
ABU DHABI – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 5

Saturday, October 28, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 GST

ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Saturday, October 28th, 2017, in Hall B Section A ALAC for the ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 5, 17:00 to 18:30.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're going to start in a couple of minutes so could you please take your positions and places?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are now five minutes late already. I don't know. We will instruct everyone to pretend the names aren't there, Olivier. We'll be reconvening in about a minute. I will be giving instructions about that.

If there's anyone outside in the hall, can we, perhaps, escort them in?

Okay. We will start. This is the session that will be recapping where we are on the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 topics. The title "ICANN Evolution," for those of you who are unfamiliar with it is you may recall, if you are around long enough, that we used to have an IANA Transition ad hoc group that was following

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.

that and advising the various people on the IANA transition and accountability Work Stream 1. We decided that it was no longer appropriate to call the IANA Transition group and this name was – we came up with, I think Sebastien came up with a name but I may be wrong. And it's as ICANN is evolving, we have people involved in pretty much all of these groups and actually all of the groups. Since Cheryl is here, we have someone involved in all groups. Olivier kindly has offered to continue to chair this operation, so this is an opportunity for the entire ALAC and At-Large leadership to get up to date on where we are. As I mentioned, there is a cross-community group that will be going in some of the areas. I do advise you to go to that one and see how their reports are different from ours. And I'll turn it over to Olivier.

I have been instructed to tell you that there are names associated with each of those topics. They were erased a while ago, so you cannot see them. They're not there. If you see names after each of those topics, you are imagining it because they are gone. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesim thinks she still sees them. She's wrong. They're not there. They're invisible. Olivier, it's all yours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And the names, indeed, are there and they are a testimony for those people that have spent a lot of time this year and previously years in our working groups and in those Work Stream 2 working groups. You can see we've had quite a wide number of people that have been directly involved in those working groups and that have reported throughout the year, throughout the years, on all of this process. There is a presentation that is currently on the screen that can take us through a couple of statistics, a few statistics in the working group. And I thought that after that, we can move directly into the updates of the different component parts. So if we can move one slide down, please.

That presentation is not peculiar to At-Large. It's an overview that was provided by ICANN staff and that provides a whole number of details, including the statistics. That's the first one. The statistics on monthly activity and that's now gives you the idea of how important those people are in the names list that we had.

The monthly activity, if you... Yes, you are seeing it correctly here. The number of e-mails is something that is a bite

frightening. I think August 2017 where a lot of people take holidays has seen a total of – is it 600 am I seeing here? It's 600 e-mails being sent across all of the work streams, of which only half of them were written by Cheryl.

With regards to the collective number of hours, you can see it's been a sustained effort across all of the work streams and I think it's not something that we often do in At-Large but I would really like to have a round of applause for our colleagues that have spent those number of hours on the calls.

So now they've had their applause, now we can tell them how bad a job they did and go through each one of those. No, I'm kidding. So before we go to the first speaker, we'll have Alan, he'll say a few words.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'd just like to ask each speaker as you come on, we have a fair number of new people in the room who may not know what the subject matter is and some of these titles are just a bit cryptic. So, if you can just give one or two sentences to summarize what the issue is that this group is looking at, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and thanks for this reminder. And so the whole Work Stream 2, otherwise known as WS2, actually comes from Work Stream 1, which comes from – let’s go back in time – another cross-community working group, which was generated by something else. Now, that something else was the U.S. Department of Commerce that announced a few years ago that they were going to relinquish their stewardship role over the functions of an organization called IANA. I’m not going to go into the full thing of what it was called fully because it’s changed since that time. But what was happening is the U.S. government had kind of oversight function over anything that went into the root of the Domain Name System, which is pretty much the central point where all of the top-level domains are located. The U.S. government said we’re not going to assume this function anymore and ICANN, ICANN communities, and all of the communities around the world working together should work out an alternative mechanism by which those functions would be perhaps there would be some kind of an oversight.

To cut a long story short, after a year of work, the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition came out with a plan, which included two component parts. One was a system of having post-transition IANA PTI take control of the IANA functions as a wholly-owned subsidiary of ICANN. The other component part where a number of accountability

measures for ICANN to be self-accountable because there was also a thought of having, “Should ICANN be accountable to another committee?” but then, of course, how would that other committee be accountable? It’s this whole ladder thing. So, having ICANN accountable to itself means that the ICANN Board of Directors needs to be accountable to the ICANN communities and, of course, the work of the ICANN communities has to go through the ICANN Board of Directors. It’s a bit of a cyclic thing.

The Work Stream 1 of the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability came up with a number of measures to create an Empowered Community. We’re not going to go into depth with this but the Empowered Community has got several powers, including the ability to, well, the need for the ICANN community to vote on the ICANN yearly budget. Also, to approve the budget of post-transition IANA, which to help everyone, has now been renamed Public Technical Identifiers. I hope you’re still following. And for the community to also be able to – and I’m not going to go through all of their powers – but to be able to spill the whole Board, so kick the whole Board out if things really go wrong and if the Board goes rogue, etc.

But there were a second set of issues, which were then raised, an expanded set of issues, which needed to be dealt with, as well, and therefore, it was decided that Work Stream 1 issues would be the ones that would be needed for the transition to take

place and the other issues would be put into Work Stream 2 for more time to be given towards them and more time they have taken to fix, but now we are reaching a point where the majority of these issues have a final report that is going out for public comment, etc., and that's what we're going to be discussing today.

The Work Stream 2 issues that have gone on for – is it two years now? One year. Okay, it felt like two years. Well maybe them. Stewardship Transition one year and then Work Stream 2, as well, for the second year.

You can see the FY18, so that's financial year, fiscal year '18 timeline. Knowing that a fiscal year starts on the 1st of July, the subgroups, because the Work Stream 2 has got various subgroups, most of the drafts are currently being completed and then there is a reporting date at the plenary, so you have subgroups reporting to the Work Stream 2 Plenary and that then goes over to the public comment process that involves all of ICANN, all of the communities, but also anybody who wants to comment on it. So, it really is a process by which ICANN's communities have come up with a number of recommendations that are now being commented on by everyone. We're just after the report date, so we're in the beginning of – well, we're just about to reach November, so I think that immediately after the ICANN meeting, I like the magic.

Let me see. If I move my eyes to the left, does the red dot go left, too? No. I must be cross-eyed. Okay. So, the, yeah, this is good. Have you tried that? This is Superman stuff. Let's try it again. It works. Okay, so yeah.

Public comment. Thanks for the laser point. I don't know who does it but the public comment period is just about to start and this is why we're having the meeting today so as to bring everyone up to date. There are also several meetings taking place in ICANN. There are some that took place yesterday and in some of the working groups and we're going to have an update on this, some of the work streams, and there are some public meetings that are going to take place later on this week, so we can also discuss some positions that we might wish to hold on this.

You can see the diagram. I'm not going to go through each one of these. You can see there are more consolidations of Work Stream 2 recommendations and then that goes over to the Board. And there's another plenary and another process with another public comment process sometime next year in April or May. So, we're still deep in the work and it's not too late to get involved. Can we please go to the next slide?

So the current status on the different subgroups is the subgroups that have got a tick are pretty much complete. We're

looking here at SO/AC Accountability, Human Rights, and then there are still that have some work to do, some more than others, and I think we'll be going through these perhaps – well, we'll probably spend more time discussing the ones that are not complete than the ones that are complete.

SO/AC Accountability, I think we can just dig straight into. Are there – first, before we go into this – any questions on the process? I hope I've been explicit enough and perhaps I've forgotten to add something, so those people that have been involved, please chime in.

Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. The title is SO/AC Accountability. As Olivier mentioned, we now have the Empowered Community, which can do a number of things, including reject budgets, kick out directors, kick out the whole Board, and a number of other powers. And the question arose when we were designing this is, “That’s fine. How do we know we can trust them? How do we know some horrible power hasn’t taken over our ACs and SOs, and therefore somehow the Board has been kicked out, the Board has been replaced, and we don’t know how that process is going and we don’t know if we can trust the SOs and ACs?”

So, this group was responsible for looking at how each of the ACs and SOs manage their own affairs, to what extent they are accountable to the constituencies that they report to. So, for instance, the ALAC reports to At-Large. How do we know At-Large as any say?

Each of the ACs and SOs in ICANN operate completely differently from each other. I don't know. Okay. So, this group was charged with looking, reviewing what the processes are and, for instance, does each group have a set of published rules? Do they follow them? And it goes on quite a long list. And the group is making a number of recommendations of – and I'll use the term carefully – good practices. We started calling them “best practices” but best practices has a very special meaning in the world of quality and that says we have proven that this is something that is good, you should be doing it. Within ICANN, because each of the groups are different, a practice that may be superb in At-Large may make no sense whatsoever in the ASO or the GNSO.

So, each of these best practices – and there's a relatively long list of them – will have to be evaluated by each AC and SO to see to what extent they apply and what extent, perhaps, they need to change their practices. And that's where we are right now. The group has pretty well completed its work and Cheryl has something she'd like to add. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairmen. I had the honor of co-rapporteur with two compatriots, one from the Noncommercial Stakeholder side of the GNSO and the other from the Business Constituency. And I wanted to assure you all that these good practices that Alan referred to were discussed and drawn out from the practices that we observed and that were reported to us by the ACs and the SOs. So, we did an analysis, we looked at what was going on and then we've drawn these good practices out of existing practices. Sometimes embellishing them a little to come in line to meet the specific needs or, more importantly, to be less challenging for some of the SOs, for example, so we've adjusted things so it can work as well in the ASO as it could in the GNSO or the ccNSO.

If this is a piece that will be going out to public comment, so whilst yes, we are heading towards completion, it is also a point where you all now get to put commentary in jointly or severally from your regions, from your individual groups, or, of course, via the ALAC. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: And one further comment. Are you all familiar with the term entropy? Entropy is a measure of the energy in the universe and entropy increases. In this case, work increases. These good

practices, some of them we'll look at and say, "Nah, not for us." Other ones we'll look at and say they make sense. We don't do them. It's going to require more work. Hopefully, we'll be a more responsible organization for having done that. But these things are real. They will come back to us and there will be work to do, so just a heads up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Any questions or comments? My goodness. You've been very good at this.

Okay. The next one, if we can go back to the top page, please. Back. Yeah, no, but I would like to jump on one thing because I think that Tatiana might have to leave early. So, it was the first. Human Rights, perfect. Okay, so then let's go to the Human Rights, please. And for this, our lead is Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much to Olivier and all for inviting me to provide the overview. Oh, we have a slide for Human Rights. Thank you very much. I even have it on my Adobe Connect. So, about Human Rights. I will try to be short, though I believe that it is a bit of a long road that we finished already. The group submitted the report but it is a long and bumpy road on agreeing upon this report.

So, the Work Stream 2 Human Rights topic comes directly from the Work Stream 1 accountability process. As Olivier explained in the very beginning, issues that were left for the Work Stream 2 were the issues, which were not decided upon in the Work Stream 1. This is not actually the question of human rights. Not exactly because the Work Stream 1 ended up with adopting human rights by law, which made it a core value for ICANN to respect human rights. But as the group in the Work Stream 1 didn't have enough time to agree on what this Bylaw means, and there were many fears that the adoption of this Bylaw without any interpretation will open the door for many claims against ICANN like to force ICANN to be a human rights watchdog, to force ICANN to enforce human rights against to third parties.

So, the Work Stream 2 was tasked with the task to develop a framework of interpretation for this Bylaw, and the Work Stream 1, the Bylaw itself had a clause that before the framework of interpretation is enforced, the Bylaw is going to be dormant. It's not going to be enforced; it's going to be sleeping. So, to wake this Bylaws up, what we do did we do in the Work Stream 2? First of all, we provided a literal interpretation for every word in the Bylaw. I will not cite it because it's really long but there's some limitation in this bylaw to protect ICANN from the third party claims. They state like, for example, ICANN should respect

human rights only within its core mission, only as required by applicable law that ICANN is not in any way responsible for the enforcement of the human rights, so it's only respect.

So, we provided the literal interpretation, first of all. What does respect mean? What does within the mission mean? What does applicable law mean? And so on and so forth. But in addition to all this, the big question was, how this Bylaw is going to be adopted by Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees? As Alan said already with regard to AC and SO accountability, each Supporting Organization and each committee is different. What will work for the At-Large will not work for GNSO and will not work for Governmental Advisory Committee. So, we couldn't come up with a one-size-fits-all solution, so what did we do?

We provided framework, we provided the answers to the question that, for example, this Bylaw is not going to change the way how GAC provide advice. It's not going to influence. We said that the Board will be the final stop in any exercise of this core value. We said, in addition to this, that every Supporting Organization and every Advisory Committee should develop their own instructions and burden the human rights core value in the processes like, for example, when GNSO starts a Policy Development Process, it's up to GNSO to determine when they

will test these policies against human rights impact against these respect human rights core value.

So, we are basically done and it is a very good report. It is a very balanced report, I believe. We have many battles. The very last moment, for example, some governments were submitting dissenting opinion because we had big battles over international business and human rights principles adopted by the UN, which are called Ruggie principles, which we argued are not applicable to ICANN because it is about operations and for us, interpretation of human rights core value was how do we respect human rights in making policy. Because this is where ICANN is going to have the biggest impact, the most impact. Why I'm saying this? Because apparently, ICANN is not going to get involved in human trafficking.

You know except the volunteer, they of course slavery, I feel like I'm a bit of a slave but this, and I know that according the international legislation, voluntary consent is actually not the precondition of [inaudible] slavery. So we all a bit slaves, but it can be relative. But anyway, ICANN is not going to really violate human rights as business, but the policies and advice have real impact here.

So, right now, we submitted the document. We are waiting for Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to approve

it. I believe that ALAC has more the same position as GNSO. We are going to see what is going on with the GAC, though we got rid of dissenting opinion because at the very last moment, we were able to marry two concepts. How governments want to see this Bylaw implemented and how we would like to see them implemented, all other members of the working group.

So, basically, these are all for me, I was trying to be brief. Sorry if I didn't succeed. I would be happy to take any questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'll switch to German. Maybe they're reminding me where I'm from now but do you think I'm going to lose my sense of humor once I'm a GNSO Counsel? I'm very sad.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. So, thank you very much. Are there any questions? Please, Bastiaan Goslings.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Tatiana, thank you very much for your summary. I'm very happy. I couldn't have done that better. From my perspective, just to confirm, I wrote the response for At-Large,

for ALAC during the first reading and not a lot has changed there besides some textual stuff afterwards, so from my perspective, I think it's a very balanced report and I'm very happy with it. So thanks again for all the work you put into that. Yeah, I think it's unfortunate that we have this hiccup of this dissenting opinion that ended up in it, so be it, so let's see what happens when everything is put together. We will look at the entire CCWG report.

My question, actually, maybe you can help us there or reflect on that what's going to happen afterwards looking at the implementation side. Also, in terms of what the impact going to be for the At-Large, ALAC specifically. Thank you.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much for your question, but I want to first to say that we did get rid of the dissenting –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Name?

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry. Tatiana Tropina speaking. So, I want to say again that we got rid of dissenting opinion so it's done. We worked in a small group. Greg Shatan, me, Matthew Shears, and David McAuley,

representatives of different groups to really trying to find the compromise and finally, we did, so we inserted a couple of words of what Jorge wanted. But not into the consideration part but to the framework of interpretation part, so it's not going to have a big impact on the real consideration.

So, how is it going to... Oh my God. Could you please delete that from the record? No, but we agreed on this. I mean, it's going to have an impact on GAC anyway and that's what they wanted. So, about the implementation part. As I said, we don't have one-size-fits-all solutions. I can say how I see it, for example, in GNSO. Because GNSO has a policy development process, right? So, at some point, any PDP should make human rights impact assessment to see how these particular policies and their outcomes might possibly affect human rights.

I believe that for ALAC or At-Large, it might be a bit different because you're not developing policy and you're providing advice. So, it is pretty much straightforward. You look at the advice you make and you see, did we consider human rights here? How it would impact human rights? Will it? Will it not? Bear it in mind how will it be different from Governmental Advisory Committee. Right? They wanted Ruggie principles to be there and they're free now to use them in their process. This is how we married these two concepts.

Okay, so yes. Basically, for you it's pretty straightforward because you're not developing policy. You just test it against human rights when you're discussing the advice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. Any other comments or questions? Okay, let's go to the next slide, please. Thank you so much for this. It's really, really great. So, I believe there's a public comment that will come up later.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, I think so.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just like all the other work streams. Okay, next is Transparency. And for Transparency, I'm not quite sure I remember who is going to take this one. Are there any volunteers for Transparency?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to volunteer Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Cheryl, you've been so transparent. I didn't see you but now I do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I can stop being transparent immediately and get rid of all of that. That was a joke. Right.

So transparency has been one of the earliest documents in the fullest form that went out for a first reading. So there's been a long break between the work on Transparency as you would have had already presented to you in our last meeting and its recent second reading, but there were a couple of fairly important points that needed to be polished.

One of the major issues was the differently-held beliefs about how important, how sacrosanct client-attorney privilege needs to be in the matter of access to the types of best, the good practice, but in fact in this case, we can call them best practices for transparency that the Work Track is putting forward in its report.

There are, for example, issues now where if an amount of \$20,000 U.S. per year is going to be spent and allocated to an interaction with any sort of governance or lobbying, that has to be declared. So, it makes it really, really obvious what ICANN and parts of ICANN are doing with various entities – business entities, governmental entities, and of course, it also makes very clear under these best practices that there are rights to access materials under the RPD processes.

Now, the default is under those circumstances you can request and get access to materials unless it is being protected under commercial and confidence. There's perhaps a matter of potential litigation, something that is going to be before the court, that is already before the courts. And, obviously, this matter of a client privilege. And they are really the only freshly polished pieces that you'll see in this new reading, this penultimate Transparency document and from that work that was done earlier.

It is, all of the documents out of the Work Tracks, probably the lengthiest, but it is also a piece of work that has I would argue more than most, if not all, of the all of the other Work Tracks foundation in established studies and practices elsewhere. So there is, for example, under the issue about having contracts and requests for expressions of interest made public. So, if a tender process is going on, [inaudible] concept in Transparency group's recommendation is that the bids and especially the winning bid will be made public. And there was concern and is still concern from the ICANN Board that this may compromise ICANN's position in future negotiations for future rounds of similar contracts. When that question was raised, it was very interesting to hear that there were three, if not four, quotable research pieces in countries that have mandated this type of

level of transparency that have not shown a negative effect. In fact, they have shown a positive effect.

So, that's the sort of material that these recommendations is coming out of. So, to me, that I think gives a great deal of faith. I think I can trust a lot in these recommendations and with that, I'll close up and see if there's any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Very significant changes. Very, very good work. Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Difficulty to follow what is being done about contracting party because the part about the contract. One of the reasons is that it is – yes, they told us that there are five studies that shows that there is no impediment about the price but they are just talking about the price. We don't know at all if there are any impact on the content, on the value of the work, on the proposal made in those contract, does the work done and I can assure you that in my experience, it's not always less expensive contract with best one for the organization to be taken.

And, therefore, I have a little trouble with that just to say we need to disclose everything and with no impediment in other

countries. Okay, maybe, but impediment about money, not about the rest. I think we care more about the rest than about the money itself. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Olivier. Sebastien, they're very important points that you've raised there and if I can channel Michael effectively from what I've heard him say on that matter, so here I am not interpreting. I am trying to mimic what I have heard. Certainly, and this is the nature of a lot of the work in transparency that is done elsewhere, a lot of focus is on the dollar value. But I believe and I am hoping I am getting this accurate so it needs to be checked, that there is also a strong proposition that says in the transparency to do with contracts and the outcomes of the contracted pieces of work, that there should be transparency in reporting and updating to the community on the effectiveness and results of those contracts. This may not be necessarily – and here I am now stopping trying to channel Michael and starting to do my own interpretation – I suspect this may not necessarily mean we will be pushed in perhaps a dashboard style all of the information about all of the contracts, but I think it does mean that we should be able to ask to have access to that information.

That is an important question to have raised, however, in the ALAC and regional responses to the public comment part of it. But there will undoubtedly be other important issues, as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Next, Ricardo Holmquist.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes, an answer to Sebastien. Was member of the group also. There was a good balance in the group between Michael [inaudible] is academic based but there's also McAuley in the group and it's a very good vision of the industry on what the industry is affected or not by some of the things that are there. We're not spectators there but I think there was a balance between academic as a civil society but also the work of David, those stopping when something was wrong with the industry and leaving it when it was not wrong to the industry, and this was not one of the issues that David pushed, put the hand and say we can't do that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ricardo. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a note. The Board has expressed some concern about the disclosure of contracts also, and although perhaps Chris Disspain who was the representative at the meeting on Friday may have been calmed a little bit by Michael's response, said he would bring it back to the board and they may well identify this as a sticking point or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. I think we can now move on and we can go to the next topic. I might follow the time. The next topic is the Guidelines for Good Faith. Guidelines, guidelines, guidelines... Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr has – oh, did you say Alan will do that? I thought you said, "I do that." Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan said Alan will do that but nobody listens to me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Aww.

ALAN GREENBERG: This one is a relatively short one. The origin of this is in the process to remove a director, there has to be a process by which the group that is trying to remove the director or the group or

groups identify what the issues are and why they want to remove it. Now, there does not have to be cause but we do have to explain it. And there was some level of concern that if we say Olivier as director, we want to get rid of you, and we give a cause, you may say, “Well, now that you’ve made that public” – and we have to make it public – “I’m never going to be able to find a job again and I’m suing you personally.”

So, there was a little bit of concern that it’s fine to have the right to remove a director but if no one ever is going to have the nerve to do it, then it doesn’t work very well. We got agreement from ICANN that anyone who is identified by an AC/SO as one of the people, one of the spokesmen will be indemnified. That is, if we are sued, ICANN will defend us and ICANN’s insurance company will defend us, but the requirement is that we acted in good faith. So, in other words, if I say Olivier, we don’t like you because we know you have committed 17 murders in the last month, now if it’s true –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I’ve been tired. I haven’t come out very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're slipping, Olivier. You're slipping.

ALAN GREENBERG: It depends on the constituency. So, if we, indeed, make a claim, which is blatantly false and known to be false, that is not acting in good faith. However, there was a concern that we need to define what is “acting in good faith” and this group was charged with coming up with a way to recognize good faith, essentially, and the tests that one would use to make sure that if you are going to be the spokesperson acting on behalf of an AC/SO, you have some guidance to know what you should say and what you shouldn’t say to make sure that if there were a lawsuit... Now, I will also say that I believe directors are being required to sign an agreement saying they won’t sue, but that’s not necessarily something you can hold them to.

So, there’s a lot of protections but this is just if we’re going to be able to take that kind of action, we want to make sure that you’re not going to feel personally vulnerable and this is part of the process of being insured and indemnified to make sure that you feel comfortable in taking that action against this nefarious murderer. And just for the record, since it is being recorded and transcribed, as far as the best of my knowledge, Olivier has not committed 17 murders or any murders. And that’s the whole story.

It it’s not quite finished yet because there was wording in that we created which didn’t fit in the model of the ASO. The ASO is a different sort of organization in that it is really just here

representing the regional address registries, and the regional address registries are each independent groups that are not subservient to ICANN, and therefore, the wording that we put in did not quite work with them. We have revised the wording and are awaiting judgment from the ASO to say whether this now meets their needs or whether we have to revise it again, so it looks like there's still a fair amount of work to be done. It may get ticked off in five minutes or we may have a little bit more wordsmithing to do, but it's pretty close. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and are there any comments or questions on this topic? I do not see anyone putting their hand up. I find it quite interesting because I initially, when this group came up, I just wondered what the heck that was all about, but it's really great to see that there were no stones unturned, really, in this whole process, so that's a really thorough process. Let's move on to the next one, please.

The next one is Staff Accountability. Now that's another, I said no stones unturned, so hey, we've looked at the community, we've looked at ICANN, we've looked at the Board, but what about staff? Who's going to speak about Staff Accountability around the table? I'm looking anyone in particular. It looks like

perhaps one of my colleagues on my left might have spent some time on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have spent a fair amount of time on the group but actually not recently, so I'm probably not the best one to give it and I unfortunately suspect Cheryl is, unfortunately for Cheryl. If there's anyone else here, speak up but I don't think there is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Seun is also listed on our list as having been on this for a while, so perhaps, Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, Seun is listed but of recent, my participation has been low due to the fact that I have a second baby, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Congratulations but letting your personal life interfere with ICANN is almost unforgivable. [Laugh]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm wondering with all the work you have to do for ICANN, how you manage to fit in to create that second baby but that's just another question. Anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure that fits in the guidelines of behavior within ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anyway. Back to Staff Accountability. This has been a very interesting group to work with. It's one where the community members from the various parts of ICANN have worked with one or two and they've been excellent representatives of the interests of staff. Something we should also point out, which if you don't mind me doing it now, but it is relevant to every single one of these Work Tracks. The Board has appointed at least two Board members who are to join us and interact with us and liaise with us, and so in this, this isn't one of those groups in particular where the Board members and specifically [George] have been very active and interactive with the development of these recommendations. So, I think that's sort of a credit where credit's due.

Now, there was some attempt by us as community to make sure that we weren't turning this into a historical exercise of I remember when something happened and I'm upset about that.

Therefore, we need grumble, grumble, grumble. That it was to look at principles, not particulars and with the benefit of hindsight and some experiences that were shared with us, to see whether we could bring together some recommendations and good practices, which would allow ICANN to fairly and reasonably demonstrate that the staff of ICANN are working as expected, as predicted, as desired by the community.

So, there's a couple of systems that have been presented. There's some routine and regular reporting, which should come out in a dashboard or annual, semiannual report that is recommended on staff accountability. There is an ability for mediation to occur if there has been an issue identified. It's a faultless system, so it's a system where it's not a "he said, she said, you're right, I'm wrong," some sort of outcome is going to be for or against one of us. It's a system we've recommended that looks at the "It appears this sort of issue has happened and it is a problem, what can we now do to ensure we minimize the risk of this happening again in the future?" So, it's a smart way, I think, of managing staff accountability.

Remembering, of course, that staff here are a mix of senior staff with very, very specific portfolios, the interface stuff that we all get to work with, and a number of those are consultants, not full-time staff. There's all sorts of layers that need to be accommodated in here. What we have from the Board

perspective is they really wanted problem statements. They wanted specific issues. They wanted to know that there was a failure point or a critical control point that they could exercise some sort of measurable remedy to, and we have resisted that and I think it was the right thing to do to resist that because this is supposed to have been everybody floats because of the rising tide to the benefit of all exercise and not the nitpicking one that I think it could have degenerated to. What have I missed? Okay, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, I was going to mention two things. And Cheryl covered one of them. The Board and the people we were talking to are either senior managers or technicians because we have lots of both of them here. Both of them want to fix things. So, the “give me examples” was a common refrain. On the volunteer side, the answer often was, “I’m not going to tell you. I have to work with these people again.” So, I could tell the story about someone who isn’t here anymore but I’m not going to endanger my working relationship by giving you an example. And there was a real confrontation between those two. How can we fix it? I think we finally made the case that we’re not asking you to fix the problem. We want a process so when things come up, we can address them, and I think we found that balance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Alan. There is a question from Seun Ojedeji or a comment.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much, Cheryl, for the brief update. I particularly recently went through the reports and I think it's a good one. Not just for ICANN but also something that can be easily used as a template for the organizations that are not ICANN. However, I have a question for you, Cheryl, even though I already posted it to the group.

There's a section in Section 3 of the recommendation, which was given the panel that was being recommended to have the discretion to determine what is confidential and what is not. I feel that that option should not necessarily be available to four people. If an issue is [tagged] confidential, they should take it as confidential. They should not be the ones to say, "Oh, this is not confidential, so I'm making it open." So, I'm reading that text unless my reading is not correct, to mean that that four people could actually tag or change or decide that a particular issue is no longer confidential, and so it should be transparent. I mean, in the name of transparency, but I think that could be risky. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Olivier. Seun, I want to adjust your interpretation just slightly on that. The panel is in fact a broad-based tool where you've got panelists from across the community, the Board, etc., that can deal with matters that are confidential as opposed to declare a confidential matter, not confidential. And I think that's an important distinction there.

These, very much along the lines of what Alan was just saying about even getting the information in, so we could create the problem statements, effectively, on fact rather than hypothesis and hearsay. The intention is for everybody to still be able to work together after these things have gone on. So, if you had a matter that needed the panel to hear the pros and cons of it, it's very likely that that panel will make good use of the confidential aspects of what it's being presented with but it will take and, indeed, should take extraordinary care to then recommend systemic and general fixes and remedial actions that in no way tie to any particular individual or group of individuals because for our type of environment, that would be extraordinarily damaging and I think that was part of what you were concerned about.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Did you want to say something?
Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. So, thank you, Cheryl, for that clarification. So, if that is what the text meant, then I'm fine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you very much. I'm mindful of the time. We only have half an hour until the end of this meeting. Let's move on.

Just next steps for this, there's a public comment period that's coming up on that, so we'll probably have plenty of time to discuss this, as well. Shall we jump to Jurisdiction? I'm not sure. John, do you have time or do you have to go afterwards?

JOHN LAPRISE: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: John has time. Okay, so then let's move on then to the next one, which is Diversity. Diversity is a very good idea.

The information on this meant that the plenary has already approved the recommendations. The staff is to prepare a public comment period. Great. We're all about diversity in this

community, for those people that weren't in on the joke. If you look around the table, we're quite diverse. So, I don't think there's anything in this part of the world in ICANN that doesn't do whatever it needs to be done, but obviously, it's great to see that there's some diversity points, which have been put together and which will be part of ICANN's own DNA.

Are there any comments or questions on this? I'm not quite sure. Should I go into details on? Sebastien, did you wish to say a few words, perhaps? I know that you've been very strong on this topic. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I don't want to make too much comment but I think it's important that we [add] a discussion because now it's for public comment and there is a disagreement within the working group about one specific issue, which is who will be in charge of taking care of this question of diversity. Some of the group think that the staff will do that very well and some other things they need to be created what was called an Office of Diversity. And it's still an open discussion and I think it could be useful to have now to have this discussion and to see where each one of us, we are on that issue.

But I wanted to say one thing. We were with Olivier and Satish Babu in the India last week and we had the discussion about

diversity, we had a session on that, and one of the participants expressed the following view – I will try to summarize what he says and if not, Olivier will correct me – but he says that what could be interesting is to see all the elements of a person to define diversity. Diversity is not one single issue or one single point. It's a lot of different points, and we try to put them each one aside, the other and to try to see how we will be able to fit this need but maybe taking into account this input could be something useful for the future.

And just for your knowledge, I am almost sure that I will do a comment and one part of this comment will be a proposal to have in the next few years, not diversity but gender balance within the ICANN Board. I think it's very needed thing and as a way to go further, I will suggest a proposal to do [so]. So, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I think you might have meant that you wanted both diversity and gender balance. I think you said not diversity, but I think we want both.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I was wrong in my English speaking. I must speak to French. I wanted to say that gender balance is not a question of diversity.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thank you. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I found this discussion, the discussion that was held over the period quite interesting. One of the things that came up early is the SSAC introduced the concept of diversity of skills and the reaction of many people, including myself, was no, but skills are essential. We don't want to pick someone without the skills. And Julie educated me and a number of other people. That's not what we meant that we need a diversity of different types of skills if we're going to make judgments on things and we're going to make decisions. That was one that I had never actually thought of in those terms. And so I think this overall discussion was a really interesting and useful one and I think many of us came away if only in subtle ways of changing our view on many of the things. I'm not sure if Julie wants to say anything, but I know Cheryl does.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm keen to have Julie come to the table, actually, because she and others around the table were amongst those that slaved long and hard on this document. I just wanted to make it clear to you all that there was, I believe, let me count them. Yes, eight recommendations specifically for our attention and I was going to mention that one in particular, Recommendation 1 will have a particular impost on the ACs and the SOs. But seeing as we've got Julie here, I'm going to switch the microphone and [inaudible] tell us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Julie Hammer.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Yes. I think quite a number of us were very active in this group and I think the discussion on the various elements of diversity, which the report defined, was particularly useful. The other thing that was useful was a questionnaire that was circulated to all the SOs and ACs. And the responses to that really cemented for us the incredible diversity of the way in which our community is comprised, so that if we take a one-size-fits-all approach, we're really going to implement requirements on diversity if that was the way this group went that were almost

impossible to meet, and that was why we had to recognize that some parts of our community like the ALAC intrinsically have great diversity within them. Other parts of the community that come from a much more narrow sector have some elements of diversity but not others, and therefore, we have to be very cognizant of the fact that SSAC, for example, is comprised of people with technical skills and variety within those technical skills is important but we don't come from a community where there are HR specialists and lawyers of different varieties or people with other types of professional skills, so I think the way in which our community is constituted is very diverse, but every element within that community does not necessarily display all aspects of diversity. I'll hand back to Cheryl now to highlight the recommendation that she wanted to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Julie. Just briefly, Recommendation 1 is important. It sets out seven key elements of diversity that each SO and AC needs to look at and address as a common starting point and they are as follows. Ladies and gentlemen, geographic/regional representation. We're pretty good on that in this room.

Language. Again, I'd argue we're pretty good but we certainly could do better in this room.

Gender. Yeah, we're working on it. Age. We have to really look at age very, very carefully and it's so very good to have missions and next generations but we're not seeing them here. They're here at ICANN meetings and they're doing good work, but it's siloed. We need to crack in to that silo and get some of that talent engaged in our work, says the very guys [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought you were going to tell us we need more older people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, I'm working on that. Yes, I'm growing older every day and anyway.

Physical disability and I wanted to clear, I argued that it should not be physical disability. It should be physical ability. However, those who aren't crippled disagreed.

Diversity of skills and stakeholder group or constituency. So, that's the type of things you'll see in these eight sections. And one of the important issues here is I believe we can be a poster child in ICANN for we're doing pretty good but to show how we could do better on it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We now have to go into diversity of speed. We have five more items, some of which are short but some of which are not, and we have buses leaving in 15 minutes for some people. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The next topic on this is going to be the Ombuds Office and for this, we have Sebastien Bachollet, who is the rapporteur for this Work Stream.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. We submit a report. It was second reading and agree after some changes between the first and the second reading. For the who doesn't know the Ombudsman is independent, impartial, and neutral. The Ombuds function is to act as an alternative dispute resolution office for member of the ICANN community who may wish to lodge complaint that the staff [brought] or a constituent body as treated unfairly.

We have put some recommendation after an external review who was requested by the ATRT2 Accountability Transparency Review Team 2, and it was given to the group I was rapporteur to take care of that. We tried to change a little bit the way it was written but not the aim of the proposal of the external reviewer because we thought that it was good proposal and they are

expert in the domain and that's important. We tweak them to allow not to have any change of the Bylaws and it's where we are with the one important point it was the main point discussed. It's to have adversary panel to I will say to be in between the Board we still will have the last say as we don't change the Bylaws, and the Ombuds Office to help the Ombuds Office but also to make the work about having a review each five years proposing the Ombuds Office, who will have this Ombuds Office in the future and other things that [inaudible] was currently doing. The proposal is to be done by intermediate body with much skill people on specific issue than into the Board.

One of the reason is that we wanted to have this Ombuds Office more independent but also we can't ask the Board to have every knowledge on everything and we think that this one it's quite specific and will be better in one specific group throughout both the community and the Ombuds Office to do the work right in the future. One thing it's important to remind is that nothing, it's about what Ombuds Office will do when somebody lodge a complaint. It will remain in the end of the Ombuds Office only as it is a confidential matter and it is work and not the work on everybody else in the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have to share something with this group. There was one small sequence of events with Sebastien that it amused me so much that I just was so delighted. As Sebastien said, his committee did recommend an advisory group and it was slightly different than what he just described and when it went to the plenary, the general consensus of the plenary is “Kill it, we don’t like it, we don’t need to build another group.” And then went a little bit in the process, and we talked about how the Ombudsman would be hired or dismissed by the Board, and people said, “But we can’t have the Board dismissing the Ombudsman.” They’re going to dismiss him because if he made a ruling against them, and Sebastien just beautifully said that’s why we have that committee. And the committee came back in a slightly different form with a slight [different] function and I have to take my hat off. I loved that sequence. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Any comments or questions on this topic? Now, we are running out of time. Let’s then move on to the next topic, and again, here, there will be a public comment period.

The next topic is Jurisdiction and it's one of these topics that has been pretty light with – by the way, sarcasm on. Yes? Sarcasm on. Pretty light. Only 50 meetings, only 1,928 e-mails, and only 1,209 collective hours spent on this. And for this, we have one survivor who can tell us about this. John Laprise, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There will be a session on Jurisdiction later in the week. John will be on the panel. Don't miss it unless you have something really important to do.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Yes. This was a grueling endeavor concerning I wasn't on the first set of meetings, so I had to get up to speed fast. We have got through a second reading in the plenary on yesterday, which was good. To be brief and to summarize, so there are a few issues. First of all, ICANN is a legal animal and so it must live in a jurisdiction. That said, the group did a fine job of trying to mitigate right now the effects of being in a U.S. jurisdiction and balance with ICANN's mission and policies.

That said, with the final report, there is a minority report of sorts voice by parties for a variety of reasons who have a disagreement with the majority on the scope of the project in

that some of them wish to explore the potential of moving ICANN out of the U.S. And to my mind, this is highly problematic. Speaking as in NARALO, at present, this is a nonstarter and we require more resources than ICANN presently has to actually affect any change and it would be very problematic politically in the U.S. perspective.

But there's also other parties are seeking to move ICANN into a more global jurisdiction perspective. However, that doesn't really exist right now. If it did exist, it'd be a fine idea.

Finally, one of the issues that stuck with me is that for the people who want to move ICANN out of the U.S. jurisdiction, I need some sort of empirical fact-based sort of cost/benefit analysis to show why it's an improvement to move out of the U.S. jurisdiction. And that was not forthcoming or really discussed. There was just the assertion that it was better to move out of the U.S. So we got through the second reading, thankfully. It was.

On a personal note, I also want to add and this I wrote into the note that I sent around on a policy for the jurisdiction group is that during the course of this project, I encountered on a couple of occasions bad actors. And in fact, I publicly called out some and reported them to the Ombudsman and that's in the public record. I am very concerned about bad actors in various groups here in ICANN, and I can talk about that at length off topic. But

this is a persistent and growing concern. Thank you. I'll take questions as the group may see fit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Just a quick question. The slide here is, of course, complete before you had that meeting yesterday. What are the next steps?

JOHN LAPRISE: The next steps I believe it goes out for public comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. Any comments or questions? And I see Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so my question – you mentioned global or international jurisdiction, a suggestion for something around this. Can you tell us more about this if there was something solid proposed or is something solid. No.

JOHN LAPRISE: No. There was just sort of this wish, a desire that ICANN to be should be fall under some sort of international jurisdiction that is binding, but we don't have any such animal at present and so

it was more of an aspiration. There were suggestions to move it to an international jurisdiction but what that international jurisdiction was, was not clear. So, no, not really.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it's important to note that the jurisdiction work started and spent a lot of time looking at was there problems that came out of jurisdiction that we have. So, we did try and analyze is the, are the issues actual issues or are they just political perceptions.

What we have done, and it's in our recommendations, is come up with a preferred option for at least contracts and what jurisdiction you use in contracts, and the preferred option amongst several options from the consensus of the jurisdiction work track is for what's called a menu system, and I think that's a big step forward, and I think that in itself will take some of this pent-up pressure for change and diffuse it. Our fingers crossed that's the case.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. We've got three minutes. I'm closing the queue after – Sebastien's put his hand, as well. Okay, so after Seun, Alberto, and then Sebastien, then we have to move to the last topic today, so Seun Ojedeji, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I also followed the jurisdiction group kind of a bit. I think even though I would note that I think we probably waste that during the beginning but I think from the middle of it, things were quite more focused and I like the approach of using addressing things by what is the problem and then picking the issues, and then focusing on that. Maybe we'll have finished earlier. I mean, if we started that way.

Question. I was not at the plenary. I wanted to know because there were suggestions that basically, what the jurisdiction addressed at two points, two issues. The one that has to do with the OFAC and the one that has to do with the [inaudible] of law. But some people were saying that they should actually also note in the report that there were other issues perhaps that – was that addressed at the plenary? Is that intentional to actually add or [spot] other issues that were not probably addressed for future? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: The OFAC issue was addressed at the plenary and as Cheryl Langdon-Orr mentioned, it was a menu-based system. Sort of a priority system for just that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just explain OFAC, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: We lack time.

ALAN GREENBERG: The U.S. organization has a list of countries that normally you are not... A U.S. organization is not allowed to do business with, but there are various mechanisms for which you can get dispensation and be allowed to deal with them. That essentially is OFAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Christopher, we really need to go very quickly because some people have to catch a bus. So, I had closed the queue, yeah.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Very quickly. The majority report describes the necessity for ICANN to require waivers or licenses for OFAC, in the event of OFAC sanctions. The minority, which will not be accepted as a minority report, but a dissenting report requires that we go a significant step forward and require that ICANN is immunized from those aspects of U.S. legislation, U.S. law.

\ I speak personally about this because 20 years ago, the fact that U.S. jurisdiction was accepted in those days was primarily the result of the agreement by the European Commission and the European Union at the time to accept U.S. jurisdiction of IANA. I think personally, the situation has changed significantly and this issue will not go away.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And that was Christopher Wilkinson. Alberto Soto has very kindly put his card down, so we just have – he’s put his card down, yes. And so we have Sebastien Bachollet to close off on this topic. We still have CEP after this and we have to finish.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would like to suggest that we find a time to discuss this specific issue because a question about whether Brazil put on the table need to be discussed somewhere and it’s, as a dissent opinion but it’s not really dissent opinion to have the

report itself because the report itself, even if they say they disagree with the report, it was much more to show that they disagree with the process, not with the result.

I think that for At-Large and ALAC, we need to agree with the report as it is but we need to see how we will enter the discussion about jurisdiction question raised by Brazil. I just want to remind you that this question, it's open in ICANN since very long time. It was first discussed in the Presidential Strategy Committee opened by the CEO at the time. It was put to me and the one of the member of this Presidential Strategy Committee who is still around, it's Jean-Jacques Subrenat, if I remember well, and others, and it could be well but it's we don't have enough time to discuss that here but I think we need to keep it as, we need to have this on the topic somewhere one day. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. There is a session on Thursday that will be dealing specifically with jurisdiction, a cross-community session, so we invite everyone who is involved in this to or interested in this to attend and I'm sure we will discuss this as we have a public comment that's coming up, as well.

Last in the whole list is the review of the CEP or CEP, Community Evaluation Process, I believe, and perhaps, Cheryl Langdon-Orr could spare 20 seconds of her time, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can, indeed, Mr. Chairman. CEP group is in fact, in stasis. We're not now functioning. There was some excellent work, review work done. CEP is a precursor or a before IRP, Independent Review Panel situation, which we encourage, if not mandate, people who are contemplating raising issues to an Independent Review Panel go through. It's one of those situations, Olivier, where people can't really tell you a lot about. The things are still being litigated. There was some very good research done that's excellent foundation and I believe David McCauley's group working on the implementation of IRP will have very effectively picked up the slack on this issue and we'll see more from them shortly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And two things, I guess, before we close this meeting. First, one note from Eric [inaudible] that was on the chat, which you might have not seen and you just mentioned that Christopher Wilkinson is right, which you've done – your small step in the direction of immunization and noninterference, so more discussion on this very soon.

Before close off, I just would like to thank the interpreters for their hard work today. And, of course, also the technical staff for making sure that all of this works. And our own staff, as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank Olivier for his diligent work in putting this session together and doing it on a regular basis. We do have teleconferences, too. They're just as interesting..

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. So, this is the last session of the day. Have a very good evening, everyone, and this session is now adjourned. See you tomorrow morning. Is there an announcement about tomorrow morning?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. For those APRALO-funded travelers for the APRALO General Assembly, please gather outside as soon as possible. The bus will be leaving from right over here but they are now gathered. There's a large group already gathered outside. This is just for the APRALO ALSes. And for tomorrow. The first meeting will be 9:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: And tomorrow I'm afraid is just as packed as today. Please get here before 9:00 and be at the table. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]