

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the CCWG accountability webinar for ALAC on the proposed cost control mechanisms, held on Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August 2016 at 20:30 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call, as it is a webinar. But if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as computers, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel.

We have English, Spanish, and French interpretation.

Thank you for joining. I'll now turn it back over to our moderator, Bernard Turcotte, manager, ICANN, PTST, ICANN staff support to the CCWG accountability. Bernard, please begin.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Welcome everyone, and glad you could take the time to attend this on such notice.

...first.

THOMAS: Thanks so much Bernie. My name is Thomas [inaudible], and I'm the GNSO appointed co-chair to the CCWG. My fellow co-chairs León Sanchez and Matthew Briar send their regards. And while I lead the substantial presentation of the newly established cost control mechanisms to Bernie and Xavier, who are, who also work on this from

---

*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.*

---

the staff side, I should share a little bit of background and a little story with you.

As you know, currently the CCWG has started its work stream, WS 2, and work stream one was a big project, and it was uncharted territory for everyone. So while there were discussions about costs, while there were regular interactions between the group, the CCWG, its leadership, other cross community working group staff and the Board, it was high time for everyone to come up with new mechanisms for the post-transition world.

And we set up preparations for the meeting in Hyderabad, which is upcoming, I had a chat with Bernie, who is on this call as well, and I said, “Bernie, it would be great if I could [inaudible] business for once.” And he said, “Well, you’re the budget owner. You could do it if you want to.” And while I certainly did not choose to fly business class, but economy class, this is a clear indication a new phase in ICANN that has started.

I’m not sure whether anyone of you has ever seen a working group in ICANN that had its own budget, and that could control its own budget, that certainly had the burden of controlling its own budget, and ensuring that we don’t overspend, and that we manage our costs wisely, but I think the fact alone, that we now have cross community working groups, or our cross community working group, with its own budget, that it can stand in order to more professionally do the community work, I think that’s just great.

---

And we have spent a lot of time with the Board finance committee, with staff, particularly Xavier, and our group, and the chartering organizations, to come up with those cost control mechanisms, because certainly, if the community is granted money to spend for themselves, this can't just go without any accountability of these groups as well.

And therefore, we have been working on mechanisms to ensure that money that can be spent, and how it can be spent, how we deal with more financial demands. You know, there are always things that can come up that influence the work plan, but now we have something that we are more than willing to share with the community, and that's the purpose of this webinar.

And therefore, unless you have questions for me now, I would like to hand over to Bernie without any further ado in order to show through the niceties of this new approach.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you Thomas. I will pause for a second in case there is anyone that odes have a question for Thomas. All right, it doesn't look like it, so I'm certainly something has come up with our friend Xavier, so I will take over his part of the presentation and start with the overall budget, as I think it presents a framing of the issue.

As you're aware, all of the remaining transition costs were a big concern in the 2016, 2017 budget, when everyone was developing the budget. And so this has been capped, as you see on your screen right now, at \$6.3 million. Now, this includes four main projects. IRP phase two,

---

accountability work stream two and it's nine projects, the implementation, and then general activities.

And basically the way this is laid out is on the left hand side, which is in white, we have what we call the community budget ownership. And on the right hand side, we have out of scope, which is basically controlled by ICANN staff. So, basically, out of the four projects that you've got there, the lines, CCWG, IRP, accountability work stream two, implementation, and general activities, the CCWG accountability only has control over parts of the budget for the first two.

That's CCWG IRP phase two, and accountability work stream two. The two remaining ones are completely under ICANN control. Now, in those two projects, let's start with CCWG IRP, phase two, the [inaudible] budget for that is 519, as you can see, and thousand dollars, and the \$400,000 portion for professional external legal services, has been pre-negotiated.

So basically, what we've got, and I see that Xavier has joined us. So that's excellent. Xavier, I'm going to keep going for a few minutes here so you can catch up as to where we are, and then I'll hand it over to you if that's okay.

So I, presently, I gave the overall presentation of the budget, and I'm discussing IRP phase two, where the 400 is under the control of the community, but of the 519, 400 has already been negotiated with the legal firm. So there is not a lot of control there. And you will see there is a matching 400 over on the far right hand side, which is the external legal that has been used by ICANN in this project.

---

The next part is accountability work stream two, where sorry. What I should say is that remaining 119 for other professional services. So basically, it was, this amount was put under there, if there was requirements for graphics works, specialized editing, or other types of research to complete the IRP phase two project. There is no hard definition for that, and as such, it is fully under the control of the control, and therefore by the co-chairs.

On the second project that has community budget ownership, we have accountability work stream two. And you will see there are two components here. There is community travel, which is equivalent to 20 seats per ICANN meeting for the coming year, and the equivalent amount for that. And basically, the community is responsible for managing those.

If we look at the Hyderabad meeting, currently we're using the equivalent of about 14 or 15 of those seats, and we're keeping a very tight grip on that. The remainder of the money for professional services, is 1.4 million for legal fees. That is to cover the nine sub-projects that compose work stream two from human rights, to transparency, to staff accountability, etc. And any legal requirements by the overall CCWG, or what we call the plenary.

That leaves \$225,000, which is basically \$25,000 per each of the nine of the sub-projects, which is under the control of the community. So basically, if you totaled that up out of the \$2.4 million that is under community control, there is \$400,000 there for IRP phase two, which has been basically been locked, but there is minor possibility for control from the ownership.

---

And then on the other side, the remainder of the money, there is \$6.4 million for the rest of the transition. So, now that we are fortunate enough to have Xavier, I hope I didn't mess this up too much, and I can hand it over to you.

Xavier, I'm not hearing you.

TERRI AGNEW:

This is Terri from staff. Xavier, I don't see where your mic is active or you have joined on the telephone portion. To activate your mic, on the top toolbar there is a telephone icon and follow the prompts. Otherwise if you send me a quick chat, again this is Terri Agnew from staff, with your phone number, I can have the operator dial out to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right, so while we get Xavier connected, I'll just keep going. So there are some assumptions here. The travel budget, as I mentioned, there are 20 seats for one full day of CCWG meetings, proceedings, at each of the three annual ICANN meetings. So, it has been a standard for the CCWG accountability, to gather its plenary the day before the ICANN meeting starts, so we can go through all of the issues in face to face, because we do wrestle with a number of the issues, and the community did request that we maintain those one day face to face meetings before each of the ICANN meetings, and ICANN did agree to support that.

Now, as you will note, it's 20 seats for one day. So basically, if we're going to ask people to stay longer, we're obviously going to have less

---

seats. And those 20 seats were derived from experience in work stream one, and the fact that only members are eligible for travel funding. So members are the ones that are selected by the chartering organizations, like the ALAC, to represent the ALAC on the CCWG accountability.

Of course, there can be participants, anyone can self-select and become a participant, but they are not eligible for this travel funding. The professional [inaudible] I think we've gone through, and it's not very interesting, but the ownership implies that it being the project completion within the budgeted resources. It allows the plenary it's supporting to define budget costs, select the resources, and requires that it identify risks, etc.

So, basically, as Thomas mentioned earlier, we are trying something new. Basically giving a cross community working group some control over its budget. But what's important to note is although they are responsible for those portions of the budget that have been identified, we're not simply tossing it to them and saying, good luck. The project costs support team was established in Marrakech.

It was established to track the costs to completion the work stream two, and has been renewed to assist the CCWG accountability with managing that part of the budget for themselves. So the BSP is not there to do the budget management for the CCWG, it's a support function to the CCWG. So it can properly manage that budget, and report to the Board finance committee as to how things are going.

Xavier, I see that you've got a little bar beside your name now. Does that mean that you have the ability to speak?

---

I guess not. Okay. All right. And so this completes the first part of the presentation, almost right on time. And I'll see if there are any immediate questions on this, because then we'll quit this topic and go into the legal cost control mechanisms. Any questions on this part?

Doesn't look like it, all right. Thank you very much. And could we bring up the other presentation please?

All right. This next part discusses, in detail, the legal cost control mechanisms that were adopted by the CCWG accountability. Now, the genesis of this, of course, is that legal costs for the first phase of the transition are until June 2016, were significant on all sides, and the CCWG accountability did have its part in that. And the Board, when looking at the overall [inaudible] for the transition, really wanted to ensure that going forward, that is from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016, for the next year, that there were good controls in place, so that they could ensure themselves that they're putting themselves of the responsibility to be good stewards of ICANN' finances.

This was discussed with the CCWG accountability, and basically the framework I'm going to present to you was agreed by all of the CCWG to, as the mechanisms we will use to control the legal costs for the coming years. All right, let's get on with this.

As I mentioned earlier, we have work stream two. You've got eight of the nine projects there, and this is one of our old slides, as part of the financial responsibility, we didn't get them redone just for that, the mission element. But there are nine sub-projects that we will be working for.

---

If we look at the budget in another way, there is staff...

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Here we go. Do you want me to hold it? Hello?

Hi, this is Xavier, sorry I'm late. [Inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

...past control mechanisms were about on time on the presentation. And I'm going to complete that, and then we'll take some questions. Is that okay?

I'll pretend he said yes to that. All right. So, basically, what we've got for work stream two, is we go through all of the cost, is about \$3 million for fiscal year 17, which runs from July 1<sup>st</sup> to June 30<sup>th</sup>.

There was initially a legal committee, and then, for work stream one in the CCWG accountability, but then circumstances changed, and we had to adapt, if you will, on the fly. And it was generally agreed, as we move into this next phase, in work stream two, that we would reinstate the legal committee. It throws the filter, analyze, refines, and approve request for the legal advice, determines the [inaudible] to respond.

The process is, the committee meets once a month, based on subgroup requests documented and shared before the meeting. [Inaudible], who are presenting the requests may attend the relevant part of the call, to discuss and represent their requests. The legal committee ensures that the request is a legal issue and not a policy issue, because we do not

---

believe that it's very useful to have external legal counsel to address policy issues.

That's for the ICANN community to do. With support from the PSP, the legal community tracks legal expenses, with a distinction between what is related to itself, versus any other legal costs. Counsel may be invited to attend parts of the legal committee meeting to ensure priority, expectations, and context.

So, the composition of the work stream one legal committee was retained. And we have León Sanchez, which is the co-chair and the lead of the legal committee. For those that are unfamiliar with the CCWG accountability, we have three co-chairs. We have León Sanchez, Thomas Rickert, that is with us and is from the GNSO, as well as [inaudible], which is from the ccNSO.

Samantha Eisner, many of you will recognize that name. She is from ICANN Legal. Pavani Budrani, Robin Gross, David [inaudible], [inaudible], Edward [inaudible], and [inaudible]. So basically, these are all community members which make up the legal committee.

Now, let's go to budget ownership. As we saw in the previous presentation, out of all of those amounts, really, this is what we're talking about, that the CCWG budget is owned. That is travel and meeting, legal services, and other. Regular updates on progress, potential trade off decisions, and requesting additional budget is necessary. We wrote that in, but we've been told that if we are to make additional requirements for our budget, the process will be that the CCWG accountability will prepare a request.

---

And that request will have to be approved by the chartering organizations, before the budget finance committee from the ICANN Board will consider it. So that's just to put that into perspective a bit. And in detail, how the process will work, if ICANN Legal already has an answer available to the question, it can be shared immediately to avoid extra cost.

Again, talking about, we're entering a new phase here. I think Samantha Eisner put it well. The work stream one situation really was different in the role that ICANN Legal had to play, versus the CCWG accountability. And it was important for both sides to have their legal counsel. And there were several issues that were resolved because both sides had their legal counsels, and they were, the lawyers, actually, worked it out.

In work stream two, I think, we've moved on. We set the guidelines in the CCWG accountability recommendations, which have been adopted for the transition. And therefore, this is reflected in how we will be working with ICANN Legal, in that if they have an answer pending, we'll be glad to take it in this case.

The committee may direct the request that ICANN Legal for external parts, based on a case by case assessment. So, again, I'm not going to run through all of the details, but basically the reality is that if ICANN Legal doesn't have the answer, we will look at who can get us the answer the quickest and the cheapest, and ensure that the question that we're asking is not an open-ended question.

---

I think the big point here is we're really trying to ensure that if we're going to use external legal counsel, that we use them efficiently as the kind of tool they are to answer very specific questions. So really, the role of the legal committee, make sure that we've really framed those questions very well for the external counsel, that once we have decided who we think is best to answer that, that we get a schedule for getting an answer, and an estimate for the cost, then we can track that and make sure things are going along.

Once the legal committee has determined if it needs [inaudible] to request the relevant details, included estimated cost and a report from the PCSP on the financial impact of that request to the co-chairs for approval. Now, for the CCWG accountability, the co-chairs have been declared the official budget owners. They are the ones who make the decisions.

So that is why the legal committee is responsible for packaging the recommendation to use internal lawyers, but the final comes from the co-chairs who are the official budget owners. The co-chairs will consider the request, and the financial impact as soon as possible, and provide a formal response of the legal committee, which will be documented on the CCWG Wiki, if approved.

So that's our process to run through this. And my presentation, almost dead on-time, and so we'll be glad to take questions now. And I say Xavier is in and he has a mic. Welcome back, Xavier. So, any questions?

Oh, come on, there has got to be at least one.

Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: This is not the first time I've heard this presentation. I have no questions.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [Laughing] Okay. I'll pat myself on the back, and say, okay, we've been practicing. We've been practicing that a lot, and I've done a great job explaining it, and therefore there are no questions. Xavier wishes to speak, I will turn it over to Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I apologize for joining late. For some reason, my phone number was actually black listed by Adobe, and I couldn't... Which is interesting. I think I've paid all of the bills, but... So, while people are thinking it through potential questions, I just wanted to add a bit to what Bernie has said already, and put things a little bit in the context of the accountability working group.

But if you think about it, the budget ownership by the co-chairs of the costs that are associated with the activities that are required to do the work, is an accountable mechanism itself. It's allowing the co-chairs to

---

be both responsible and therefore accountable, for the activities that are required to be carried out to achieve the objectives, and for the costs associated with those activities.

So it's about accountability. It's interesting that this working group is about accountability, but the budget ownership of the co-chairs is an accountable mechanism. And it's quite responsible to use that the co-chairs have shown the will to take on, to be able to carry out the work and it enabled the broad community, with the CCWG members, to take on the work, to carry out the work to completion, and to take all [inaudible] of the budget responsibility of the costs incurred as a result of that work.

And it's not a simple task. León, Thomas, and Matthew have put themselves forward, bravely, to take on the task of co-chairing in [inaudible] taking on in addition the responsibility of saying, this is how much money we have in our hands to be able to ensure we have face to face meetings, to be able to ensure that we have the right advice for the work that we need to carry out.

So that the outcome is of the quality that it needs to be, and that it achieves the objectives. And we need legal advice for that. And everyone across the community, and the Board, and the staff, all agree that the outcome, the quality of the outcome is indispensable and that therefore, the legal advice is something that needs to be provided, so that this outcome is of the quality that it needs to be.

It comes at cost and the co-chairs have taken on the duty of managing the budget that is associated with those costs. And it's a big

---

responsibility, it's a new one as well, so we all have to recognize that this is something new for ICANN as a community, to explicitly sign responsibility of the budget in this exercise to community members.

So, I'll stop there, but I thought it would be useful to emphasize this fundamental responsibility and accountability role that's take on by the CCWG. I will stop there and see if there is any questions or reactions. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you Xavier. And I see Alan has his hand up. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have no questions. I do have some thoughts, though. One of the issues, and as chair, no. If everything goes well, and the budget is managed within the parameters that we've been given, then I think everything is just dandy. There are other alternatives, however, the estimated legal costs going forward, have not been created scientifically based on what we know is going to happen over the next year.

A complete estimate based on a little bit of past history, some rules of thumb, you know, and sticking our fingers up, our wet fingers up in the air and seeing which way the wind is blowing. So it's quite possible, as we go forward, we will find that the legal budget or other parts of it, are just not where we hope they were. And I have a little bit of concern as the chair of one of the chartering organizations, were presumably, at least what I've been told until now, is, should we have to go back for

---

additional budget, it will rest on the chartering organizations to approve it and ask for that level of funding.

And I guess I don't understand what the process would be. I can easily imagine being told that, well, you approved the budget, you know, and tough luck. And yet, I also understand the uncertainty that was associated with at least parts of the budget, certainly the external expenses. Travel is a little bit more predictable. So I guess I'd like some comments from Xavier on how we would go, how he would see this going forward, if as we go forward, it becomes clear that the budgets are not sufficient.

And I'm presuming it won't suddenly be, we won't suddenly be told one day we're out of money, but, you know, we'll be tracking it month by month, and hopefully understanding that we're not on course. But how does he see that playing out?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you Bernie, and thank you Alan for providing that question, because obviously, I think this is one that everyone will relate to logically. The way I view it is that, you know, whether it's in these circumstances, or more standard [inaudible] for any organization, when there is a [budget?] to associate with either a department or a project, there is the intent by the project owner or project manager to carry out to completion the project within the budget.

---

But to your point, and we have emphasized that as it relates to the CCWG and the WS 2 is that, to your point, Alan, we don't really know what's going to happen. We don't even know for each of the work streams within WS2 whether each will require legal advice, and how much legal advice, and so on.

So, the past is not necessarily a prediction of the future, we don't know for sure what the level is going to be, and therefore, whether or not the budget is going to be sufficient. So it is, it would be actually quite surprising that we've been so insightful in the prediction of that budget, that they will not be differences.

So, what happens if there is? I think that first, exactly as you said, Alan, we should work, and this is where the PCSG is providing support, we should work to ensure that we have a clear understanding of what the costs are on an ongoing basis. So the plan is that we are able to report the costs incurred in relation to this project, on a monthly basis. Sometimes it will take a bit of estimation, but that's fine.

So that we have a good understanding of what the costs are for the activities that have that incurred. Second step, [every month?] as well, won't we have the understanding of what the costs are, we then need to be able to work between the PCSG and the co-chairs and anyone who needs to help with that, to try to understand what does that mean for the future?

Based on what we know, what do we think is going to happen in the next weeks or months, so that we can try to use the knowledge of the most recent past to predict what is going to happen in the future, and

---

therefore, how much legal advice, for example, do we think we're going to need to use?

And this is again an exercise of prediction, which is never precise. On that basis, we should have a certain amount of ability to be able to say, at some point among that path, you know what? We've consumed, after two months, half of the budget, we're not even close to halfway done, we think we're going to need more resources.

So there is a precursor of the need, the future need, that comes out of the ability to monitor the costs closely, and use that monitoring to try to forecast what's going to happen. So hopefully, to not, it's not coming as a complete news, when the need is coming for more resources.

So if that forecast happens, and that ability has allowed to identify that there is a need, I think then a request is put through to say, this is what has happened, this is what we think needs to happen in the future. For all of those reasons, we think we need that much, or that little, amount of extra help, but for, to accomplish this.

We've evaluated alternatives that maybe work or do not work, and as a result, we think we need this much more budget. That request is formulated, documented, submitted to the SOs and ACs chairs or for the chartering organizations, for them to look at, evaluate, assess and approve or deny.

And if it's approved, then it's a request that's submitted to the Board, who will do the same exercise through, probably, the finance committee to say, we understand, we agree, and we're going to allocate

---

resources. We're going to try to find the funding for it, and we're going to allocate the resources.

So I think, Alan, this is the general path. It's not a science, it's more of an art, but if we have a transparent process all along on the analysis of the costs, the forecast of the costs, and the process to review that all together, I think we have a chance to make it transparent, and therefore, make it clear and accountable for everyone.

Let me stop there. I see that Thomas has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And it's a new hand for me, too.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Let's go to Thomas first, and then we'll come back to you Alan. Thomas?

THOMAS:

Yes, thank you. And thanks Alan for the question. I guess that, we as co-chairs, but also you as a member of this CCWG, will talk very soon if something is getting out of control. So it may well be, let's say, that we put something out for public comment, and we get feedback from the community indicating that we got things totally wrong, and we need to start from scratch again.

---

You know, those would be indicators that we would certainly [inaudible], try to sketch out [inaudible] and ask for more money. So, we would [inaudible]...

...I think that everyone community, staff, Board, is fully [inaudible] of the fact that there might be [inaudible]... require all of us to readjust. [Inaudible] I have no doubt that the chartering organizations will approve such requests, as well as the Board would.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you Thomas. All right, back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. First an editorial comment. I'm very pleased with Xavier's answer. The discussions on this subject have been held for several months now, and at one point, somebody in a senior position told me that these budgets were calculated, you know, with a great amount of precision, and there is going to be no reason, if we're doing our job properly, that it would ever be exceeded.

And that's something that I just didn't buy in. I'm glad to hear that Xavier is saying that this is closer to an art than a science. And perhaps a black art, and you know, we're going to have to work to see how it goes.

One question, and then I have one other comment to make. At one point, I was told that the external legal counsel, or at least one of them, that the CCWG was using, was not able to produce bills in less than two or three months. And that clearly makes projections a little bit hard if

---

you're months behind. Do we have some level of assurance that all three external counsels, the ones that the CCWG has been using plus ICANN's external legal counsel, are in a position to give us pretty accurate numbers on a timely basis?

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Xavier, I see your hand up. You want to take a crack at this one?

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** Yes, please. Thank you Alan for the question [CROSSTALK]. Well, so, it has always been [inaudible] for a reason that I don't understand, to produce invoices. They have an internal reporting system. It's ongoing, the details. Some are faster than others. What we have tried to do, Alan, is try to...

Rather than resolve that problem because it's out of our control, we try to get around the problem, in what we now have is a more timely communication of the number of hours, which seems to be easier for the legal firms to produce, then a final bill.

And the amount of hours lets us then produce an estimate of the corresponding costs, because with our times per rate, produces the expense, and we are able to, using that more timely information, round to the number of hours, we're therefore more timely able to produce estimates of the costs.

So this is how we are trying to get around the problem, Alan, to try to help ourselves having more timely understanding of what are the costs

---

that have been incurred, as a result of the time spent. And this is how we...

Now, this is about a two to three weeks exercise between the end of the month and the time when we had managed to get those hours in the past. So we're hoping to be able to stick to that, but it's better than two to three months, is the bottom line.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I'd just like to make a brief comment, if I may. We've been having discussions on this issue, since I think, early last December, when there was the first discussion with the Board finance committee that there were problems in the last problem, and how were we going to fix them? And we've gone through a number of iterations, and at the very beginning, I think it was me who originally pointed out, that the radical shift in concept that we are now going to have co-chairs who are not simply there to run a meeting, and to gently try to push the group in a direction which will address the problem, which is traditionally what chairs do within ICANN working groups, but actually have some level of responsibility, and be able to say, under some conditions, no to the working group, or we have to do things differently.

You know, not would you guys like to do things differently? But we have to do things differently. And we're doing this without any increase in the salary of the co-chairs, I believe, and I would like to thank all three of them for taking on the responsibility, and thank ICANN for putting staff into it to give them the tools and ultimately the chartering organizations the tools, to try to take responsibility for this. Thank you.

---

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Thank you Alan. All right. We have about 13 minutes left. Are there any additional questions or comments?

Not seeing any, I will ask if Thomas has any closing remarks?

**THOMAS:** Thanks very much Bernie. Just very briefly. I think the three of us know that there is some responsibility going along with this, but let me confess that I thought responsibility for making the project work, content wise, was... Or at least, I perceived that burden bigger than the additional budget controls. But we do know that extra budget controls is required to improve the working relationship with ICANN, the organization.

I think we are growing together more in this post-transition world. I think that we would now have to demonstrate that we live up to the expectations from the community, and I do sincerely hope that this model can be exported to other areas of policy making, because I think that this is part of a truly empowered community. Thank you.

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Thank you Thomas. Xavier, any closing comments?

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** Thank you. I just want to add to the same direction as Thomas has, that you know, I think this is... We're entering a new era, and we need to, as

---

a community, come together to make things happen in new ways. And I'm very confident that the cooperation of everyone around the table to do the right thing, which is, deliver these proposals for WS 2, done in a most cost effective manner, but with achieving the objective, everyone coming around the table, it will work.

If we put our minds to it, if we put our efforts to it, and we're all rolling in the same direction, we will make it happen. Collaboration and good will, is more powerful than all of the obstacles, and the politics, and so on, and I'm very [inaudible] that we can make that happen well.

It's innovative. It's ground breaking, but it means that we need to put all of our efforts behind it. And I think this roots participation and endorsement of this approach, as well as the GNSO and the other groups together, is important so that we can all make progress together as a community, and start, be able to work more collaboratively together, for a better outcome.

And I think this is a very good example of it, and I'm very confident that we can manage this. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you Xavier. All right then. I see Alan has his hand up, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

He does indeed. I have to respond to Thomas. Thomas is right. This budget control, on an overall level, is not the largest part of the responsibility of the chairs of this working group. The chairs of all

---

ICANN working groups, and I'm talking about within the SOs, within the ACs, and certainly the cross community ones, is a rather onerous task.

And it's one that ICANN has never it really appreciates and understands. And perhaps this process we're going through now will help to open people's eyes. Now, I won't go into details, but there are examples where clearly, chairs have been really, really important, and have been treated in a way that's completely without recognition of that by ICANN, for a good number of years.

So I agree, but this one is different in that the chairs are not taking responsibility for the success of the group and the project overall, but are also taking a managerial position with respect to the working group. It's different from the other parts, and that is the part I was alluding to.

Anyway, thank you all.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right, thank you Alan. Are there any last comments from anybody else?

All right. Thank you very much everyone for attending, and I'll hand it back over to Terri to close us off. Thank you everyone again. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**