caused grandfathering to be included is a worry that they have too, and I have not fear that the ICANN lawyers as we go forward will make sure that the actual drafting of the Bylaws covers the concern even if they don't use the term grandfathering. So I think we're okay there.

The one item we did not get changed is one that was only brought up a week or two ago that was not in the original concerns. That is the use of the term "policy development process" lower case, and the Bylaws use the expression in both lower case and upper case. They use it in upper case in relation to the GNSO and possibly the ccNSO with regard to their

policy development processes. It's used in lower case in a more general sense in a number of different places in the Bylaws.

The reference was that if ICANN is to enter into essentially interfering in the open market, that it does so as a result of a bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development process. And we had a little bit of fear that things like the Africa Strategy could be deemed to be out of scope because although they were definitely developed with a bottom-up multi-stakeholder set of activities, it might be hard to say it was a process as one that is well and carefully defined ahead of time in terms of the steps you take. And it's also not clear that the Africa Strategy is a policy. We use the term "policy" many times at ICANN, but we never define it.

But nevertheless, there was virtually no support anywhere else, and in retrospect the terms "policy development process" are used within the Bylaws in a more general sense, so I think we're okay. It's not perfect, but I can't see anyone really claiming that we did not follow a lower case "process" in terms of the Africa Strategy or things like that, so I think we're moderately okay on that.

Everything else pretty much we got, including the request we had saying they originally said ICANN under no conditions can address market issue, that the market had to stand. And we got that one put in exactly the way we wanted it, so I think we had significant impact and I think the mission and core values part of the Bylaws will be better for the work we did. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. On the issue of bottom-up policy development process, of course, I've followed this discussion very closely as well. I just wanted to ask one thing. We took the Africa Strategy as the one example, but there are other strategies which are currently being developed by staff such as for example the civil society incentive or some of the next generation program or some of the capacity building programs that are out there. There's NextGen on one side. There's the Fellows. There are all sorts of things which staff are working on. How is that going to be impacted? Is there any chance that this might be impacted?

Because I'll tell you what. The reason why I'm asking the question is because I have heard from some corners of ICANN that ICANN is just going in all sorts of directions doing all these things, and it should really go back to its core work and forget about everything else. Of course, I as an individual and also as a member of the At-Large community really value those programs which staff are bringing up, especially when it comes to capacity building, I have concerns.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I think the way it's going to be to address that is through things like the budget process. If we have items in our strategic and operational plan and budget for NextGen as an example – and I don't know if there's a dedicated budget there, but I suspect there's something which is traceable to it or there should be – then I think that's the level at which point you have to fight that if indeed you feel that's not good use of ICANN's money or you feel it is good use of ICANN's money.

The particular item we were looking at was specifically introducing and promoting competition in the registry of domain names where practical and beneficial in the public interest as identified through the bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development process. That particular one was really in the issue related to competition in the registration of domain names. So I don't think our civil society or NextGen programs have anything to fear over that kind of thing.

In the more general sense, the statements that we have added to the Bylaws more and more that things have to be done with a bottom-up multi-stakeholder process, I think the fact that budgets go out for public comment bring those back into focus. That is, if the community as a whole – and to be honest, it's hard to imagine things that the community as a whole objects to because no matter how much X person or AC/SO X objects to it, someone else is probably for it – so I don't think those kind of programs are in danger.

And to the extent they are in danger, they probably should be scrutinized carefully to make sure we're not wandering off in directions we shouldn't go in. So, yes, because we are pushing the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process, perhaps does endanger some things that staff are doing unilaterally, and that's probably as it should be in my mind. Rebuttal? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, what will [not be] in the future is a new NETmundial. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, you're making that commitment. I'm not that sure. But certainly we are more sensitive to those things than we were in the past. I've seen too many things in life that I would think can't happen, but they happen anyway, so maybe you're right. Anyone else on the overall mission issue? I think we did okay there. We picked a bunch of battles on this one, and to a large extent I won't say we got our way but I think we convinced the group that some of these changes were in fact necessary.

Alright, next item on the agenda is Recommendation 11 – GAC Advice. I believe what we ended up recommending (and those who were more awake than I can verify) but I believe what we ended up recommending was the "compromise" that was agreed to by the subgroup that met a few times last week. That is, to reject GAC advice, the Board must vote at least 60% of the Board, which essentially increases the threshold by typically – it depends on how many people are present at the time – but typically says there has to be one more person voting for rejection than it would have been in the simple majority and typically one less than it would be for a super majority.

In exchange for that, the GAC agreed to essentially lock in their current consensus method. That is, an agreement to make a recommendation to give advice in the absence of a formal objection from any country or countries. That generated some very negative reaction from specifically within the GNSO, although there may well have been some in other places.

What was then recommended is a "carve-out" the expression was used that says, let me get this right, that if the community attempts to take

some action as a result of Board action or inaction in response to GAC advice, that the GAC cannot participate. That is, the GAC cannot be an AC for or against the action that is directly related to the advice they had previously given. So in other words, if they gave advice, the Board did something because of it, the rest of the community says, "No, you shouldn't have," then the GAC cannot use their objection to weaken that community action and vice versa. They can't use their community support to strengthen a community action that something should be done.

There were claims that that essentially disadvantaged the GAC to a large extent. It certainly takes one bit of power away from them. The chance of it ever happening is exceedingly small because when you think about it most GAC advice that is controversial has to do with gTLDs. It is hard to imagine that you would get strong support from the ASO, from the ccNSO, and from the ALAC and two of those at least to support the GNSO in objecting to an action. So the chance of this ever happening is exceedingly slim.

The other implication of it is because at that point for such an action you only have four ACs and SOs, it lowers the threshold for certain critical ones from four supporting the action to three. That includes the removal of the entire Board if the entire Board was being removed because of action related to a GAC advice. Again, I just cannot imagine in any real case that that's going to ever happen. The Board also, if you remember, had objected to the concept of removal of the entire Board with only three ACs and SOs. I suspect they are going to accept this one because it just is so far from the realm of possibly that it's just not going to happen.

There was some strong reaction to this by some GAC members and a lot of rhetoric essentially saying that since GAC gives advice at everything, that means the GAC could never participate in any action. I think that was pushing the matter. Clearly, not every action the Board takes is purely in reaction to GAC advice. And because the GAC has given advice on certain gTLD issues does not mean that other action unrelated to GAC advice is not something they could exercise power on. So there was a bit of rhetoric.

The GAC is very divided on this, and I cannot see how the GAC is going to end up either approving or rejecting Recommendation 11 because it has some supporters within the GAC and some people objecting. The potential downside of this whole thing, however, is that because of the carve out, it also affects recommendations 1 and 2, and that may have moved 1 and 2 into an area where the GAC can no longer support it. So that's potentially problematic on that. Thomas Schneider is going to have an interesting meeting in Marrakech is all I can say. I don't envy him his position.

And that's where I stand. Anyone have comments? Olivier has a smiley face. Seun, did you say you want to speak?

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'd like to get in the queue, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're in the queue. You're the queue. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Alright, thank you, Alan. Thank you for the feedback from yesterday because I wasn't in the meeting. Can you hear me loud and clear?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you. You're not very clear, but I can sort of hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, how about now?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's better.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I think it's quite unfortunate that the meeting went that way yesterday because we have some of the justifications that have been provided just does not really match up with what we've done. For instance, if the current proposal of the CCWG the way it treats the policy that comes out from GNSO, for instance, it requires that if there is going to be any Board action on the policy requires [inaudible] SO or AC [inaudible] on such policy it must receive an approval of the [inaudible]. So I really don't see why [inaudible] this way.

I think it's an advantage that the GNSO is taking [inaudible] because they know that it is difficult to get consensus within GAC. So they [technically] are leveraging on that to actually push their interests. I want to say that, yes, you say that it is something that will never

happen, but [inaudible] been documented now and that documentation alone is going to be [references] that other governments are going to be looking at [inaudible]. So [inaudible] whether it's going to be implemented or whether it's going to happen, the impression gives also to GAC themselves and also I think we are about to lose one of [inaudible] power from an advice here.

I don't like [inaudible]. I wish ALAC has [inaudible], but the reality is that [inaudible] against the GNSO [inaudible] going right now. The only way GAC actually should express itself is through the advices. So if you say they cannot defend their advices, then it means that [inaudible] it means that they can't do anything because that is the only [inaudible] give their input to [inaudible].

Without taking too much time, I'd like to suggest that ALAC reconsider whether they want to support this particular recommendation. Certainly, I would say ALAC should actually consider the option of actually [inaudible], even if it [inaudible]. I think this should be noted. [inaudible] Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, just to be clear, I think what you said – again, your voice got a bit muffled – I think what you suggested is you said you feel very strongly about it and you believe it should go to a vote in the ALAC on whether we support the recommendation or not. Did I get that correct?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, well, everything is going to go to a vote, so there's no question about that. We have a queue. Tijani in the queue, and then I'll give you my position.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. As you remember, the removal of the entire Board was said there as a stick for the Board so that they know that it is possible to remove them only. But all the members of the CWG expressed their will that this will not happen and their hope that will not happen at all because removal of the entire Board will destabilize our organization and may affect the continuity [inaudible]. It is like an earthquake. So we had a proposal before asking for lowering the threshold even if there is one abstention, and we refused it for the Board removal. We accepted for the change of the fundamental Bylaws.

[Today], we come to the same point. I accept that GAC don't be the decision making group if it is something about its advice. I accept it, but why do we have to lower the threshold because the remaining thing is only the removal of the entire Board, so why do we want to lower threshold? Why? Do we want the removal of the Board to be more possible? Think of it the other way. In this case, if there are only four participating in the decision making and if you accept that three can remove the entire Board, to prevent the entire Board to be removed, we need to [object] in this case. That means 50% of people of the organizations who are participating in the decision making. You see how weak we make this power, not the power, how possible now it is to

remove the Board easily. I am really concerned about that, and also I will make a minority opinion for it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier, I'll let you go first, and then I'll come in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I have a concern very similar to Tijani's. I keep on remembering that we are having these community powers in case things really go wrong. That's how this whole thing was marketed to start with. We need community powers if ICANN goes rogue, if the Board goes rogue, if the budget goes rogue. It's the nuclear option in most of the cases there. If we remove a whole Board, that's pretty serious. If we block the budget, that's pretty serious. I have concerns if we start lowering those thresholds, it's not making it like the last solution. It starts getting people to think, "Hey, that could be one of the solutions that we use." Yeah, it's a concern.

I don't know whether this is a redline issue for us or not, but I can certainly see that any lowering of thresholds for these community mechanisms is not going to enhance ICANN accountability. It's going to enhance the risk that those powers are used. If ICANN really does go rogue, well, at that point it's going to be a bit like Board, isn't it? It's not going to be a split vote. All of the communities will want to do something and all the communities will say yes, so then there's no issue of the threshold. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and I think you're right on that. If indeed things are going so badly, changing the threshold from four to three if we're saying the GAC is not allowed to participate doesn't really change the overall thing. But remember, these are only in regard to actions directly related to the implementation of GAC advice. So we're not changing the threshold universally.

Now, if you accept the concept that – and I'm giving you the logic behind it, not defending it – but if you accept the logic that the GAC should not be able to try to override killing its advice, essentially they shouldn't be given a second kick at the can to force their advice through, then we only have four ACs and SOs left. And we had established a principle, perhaps a wrong principle but we had established it, that unanimity should not be required to make any decision, thus the lowering of three to four.

Now remember, Tijani implied it was only the removal of the Board that's left. That's not so. Four is also required right now for overruling budget and planning issues and overruling IANA issues. So if the GAC makes advice which essentially endangers IANA and this eventually goes to some Board action and the community objects to it, this says the GAC should not be able to participate to try to reverse that decision to try to force that decision through.

Now I'll give you my overall position. This is not something I would have invented if I were doing it from scratch. I think this is a visceral reaction from the GNSO, and I don't think it was particularly called for and will likely result in the GAC refusing to either ratify or object to Recommendation 11. The other alternative was a virtual certainty that

the GNSO would reject Recommendation 11, and that I think had a set of problems associated with it which were quite critical. So as a compromise to get the GNSO to not reject 11, that's what the CCWG decided.

Whether it's the best thing we could have come out with, I don't know. Doing it in the timeframe to actually get this approved – and for all we know the window has already passed and it's too late for a transition to happen right now, but we think it just might still be able to happen – so to make the timeframe, this was the compromise. It's something that I personally can accept, and I would not not ratify the recommendations because of it. It's certainly not optimal, but there are many things that are not optimal in what we've done, and that's the nature of the compromise and the multi-stakeholder process that we all so greatly love. Not optimal, but I don't think it's dangerous.

Certainly some people in the GAC are going to object to it strenuously, but there are other people in the GAC, other countries in the GAC, that are strongly supporting it. So it's not trivial to understand what the net effect is going to be.

Any other further comments? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we will go on to the next item in the agenda, which is – I've lost my agenda. It is in here.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, sorry, Alan. I just wanted to know what was the way forward on this particular item we just finished now?

ALAN GREENBERG: What do you mean? What is the way forward in the CCWG?

SEUN OJEDEJI: No, within ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll be talking about how we go forward later.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Oh, okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next item is the IANA CWG requirements. I honestly don't know. Maybe Leon has a better handle than I do on exactly where we are. My recollection is there were still some things that required some word changes and stuff like that, but essentially we believe we have met all the requirements but there are still some details to be resolved. But that may not be correct. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. I have a little bit of a background [noise].

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay.

LEON SANCHEZ: [inaudible] but otherwise I will be providing you with an update. What we are [planning] right now is that we have Recommendations 1, 2, 3 finalized. We have Recommendation 6 also finalized. We have Recommendation 8 also finalized. Recommendations 10, 11, and 12 finalized, and we are pending with some small details either waiting to listen from ICANN legal or from our lawyers or from other third parties on Recommendation 4, Recommendation 5, Recommendation 7, and Recommendation 9.

So we are mostly done with all recommendations, and the timeline is to [inaudible] on recommendations for tomorrow, February 11. Then we will be reviewing [inaudible] the leadership team in the CWG, will be reviewing the complete package of recommendations between February 12 and 13. And in February 15, we will be incorporating the edits from leadership team and our [inaudible] lawyers to this document. And we will then forward these final versions to the list the CCWG and will provide a window of 48 hours for review of the whole package by the CCWG.

And in the meantime, we are also calling for minority statements to be filed, and minority statements should be filed on February 17 at the most. That is the deadline for filing minority statements. And we are

also calling for [inaudible] asking them to confirm whether the [gaps] that they had raised or envisioned have been properly addressed by this last version of the proposal and, of course, they are also entitled to file any minority statement they see fit.

Then on February 18, we would be sending the finalized package to the charter organizations. This will, of course, include the publication on the CCWG's website. There will be, of course, also a public announcement of this publication. As I said, these will go to the charter organizations, so each of the charter organizations will be able to make their final assessment and [inaudible] of approval for this final document.

And hopefully, we will be expecting to have approval from the charter organizations before Marrakech, or at the latest in Marrakech, so we can have a final [event] on March 10, which would be the handing over of the proposal by the ICANN Board to the NTIA.

So this is more or less where we are standing right now and the planned timeline that we have so far envisioned at this point, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon. I have one question for you, but I'll defer that for a moment, and perhaps we can go back to the question I actually asked you. The question that was on the table at the moment was not the process going forward but what is the status of the satisfaction of the CWG requirements.

LEON SANCHEZ: We are waiting to listen from the CWG chairs. We are expecting to have their sign off by February 25, I believe. So far, what I can tell you as a matter of the coordination calls that we've been having, I feel like all of the CWG [inaudible] have been addressed. But of course [it's a process] that the chairs of the CWG need to run within the CWG itself and then come back to confirm. So we would be expecting confirmation from the CWG on February 25.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The question I have on the process going forward: we have been working with all of the annexes. There's also the core document, which I presume is being updated or has been updated or will be updated in line with the changes in the annexes. When will we see copies of that? Because we haven't seen any drafts at all of those.

LEON SANCHEZ: Of the final versions you say?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not of the annex but of the core document. The part before the annex.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, so if I'm not mistaken, that should happen on February 18.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It would be really useful if, as those chapters are completed, if the chapters are sent out so people can look at them. That's a big

document, and we need to make sure that everything was tracked properly between the annexes and that document. So to the extent that we can get chapters out earlier, we shouldn't have to wait for the 18th and it literally being frozen before we see our first drafts of that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Alan, I agree with you. Actually, I think that staff has been sending the final [inaudible] versions of the different recommendations to the list, and I believe we have been providing a window of 24 to 48 hours I guess for any final comments. So I guess that should be – yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think I've seen any of those. Maybe I'm wrong. I thought all we've seen are annexes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The annexes are the primary places of change of text. The change of text to the [substantive, as you said,] precursor part of the document in draft three are being attended in parallel, and that's what Leon is referring to. So staff, and I think third-party readers are going to go through it as well, are doing their very best to make sure that

everything is captured across. But there should be minimal change in fact to the big [lump of] document.

The important part and what will be coming out as soon as the Is are dotted and the Ts are crossed and we've got the [inaudible] back from the third-parties and legal advice that Leon just outlined will be then into a separate, a new section of text, which is being written and has been being written along the whole process, and that is the "this is what has changed" piece of text. So there will be – not an executive summary, nothing so [inaudible] as that – a specifically new section added to what you're familiar with in draft three that says, "And here are all the changes that have happened." So it should make the task far less insurmountable than I think you see it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sebastien, go ahead. Can't hear you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I don't know if you can. The connection is very bad, and maybe you [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you. It's obviously delayed, but we could hear you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible] says that the full CCWG will receive the [inaudible]. Okay, it's too difficult. I will not talk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No, you're cutting out. I'm sorry. Anyone else have any comments on what Leon told us about the plan going forward? Then we'll then go on to our plan going forward.

Okay, next item then is: how is the ALAC going to handle this process? I did send out a message a little while ago that all of you should have seen. The overall intent is still the same. The details have changed a little bit, however.

I believe we need to go through this recommendation by recommendation, and what we need to produce is a concise statement for the ALAC for each of the recommendation, essentially each of the annexes, as to what we had said, what were the issues that we saw, what were the changes that were made, and our summary or analysis of those. That is, the summary or analysis of whoever is trying to summarize it. And then have those go out for comment to the ALAC.

There's no way we can try to tackle all of this in Marrakech in parallel. There just won't be enough hours to do that, so we have to really do it on the list and try to at least air and get out in the open any issues that we still have that will then need to be discussed in Marrakech.

I did ask for volunteers on who will volunteer to do some sections, and we had one volunteer from Beran on I think human rights, but I don't remember for sure. I'm still looking for other volunteers.

Now, I had hoped that the job would be made a lot easier because I was presuming that there was a redline version that showed all of the

changes in the annex from proposal three to the current version. So although that would be a noisy redline because there's a lot of just editing things where the substance wasn't changed but the text was fixed, but it would also identify all of the areas. It turns out that there is no such redline. So we don't have the luxury of looking at the definitive redline of the changes in the text.

Therefore, we're going to have to rely partly on the list. There is a section in each annex saying what has changed from the third proposal. And whoever is doing each review is going to have to take responsibility for comparing, not holding up to the light, but going through the original version three and the new one and identifying anything else that might be of interest to the ALAC that is not explicitly identified in the high level list of changes.

So the intent is to try to get those out as we're going forward. As Leon said, we have 8 of the 12 sections that are finalized right now or will be finalized very shortly. I don't know if they've all been distributed yet. And we need people who are going to go through those one-by-one and identify for the ALAC what the changes are and what issues should be brought to the attention of the ALAC for discussion.

So that is how I'd like to go forward. I don't have the bandwidth to do all 12, however. I will certainly do some of them, and I'm looking for volunteers of people who have a good understanding of each of the other recommendations to identify what the changes are. I see Tijani has his hand up though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Alan. I agree with your methodology, but I don't like it to be [expected] to the list to be changed on the list. I do prefer that we have more calls before Marrakech. This is a very important issue. We will ratify something that will have a big impact on the governance of ICANN in the future, so we need to everyone of ALAC will vote or will give his voice should understand very well the implication, sometimes the hidden implication, the not seen implications. So we have to explain, and we have different points of view. We have to explain all of the points of view so that each member of the ALAC took his or her position with good knowledge about everything, including things that are not explicitly said. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, thank you, Tijani. That really means that that would have to be done on the week of 22 February. Since we're not going to get the sections of the report until for all intents and purposes this weekend within the next couple of days, it's going to take a day or two for people to start doing the summaries. We perhaps could schedule a call starting around the 17th or 18th and go through the next week.
	But the question is: how many hours are you talking about? We have 12 recommendations. If everyone is going to voice their views on each one, we're potentially looking for an awful lot of hours of ALAC meetings. Do you really think we could do that with reasonable attendance? Because without the reasonable attendance, there's no point.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Alan, you'd need five to six hours by my guesswork.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would be about what I would say. Now, some of the recommendations are going to go simply. We didn't have much comment on them and there hasn't been much change.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But I think we could do it in two dedicated topic calls of two to three hours each.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's the will of this group? Is that what we want to do?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the will of the ALAC. I mean, this group [inaudible] eyeballs. It's your ALAC who are not fully constituted within this group who need to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: My question is: is that the recommendation of this group to the ALAC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the only way we're going to get it done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien? Sebastien, you have your hand up. I'm not sure if you're trying to talk or not.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I tried to talk. Is it possible? Can you hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is working. Yes. Well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, I'm on my mobile now. It may be easier. First of all, I wanted to say the last discussion that the CCWG may receive the full document on the 12th and might just have 48 hours to read everything but all the changes but to have a little bit more time. I really regret that we were not able to schedule a face-to-face meeting. I understand that with the time we have now it's almost impossible, but I still consider that this discussion must be done face-to-face.

Therefore my suggestion is the following: we spend all the time possible and [inaudible] all the time prior to the date of the decision who if I read well the proposal by the co-chair by 8 March, by 8 March some of us will be at [New York City], therefore we need on Saturday, Sunday, and there is no meeting on Monday for ALAC, but the weekend to spend the time on just that issue and to be able to discuss, be sure that everybody understands what we are talking about. I talk about the ALAC members, of course, but the others will be interested too I hope.

I know that part of your question will be: but we will not be able to do the [inaudible] like we're supposed to do during the meeting. Therefore, my suggestion is that we request [intersessional] meeting face-to-face after Marrakech to do this important work of ALAC, but we concentrate on doing the face-to-face meeting on Saturday and Sunday on that issue.

I think it's the best way to be sure that everybody is on the same page, that we agree or disagree but we know why we agree and why we disagree. It is so important issue that I don't think that doing so by a conference call, not seeing the people, not having trouble with the understanding of the discussion. Because if we are to go to present the situation, we here in this group, it's not understandable by somebody who didn't follow closely the situation. We need to be very careful on how we would talk and what we would say. Therefore, that's my proposal to go ahead with that.

I want just to remind one last thing, and it's unfortunate, but the [rules] of providing document to be discussed during an ICANN meeting [inaudible] working day. That means that the documents will anyhow come late for the meeting in Marrakech. [inaudible] could be ready for that because I think that there will be people who [inaudible] on that, but it shortens the time. Maybe we can have also some conference calls prior, but I suggest once again face-to-face use for that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So to be clear, you're suggesting no discussions about any other At-Large issues, no meetings with other people, just focus on CCWG?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: At least prior to the date of decision. And as I read the date of decision, it needs to be done prior to the 8th. If I am not [wrong], the 8th is the…

ALAN GREENBERG: The 8th is the Tuesday.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tuesday.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's the Tuesday. Therefore, I guess on [inaudible] to have any ALAC meeting. On Tuesday, some of us will be at the university, therefore we will not take any decision this afternoon. Then I suggest that at least Saturday and Sunday be concentrate on that issue and allow us for a decision at the end of Sunday, and we don't leave the meeting room before we take an ALAC decision. Thank you. Yes, it's my proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG: What I have told ICANN management is our intention is to ratify by the end of Saturday – or not ratify but whatever, to make a decision – but it might not be done until our meeting on Wednesday. That is what I've told them, and that still stands at this point.

I'll go ahead with the next people before I have some comments, but I do have some comments. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I agree both Cheryl and Sebastien. First of all, I support two calls prior to Marrakech, at least to begin to explain, begin to discuss with the whole ALAC members. And we have to tell them that it is compulsory for them to attend those calls. And then in Marrakech, we start by this issue. We may defer the other issues to Tuesday and Wednesday if possible, but all our discussion about the accountability should be done, in my point of view, Saturday and Sunday. And we don't have to leave the room before having a decision, but a decision based on a very good understanding of every ALAC member of all the implications of our decision. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any comments? What is being proposed is to redo the agenda for Saturday and Sunday, taking off all visitors, all meetings with other people and any other items on our agenda and just focusing on accountability. Nobody has any comments?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I was just thinking perhaps [inaudible] sufficient and not Saturday and Sunday. Maybe [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Seun. I can't make out what you're saying. Try louder.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, so I was saying perhaps a day would be fine instead of the two days that you just mentioned now because I think it's also important or it's also good to have some of the [inaudible] to also have the normal meetings that we [inaudible] the community. I was thinking maybe we could do [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So if I heard correctly I think you said that you think it's important for us to do some of the other things too and that we should do the CCWG work in a day or two days. But we only have two days total.

| SEUN OJEDEJI: | In a day. I said in a day, not two days. I said in a day instead of two days. |

| ALAN GREENBERG: | So a single day instead of two days? |

| SEUN OJEDEJI: | Yes. Thank you. |

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Okay. Heidi, go ahead. |

| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Thank you, Alan. Just a comment that if the decision is made that Saturday and Sunday is purely for discussion on CCWG issues, then some of the ALAC will not be able to be at the sessions on Tuesday where we would then need to move the discussions with other groups and senior staff. I just wanted to make sure everyone is aware of that. Thank you. |

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Olivier? |

| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thanks, Alan. I support having some webinars or conference calls before Marrakech. I think it would be terrible if ALAC members arrived in Marrakech with their hands in their pockets and felt, "Oh, I know nothing about accountability. Tell me about this." If we do that, I would |

say and I hope that we would need just one day rather than two days to explain this. And we could shuffle, and that's again just a big question mark because I'm sorry I have not focused on this ALAC stuff. I'm not ALAC. I'd hope that there would be the ability to do that final discussion in one day so we only have to shift one day's worth of things over to the Tuesday afternoon. That's the thought. When we're talking one day, then it would be like a long day.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Anyone else want to weigh in? Alright, let me tell you my thoughts on this. I agree to the webinar/seminar.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien put his hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think Sebastien has got his hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is that a new hand, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Alan. Yes, I agree that having a call will be useful prior. I would like just to be sure that we can spend time to explain the situation during the call with interpretation, but we need to have the discussion in face-to-face. Maybe one day will be enough, never sure. On that topic, I really don't want to be in the situation that you say, "Okay, you have two minutes. That's it." It's a very important topic. We need to have time. We can try for one day. That's your call, but I would like to urge you if we need more time, to have more time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else before I make some comments? No? Alright, Sebastien, that is an old hand, I assume. Okay. I agree with the webinars. The concept saying it's mandatory and everyone must attend, we say that about ALAC members and you know what the net result is. Yes, some people will attend; others will not. The timing is going to be such that, well, you understand. It's not going to meet everyone's times and that obviously influences things. Plus, conference calls on short notice, people have jobs and lives and to pretend everyone will be there I think is not realistic. We can certainly try, however.

I don't believe we will change things in two days that we can't do in one day. My personal preference would be to schedule a number of hours

on Saturday and then Sunday with the understanding that the rest of the time on Sunday could be repurposed if necessary, depending on how far we get on the Saturday.

We can always cancel meetings with other people, and we can redo our own agenda as necessary. But I would tend to put a gap in between if only because both people's attention span and their ability to focus is limited if we're going to push people in too much in all indoctrination of this. We have been discussing this for a year, and hopefully it's not all new to everyone. But I'm not sure we can absolutely control that.

Olivier, I see a new hand. Would you want to speak before I finish?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. If you're going to chop this day into two parts, which by the way I would support. I think it's a good idea indeed to change people's minds. They would probably fall asleep after three hours anyway, so we do need to chop this.

May I also suggest that members of this working group who are in the know, and they're all here, members of this working group are offered as mentors to specific members of the ALAC. So we basically take like

say, I don't know, Alberto and Leon are to be mentors for X, Y, Z – tick the people in the ALAC. So after the first session, if these three people have any further questions or want to discuss this thing further over a beer or something, then there could be something like that happening.

I don't know. It's just a thought so that we don't end up with these people just sitting there not doing anything and then being there afterwards the next day and nothing having happened in between those two sessions. Sometimes it's good to talk in smaller circles. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't disagree. In answer to Avri's question on the chat of: weren't the ALAC involved in the comment periods that we've done? We've now responded to three draft proposals. The answer is yes, but we don't give tests afterwards and there's clearly some belief among people in this group that although everyone who was exposed to this stuff and voted on it, they may or may not have understood it. That's clearly the message we're hearing, which is probably true.

Alright, I don't think what you're proposing right now other than the seminars is radically different from what we were looking at. I will point out that there almost certainly will be time limits and restrictions on how much people can talk. There's just no way to go around the table and give people an opportunity to talk if the conversation is dominated by small numbers of people. So I think that the onus will be on people to try to be concise and say what they're trying to say. I don't think we have any choice but to do that. At least, experience shows that.

Anyone else have any comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm quite [inaudible] the mentoring aspect and the small group activity. My only hesitation with mentoring is that we need to both match it up and mix it up. So if we match it up in terms of let's use the example of Leon/Harold, that just so we don't have little clones of each other happening which is not what I would call full, frank, and fearless decision and discussion making, as Olivier suggested, some small group activity is done on the Saturday. So you'd have the Leon/Harold clone sat down with one or two other sets of clones.

In other words, [inaudible] with two if not three with their mentors and have small group discussions so you know that things have been thoroughly and truly discussed and explored. Because the Tijani/Seun clone or the Tijani/Wafa clone might have some particular views that are quite different than the Leon/Harold one, or indeed they may have looked at something in greater detail than the other one. So if you mix it up properly, I think it's doable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm not quite sure how we handle logistics of breaking up into groups and things like that and at the same time do what has been requested. That is, we have an open discussion with the whole ALAC. I'm not sure we can do both.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you can. It's just a matter of timing. You might need a little adjustment on your scheduling, and I'm certainly happy to help you with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, certainly the cloning part I have a problem with. Please. I don't know why we suddenly have echoes these days.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I speak?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to try to say something first myself, but we seem to have a problem. Have we figured out where the echo is coming from?

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, we're checking each line.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will keep on talking until the echo goes away. The echo seems to have gone away. What I was going to say is, yes, I do have a bit of problem with the clone. That is, I counsel somebody or other, and therefore they simply end up repeating my personal positions. That's potentially an interesting situation and not necessarily one we want. The whole idea of general conversations is to expose everyone to the range of positions. And although I support mentors to answer questions, I'm not sure I support mentors to be the briefers because I think then you end up with the person being mentored getting a narrow perspective of positions.

Sebastien, is that a new hand?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Alan, it's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think that – I guess that Tijani opened his line, and we have an echo now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would like to suggest that if we do have the calls before, webinar or whatever we want to call that, the explanation will be done at that time. And we need maybe to be able to give some more explanation to people. My experience since I joined again the ALAC is that I was requested to answer questions in the native language. Therefore, if I have to split the group, I would allow a discussion in English, one in French, and one in Spanish.

I would suggest not too much to do it during the meeting, but maybe the idea could be they have breakfast, lunch, and dinner together and they are able to exchange around those points in an easier language for them.

I think that the goal will be also that it's not for the mentor to be talking about their position but to try to give the [inaudible] position on the table. It's not always easy, but I guess it's possible. And like that, we have a better discussion in the whole group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Oh, I see we have Tijani. Go ahead. Cannot hear you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I am sorry. I was muted, and the line there was an announcement, so [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's okay. You're on now. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I am again [inaudible] speaking the group and small groups because it will be an influence of people who knows more and who have their own mind. They will [influence] the others to have all of the points of view on the table for all people. What you can do, we can ask everyone of this group to express a point of view and to answer any question inside the whole group. So you would have different answers for one question because there are different points of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Olivier? Please mute Tijani's line.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're well over time at this point, and I'd like to wrap it up. Staff, are we still okay with interpretation?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you'll let me speak Alan, I'll let you know that we have another four minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I wanted to intervene for.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to suggest to you that we would actually not discuss this and finish this today. We can continue the discussion in our next call, which takes us to the last agenda item of any other business, which is: when do we want our next call? Hopefully, in the last four minutes of this call, we can decide when we want our next call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, is there another CCWG meeting next week?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Alan. We do have a CCWG meeting next week. Let me just check. That's going to be on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: What on the agenda?

LEON SANCHEZ: It hasn't been defined yet, I think. I need to check on my notes, but I don't have [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Will we likely need a meeting after that, or should be try to do the meeting on Monday?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I would say that it would be a good idea to have it after because let's not forget that on the 18th is when the final [inaudible] is going to be submitted to [inaudible]. So if we have the CCWG call on Tuesday, then we could have a call on Wednesday of this group so we can discuss the things that they send after the call of the CCWG and plan ahead for the Marrakech meeting and, of course, for the approval process that should be undertaken in regard to the final document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we'll try to schedule a meeting for Wednesday, Olivier, if you could ask for that. That's going to be far too late to decide on our way forward though. The Marrakech meetings and if we're doing any conference calls are going to have to be lined up well before that. So we will do a meeting on Wednesday to do any clean up at that point, but the decisions will have to be taken before then on the things like agenda. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So next call [inaudible] to be set for Wednesday, 17 February 2016. I'd like to thank our interpreters, Veronica and David. Suggest that the call discussions continue on our mailing list and perhaps also on the Skype chat.

With this, I'd like to adjourn the call. Thank you. It has been very interesting and very productive today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]