EN

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability taking place on Thursday the 22nd of September, 2016 at 12:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Gordon Chillcott, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Kaili Kan, TIjani Ben Jemaa, Louis Houle, Maureen HIlyard, Tatiana Tropina, Barrack Otieno, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Harold Arcos.

We have listed apologies from Leon Sanchez, Alberto Soto, and Bastiaan Goslings.

From staff we have Ariel Liang and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

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

With this, I'll turn it back over to Olivier. Please begin.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Welcome back to another one of our calls on IANA issues at ICANN Accountability. A call that is going to be a little bit different in that we are going to have an agenda item to change the work group name. I hope we're not going to spend half an hour on this, but there have been some suggestions on the call. So that's one thing.

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.

After that, we'll be having a quick look at the IANA implementation update of what's going on on this, and some of you might have followed some videos online and streaming with some battles going on in Washington D.C.

After that, the bulk of our call is going to be focusing on Work Stream 2. Work Stream 1 on ICANN Accountability is pretty much done, and Work Stream 2, there are many different work streams – Diversity, Guidelines for Good Faith, Human Rights, etc., I just took those from the wiki. We might have missed a couple but so far this looks to be the full list. Hopefully, we will have people from our participants in the different working groups that will be able to provide us an update of what's going on there. It's very difficult indeed to keep track of everything at the same time.

That's the agenda as it stands. Are there any amendments to the agenda that anybody wishes to make or any additional items to be added anywhere in the agenda or in Any Other Business?

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have an update of the agenda issue that if anyone would like to offline volunteer to look at, please do. You'll notice line E of the main agenda Ombudsman is in a different font. I spent far more time than I should have yesterday trying to fix that, including retyping it in from scratch

and it always shows up in a different font. If anyone could figure out why, I'd really like to know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Perhaps we can have an action item of our Technical Task Force to investigate this matter [inaudible] contact them directly. I'm faced with the same problems as you with these different fonts on the agenda.

Anyway, so no problem with the fonts and the agenda is adopted as it's currently listed but with the correct fonts.

Work Group Name is the next thing. At the moment it's called IANA Issues and ICANN Accountability or the IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability. The mailing list is called IANA Issues. The idea is to keep the same mailing list name but to actually change the working group name. There have been some suggestions made and put forward including one to call it ICANN Evolution. And I gather you've all read your e-mails. And I noticed that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up and then put it down. Alan, did you wish to intervene on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: You already intervened. Most of the names had some level of criticism except for the last one that was suggested by Sebastien which I think if I remember correctly was ICANN Evolution. I actually came up with that independently. There's been a few people who said they like that. I think it's neutral in terms of the subject and it certainly is what we're

talking about and is what we have been talking about. So I would suggest we not spend a half an hour but just accept that name.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you. I support what Alan has just said with two little remarks. The first thing is I think the broader the title of the working group the better it is. And in that sense, ICANN Evolution is I think really very good. What I cautioned against was using the word IANA Transition in any form or shape because we are not transitioning IANA, say out of this. It's not the operations we are transitioning, it is the proposal to transition the oversight [over it]. I had sent around an e-mail and that was my suggestion. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I think that some of us actually made the point two years ago to ICANN staff that were in charge of the IANA Stewardship Transition that they should not call it IANA Transition, and it just ended up being IANA Transition.

In any case, that's all the past. I see no objection on the call, at least to the ICANN Evolution suggestion. There has been no objection to it on the mailing list, in which case I think we can say that this is moving forward and that will be our first action item to staff to rename the working group to ICANN Evolution.

We can move swiftly on to agenda item #3 – IANA Update – the latest implementation status on this. I was going to add a few links to this, but there's just so much going on in parallel and if you're interested in tracking the evolution, you can actually have a look at the latest calls. The one that is supposed to take place I think it's just after this call is going to have the usual mix of the implementation update and key issues that are still a problem.

Of the things that have been resolved, first the contract on service level agreement/service level expectation, that's been basically dealt with. On the implementation where a large number of things that needed to be done in parallel and it looks as though everything according to the beautiful graphics that are supplied by ICANN staff and by the Implementation Team, it looks as though everything is on course for working and being ready by the 30th of September, which is only a few days away.

There are still some issues lingering around, one of them being the Intellectual Property side of things – who owned iana.org and the whole associated debate around this whole thing. We initially thought it was going to be a small thing, but obviously small things always end up being huge problems, headaches, I don't know, but it probably will be fixed one way or other. This is an issue which needs to be fixed with the other operational communities so it's not just a naming community side of things, and Sidley is working on this.

Apart from that, there is always an update from the Client Committee letting us know what is going on with Sidley and with the other law firm,

especially in the matter of controlling costs since, as you know, they had been spiraling.

That's the quick update. I think that Alan Greenberg, we might have a few other points to point out in this. I'm not quite sure there's anything that we need to take action on at this moment. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's very much actually related to that group. There's a budget item which I was reminded yesterday we've dropped the ball on that ICANN has come back with some numbers and methodology to both control the costs on Work Stream 2 of the Accountability CCWG and fund all of the remaining transition costs. And that requires approval of the ACs and SOs. And it turns out we didn't do anything about it. We did have a webinar on it a little while ago and there was an action item out of that or should have been that hasn't gotten acted on and we will be doing that imminently.

Other than that, I think you've covered it all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Are there any comments or questions from any of our participants that are still holding on dearly to the IANA calls? As I said, if you are feeling withdrawal symptoms, there is an IANA call immediately after the call that we're currently having.

I don't see anyone jumping up and down or putting their hands up, so we can move to the next agenda item, that's Work Stream 2.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Just a word not so much about the mechanisms and all the things you mentioned, but rather the possible outcome. As you probably saw, there were e-mails from Vinton Cerf and others underlining the political factor and the decision which might arise from all this turmoil. Actually, you can consider that there are two main groups of outcomes. So to make it simple – two outcomes. One is that the Congress manages under the pretext of adjusting the financial aspects, the budget aspects, of the United States to block this for an undetermined duration. And if that's the case, then during this presidency, during this administration, it will not happen. And of course, in that case, we don't know if and when the next presidency would take it up. And in any case, that would represent at the minimum several months' delay if not sidetracking altogether.

The other alternative which still seems to be a possibility that the administration, meaning the President of the United States decides to go ahead because he can rely on the written advice by the GAO (General Accountancy Office) of the United States which has said that we cannot consider the Internet, as Ted Cruz has claimed, is a material property and therefore it would not be taking it away from the property of the United States because it isn't that to begin with.

That would take some political courage. If this is one of the things that President Obama really cares about then he could do it theoretically,

but I don't know how far he is engaged in this. So I just wanted to point out the two possible consequences. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jean-Jacques, and for this very interesting analysis of the various scenarios that can roll out from today. I note that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for comic relief and to take us all down a notch on how important the Internet is, I'll note in a report yesterday there's discussion saying that in the Senate, Democrats are willing to horse trade delaying the IANA Stewardship Transition in exchange for funding a international trade program. So we now know what our value is and where the pecking order is. I've heard nothing about what's going on in the U.S. in the House of Representatives which presumably would have to have a similar bill for this to actually be enacted into law.

Anyway, we could talk forever on that on this subject and I'm not sure there's a lot of merit other than saying keep watching your ticker tape, as it were.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course that is the technology we'll go back to as soon as the Internet is destroyed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, Alan. Just to mention for those that still have the ability to watch videos and so on and you haven't watched the recent Senate Committee intervention, it makes for entertaining watching. So I would thoroughly recommend a view or two, and there are some recordings around.

Moving now to Work Stream 2 and happier times. The various Work Streams have been hard at work already. Thankfully we have hastily identified a few people that are participants in each one of these Work Streams. To remind you, anybody can be part of the Work Stream. You can be either a participant or you need to be active, respond to e-mails, and actually say something during calls. Or you can be an observer where you can just watch from the sidelines and apparently you do not have the ability to post. You just look at the train wreck as it's about to happen.

We start with Diversity, and thank you, Terri, for having put that page on the Adobe Connect. I'm not sure who wishes to speak to that. We actually have, I believe four people that are identified – Cheryl, Sebastien, Seun, and Tijani – so I'm not sure who wishes to take the floor. I know that Sebastien has put his hand up, so let's have Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to say that this group met only once two months ago and was waiting for the staff paper. The group received the staff paper just a few days ago, then hopefully this work will really start next week. We are still waiting for an announcement on when will be the first real working meeting on the Diversity Drafting Team or Design Team, whatever name we want to [give] to it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. So if I understand you correctly there hasn't been a meeting yet – no call so far.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one at the beginning but the conclusion was we will not organize any other meeting before we got the staff paper, and we, the group got the staff paper a few days ago and then I guess now we will see a call for a second meeting where we will start to work really. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Anybody else on further updates on the Work Stream Diversity? I don't see anybody's hands up, so that means we can then move on swiftly.

But in the meantime, whilst we move from one agenda item to another, Alan Greenberg will be a very happy man to note that Terri Agnew has fixed the font on today's agenda. How delightful. Thank you very much, Terri. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we should thank her for shaming us old people, but thank you, Terri.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That was specifically to put you there, Alan. And me, too.

Guidelines for Good Faith – Cheryl, Avri, and Alan are part of this Work Stream. It would be interesting to also have an update. What does that mean – Guidelines for Good Faith? I wondered and I didn't think there was any religious item to this, but "good faith" it was just a weird name. So who wishes to provide us with an update on this, please?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up for this one. Alan, did you wish – I note that you are in bold on this page so I'm not quite sure whether you're a co-Chair or… Oh, you're not. You're just –

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just there. We had the first meeting yesterday so I can't say we've done an awful lot of work. There was a fair amount of discussion on just what the group is doing and what exactly do we mean by operating in good faith and to what extent how much flexibility do we have in reasons for removing Directors. The discussion was largely focused on that. Certainly there were a number of different beliefs of where we are. I think we're now all on the same page, and the discussion will presumably start in some level of seriousness in coming meetings and online. So there hasn't been a lot of actual progress and I'm not going to say any more than that. Cheryl was at the meeting and can certainly

contribute if she wants to. Cheryl's at all meetings as far as I can tell and always has something to say.

I think that one is looking at the process of if we ever go start initiate the process of removing one or more Directors, this will to some extent provide the guidelines and ground rules to try to make sure that none of us are sued as a result of the process. You may recall that the new Bylaws provide for indemnification of people designated by ACs and SOs to act as their spokespeople if they act in good faith. This is some level of attempt to make sure that we've defined that ahead of time so people aren't surprised that a lawsuit comes on the door.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. That makes a lot more sense than the current name of the working group. I also note that it seems to have attracted the least number of people to work on this, but it's pretty important of course, if one is looking at the ability to be sued when you carry out the responsibilities that the Empowered Community has bestowed upon you. That's a very interesting group indeed and I would recommend if anybody is interested, to perhaps join. I think you're allowed to join at any time, so you can indeed.

Okay, any questions or comments from anybody on this call on this topic? I'm not seeing anybody, so thank you very much for this update, Alan. Cheryl, I know that you want to do an update later on on other things, so jump in when you can.

The next one is Human Rights. Now, that's a huge topic and that is one that has a very large group of people associated with it and working in

it. The At-Large community representatives that have been identified so far are numerous, from Avri, Bastiaan, Erich Schweighofer, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Leon, Seun, and Tijani. I would ask any of those people to provide us with an update to step forward. I see the fastest person on the buzzer has been Tijani Ben Jemaa. So Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. The last one [inaudible] the fastest on the buzzer as you said. Okay. I am a member of this group. I would like to make a general statement. I have been registered as a member of four groups. By the way, we called them subgroups, Olivier. The CWG you call them [Inaudible] in this group, in the CWG you call them subgroups. So I [inaudible] the four subgroups and I started working on the four subgroups, but I realized that I will not be able to follow the four. That's why –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, you have started to cut off. I don't know whether it's me or whether it's you, but I can't hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: He has cut off.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA: [Inaudible] and now I think we are on the [inaudible] one next week. My comment on our work is that we are turning around. We are not going straight forward to that in the CWG Plenary a few days ago because I

said in the subgroup that we have a very clear mission which is in the [inaudible] of the CCWG final document and we need to stick to this mission. Our mission is to provide the framework of interpretation of the Human Rights in the ICANN context but importantly the members are always trying to widen the discussion. Now we are discussing the [inaudible] made by someone who is called [inaudible] and I think those [inaudible] are used by the UN. So I think that we try to see which of those principles will be applicable to our work. Now the last meeting which was two days ago we discussed four of them. Unfortunately, I was cut in the middle of [inaudible], everything was cut because ICANN is using voice on IP and since the Internet was cut, everything was cut, even the [telephone]. So I was cut in the middle of the conference which is really unfortunate.

But I can tell you that we are discussing those principles to see how they can fit in our work. And I am feeling that people try to widen the discussion because they want to widen more or less the mission we have, but I will not be [opinionated] about that. I am waiting until we finish at this discussion until we decide to start the real work which is starting to do our work we have I think six points defined in the Annex 6 of the final document that we have to undertake and we will start. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Tijani. We lost you for 20 seconds in the middle of your intervention but I think that we caught the major parts of it. It was only 20 seconds. So thank you for this.

Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to make a general statement which is an apology to all my colleagues on the four groups to which I belong, meaning Human Rights, Jurisdiction, SO and AC Accountability, and Transparency, because I've been occupied with some other stuff for these past few weeks and I have missed out on most of the meetings of these particular subgroups. So I'm now coming back into that and I just wanted to say sorry to my colleagues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this apology, Jean-Jacques. We all have lives outside of ICANN. That's absolutely okay to miss some of the calls. Welcome back and we hope to have your good contributions on these topics. You're very brave to go for so many as well, so many of these subgroups.

Next we have Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello everyone. I'm new to these groups. I would like to support what Tijani said about Human Rights because I do share his concerns. While I have been very active in this subgroup – or let's call it Design Team – and I believe that this subgroup is really trying to move forward and the co-Chairs are doing their best to create a real content and draft something. I believe that this subgroup is so big and the voices are very diverse and many people would like to go much further than is defined in the Annex 6 or Annex 12 the scope of this work. I can see that the

task for us now for people like Tijani, like myself, and others is just to bring discussion back on the thread because I believe that a Human Rights Framework of Interpretation can be used quite a dangerous tool for widening ICANN mission if it will be used as framework of implementation, for example, instead of interpretation.

Basically, I think that with due caution we can get this back on track, but it will still require some efforts because many people I knew they didn't participate in the CCWG Work Stream 1 or in the work [inaudible] Human Rights and they don't know the previous discussions. And as much as we wanted to update everyone, it seems that sometimes people just don't read the documents so they are not aware of the discussions, or they just don't want to be aware of the previous discussions. So I do share Tijani's concern. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. Indeed the group has 66 members and 55 observers, so that makes for a very, very, large party indeed. And if indeed everyone is pulling in a different direction it might take a little while for things to weed themselves out and start focusing and to converge the different points.

Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just an interesting sociological comment. It's interesting that there's a heavy overlap between the people who want to widen the Human Rights scope and people who are on a regular basis saying we

need to keep ICANN, not widen ICANN's scope and keep ICANN out of content in a variety of other things. Just curious. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Tatiana, your hand is up again?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, I just wanted to make a comment, sociologically I hope Alan doesn't mean me because I was always opposing to widening Human Rights and I really want to narrow it down as far as possible. So I'm out of the sociological – how to say – research maybe or I'm just an exception which proves the general rule. But I actually concur to what Alan is saying. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: No intent to spread the sociological ills.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. I guess we don't have anyone else in the queue for the Human Rights, so good luck everyone who's involved in this and we hope that you are able to converge sooner rather than later, and we'll look forward to some future updates.

Next is the Jurisdiction. Another one of these huge, big, discussions with very, very, vocal people out there, including people in the United States each pulling in a different direction. This group has an equal large number of people – 57 active participants, 43 observers. It must be an

absolute party on these calls and I wonder who wishes to provide us with an update on this? The people we had identified were Avri, Christopher Wilkinson, Erich Schweighofer, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Tijani Ben Jemaa. I see Tijani, you've put your hand up so you have the floor, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. As I said, I am now concentrating on those focusing on those two groups, Human Rights and Jurisdiction. That's why I asked for the floor. [Inaudible] ago. We are working from the beginning and I think we will have our sixth meeting next week or so. So a very active group. [Inaudible] remark. We are not doing straight forward to the point. We are turning things around again. Yesterday night we had our teleconference and I said that I was really sorry that we are discussing, we are not going to the work directly. We are discussing things that [demanding] that yesterday we spent our time to discuss if we have to take out of the table the jurisdictional layer of the incorporation and the location. Why it is in the final document for CCWG. Some people want to remove it and so we spent a lot of time to talk about that and I said that and people said we will not reach consensus. I said if we don't reach consensus, we will report it. It's not a problem. We don't have to make use conversation like this. We need to go to the work. We need to start our work. We have our list of tasks that we have to do and we have to start. But we didn't start.

Yesterday we discussed whether we need to take off of the table the layer of the incorporation and the location. Why [pending] on the group? Everyone is almost convinced that to [while we] address this

issue, this layer, we will decide, we will recommend that the location will be California and the incorporation will remain in California. But people want to remove it from the list. And this is a problem. There were people who really want to move it. I didn't care because I know the result. But the problem is that we are discussing things that we don't have to discuss. Our work is to go and address this layer, address the location, address the incorporation. But we didn't do. Greg Shatan was the rapporteur and I told him that really I am really upset because we are spending time, we are losing time on those things. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Tijani. I was somehow expecting this sort of a discussion. Having heard the different points of view of what the actual scope of this working group is, some saying that jurisdiction, as you said, is the location of head office and the incorporation, some saying that that's been already discussed in Work Stream 1 and it's done and dusted. We've established that ICANN will remain in the U.S. And others are saying that the Work Stream 2 work is to do with what happens when you have contracts, etc. that are all based under U.S. jurisdiction. Is there a way for ICANN to, whilst remaining incorporated in California, to use its other offices around the world to perform more local contracts, etc. Lots of different angles I had heard that could be touched on, but if the group can't focus that's a challenge already.

We have Tatiana Tropina in the queue and next Alan Greenberg afterwards. But before that, I have been told by staff that Maureen

Hilyard had put her hand up and I missed it somehow. My Adobe Connect is a little bad. Maureen, did I zap you at some point?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. No, you didn't. I actually put it up accidentally.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. Let's go back to Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thanks very much to Tijani for this update. I missed the call yesterday because of my travel schedule. I was on the airplane. I wanted to read the transcript but I'm not sure I really actually want to read it. What really surprises me about all these discussions is that it is not up to Work Stream 2 Drafting Team on Jurisdiction to define whether the place of incorporation would be discussed in this group because I believe that this is clearly reopening the issue which has already been decided and sealed as a deal in the Work Stream 1. And to be honest, I do not understand why the Drafting Team, why the co-Chairs, don't bring it up to the CCWG Plenary to solve this question once and forever. I believe that if it was discussed again on yesterday's call, it has been like third time this question pokes up again and again and again.

I don't understand the diverse forces that don't understand different interests who want to bring this topic up, but I believe that it's outside of the scope of the group and this should be solved somehow and if necessary, with the CCWG Plenary because I believe that we do have the report on Annex 12 as well for Work Stream 2 which states what

we're going to discuss there in Work Stream 2 actually and nowhere it says that the place of incorporation should be reconsidered.

I believe that I personally will be trying to push this to the Plenary. I saw [inaudible] that Greg is a bit against this. But I believe that it shouldn't be decided within the group because these discussions will go on and on and on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tatiana. You must be a newbie in this part of the world because when you say that something has been dealt with and has been resolved forever, this is ICANN. Nothing gets resolved forever here.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm not a newbie, I'm a lawyer. I'm spoiled. As a lawyer I just can't believe that questions like this might pop up again and again and again, be they at ICANN or anywhere else. But probably you are right. I'm quite a newbie. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will sadly have to tell Tatiana that a good number of the people who are on the other side of this discussion are also lawyers. That alone does not explain anything.

I think the problem we're having here is the same as the one in Human Rights. There were interminable discussions within the CCWG, and although we did put words in the Annexes describing the Work Stream 2 work to be done, we did not actually reach closure and satisfaction of all of the participants. We effectively from the point of view of many participants simply said we will stop the discussion on Human Rights or Jurisdiction here and continue it in Work Stream 2.

Certainly that is the interpretation from a lot of people's perspective and that's what we're seeing here. How we get out of it, I don't know. The discussions were not likely to be easily closed in the CCWG proper, and I think it's going to take significant strength to do it here. Whether we do it with people agreeing or simply agreeing to disagree, I don't know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I note in the chat that everyone is saying yes, that will be a very tough task indeed. I see Sebastien Bachollet. You're next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I think this topic it's of course interesting and difficult topic but it's also a question of timing, and I guess one of the reason it was discussed like that in the subgroup it's because of the hearing at the Senate and the discussion with Republicans about a few question and one is the incorporation of ICANN and the answer was that anyhow whatever we decide today, any organization, whatever the

type of organization [except] the government can move to another place within the country or outside the country.

I guess if it was taken out of the discussion of Work Stream 2, it would have been a good way or at least a good image to show to some of the people who are trying to derail the IANA stewardship transition. But there are people who are willing to have their own position taken into account and finally the transition is not what they care about and it's why it's so complicated, I guess.

But we will need as a full group to decide where to go and maybe we as At-Large ALAC or this subgroup in the ALAC and we need to say a few things about both Human Rights, Jurisdiction, and maybe others, to say we as one of the group who are supporting this work we want to have a stop on those issue or we want to have it done in this way or the other. Because it may be one way to go ahead and not just give the subgroups or the Drafting Team to go what they want and have it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for that. Talking about the Congressional hearing which happened a few days ago, there were allegations made that the previous ICANN [inaudible]. Any thoughts on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Olivier. You cut out just in the middle of your sentence.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let me rewind then. I was saying that looking at the recent Congressional hearing there were allegations made that the previous ICANN President had told the French government recently on a recent visit that when it came down to jurisdiction everything was up for grabs, or at least the location of ICANN was part of this. Anything to mention or any correct allegation, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I followed this hearing and I really think that both the question and the answer were quite [inaudible]. First of all, it was not an allegation or [inaudible] the French government [inaudible] hearing at the French Senate [inaudible] one year ago I guess it was two years ago. I can check the date exactly. At that time we were still in discussion and many option were open. It's a little bit difficult to say that the President of ICANN say that he will move ICANN to Switzerland. It was a topic for discussion and I guess that Jean-Jacques will say because he was involved in the President Strategy Committee and it was a long time ago when his discussion went on the table.

Yeah, Fadi said that definitely, but it was another time and it was before we as a committee came with a proposal about Work Stream 1 and take into account all the inputs. And yes, as a President he was supposed to prepare different scenario and one among them was Switzerland. I can also tell you that I asked our Minister in France to propose France to receive a multistakeholder organization, and there is no place for a multistakeholder organization. There is place in Switzerland for international organizations. There is place in New York also. But this was not taken into account. Let's just say that it's difficult to say that the

President… We know where it's coming from and why they try to push in the corner Fadi what [we] have done on that and what [we] have done with China and some other thing. But if we are in this transition it's because he was very active and he have done a very important and good job.

I really think that it was a bad [bush] the discussion. Both side of the discussion was very difficult at the hearing and it's why I really think that we need to go ahead with what we have done, and we have done just taking into account the input of Fadi but all the committee. It's why we are where we are today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Jean-jacques Subrenat is next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, a few points. First of all, I don't know Fadi very well but in the meetings I've been in I think that he is always ready to speak in terms which were understood [interlocutor] of the moment. That wasn't meant to say that he will say anything just to please his [interlocutor]. That's the first thing.

The second thing is that whereas Geneva and other places were indeed contemplated, it was never at that time when I was a member of the Board and one of the [choruses] of the improving accountability – or I'm sorry, improving some other name – of ICANN we had looked at at least a dozen if not more locations for (and here I quote) an "additional jurisdiction." So it would in any case not have been the jurisdiction of

ICANN which would have remained incorporated in the United States and in California, it would have been an additional jurisdiction. I know [Inaudible] that very notion.

In that sense, we contribute with the help of a specialist firm who had gone through a great lot of trouble to examine all the advantages and inconveniences of places like somewhere in Africa, in Asia, etc. That the single most favorable place from all those points of view – [inaudible] policy, facility to hire people, communications, etc. – was Geneva. But in any case, it would have only been an additional jurisdiction. It was not the replacement of the corporation headquarters in California. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques for this historical note. That's very helpful and no doubt you would have shared this with the Jurisdiction Working Group. Of course, it really depends on what the scope of this subgroup is and we will look forward to further updates in our next call hoping that things will have moved forward and some kind of a consensus will have been found as to what will the actual topic be of this Work Stream subgroup.

Let's move on. I don't see any other hands in the queue so we can move on to the Ombudsman now. That's the next subgroup. The rapporteur for the working group is actually Sebastien Bachollet but we have also Alberto Soto, Carlos Vera Quintana, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jose Arce, and Sivasubramanian which are listed as members. Ombudsman – Sebastien, do you wish to provide us with an update on this?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. We have got, I guess, seventh call in this Design Team, and we have a document with a lot of pages and ideas and suggestion. We are working on different, I would say, key issue for the moment. One of them it's that we discovered two weeks ago that the ATRT 2 overlap between ATRT 2 recommendation and the CCWG on Accountability contain few issue and among them some dealing with Ombudsman and we are taking that on board. We are having discussions about what to do with PTI regarding the role of the Ombudsman, and that's something I will say it's still open but we are in a good way to find hopefully a solution on that.

What else I can tell you? We have a very small really participation group, unfortunately, and more participation will be welcome but we are trying to have a document ready for beginning of October to be able to have this discussed as a document during the face-to-face meeting of the CCWG on Accountability Work Stream 2 before [in] Hyderabad and hopefully maybe another place during the meeting.

The last point is that we try and we have designate liaison to the other Design Team and it's one way where we want to bring back to this Ombuds Office discussion if there are topics raised in other group and in the other hand to send or to discuss with the other group exchanges. For example, we have a question about the possible role of the Ombudsman regarding staff, and we are waiting to have this discussion with the Design Team of Staff Accountability. There are other groups where we will have to have this discussion – Diversity, SO/AC Accountability, and some other.

We try to advance the work. It was not an easy period during the summer for Northern hemisphere, but it's also maybe because of the deadline about the IANA Stewardship Transition that we have not mobilized much people on that [issue] and maybe it's not so interesting for other people [then] we will do with the people we have.

I'm ready to answer any questions if you have or happy to have input from you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update, Sebastien. Are there any questions or comments on Sebastien's update on the Ombudsman? I note that there have been quite a few calls already. The only thing that I was not quite aware is you do have some documents which are published in there, yes. So maybe the document you were speaking about, is that the latest one from the 20th of August – CCWG Work Stream 2 DT Ombuds %4v0. Is that the document you're currently working on?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I am myself working on the version 5 but yes, the one sent to the group is the version 4 and I am taking into account some inputs to version 5 I will produce at the end of this week to our call on Monday.

If I can say, one of the difficulty we face is that we had – and maybe it's something we can do at the end of all the review – it's to see what's happened at the level of the plenary and where we are in discussion regarding the plenary, and at that time I will come back on what I

wanted to say about our group to bigger vision of where we are. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Sebastien. Any comments or questions? I don't see anyone putting their hand up so we can then move to the next one which is reviewing the – and it's funny because the wiki site actually says Reviewing the CEP in typical ICANN fashion, another new acronym. What in the world is the CEP? It's the Cooperative Engagement Process. Alan, Avri, and Siva are all three active members in this. I would ask for an update from either of these people. I believe that perhaps I don't think that, is Siva on the call? No, I haven't seen Siva on the call so it would be either Alan or I don't see Avri either. It would obviously have to be Alan then. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The CEP, which I had to remind myself what it meant so I put it into the title, is the process that one optionally can go through to try to resolve problems before filing an IRP request for consideration. The process is voluntary but if ultimately you end up losing, if you hadn't participated in it in good faith, that could work against you in terms of how fees are assessed and things like that. The group has not yet met. At least I couldn't find any record of them having met and I haven't been at any meetings so I think it's one of the things that's pushed down the road a little bit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. I have noticed that there are indeed no further links below this header. I do note, however, that we do have more members than we thought just looking at it – Olivier [Kurami] for example, being one of our new African ALSes, Farzaneh Badii being one of our new individual members in Europe, and I just wonder maybe [inaudible] might also be out of one of our ALSes. I just identified the ones that stuck to mind as being perhaps on the call today.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't honestly remember signing up for that group but my name is there so I believe I did.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. I think usually you're signed up to all the groups unless you say you don't want to be signed up as a default. Or is that Cheryl? And speaking about Cheryl, if there are no comments or questions on the CEP and I guess we're eagerly awaiting the start of its work, we can move on to SO and AC – so Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee – Accountability and Cheryl is a co-rapporteur in this group with Alan, Avri, and Christopher Wilkinson, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Sebastien Bachollet, Seun, and Siva. Goodness, that's another very busy group indeed and a lot of members and a lot of participants. Maybe not as many as the other ones that we've spoken about but still it sounds like a big discussion for this.

May I call on Cheryl Langdon-Orr? Is she on the call or has she sent her apologies? I'm not quite sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: She's listed as being on the call, not in Adobe Connect though. Maybe Terri can help us.

TERRI AGNEW: I do think Alan she's still connected on the telephone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. In the meantime, would anyone else wish to step forward and provide us with an update on this please? And we have enough people on this they should be able to step forward. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Yes, I do now. Christopher Wilkinson, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm not really in a position to give a full briefing about the SO/AC Accountability Working Group because I missed some of the earlier calls. I would just say that my personal impression is, first of all, to limit the scope of this working group or this subgroup specifically to the aspects of the implementation of the transition. I don't see how far they'll get if they in effect try and rewrite the internal rules and procedures of each of the SOs and ACs as to how they determine their policies and positions.

                          At one extreme, you have the GAC where the GAC will find it it's complicated enough to work out its own policies and positions within the process of accountability of among the governments present in the GAC. On the other extreme, I see the GNSO with an extremely complex

structure and internal decision making process. If this accountability group is to deliver useful results, it should focus specifically on what is required to ensure the SO and AC delegates to the Empowered Community as to what their accountability is to their own SO/ACs.

I think there is a serious risk both in the private sector and probably even in the public sector of that the individuals who finally sit in these rather small groups who will decide how to proceed with each aspect of the Empowered Community's work, I wouldn't say they'd have their own axe to grind but they would not necessarily reflect the general position of the Supporting Organization or the Advisory Committee that they represent. I think that's a problem area which has not yet been fully addressed.

Thank you, Olivier. I hope that that's helpful. Needless to say, we found the same concerns apply to At-large, but experience is that [At-Large] first of all there is less to be gained and lost because some of these positions are extremely financially valuable to some of the SOs and our internal procedures are relatively transparent and open. But certainly in due course At-Large will also have to address the question as to how to mandate the individuals who represent At-large in different branches of the Empowered Community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Christopher. That's a helpful starting point for this working group. Next we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. It's a challenging topic in that we have still not come to closure on exactly who are we supposed to be accountable to, and in fact the answer probably is different. Sometimes there are multiple answers and the answer is probably different for each of the ACs and SOs, and the accountability issues range from what I would consider nil for the ASO for instance, which is made up of representatives of the Regional Addressing Registries and there are only a finite number of them and each of them are represented. So if the people are not doing a good job of representing them, then it's up to each organization to replace them. But there is no one else outside of that group, and each of the addressing registries has its own process for accountability within its own community.

The issues range from there to the complexity of how do the various subgroups of the GNSO ensure that they are accountable to whoever it is they're supposed to be accountable to? And there's not closure on to what extent it's the people who are actually members or the wider group of maybe millions of Intellectual Property lawyers or whatever in each group. So we have our work cut out for us, and there's some disagreement over whether we should even be talking about who each group should be accountable to and whether we are in fact accountable to let's say other ACs and SOs. Should the ALAC be accountable to the GNSO? Should they be able to say, "Hey, you're not doing your job?" And there's quite different opinions depending on who you are in that kind of issue. So it's going to be a challenge. We're holding lots of meetings and I'm hoping we will make some progress.

And I see Ariel has her hand up for a while.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Alan. I'm aware of what Ariel is to speak about and I was deliberately waiting until our main queue was empty. I don't see anybody else's hands up. I thank both Christopher and you for the update on this topic of SO/AC Accountability, and of course we've also had our own discussions on our Skype At-Large discussion with regard when it comes down to the consumer, the end user, the constant questioning of At-Large as to how we relate to end users and whether we really are accountable or whether we're just a bunch of people that are unaccountable to anyone in fact or any SO and AC accountable to anybody outside of ICANN. Big questions. No responses so far. We wish all the best for the working group.

There's also an added angle to this discussion, and that's one which was raised during the At-Large Summit a couple of years ago in June, 2014 in London. I believe I'm right [inaudible] 2014. It sounds like such a while ago. There were the At-Large Summit recommendations and one or a couple of them were dealing with this.

Ariel Liang, you have some more details on this and we might wish to spend a couple of minutes on this please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks so much, Olivier. There are two recommendations related to SO/AC Accountability but it's not worded in the way… It's more about the question whether the composition of ICANN stakeholder groups are balanced and what is adequate to address relevant decision making. I

will put the links in the chat that you can see the wording of these two recommendations. It's the Recommendation #7 and #13.

I'm just curious whether the SO/AC Accountability Subgroup actually deals with this topic or whether there is any discussion on that, and then if Alan and Cheryl, Sebastien, if you have any insights, that would be very helpful.

An another additional aspect I want to ask is whether the composition of SOs and ACs is a topic that ATRT deals with. I need to have an insight. That would be great. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Ariel. Just for the transcript, the Recommendation #7 of the At-Large Summit mentions: "A periodic review of ICANN's multistakeholder model should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN's constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision making requirements in the corporation."

Recommendation #13 says: "ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views proportionally to their scope and relevance."

The question to our members who are on the SO/AC Accountability Subgroup is: is this being addressed in that Subgroup? Is this in scope?

It's a big question. I don't see anyone appearing to know the answer on this. Alan Greenberg, and then we'll look at Tatiana afterwards. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the first one is out of scope. To some extent, that's what the CCWG Accountability did. I'm trying to identify who are the stakeholders that should be controlling ICANN, and that's a done deal at this point.

` The second one, I think that has been [inaudible] more an ATRT type thing, that is, "Are people adequately represented in the processes?" as opposed to, "Is the group accountable to their own stakeholders or to whoever?" So I don't think either of these are within scope of the group at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's my position anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this. That obviously is not helpful. These are being bounced off around since these were assigned for the IANA Transition and the ICANN Accountability Working Group, we might have to think of a way how this should be addressed and who should be performing a periodic review of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

It does sound like some kind of an ATRT Accountability and Transparency Review work rather than the Work Stream 2 work, at least at this stage.

We have Tatiana Tropina on the line. You're next.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thanks, Olivier. I was actually going to say more or less what Alan already said. I don't think there is any specific formulation or reference to any recommendations per se, but I believe that these issues, especially the second one, poked up in the very beginning when we were discussing how to ensure and what are the criteria to ensure, for example, stakeholder balance or stakeholder representation, how the outreach and the efforts of the constituencies or stakeholder groups can be assessed, how they're actually trying to engage people. I don't remember where it went and whether it was actually shaped like this in this form of questions, and I also agree that this is maybe the way to go, these are maybe the issues to bring up. I don't know whether this group or any other streams, but I think they are very important for accountability as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. I gather the wider question could be to ask whether any work has been done to study ICANN's overall structure and find out if it's best suited in the way that it's structured with Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees now. Has any such work been undertaken either by Work Stream 1 or Work Stream 2? An open ended question. I see Sebastien is in the queue. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Just to say that when I was a Board member I request to have a systemic view of ICANN, and it was always postponed or not done. One of the reasons is I guess there are people who feel that the work to set up ICANN 2.0 was too difficult and we can't have this discussion again.

In one way the CCWG on Accountability have done part of the [inaudible] with the setup of the [inaudible], and the new community and who will participate, how it will be done. But the question you raise it's still under discussion, and I guess it will not be within Work Stream 2 that we will discuss that and hopefully ATRT – I don't know, 3 or 4 – will be the right place to put it again and to have the discussion.

When time will allow people to do that and maybe it's not the best time to do it now with all the work on new gTLD with the Accountability with everything we are doing now at the level of ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to say that Sebastien has raised this a number of times over the years and the Future Challenges Working Group also looked at is there a better way for ICANN to fulfill its mission? I don't see a major reorganization of ICANN at this point happening in the very near future. We've built the whole Empowered Community around the current structure. It's as hard to imagine as going back and reopening

that today or in the very near future. So I think we're at this point, for better or worse, going to result in tweaks and go forward from that. Whether it in fact needs it or not, clearly there are different people with different positions, but I don't see any major change at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I'm asking the question because some Board members asked me the question in Helsinki, would you believe it, and the R3 Paper which was the paper that you referred to regarding the Future Challenges Working Group is somehow a little dated now. It does focus on points which were made a while ago. But it certainly looks at a more wholesome view of ICANN and saying, "Well, what if we changed things dramatically and changed the actual structure?" I just wondered whether there was any addressing of this structure of ICANN in its core in Work Stream 2. Alan Greenberg again.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there are some people who are thinking about this, but I think they're thinking about it not so much of how do we redesign ICANN as to are there major changes needed in, for instance, At-Large which we're looking at both internally and through the current review. There are certainly some people who have said the GNSO is not capable right now of addressing the public interest and that's essential. If we believe the Board should not be making decisions when the GNSO fails to address something, then the GNSO needs to and does the GNSO need to be reformed to be able to do its job better?

So from that perspective, people are talking about it. Whether it's going to happen or not is a different issue. But I don't think that's at the level of let's start with a clean piece of paper and redesign ICANN. I think it's much more an adjustment to the current concepts than let's start over again and see if there's a better way to do it. That's my perspective.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. So to Ariel regarding Recommendation #7 and regarding Recommendation #13, I think we might have to shelf this for the time being, as the response from this working group is that it looks as though the periodic review of ICANN's multistakeholder model is not taking place in Work Stream 2 and the review of the overall balance of stakeholder representation, also a structural review, doesn't appear to be undertaken in Work Stream 2 either. We're going to have to think of some way for this recommendation to move forward.

The recipient is the ICANN Board and it might well be that these recommendations do need to go to the ICANN Board for the Board to take action on and define where that kind of – maybe not "define" because the Board doesn't define anything – but suggest, make suggestions as to where those topics should be addressed.

I don't know if we managed to get Cheryl back. It looks as though she's still away so I'm not... It's not something that we'll be able to have to close off on SO/AC Accountability, in which case we can move on to something equally as important and that's staff accountability. Yes indeed, we have several people on this Work Stream subgroup including Alan, Cheryl, and Seun. So if either of you could please provide us with

an update of where we are on staff accountability, that would be very helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is we've had one meeting. We are still waiting for the staff paper on the subject and there's been no substantive work done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note the irony that we are waiting on staff to write the paper on staff accountability and they have not come through in the deadline that was in the targets that were given and that they volunteered. Just for those who are irony interested. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and you've taken the words and the joy out of me. I was about to come up with exactly the same ironical and cynical comment. We might be both in the run-in for the chocolate medal of the ironic comment today. But I note that Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: In fairness, they have delivered an awful lot recently.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. I really don't understand those subgroups that are stopping their work because staff didn't provide the [inaudible] paper. I don't think that staff is tasked to do so. They are helping perhaps, but the most important thing is that we do the work. We have tasks defined in Work Stream 1 and we have to do them. So if staff, for example, for Staff Accountability, are you asking the staff to make the Staff Accountability [reference] paper? This is really, as you said and as you [start], I think that this is not [inaudible] and if you continue like this, that [inaudible] that our community is not [inaudible] the responsibility of this work because we cannot have a reference from the staff –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Tijani here? You have finished, but I think you were cut in the middle of a sentence. What I did manage to grasp from you is that you found it bizarre that staff would write a paper on staff accountability in this instance and you felt that it was probably inappropriate. Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. They should not [Inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And for everyone, if you click on that page actually, there is a Google Doc with Staff Accountability Work Stream 2 draft staff paper. It sounds really strange. I don't know what to say about this. Are there any comments or thoughts? Has this been questioned on the Work Stream itself in the working group?

ALAN GREENBERG: The group has met once. The paper was not delivered. Clearly the group will not sit around for six months waiting for a paper if it doesn't show up. Let's let the people who are running that group do the job.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But the paper is out there. The paper is on a Google Doc so you can actually see how it's coming together [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Then it's been put there since the last time I looked, or maybe I'm completely imagining this. In any case, the group has just met once. There was an introductory meeting. It will continue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well the last document dates from the 18th of September, so it is rather recent.

Right. We haven't got that much time. Let's then move on since this one is still at very early stage. We still have Transparency, and in the Transparency group Alan, Avri, Cheryl, and Jean-jacques Subrenat, are

active in this group. Who wishes to provide us with a transparent update on Transparency and shed some light over those dark areas? Who will enlighten us?

ALAN GREENBERG: In the absence of anyone else, I will give a very brief update. The group is looking at things like document disclosure, that we have met several times. It's not one of the groups I'm focusing on heavily and I've missed a number of meetings so I'm not really in a position to give you the absolute current update. The group is actively working is all I'll say.

By the way, we're just about out of time and I'm going to have to leave.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. We've got four minutes left on the call, but I think that beyond this that's the last topic in our agenda, Transparency. The next question really just comes as to when we want to have our next call and I was going to suggest that we do not have a call next week but we have a call in two weeks' time. That will be the week immediately after the 30th of September, which means that by then we will either know yea or nay on IANA Stewardship Transition. So we might have an update on this and obviously there will have been two weeks' worth of work in the Work Streams.

How are we feeling for the next call? Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think we can have next week but in two weeks' time it will be okay also. But we are missing one point and it one hour discussion in the plenary yesterday is the one about the IRP Phase 2 and maybe it will be good to have some input on that just briefly, not today but next time.

The second, it's that I would like to add to the next meeting discussion the overall Work Stream 2 the plenary and the discussion going on at the level of the plenary. It will be great then. If it's in two weeks it will be okay. Thank you very much and I have to leave also sharp at the middle of the hour.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien. Are there any objections to convening again in two weeks' time?

I don't see any objections, so let's have a Doodle then please for two weeks' time so that's the week starting the 3rd of October already.

And with this, I would like to ask for Any Other Business. With one minute remaining on the clock for the first time in a long time we're ending up on time. I thought we were going to end up on time. Obviously someone's going to shoot this down. That's Heidi Ullrich. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just a quick question on the Doodle. Is it possible to try to have a Doodle that defines a permanent time for ongoing calls so staff does not need to send Doodles for each call?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Heidi. I think that we had discussed this in the past and we never found a suitable time for everyone. It became very hard because people travel and there's also it appears that some of the calls of the other groups are changing. I don't know. Correct me if I'm wrong. I was under the impression that all of the Work Stream 2 groups had rotating times and were not set times so that's why.

ALAN GREENBERG: They're rotating among certain set times, so we know at this point until they change we know the full subset of those times.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so rather than spend time here what I would suggest is we do a Doodle for next week based on a new set of rotating times that we could do and staff would have to study the different rotating times of the CCWG Accountability Work Streams so that it doesn't clash with anything and work it out. I don't know what's easiest, whether a Doodle is easier or whether this in-depth work is easier but it has to be done somehow.

Okay? Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I know that the staff and the interpreters don't like me to speak from the computer but my phone has dropped so that's why I am speaking from the computer. As for the Work Stream 2

subgroups, the Work Stream subgroups, they are rotating between 13:00 UTC and 19:00. So those are the two slots that are used. I am afraid if we don't have a dynamic time then we may fall one day in conflict with one of those calls. Really we need to define the time of each call we will have according to the other group's call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Tijani. So we'll proceed by Doodle and follow up with trying to find out if there is a chance to miss something due to rotation or changes in the Work Stream calls.

With this, I think it's now two minutes beyond the official end of the call. I'd like to thank each and every one of you for having participated. It's been very, very, helpful. And thanks to the interpreters for having been able to keep up with everything that has been said today.

With that, seeing no further hands up this call is adjourned. Until next time, goodbye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]