
TERRI AGNEW: ...and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc Working Group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability, taking place on Wednesday the 17th of February 2016 at 13:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jimmy Schultz, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Harold Arcos.

We have apologies listed from Maureen Hilyard.

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

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier speaking. Have we missed anybody in the roll call, or has anybody arrived since Terri started the roll call?

I'm not hearing anyone. So thanks, the roll call is complete. Today's call is mostly again about CCWG accountability. As you know, the process is moving forward where one recommendation after another are being finalized, and are landing in front of us, much to discuss.

So we'll spend most of the call today on this process. Are there any other business, any additions to the agenda, or amendments to the agenda that we have before us today?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I don't see anybody putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as displayed. Next, the review of the action items. It's very swift indeed. It's just about the Doodle for this call, and that's done, and therefore we have reached agenda item number three, with an update on the IANA coordination group activities and also on the CWG IANA stewardship activities.

I don't see anyone from the IANA coordination group with us so far. So, we can go straight to the CWG IANA stewardship. And there are two links in your agenda, of the two items to note. Specifically, one is an email, is a link to an email which was sent by Johnathan Robinson, that provides us with an update on the process and the timing regarding the work of the CWG stewardship, as relating to the, whatever dependency it has on the CCWG accountability.

The draft supplementary proposal to the CCWG should have been published by the 16th of February. I looked for it, I didn't quite find it. I might have just missed it on this. The CCWG plan is to distribute the supplementary proposal to the chartering organizations on the 18th of February, and that's tomorrow.

And once we have that, there is a process moving forward on a day by day basis. But obviously, that totally is depending on whether things are done by the 18th of February. There is a lookout for a response from the CWG to the CCWG, a response as prepared by simply the legal advisors of the CWG, the final review by this group, which should be on the 18th of February, so tomorrow.

So that the response will be up for the CWG tomorrow to look at, and should be sent out by the 22nd of February, so next weekend the members of the CWG stewardship would have to be looking at that response and coming back with some feedback.

That's all for the activity regarding the timing. I don't know if anybody else wishes to add to this. The other item worthy of note is the proposed principle terms of intellectual property agreement. And these are now, at the moment, on the Google Doc. The link to the Google Doc is in the agenda as well.

What I am aware of is that there is also a working group, a working group that is an IETF working group that has been created with several members of the group on there, from the different parts of the different operational communities. And so they're all working together to come up with a solution, a concerted agreement on this whole thing of intellectual property.

Just trying to see, there is a link somewhere that I have. There we go. So, it's with the, all about the trademarks, and the domains, and the IETF trust. And so that there, the working group incorporates people from our own community, but also from the others as well. I'm not too clear on that one, because I didn't quite...

I don't have the link in front of me anyway. It's, things are happening. Here we go.

Any comments or questions on this from anyone?

And finally, there is a third thing also, and that's to do with the service level expectations. There has been a very, very good presentation by Mark [inaudible] from [inaudible], a contractor in charge of putting these things in place. And I think that all in all, and we have already mentioned this last week, but all in all the more we move in that direction, the more, I think, that it is being done in a very good way, and certainly very thoroughly.

So I don't we have any concerns to have on this. On the matters of the budget, design team O, if you recall there have been a couple of points which were somehow lost in translation, or something took place that happened, that basically got these things lost. And that was to do with having several years of budgets ready in escrow, or in one way or the other, earmarked for the IANA budget to be unaffected by any shortfall, or any collapse of the ICANN budget.

There is not much movement in this, apart from... There is some references in the CWG changing its proposal. But we're still awaiting some feedback from Sydney. They might be able to weave something into this, otherwise we might have to leave that over to implementation, and I do note that Alan had previously had mentioned that if we leave this to implementation, that it pretty much would not make it into the bylaws.

If it doesn't make it into the bylaws, then it would be at the whim of the Board in the future, whether they want to pursue something like this or not. That's understood. There hasn't been very much feedback on this. I'm not quite sure whether we should push or not. At this stage, I would say let's just wait and see what Sydney comes up with, and maybe we

can then comment at that point. Although really, it is the 11th hour, and I do, I am a little concerned that this is just now ending up... This is so very last moment in time.

We're just about to jump, and we're still trying to see whether we should wear a parachute or not. So let's try and find out. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. When you combine the financial situation right now with the significantly greater expenditure than had been budgeted, and the unknown numbers for the future. The reserve fund is down into, well into the double digits. I think somewhere around \$60 million right now. The couple of years' budget at 9 million or whatever it was estimated at, when the reserve was 120, was not a significant lump of that.

When we're talking about potentially 60 or less right now, it would be a significant increase in commitment, that is taking the money out of ICANN's reach in its reserve. I think there would be significant reluctance to putting that in now if it's not already there.

So I'm not happy about it, but at this point, just the reality of what the numbers are, I think make it far less likely that we're going to push it in at the last moment, then we would have before. That's a very pragmatic answer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. You're quite correct. I don't see anyone else putting their hand up, so I think that's all the updates about the CWG IANA stewardship transition.

Does anybody wish to...? Or is anybody aware of any update in the ICG. I gather that since the IANA coordination group is waiting for final proposal from the CCWG accountability, it probably is okay. So waiting like everyone else. So there really is nothing else to report in this section.

Seeing no other hands, I think we can therefore move to the next agenda item, and that's the CCWG accountability. And for this, we have Alan Greenberg. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Let me pull up the agenda. There is not really a lot on the agenda. There is more than there was when I wrote it last night, but there is one item that's not on the agenda, which it turns out is on the agenda. Sorry, it is there, it just wasn't explicit.

There was a meeting yesterday of the CCWG, and it was largely tying up ends with the one major exception of the Board's reaction to the carve out in community powers, if the community powers are being exercised as a direct result of GAC advice.

You may recall, if you've paying close attention, that the carve out was that if the community is taking action on, because of how GAC advice was implemented or not implemented, then the GAC is prohibited from participating, lowering the number of AC SOs to four.

To go along with that, and to preserve the principle of that unanimity is not required to exercise any action, those actions which require four AC and SOs in the absence of more than one objection, to be exercised, that is rejection of a budget or a strategic plan, rejection of an IANA action, and removal of the entire Board, the threshold was going to be lowered to three from four.

The Board, unsurprisingly, objected to the reduction of the case in the removal of the entire Board. Said that there needs to be a IRP first, presuming an IRP is possible under the specific action. Not all actions might be subject to a IRP, and the reduction would only be valid if there was an IRP, and if that IRP successfully essentially reprimanded the Board for violating its bylaws.

The description was misunderstood by some people to be globally lowering, not lowering the... I'm sorry. To be requiring that there always be an IRP prior to removal of the Board. And this was viewed by many as adding something in. That was not specified. It was only with regard to GAC action.

In any case, the meeting yesterday, there was only one person present who was vehemently objecting to the Board's suggested change. As it turned out, the people who you might have expected were going to be objecting, weren't at that meeting. Virtually everyone, with one exception, was not at that meeting.

And there has been an outcry in email since that time. The co-chair said in the, with only one person objecting, that the change would go forward without a second reading because we're in the last moments.

And that's where it stood until the email barrage. Now some of the emails were overreacting to the Board change, believing it was wider than indeed it was, others are reacting to the details of the exchange, saying they don't like it. There was some specific comments made, as of very little while ago, Erica Mann, one of the Board members, said the Board will consult on some of the comments that have been made and will get back in a few hours.

So at this point we are on hold. The draft, final draft as Olivier described, should have been sent out last night. It was delayed by a number of hours because of a staff member in transit, and therefore it was delayed by eight hours and should have been sent out a few hours ago. I haven't seen it, and I don't know if anyone else has, so the current discussion, ongoing, may well have it on hold again for some small number of hours.

Hopefully small. So I'm assuming all of the days, all of the deadlines, are now pushed a little bit. That is the report was not issued on the 16th, it will be issued, presumably, on the 17th, the 48 hours will push the publication of the final report to the 19th, I'm guessing.

So that's where we sit right now in the report. I will point out that when this final report, the final draft does get published, we will presumably have 48 hours in which case, in which to point out any errors in the report. So anyone who cares enough to put some time into this, really should be looking at the substance of the recommendations, and specifically the things that were of interest to the ALAC, and try to make sure that everything indeed was in the report, as we believe it is, because it's going to be really difficult to change afterwards.

And that's where we sit in the current status. I guess we should take questions at this point, and I see I have two hands. I'm sorry if I missed them earlier, before we go onto the next agenda item. Olivier, I think, was up first and then Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Actually Tijani was first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan and Olivier. Tijani speaking. I think that the 24 hours, the 48 hours, we had them. It was for correcting any issue or any, not change. And I think it was already done, and the last call was after that, so that at the end we included every [inaudible] about it, and normally on 18, as a final, final [inaudible] issue to the chartering organization.

This is my understanding. Thank you. That was... The intent was, there was a 48 hour review where some, a few CCW members or participants, made some comments. Andrew Sullivan, in particular, made a good number. And there were legal comments that were incorporated.

That ended on the 16th. Sorry that ended on the 14th, I believe. The meeting yesterday, which was held, early on the 16th, was to discuss those comments, and anything else that came up and in theory, a new report was supposed to be issued, 23:59 yesterday, where we would then have 48 hours until 23:59 on the 18th to make any final comments,

at which point the report would magically go out almost immediately. I did question how we're going to vet those changes, and the presumption was, most of them are going to be editorial. If indeed, there is anything of substance, the co-chairs would have handled it on a more ad-hoc basis.

But that report has not been issued yet, to my knowledge. And presumably, when it is issued, there will be a new 48 hour clock starting. That's my guess. I haven't seen an email to that effect. Olivier. If anyone knows something better, and Cheryl in particular often has better information than I do on this, I presuming she will speak up.

But I haven't heard anything, so I'm assuming that's correct. Olivier go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. I'm just concerned that now we're not even talking feedback in days, we're now speaking feedback in a number of hours, comes back. I just have... I've heard from several people coming back and saying, look, this is starting to become really very much pulled by one's hair, because the feedback is of the participants that are present there in the working group, and some obviously are engaged full-time on this, it seems, judging by the amount of emails that they're able to write in a 24 hour period, whilst others have a life outside this.

And not only a life, but also have work outside this thing. So I'm just a little concerned that we're now just reaching the matter of hours, and I hope that we're not then going to be a case of minutes by the time we

reach Marrakesh. Because when one looks at the whole process, I guess, it should gain widespread approval, and I just see still so many big question marks, and matters of people not agreeing with each other, at this very moment, on small things such as this, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. This is not a small thing to some people. They see... Essentially what the change says, is in certain cases, that is in the case where the removal of the Board is directly associated with GAC advice, and either the community cannot or has not filed an IRP, or the IRP has failed, then it requires unanimity of the remaining four ACs and SOs.

And so the only change is to the principle of unanimity for removal of the entire Board in those specific cases. I personally find this completely acceptable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan, it's Olivier. I'll put a parallel to this. If your, and I hope that people who go to ICANN meetings will understand that, if your flight crashes in the middle of the Atlantic, and your life buoy is fully blown, or half blown, you pretty much are in such trouble that you're not going to survive.

And I think that's the same sort of thing that we're having here, where we're thinking of well, should we have full consensus from all of the SOs and ACs, or should we have a lower threshold? When we look at something as important, as filling the Board, for example.

And stuff which, I think, would show that ICANN is in real trouble anyway. I've seen this point being made already in the discussions, but others seem to be completely deaf to this point, and are sticking to those...

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no, Olivier. Let's not debate. I think we're all in agreement here, at least... I may be wrong, but if there is someone here who does not want the change implemented, then speak up, otherwise we're agreeing with each other with different sets of words.

The point right now is, in the minds of some people, a small number of people, most of them not members, but participants. So if it ever came to a vote, or a poll, I do not believe there would be an issue, but it hasn't at this point, and it's not clear we have a mechanism for even doing it within the timeframe that we were looking at, given that there is no meeting scheduled in the next 24 hours.

At this point, there are people who are saying, because we went to the membership models, filling the Board is the only ultimate choice, or away from the membership model, filing the Board is the only ultimate choice, and therefore we cannot except that that be lessened. That's what they're saying, and that's where we are right now.

So I personally find the change acceptable. I am easily willing to live with it. I might even rejoice about it, but that doesn't really matter. And I see we have hands up. Sébastien and then Tijani.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much Alan. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, my trouble is where we are with the schedule. I have, as Olivier said, we may have some life outside of this working group, not too much but a little I have planned to this full day to read the last version.

If not today, then I will not be able to read it at all before Marrakesh, and it would be too late anyhow for the 48 hours. That's a pity. That's the situation that where we are. But my other problem is that, when we are a working group on accountability, we need to abide to some rules. And one of those rules is ICANN rules to produce documents before meeting.

And the rules read 15 days prior to the meeting, to be discussed at the meeting. We are already less than the 15 working days. We don't have the last version to be discussed during the Marrakesh meeting. And it's a very big trouble, not too much for the member of the participants of the working group, and even maybe not too much of the ALAC member, because we will, as you suggest, try to put them on the right speed with a call before Marrakesh.

But for the rest of the community, for the participants of the meeting, we are not on the right track for that. That's, for me, one of the concerns. I have the impression that we are doing everything to have this document signed off by the chartering organization, and we don't think we will have any possibility to discuss, and my last trouble is that we spent a lot of time in discussing small dot for the [!], or big cross for the T, but we never have a moment to have a discussion for the overall proposal.

And if I take what I say at the beginning of this discussion, of this work of the CWG, I am still concerned by what we are producing. A very difficult to move ICANN, to change ICANN, to have ICANN really accountable and transparent. And that's my main concern.

In fact, I don't think that each and every thing are so important, but if you add all of those little things, it will become very troublesome, and very difficult to see where we are going. Who will answer the question and who will be taking care of ICANN? I am very concerned. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Two things, and I will be quick about it. Two questions. My recollection is that we have discussed the overall proposal. We have not always been completely happy with it, but we are willing to make the compromises to move forward. So I think we have discussed that a number of times. And the report overall, the proposal overall has changed, partially because of our discussions.

So I'm not quite sure what you would want us to do in terms of overall discussion. The second is, with regard to timing, are you suggesting that because of the short timing, because we have not had the chance in your mind to discuss it, because we might not meet the 15 day deadline, that we should take it off the agenda for ratification in Marrakesh?

A simple yes no, because I understand your discomfort, but I'm not sure what it is you would like to see as the remedy. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am not asking... Sébastien Bachollet speaking. It is not that I am asking ALAC to say that, but I am asking the organization, the community. We have rules, and we need to be careful with those rules.

And because it's not the rules that we are trying to implement, if at the first occasion we are sitting on, and we are in trouble. It's not a question of us versus the other. It's not to say, we need to take that off, but as the ALAC or At-Large, but it's a much more important question of, how we undo all of that. And it seems to me that even now we are taking more time and more time, and we don't have the final report to be published.

And it's just my concern. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I note that the ALAC is within its rights, to say we have not had enough time to contemplate the final report, and because of the deadlines, and we will, can refuse to ratify. You know, you said it's not the ACs and SOs, ICANN as a whole, well the ACs and SOs is composed of the... ICANN is composed of the ACs and SOs. So all we can do is make a choice on our own behalf. Tijani. And Seun, yes, I see your hand is up and I see your comment in the chat.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I hear you Sébastien. And what I understood from what you said is not that we didn't discuss the full issue, and we have the full [inaudible] in our minds, but we will get the [inaudible] and tell ourselves [inaudible] not accountable, and what

[inaudible] so that the operation, the Internet will not be affected. These should be the questions that we ask ourselves, because we didn't have time to do that. We didn't even have time to see the [inaudible] of the [inaudible] or the whole proposal.

That's a point. Second point, I think that the, regarding the issue, the remark of Olivier. I also understand what you feel Olivier, we all think, I think we all think the same, but we don't have the same quantity of, or the same level of rejection, of feeling the [inaudible] Board with only three SOs and ACs.

But we all, all, the five elements, the five members of the ALAC who are on the CCWG have all the same point of view. The problem, I want to tell you that we received a proposal some time ago, telling us if one abstains, we have only four deciding. And in this case, we had to lower the [inaudible] from four to three, and we rejected it.

We rejected it especially for the Board removal. And when I asked the one who proposed this notification, he responded to me privately saying, we want to prevent the GAC to decide whether to [dismiss?] the Board or not, or whether those serious decisions has to be done or not. So [inaudible], I don't have to repeat it.

I tell you that the idea was there. People were thinking about it before. And I think that it is, this was a good occasion for them to implement it, and to make it happen. And the reaction of the Board was a little bit late, it was late because we, I personally strongly opposed to that, and they didn't react before the issue of the final explanatory report.

That's right. But it is [inaudible], I don't know why, but it is [inaudible].
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, Tijani I'm not quite sure what you're referring to. The Board did react to the lowering of the threshold. They refused to accept it, and the chain, the lowering of the threshold, if the GAC abstains, was withdrawn. That disappeared. It was only with the acceptance of the GAC recommendation 11 compromise, that it will back on the table in the last moment, and the Board reacted pretty quickly to that.

So I'm not quite sure what you're talking about, you know, we're being the only ones who objected. The Board did object very strenuously to the reduction of, from four to three for removing the Board. Seun, you ask, did anyone from the ALAC express support for the Board change on the meeting yesterday?

I don't believe anyone spoke. I think there might have been some comments in the chat, certainly, I think I put some in. This was very much the co-chairs, however, asking is there anyone who objected, other than the one person who was vocal at the meeting, and there was silence. So this is a case where they were explicitly not looking for, I support the Board but we're looking for objections and there were not any.

So I believe that that was an indication of support from all of the ALAC members present. So I don't believe there was any requirement to make explicit comments. But if, do you want to add anything or not?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I want to add something.

ALAN GREENBERG: First I'm asking Seun.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [Inaudible]. I was, okay, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Tijani, I'm incorrect. You did speak against the, in support of the Board reinstating the four instead of three. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you...?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Alan. Just a second. I wanted to thank you for the [inaudible]... I just wanted to then ask, based on what you just said, is this [will be helpful?] to actually have a formal statement from ALAC in relation to this?

I remember we've done [inaudible] meeting in the past. Not [inaudible] the statement during the last meeting in Dublin. [Inaudible] on when we had a particular view that we think is very important. [Inaudible] I also recognize that the do not [inaudible] time and [inaudible] and that we, end of the process.

But I think if we do a comment, comments, you know, so in the case of [inaudible] some impact. So the question for me is, is ALAC willing to do so much for [inaudible]? And will they actually help at all? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Seun. In answer to that, there is no real practical way the ALAC can make a formal statement at this point. And although the ALT is empowered to act on behalf of the ALAC, I would not feel comfortable on a statement of this sort without actually going to the ALAC.

What I have done on a regular basis is following these meetings, I have made statements saying that the CCWG advisory group believes strongly something or other, and I would be surprised that the ALAC didn't support it. And that's the kind of message that I sent, and I will send one like that after this meeting, assuming, I believe the position of this meeting, despite the fact that we are all using different words for it, is that we support the Board modification to, under certain conditions, either to keep the four AC SOs require to spill the Board, which implies it does require an unanimous decision of the four remaining ACs and SOs, and the ALAC supports that position.

I believe that is the position that we're supporting. I haven't heard anyone object to the substance. So if we come up with that decision in this meeting, if I don't hear any objections to that, then I will issue a statement like that, on behalf of this group, and imply that it will likely influence what the ALAC will do, but that's as strongly as I can make it.

But that would be sufficient, I believe. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. First of all, if you will remember, the meeting that was chaired by León, when he asked for a consensus call, about recommendation 11, and I ask if we are voting on recommendation 11, or the changes in recommendation one and recommendation two, and he said it is a package. We are working on all of this.

And I was the only one who objected, because of the change in recommendation two, but [inaudible] [51] regarding the change of the recommendation. The Board members, they didn't react at this time. It was one day after when we decided that everything is finished, now we are going to make the last draft, that they react.

Coming back to the, what you propose right now. I agree with you. We have to support the Board proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. For clarity, yes, you were the only one to object. The rest of us said, and I'll again, summarize. I'm not quoting verbatim. Said we believe the situation is uncommon enough, that it's not likely to ever happen, and we're willing to accept it. The Board was not. And it took

them a day longer than it took us, to come to that decision. The Board, like the ALAC, does not meet every day, and we are in a position that we can say the support group says, but they're not in that position.

They actually have to make a decision based on what the Board itself feels. So yes, the rest of us were willing to compromise. You were not. And ultimately because of the Board's comment, to be blunt, you've won and we've lost. I don't think any of us is unhappy about that, because ultimately, I think we're all agreeing that that should be the place we ended up.

But we can continue talking about this for a long time. I think we're all in agreement right now, that we are supporting the Board's position. The Board is not going to back down at this point, I do not believe, but they might. We'll see. And we are where we are.

Anyone want any further comments? Go ahead Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, thank you Alan. Just to [inaudible]. If [inaudible] Board backs down, does that mean we back down as well? We actually feel convinced irrespective of what the Board said, that this is actually the right thing to do? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm assuming, unless I hear something otherwise, that if the whole Board's comment gets withdrawn, and the Board says, okay, we'll accept three to remove the Board under certain circumstances, that I'm assuming that we are reverting to the position that we took a week ago,

that where, with the exception of Tijani, the rest of us were reluctantly willing to accept it. If I hear something different, I want to hear it.

You know, I know you also expressed, as did I, expressed a dissatisfaction with it, but not that we would reject it because of it. And I think Tijani also said, ultimately, when it comes down to it, he's not going to reject the transition because of it, but he believes it's the wrong thing to do.

We're accepting an awful lot as we've gone ahead. If you go back to the whole CWG proposal with PTI, most of us, believe, believed that that was a waste of money and time, and isn't getting us anything functional, but that was what was required to get compromise. So at this point, I think that we, the ALAC is likely to support either of these proposals, perhaps with one or two objections.

But it's not likely to change our ratification. So that's how I'm reading what people are saying.

Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, it's Olivier speaking. And I just wanted to ask, I know that we have said most of the points that are on the table, none of them are redlines for us not to ratify. And I gather one of the concerns is, of course, is that if the ALAC does not ratify, the whole transition might go, and might not take place.

And obviously, that's a big responsibility. That said, seeing other parts of ICANN being in the position that they are, do you think, or does

anyone think that our positions might harden up if we see other parts of ICANN not ratifying? And therefore the ALAC not being the sole obstacle to a transition?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well Olivier, I'm not sure we're going to get the message early enough to make that decision. That's number one. And number two, that's why we've allocated two seminars and before Marrakesh, and something like eight hours of time in Marrakesh. I'm not going to try to predict what we're trying to do, and if it was a done deal what we were going to do, then we wouldn't be allocating all of those hours.

Is it likely that the ALAC will not ratify parts of this proposal? Yeah, not likely, I would think, but it's possible. I'm not predicting it right now, but I wouldn't rule it out completely. There are many of us, like Sébastien, who don't like the overall proposal.

I'm not sure ICANN is all that more accountable for all of this, for all of the changes. I mean, it is different, and different people will, are in a position to mess things up. Are we overall stronger than we are before? I'm not 100% convinced, but I'm not sure we're an awful lot weaker either. Some of the proposals would have made us a lot weaker. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, thank you. It's Seun for the record. Considering that the current discussion on the GAC advice actually effects a few of the recommendations, so from what [inaudible] is that is a possibility that

we can actually decide if we feel that it is [inaudible] to [inaudible] some of the recommendations [inaudible] reject the overall proposal. [Inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're asking me for a projection. We could... Look, I believe if there is anything to object to, if we refuse to ratify, we will do it on a recommendation by a recommendation basis. So if we are going to reject, we will reject with great specificity as to what it is we are objecting to. That certainly is my intent as Chair of the ALAC.

That could be overridden by the ALAC, but that would be my intent. At this point, I am not predicting it, but it could happen. Please, I'll try to be brief. What the impact of us doing that would be, you know, the current proposal does not stop it from going ahead if we object.

I haven't heard a recommendation that in the, within the 48 hour deadline, the 48 hours is for proofreading the document as it is delivered when it's delivered to us, and for creating minority statements. I have not heard a proposal here that we write a minority statement. If someone believes we should, then that proposal needs to be made very quickly, and that would have to go to the ALAC for a very quick ratification.

So someone better speak up and be willing to write it. But I haven't heard that. So at this point, our current plan, as to be described in the next agenda item, is going forward. More than that, I just can't be in a, I can't predict, and I don't know what order the hands came up. Seun, I

presume, yours is an old one. Let's go to Olivier and Sébastien in that order.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And you mention that, point that I just actually want to focus on, the whole thing of writing minority statements. I'm a little confused about this because in general, minority statements are there when one deals with ratification of the overall thing.

I mean, these would be working group minority statements then, I gather. They wouldn't be SO and AC and SG minority statements, would they?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, they could be... They can either come from members or from members representing their AC and SO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, yeah. Well, I don't know what the worth of this is, and whether it's done in the right order or not. But you've also said that we are going to, if I understand correctly, the ALAC will ratify on a per recommendation by per recommendation basis. So then the next question, and this really is one more process...

[CROSSTALK] ...someone else does...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, to be clear, my intent is to ratify on a recommendation by recommendation basis, if I believe, there are any things that we need that might be rejected, or that we need, you know. I don't plan to have 12 motions if, just to go through the motions of having 12 motions.

I've said we're going to review the whole thing, and then at one time, do the ratification or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And to remind us of the rules, so how many SOs and ACs have to ratify a specific recommendation for it to move forward? Because I gather, if we're going to deal on a recommendation by recommendation basis, and I've certainly heard in the GNSO that looks like what they will be doing, although it's still not sure because they have yet to discuss this whole thing.

But if that's the case then, how many SOs and ACs do you need for that recommendation to be in the final proposal that will go to NTIA?

ALAN GREENBERG: There was a belief that one AC and SO could object, and it was not clear if it was to the whole thing or on a recommendation or recommendation basis. That is not actually in the charter. There is no prohibition of sending it forward with some rejections.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess Seun was before me, it's up to you. I can...

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead. You're speaking [CROSSTALK] we'll go to him next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I think that the question of how we will ratify that, it's an interesting question. But both for ALAC and for the, will process, but let's do as we can recommendation by recommendation, and I guess at the end, we will vote for the overall packet. I agree with you that we have had some discussion of the overall situation, but for me, the question is that when you finished your work, you have done the work, and it's part of the work you need to have another review, at the end, not because we have done it two months ago, but at the end.

And it was not done by the CCWG. And it's problematic. And the other point is that if we, there is a question of the minority report. I put minority report in the first and second, but I, at the moment, we issue the third report. It was supposed to be a SO AC discussion. And therefore, it's now the time for us to discuss, and I don't think we need to have, to input any minority report.

We need to take a decision on what we have on the table, because a minority report, what we will do with? Just to tell the people that we disagree with this part or this part? Let's take the time to discuss it. And at the end, we will issue our opposition. It's why I am not weary at all about the minority report now, it's not for us I think.

And it's not for us individually because we are in a collective work time, and not for ALAC because it's not the right time. Let's go for a decision in Marrakesh. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Sébastien. In general, minority reports are going to be issued by a subpart of the group, you know, one of the representatives who aren't necessarily in a position to sway their AC and SO. But there is no rule. An AC and SO can do something. You will recall for the CWG, the ALAC ratified the proposal, and made some comments saying we didn't like certain things.

We were not withholding our ratification because of it, but we wanted to go on record as saying that. That had no impact whatsoever, to be quite candid. Given that this now goes to the ICG and to the NTIA, it is conceivable that such a comment, that is we ratify but could have some impact.

So I think we want to be careful about whether we do that or not. So, you know, there are no rules at this point, we can write whatever we want. We just have to be clear how we expect people to react to it. Seun, go ahead. I don't, I've lost track of which hands are new and old at this point. Seun, if you'd like to speak, go ahead please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. Thank you Alan. One of my comments have to do with the minority report, but what you just said now perhaps makes it [inaudible] because I was also thinking a minority report will not make any difference writing it now, especially since we are in the final stage.

My other comment is in relation to what the outcome of the meeting yesterday was, of GAC, or what Board proposed. Since there was no significant objections to the questions raised by the chair, by the co-chairs. Does that mean [inaudible] updated report to reflect that proposal from the Board? Can you actually confirm that that is the case so that, I know if [inaudible] making [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry Seun, you got somewhat garbled. I think what you're asking is, the change the Board requested two or three days ago, is that in the report or out of the report. Is that correct? Is that what you're asking?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. [Inaudible] report since [inaudible] objection.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was ruled to be in the report by the co-chairs at the end of yesterday's meeting. That was based on the absence of complaint. You do recall that in general we have a rule saying, things must be agreed to at two consecutive meetings. The implicit statement was that they were waiving that requirement. However, since then, there have been a

large number of comments on the email. Most of them from participants, but nevertheless. So it is not clear to me what the current status is right now. So I will not pretend to know what the current status is.

Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. A short, not answer, but coming from what you say. I was talking about the minority report. I am not talking about the fact that we will send our position on the full report, we will do comments. But that's not the same timing. It's why I don't think minority report is first important now to take into account, or to do something as ALAC.

Let's take the time to discuss the full package and decide if we want to make comments on some issues. And like it was done for the CWG, I guess. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A minority report issued right now will be included in the full document, and other parts within ICANN or outside of ICANN will have the ability of looking at it, and potentially changing their mind because of it. So that's the impact of a minority report, or potential impact. I have not heard any strong, or any advocacy at all, to issue, to append a minority report to this version.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. You mentioned that during the ratification of the CWG IANA, we sent in a statement along with our ratification. I just wanted to make sure that if we are not going to have a minority report, which would be part of this proposal, we would, I guess, if we do decide to comment on the ratification of the CCWG accountability work, both of our statements would have to be carried through to the ICG and through the whole process.

Just making sure basically that our comments would go along with our ratification over to the authorities that will be in receipt of this, rather than needing to make comments in the report to be sure that it gets there. You see what I mean?

It's like having the comments outside of the envelope or inside the envelope. We obviously need them to be, whether they're inside or outside the envelope, they need to be on the desk of those people that will make the final decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, several things Olivier. Number one, I have no ultimate control whether we do something like that or not. I recommended against it on the CWG, the ALAC decided to go ahead with it. That was a decision that was taken. We have no control over what happens to our comment when we issue it.

I would doubt that any of the bodies, be it the co-chairs or the ICG, would eliminate a comment if we choose to make it. But I have no control over it, nor do you. So it is what it is. The formal process does not allow for that, and therefore there is no provision guaranteeing that

it would be carried forward. I would find it hard to imagine that would be deleted. But I can't, that's not something under our control. On the other hand, I personally don't see the value of saying we ratify the report, but we really didn't like something.

There is lots of things we really didn't like, and I'm not sure identifying the last three is, has an awful lot of merit at this point, unless we really believe that comment will result in a substantive change because of it. And to be honest, I find that hard to imagine at this point.

I see no hands. Before someone has a chance to put one up, I'm going to go on to the next item. And the next item, I believe, is the way forward, I don't have it on my screen anymore. Yes, the ratification process.

So, there are several steps to it. Number one, I have asked for volunteers, I haven't gotten very many, but I'm asking again at this meeting. We need someone to take responsibility for going through the final draft, or the second to final draft, which is the only one we have today, and there are not many changes between the two. And identifying or summarizing it.

There is a template I put together which says, you know, again, we expect for most recommendations this to be a page. Not a huge document. So, it should be gauged appropriate. A summary of the recommendation.

Much of this comes out of the report. That this is for ease of processing of the ALAC members. The summary of the report, the summary of changes from the third draft. That is already a section within each

annex, but the responsibility of the person taking each recommendation is to do their own verification. What the ALAC concerns were, and how they were addressed, if they were, and any concerns that have still been expressed by people going forward.

I have a volunteer for 11 from Beran. I have a volunteer for one from Seun. I will certainly do five, and I'll do a few others that people will leave off, but I would like volunteers for the other ones. These have to be done to these seminars, to the briefings that we're going to be doing next Wednesday and Thursday. The timing for those briefings should be set shortly after this meeting.

And so I'd like the briefings out. I would like... Obviously we are going to do the, or not [inaudible] summaries out, these review documents. I'm happy to do the bulk of the talking on the briefings next week, but if anyone else would like to take over for certain recommendations, just speak up, and somebody with a good communications line.

Since that's obviously, if we're going to speak to the rest of the group, but other than that, we then go into Marrakesh and we hold a number of marathon meetings, which either, you know, I thought this particular, today's meeting was going to be over very quickly. I obviously was wrong. So I'm not sure how many of the seven or eight hours we're going to use in Marrakesh.

We may repurpose the time if we finish this project quickly. Or we may spend a lot of time talking about these issues. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. Just to let you know, I'm ready to do whatever talking is necessary on any of the recommendations you assign to me. So that's fine. I'm totally overwhelmed with work, but you know what? This is important.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone wants to do some of these summaries, or take over part of the briefings, talk to me privately. We'll decide how to divvy it up. Doesn't have to be done on a communal call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the record, I don't want to do them, but I'll do them if I'm told them to do them.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't want to do them either, but somebody has to do them. I would prefer to just dial in and listen, but that's not going to happen.

Anything else on the way going forward? I understand it's at some level, crystal clear, and at some level, it is clear as the proverbial mud. You know, as Sébastien suggested, we will of course, be talking about, do we support the overall proposal? The proposal is the sum of its parts, and we can't, but we can't avoid the overall concept if we're buying into this.

If we're not buying into this, I ask why we've spent all of this time working on the details, but we'll make whatever decision we want. And Sébastien, thank you for your volunteering in the chat.

I have nothing else going forward. Olivier, I turn it back to you before someone raises their hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat who has joined us since the call started. If we recall, we missed earlier an ICG IANA coordination group update. So I guess I can give the floor for a couple of minutes to Jean-Jacques to let us know if there have been any developments in the ICG. Jean-Jacques Subreant, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Sorry for being so late on this call. My train back home was caught up in a problem [inaudible] somewhere along the line, and that cost me about 50 minutes. So on the ICG, I can only point out that our next teleconference is scheduled for the 1st of March. Other than that, I fear that I don't have much to add. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Jean-Jacques. We look forward to hearing some feedback past the first of March. Now, any other business is all about when we want to have our next call. I can see here the next CCWG accountability call will be on the 23rd of February.

Now that's what on the cards, I'm not sure whether an ad-hoc call might be staged before this. All these schedules are pretty much with big question marks. I note Seun has put his hand up. So Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you Olivier. Yeah, I decided to put this on any other business, because I think it's a minor issue. In relation to the CWG, one of the proposal that was made, or changes that was made in the draft document on the [inaudible] on the trademark, was to lower the number of representatives from each operational community to three.

On the CWG, I actually commented to [inaudible] it would be better [to leave it] at five. On the basis that the CWG [inaudible] by five group, and also the regional registry are also five regions. So I thought would be [inaudible] and that if perhaps anyone [inaudible] review of that [inaudible] in this group on behalf of the CWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Seun. It's Olivier speaking. Could you just sort of clarify a little bit. So are we talking here about the overall group that will work on this IPR issue? Or are we talking about an ongoing thing?

Seun, you might be muted.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Oh, can you hear me? Hello, can you hear me? Okay, yeah. In the proposal that was sent in by Jerry of IETF, there was a group that they call the IANA IPR government [inaudible] group. This group would be in charge of the IANA [inaudible] the IPR and trademark issue post transition, once the transfer is done to the IPR trust.

And there were initially five was proposed as the representative of each of the operational communities. But in the last meeting of the group that is currently discussing the proposal, they recommended that they be changed. Okay, so what I said before follows this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Seun. It's Olivier speaking. And the list that I have seen so far, and I can't find that list unfortunately. I have a listing of the actual people who were involved in the discussions. Let's go through the queue and I'll come back to you on this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll be blunt. 15 people to do this kind of thing is ridiculous. Nine, I think, is overkill, but I understand the need for having some level of redundancy if someone gets sick or changes jobs, or something like that. I see absolutely no reason to have to represent the chartering organizations, or to have to represent the regions in this kind of thing.

You want a number of responsible people who will make sure the right thing gets done. If you don't... If the three people are from three regions, and the NRO cannot convince one of their three representatives to say something on behalf of someone who is not, whose reach is not representative among the three, they have some very significant problems.

The same is true within ICANN. The vast majority of people are not going to care, and I think lowering it from 15 people to nine was a completely rationale thing to do. I really bristle every time that we say

everyone has to be represented on every group, because I just don't believe it should have to be the case. And certainly for something here, where there is nothing particularly regionally associated with the IPR or in the case of ICANN, to strongly associate it with one of the chartering organizations of the CWG.

So I'm happy with the change. I wasn't part of the decision. If they had lowered it to two people each, I would have been equally happy. One probably is just a little bit too low. So I'm happy with the change. I don't think it's necessary to have representation on that level with this kind of group on an ongoing basis. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Are you okay with this response Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun for the record. I really, ALAC At-Large or this group's call, what I just thought I should also like, is that once ALAC... I don't know if it is a decision making that will be done by this group. I haven't actually looked at it that much. But again, if for instance, or this group for instance feels perhaps [inaudible] from maybe the GNSO or even from the ccNSO, if that is fine with At-Large, then I don't have a problem.

I just thought I should flag it, but if we think it's not an issue, so be it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. Olivier speaking. And I've been looking at my past message. It's a bit silly of me, just a little earlier I actually saw a listing of the people that were going to be involved in that group, they have put themselves forward. And I can remember several people from the RIRs, several from the IETF, and a couple from ICANN, including Greg Chaplin, obviously, who has been leading the charge in the naming circles.

I can't find it. Never mind. I don't think it's primary that important. Alan, your hand is still up.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, my hand is up again. Let's be clear. First of all, we don't have to have unanimity on everything. Within the ALAC and within this advisory group, we can differ. You know, let's not feel everyone has to agree on everything, because we don't.

In this particular issue, if you look at, it's hard to come up with things that the GNSO or the ccNSO representative on this group, if there were one, would say something that we would disagree with. It is in everyone's interest that the intellectual property is preserved, and the domain name is usable. It's hard to come up with reasons why there would be a great split in these kinds of things.

Remember, we've taken the position all along that the IPR is not a crucial thing. You know, if for some reason it falls apart completely, we will survive. We will scramble. We would not have to scramble as much as some other groups will have to scramble, but we might have to do a little bit.

And it just doesn't matter all that much. The group will have to make decisions on, I suppose, you know, which registrar to use if there is some strong feeling. And the selection of registrar was in fact a discussion point because of multiple technical contacts or something like that.

The largest thing this group will have to decide is whether to take action against the abuse of the intellectual property. You know, if someone else is using the IANA copyrighted term, not copyrighted, yeah, then the group will just have to decide whether to send and take legal action against them in the case of someone misusing it.

Those are things that the group will have to do. I just don't see the need for heavy representation in making those decisions. Pretty much everyone is going to see, have similar positions on this, from the point of view of the overall ICANN IETF or RIRs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Any other comments or concerns? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So back to when we need to have our next call. The next accountability working group call is going to be on the 23rd of February, barring any changes.

I gather we need to have a call very soon afterwards. So the 23rd is Tuesday next week. It seems to be at 16:00 UTC, 16:00 UTC, should we have a Doodle for the UTC afternoon of the Tuesday 23rd and the 24th as well? [CROSSTALK]

Sorry Alan. Sébastien Bachollet. I'll give the floor to Sébastien and then you can speak.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Do you think we really need to have this working group? We have already almost scheduled two time for the all ALAC and more members of At-Large to participate to the discussion. I don't see what we can add. We need more to be ready for these two calls, and not to add one additional call. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Sébastien. It's Olivier speaking. What I was going to suggest is to make use of that call to prepare the webinar, or the other two calls. So solely to prepare this, not to actually discuss the issues, but to make sure we're ready and we know who speaks about what. And ultimately we need to be very professional so as to retain the interest of our At-Large structures, hence the suggestion for this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I was going to say what Sébastien said. That we have meetings scheduled. That I don't think we really need another one. We apparently have the ability of filling up every, any meeting that we schedule, which is, in my mind, perhaps a good reason not to schedule it.

We need to be professional to make sure that we're giving the right impression. We're going to be doing these seminars by the skin of our

teeth. None of us have the time to spend a huge amount of time in preparing them. Let's be realistic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So what are you saying Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm saying...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...saying yes for a call, no for no call?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can schedule a call that we will, you know, if you want... I'm just looking up, when is the CCWG meeting next week?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tuesday, 06:00 UTC, Tuesday 23rd of February...

ALAN GREENBERG: Another 06:00? Normally we rotate the times.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That seems to be what Terri has put on the listing. Terri is this confirmed?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, she's right. She's right. Sadly. I thought I was finished with my 1 to 3 AM calls. We can schedule another call and cancel it if there is nothing really crucial. We're getting close enough to Marrakesh that my life is getting really complex, and an hour and a half, if there is nothing to really discuss, then I would prefer to cancel.

But if we really want a meeting, than schedule one, but I'm going to strongly suggest that we cancel it if it's not crucial.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Alan. Thank you. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Olivier. I just want to, I'm not sure we really need to be, to prepare this. I just suggest that we set up a table with each of the recommendation, and we put the name of the one in charge of, and I am sure that if there are blanks, we have good people participating in this working group to, who are also co-chair of the working group, or participate in the leadership team, or the chair of the ALAC, will fill the gap.

And they will do a very good job. I am not afraid of what we will do for these two calls. And I suggest not to have an additional call next week. But then it's up to you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just for the record. I'm hoping, I'm working on the assumption that people will take up the job of filling in these templates, and I plan

to use those templates to populate the slides for the briefings. So they are going to be the input for the briefings. I'm happy to format the whole thing, because I think we need a consistent look to it, but from my perspective, those briefing documents are the contents of the seminars.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I note Eduardo is mentioning the ALAC monthly call is next week. Why not bring some of the discussion there? Well we have, actually those two other calls next week as well. So that will be really up to Alan whether he wants to also bring the discussion on the ALAC monthly call, but I suggest that we'll have enough already in those two calls next week.

Seeing that there is no support, explicit support for a call of this working group next week, then we will not have a call. I notice that Cheryl also has given a green light to not having a call next week. [CROSSTALK]

Hardly surprising, since you're having such a wonderful time Down Under on these calls. At this lovely time for you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just a wonderful timing. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just enough for a morning coffee, or evening drink, whichever it is. So somehow we...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] if it was either, it would be fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Terri Agnew, you have the floor.

TERRI AGNEW: Just want to confirm. So there will be no IANA issues call before Marrakesh then?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Terri, if there is, we will do one in an emergency.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, as I said, if you want to schedule one that we can cancel, go right ahead. If that gives people a feeling of comfort.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Alan, thank you. It's Olivier speaking. But you know, I was thinking, because the CCWG accountability call is on 06:00 on Tuesday,

cancelling at three hours' notice doesn't really help in any case. And I don't see us making a choice or changes and so on until then. So let's just not have any, and at the end of the day, if we do need to have an emergency call and so on, we will be able to have one.

But in any case, we'll have more flexibility if we don't block it at some specific point in time, then if we do. We might wish to have that call later on that week, on the Thursday or the Friday, rather than on the Tuesday or Wednesday. And at that point, we don't really have any knowledge of what the next step is going to be and what the schedule is going to be for the text we're supposed to receive in our inboxes immediately.

Terri Agnew? Okay, Terri as put her hand down. Well thanks to everyone. This has been again, a very interesting call. Let's see what turns up in our mailbox the next two days. And with this, I think that we can thank the interpreters, Veronica and Sabrina.

We're six minutes early today, quite unbelievable, but there you are. Thanks to all of you, and thank to our representatives who have been doing so much good work. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]