
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's Ad-Hoc Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic Coordination on Tuesday the 6th of May at 13:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Klaus Stoll, Fatima Cambroner, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Rudi Vansnick. Avri Doria will be joining us halfway through the call. Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ulrich, Ariel Liang, and myself Gisella Gruber. If I could also please remind everyone to state the names when speaking for the transcript.

Thank you and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Just before we start—

GISELLA GRUBER: Apologies, Olivier. I forgot Rafik Dammak. He is on the call as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Gisella. Did everyone else hear Gisella correctly? Because I had a few dropouts when I listened. Not sure. Okay, let's proceed forward with the call and I hope it's just my end. If you cannot hear me, then please let me know in the chat.

Welcome, everybody, to this call. This is a follow-up call to the action item on the Singapore ALAC Meeting with the NCSG that took place, well, not even last month. It was the month before last month.

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

The action item read as follows. The Ad-Hoc Group on NTIA Topic Coordination is to be formed. NCSG members are – and these are the people who put their hands up in the room at the time – Avri Doria, Rudi Vansnick. ALAC members are Rafid Fatani, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Holly Raiche, and Fatima Cambronero.

I see there are a couple of more people on the call. Of course, there's Rafik Dammak who is the chair of the NCSG. I thought it would be good for him to be here since we are just starting this up, and obviously I'm not listed on there either. But as the chair of the ALAC, it's a good way, so I'll hand over afterwards. I'll probably remain as ex officio in the working group to keep an eye over how things are. Proceeding forward, I gather that – and I haven't asked Rafik Dammak, but I gather that Rafik will probably also do this as well.

I noticed that there's also Klaus Stoll, GNSO councilor and NPOC member who has also joined us. Welcome, Klaus. Really the purpose of this call is to try and get moving on this action item, see how we're going to have that working group work. One of the things I was going to suggest was to basically provide an update since this has been over a month since the action item has been drafted. Provide an update on what's been happening within the NCSG and within the ALAC regarding the NTIA Topic. The bulk of this call is really on this, and then afterwards, we'll see what we need to do for officially creating the working group and then the next steps afterwards.

Are there any suggestions for additions or amendments to this agenda?
Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I just want to make sure that at some point, Olivier, perhaps at the beginning you could give us a quick overview of what happened in other fora which have a direct relevance to our subject. I'm sure that even if the NTIA thing, the IANA function was not the centerpiece of the meetings in Sao Paulo. Everything is linked. So, it's [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's a very good point, Jean-Jacques. And I'll call upon other colleagues who were in NETMundial in Sao Paulo to comment on this.

Let's go directly then to Agenda Item Number 2 and start with the update on the NCSG and ALAC activities regarding the NTIA Topic. By the way, we've called this the NTIA Topic, of course being very much aware that now it's transition of stewardship of IANA function and the whole long list. We're just calling it NTIA Topic for the sake of time. We all know what we're talking about. We're well aware that it's not the exact name of what the topic is these days in ICANN. It just takes too much time to say the long name.

Rafik or anyone from NCSG who would like to let us know then what's been happening in NCSG since the initial call.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Olivier. I guess having NETMundial in the middle quite shifted the attention of everybody regarding the NTIA. But we're having now a proposal for the ongoing public comments regarding the IANA transition

from – I forget the name – which ends I think the deadline is the 8th of May. So it's this week. So we're having ongoing discussion about this statement to comment the proposal [put on the table] by ICANN.

So basically, I don't think there was progress from that. We have that public comment and we are waiting for the new track about accountability, since I think the understanding is that we should have to trust regarding the NTIA towards the transition. I expect that [inaudible] you're working through in the statement for that public comment. That's [all] from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. I was wondering whether there was any more. You mentioned a two-track process. Could you expand on what the two tracks you're suggesting on?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Not two-track, but [opposite]. Regarding the NTIA Topic, I think the understanding that's what Fadi explained in NETMundial, now it's almost two weeks ago. There will be a new track about the accountability. We will have two tracks. One is the IANA transition and then accountability.

I'm not sure if we should handle this two tracks in this working group or not, because I think it's quite interrelated. As explained in NETMundial, even shifted the attention for weeks of our members. So, [inaudible] now to focus in the first public comment regarding the scoping document and the proposal for the process from ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Rafik. Anyone else in NCSG that would like to add any other points? I see no one put their hand up, so now I'll give you a quick rundown on what's been happening in ALAC.

As you know, there are several threads which have all taken place in parallel. First, there is the NTIA Topic as you mentioned with the deadline being the 8th of May for comments. The ALAC had a first statement that it sent out immediately after the opening of the comment period that it actually read at the public meeting in Singapore.

Then that statement was sent in writing to the Board afterwards. And essentially, what the statement said was "Any type of solution or stewardship over the IANA function should be based on enhancing the multi-stakeholder model, maintaining the security stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS, meeting the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services, maintaining the openness of the Internet, providing full and effective accountability for the new stewardship responsibility to the broader stakeholder community by establishing an adequate set of checks and balances and guaranteeing the common good and the public interest of principles to better serve the end-users."

This was the final version that was sent to [inaudible]. For anyone that was in the public meeting, you would have heard it in Singapore.

More recently, of course that public comment period received more information and then provided details of a mechanism for the process with the creation of a Steering Group that was – at the moment it looks

like it's selected by the Chair of the Board and the chair of the GAC. It's very much like an ATRT type. To us, at the ALAC, it looks very much like an ATRT-type process.

After discussion in At-Large, the ALAC, the vote was that the proposal for the creation of a Steering Group itself was something that the ALAC was agreeable with. And the membership given there, the ALAC was happy with the membership listed. There were no objections to the proposed membership which was given by the graphics, etc.

On the other hand, though, it did mention – one concern was that the Steering Group might jeopardize any community-led system. As you know, there is also a parallel to this. The chairs and SOs and ACs have been discussed in the creation of a Cross Community Working Group on the NTIA Topic.

I had in Brazil a meeting – a very quick meeting – with Jonathan Robinson, chair of the GNSO Council, and also with Heather Dryden, and with Byron Holland. The four of us who were present thought, “Well, who's going to start? Who's going to push for this Cross Community Working Group on NTIA?”

I suggested that since the ALAC and the NCSG had worked on the creation of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, maybe it could be for the ccNSO and the GNSO to start that Cross Community Working Group on NTIA and invite all the other SOs and ACs to join.

I haven't seen very much movement on this yet, and perhaps those of you who are in the GNSO might know more than I do. But the big

concern that we have is that we just don't want to have a system where the Steering Groups trumps the work of the Cross Community Working Group that will be created. That's the only note that we put in our proposed draft for our next statement, and we're still commenting on this at the moment and will probably be supplying the answer late I think. Let me just see.

Call for comments closed on the 7th. We'll probably submit it and then ratify the statements immediately afterwards. But if we reach consensus on the Wiki, it's highly likely that this will be ratified. You've got the text in front of you on the link that I put in the agenda.

Next to this, we are creating the ALAC – a specific working group on the NTIA Topic. We're basically going to get people involved in that. In order to put people in this proposed Steering Group, we are in the process of creating a Selection Committee that will be receiving the information and applications from members of our community in order to select them to go on there, the reason being that it's very important for the best people to be on that Steering Committee and the best people to be on that Cross Community Working Group.

There will be no selection for the Cross Community Working Group. We'll keep it open. But certainly, for the Steering Committee, there's going to be a selection that has to be made because it's just particularly important.

Our biggest concern is that solutions which have been shared by some of the community appear to be putting the end user and the public interest completely on the side and making it like they would rather

have control of the system because no one else could be trusted. Very strange thing. You might have a different view to this.

That's the background on the ALAC side. I don't know if any of my At-Large colleagues would like to add something. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier. It's not a remark on what you said. It's rather a question perhaps. For the coming Steering Group, I think that there is a danger and perhaps a solution. The danger as I see it is that now every part of ICANN and many other people outside of it will be wanting to use this opportunity and the momentum given by the NETMundial meeting in order to express views on what the global architecture of the Internet should be in the coming years, and that's fine. But as you just mentioned two minutes ago, Olivier, I think the danger is that it will result in a huge amount of paper or texts which are very general in nature.

So my proposal is that we, at least as the ALAC and perhaps ALAC and NCSG, should concentrate really on one topic which is the user perspective, which is also by the way the overarching theme of ATLAS II. Because everyone will be saying the usual mantra which I approve of course. That is to say it has to be multi-stakeholder based. We don't want to trump by governments, etc. We all know that.

What is really missing is a view which emphasizes the necessity to come back to a user-centered or user-centric view of the Internet and its mechanism. Because from all the things I've seen coming out of the

NETMundial, as is also the case from ATRT, it's a drowning exercise that if you put so much stuff into it that you drown everyone, including the most important elements by stating over and over again that all the stakeholders are important. And then you give a list of the [inaudible] providers, the domain name business, etc. That is not actually our main task. I think that we must concentrate on the user perspective.

My second and last proposal is that if my approach seems to [be] correct, then I think we should start by just among us, setting out in a few lines what we think is essential in enhancing and protecting the user interest – privacy and all the rest, access, etc. – and that would become the seed of what we would input into the larger picture of all the contributions. Although I think that our contribution risks being simply lost in a mass of other stuff which will be quite similar, actually. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Certainly one of the things I have heard already – inside of discussions that I had heard some people at NETMundial was, “Oh well, end users might be interested in designing the next stewardship process that will be there.” But really, they have absolutely no idea about how this whole thing works and they should definitely not be in the operational part of things. You can design it, but leave the professionals to deal with the stewardship. I have real concerns about that. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Olivier. Since you started to discuss about a specific points, in the draft comment we have, I think this kind of contentious point is about the Steering Group. I don't think that we'll find an NCSG some support to this kind of Steering Group in particular because selection will be done by the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC. I don't think we really want or we need to replicate an ATRT model because it has its own drawbacks. The question I think is the composition [ready]. It's giving them over a presentation to some parties against other parties.

In this particular – what we described as an affected party. We may need much more maybe [inaudible] Steering Group or different composition. So maybe it's just something we really need to think about even though we don't have so much time, because if this Steering Group will obtain an important role on how to steer the discussion and the process, it may have an impact. The ICANN is the interested party in the process.

I don't have a specific problem with this itself, but I don't think that we should replicate an ATRT model in itself. We should really have something more community-led.

Regarding the Cross Community Working Group on IANA transition, I think that's the topic for discussion for the GNSO this week. So I think the GNSO Council will discuss about and NCSG will have a call in one hour and a half, and I think this is one of the topics that we may discuss about. At least it's very clear that there is no competition between the Cross Community Working Group and Internet Governance. This Cross Community Working Group, hopefully it should be open to the whole

community to participate in this Cross Community and to feed the process.

I'm not sure what has happened after with all this input because I don't think other parties like the IGF or the IAB or ccNSO are really supporting this Steering Group model. I think it's something that would be controversial and I hope that we find more community-led structure than just the Chair of ICANN Board selecting people, even if it's through appointment. For GNSO, only two people are from the GNSO that can do just the kind of call for problems within GNSO who can represent the non-contracted and the contracted party.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Rafik. Next we have Rudi Vansnick.

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you, Olivier. I agree with what Rafik brought up earlier that there is a need to clarify the more – I noted myself that what the outside world for the whole community, if I may say, it is not clear at all what the whole discussion is about. I think that there is a need for clarification to the outside world what the NTIA decided and what the NTIA is expecting. As Rafik was mentioning that the ICANN Board Chair would select people, that probably will be not accepted by the NTIA as a good step forward.

By the way, looking into the documents that come from the NTIA, that come from the U.S. government, is clearly indicated that one of the

affected parties is Internet Society, and it looks like the NTIA is essentially looking to ISOC to come to step forward with some ideas.

With that regard, I think it is important that from the At-Large for sure, as we have a lot of ISOC Chapters in there, there is a need to come up with some ideas and some proposals. I really think that a good solution is to have a Steering Committee from inside the community and not from the Board [type] that will help in guiding the rules and processes we have to go through in order to set up a first proposal of possible transition, if there is any transition possible at all at the end.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Rudi. So if I understand correctly, there is [inaudible] to the opposition from the NCSG and I gather from – I've seen the input, by the way, from the ccNSO and I know that there is some opposition to the Steering Group from the ccNSO. It looks like there will be some opposition also from the GNSO. Do I get this correctly?

RUDI VANSNICK: I don't think we can have a kind of [government] statement for the GNSO, but they expect that several [constituents of the] Stakeholder Group – they will have their own statements regarding the proposal. I don't expect [inaudible]. That will be hard and it will be already late because the GNSO Council call is scheduled for the 8th of May.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I think as far as this proposal is concerned – the staff proposal is concerned – it will be good for us to maybe follow up in a future call seeing what the overall decision has been based on the input from the community. If I see the ccNSO and several parts of the GNSO being opposed to the Steering Group, I would be surprised that ICANN moves forward with having the model that they describe in this public comment. But then again, things have been different in the past as well. I know sometimes ICANN is run exactly the opposite of what the community has asked for. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. A few remarks about what you said and what Rafik said, two or three points. First, there is a problem with the Steering Committee as we have just found out.

Now, if the designation of the members of the Steering Committee is only by the Chairs of the Board and the GAC, then that's the ATRT model, plus or minus some details.

So that leaves us with the necessity to choose strategy. Do we consider both in the ALAC and perhaps NCSG perhaps ccNSO and elsewhere, do we consider it more important to lobby in order to have one of us, meaning the Chair of ALAC, for instance, to be at all costs a member of the Steering Committee or do you think that we can best exercise influence on the content by actually first drafting a joint position of as many parts of ICANN as we can get? For instance, ccNSO, NCSG, ALAC, etc.

In other words, to draft [quite] quickly a position paper, very short, to the point; and as I said about ten minutes ago, centered on the user perspective and user rights. And then that would become something, hopefully, which others would find more difficult to neglect or to forget.

So what I'm really aiming at is how do we ensure maximum efficiency? And perhaps one method – but not the only one, it would have to be used alongside something else – the one just proposed by Rudi that's sort of inside Steering Group may do the trick.

But honestly, I think that we have to choose now between two main avenues. One is to lobby to get one or several people [inaudible] inside the Steering Group, but there's no guarantee that we'll manage, because after all, it is in the hands of the Chairs of the GAC and Board.

Or, to put our weight behind a joint position, do that fast and in a forceful way, so that at least the positions will be taken into account, hopefully. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. The proposal is actually – the [inaudible] for the proposal – the proposal is actually here. I just put it in the chat. That provides the details that every SO and AC would have two members. So two members of ASO, two from GNSO, two from ccNSO, two from ALAC, two from RSAC, two from SSAC, two from GAC and then two from the Internet [inaudible], two from the IETF, two from ISOC, and two from the NRO and one person to be a Board liaison. That's what the Steering Group would be.

The Chair would be selected by the Steering Group and there would be a secretariat's support that would come into this. The composition in there is quite clear. Obviously, as one of the ACs – the ALAC is guaranteed to have two people, at least in the current proposal. I think it becomes very difficult in the GNSO because only two people for the GNSO when you've got the bicameral system and the various stakeholder groups. That's going to be particularly challenging. And I gather that some might say they want more than two people.

I think that there has been some concern that ISOC gets two people in there because ISOC is already present through the IETF and through the IAB, so the affected parties – the external affected parties – ISOC seems to be having more than a fair share of people on there. That's the feedback that I've received so far informally from people and from Chairs of SOs and ACs.

Now, with regards to having a common position that you mentioned there, I think that's probably something we might be able to do with the NCSG and I'd be interested to hear from our NCSG colleagues on the call. I would say it's going to be hard to get a user-centric position any further than among our ranks, because frankly, some out there don't really give a damn. And I did say that. And I know it's transcribed, but they don't. They see it totally differently and don't believe the user has anything to do with this.

Jean-Jacques, you still have your hand up.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Fine. Olivier, I must say that I had forgotten the thing for which gave us the link proposal and I had not in mind the exact composition which is proposed. So that's fine.

But it doesn't – how should I say? – take away anything from my suggestion or my remarks a few minutes ago, which is that we need even more strongly to come out with a statement, a sort of position paper which is shared in advance by as many parts of the constituency as possible. Because in these large things which are headed by the Chairs of GAC and Board, everyone will be called upon to make remarks about everything and it will get lost, and then finally someone on senior staff who does the collection of all the ideas.

So I think the important thing, whatever we do for membership in the Steering Committee will be actually to define a clear-cut position paper. And Olivier, I agree with your remark that some people really don't give a damn about what we consider the global public interest, but I think we really have to work on that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Well understood. And next is Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. Just was going to ask, I think maybe we'll have several suggestions here, but maybe should we discuss this ad hoc Working Group, maybe we need more people involved. Then should we maybe agree on some elements I think maybe if this group needs a weekly or monthly call and so on, and if we can extend it and if it should have a

clear objective. Not necessarily a charter. I'm not going to [inaudible] again.

But if we give the volunteers some clear objectives, like I guess the [inaudible] by Jean-Jacques and so on to move forward. I think we have a [inaudible] public comment I think is already – we cannot catch it. But [inaudible], we have London meeting in 50 days if I'm not mistaken, or 40 days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 41.

RAFIK DAMMAK: 41, you are good in counting. So if we could just agree on some objectives for this Working Group extending and then supporting them to deliver in time something that we can use. Maybe other [comments], maybe [inaudible] statement or proposal and also maybe to work with other parties of the community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. Totally agree, and maybe that's what we need to do now, basically. I was going to suggest that – first, let's take suggestions. But what I was going to suggest is the first question we have to ask ourselves, is this Working Group just a number of people who are on the call here today plus – I see Avri has also made it. All of the people who are on the call today or would this joint working group be open for more people to join? Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. I think I'm going to ask again other volunteers, I guess. We have a few people in the Singapore meeting, but I will circulate a call again for participation and we get more people involved, hopefully.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If no one objects – if you do object, please put a big red cross next to your name. But let's have a quick check. So this working group would be open for any members of the NCSG and any members of At-Large to join. I see a green tick from Fatima. That's fine. That's one thing.

Now, with regards to a charter or a mission – well, we're not going to call it a charter, but we'll call it a mission. Shall we say that this is a good – that this working group would be a coordination body for the work of the NCSG and the work of the ALAC as far as the NTIA issues are concerned? But a good way, coordination body or do you want it to be more than that? I see green tick coordination body. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Whatever coordination group or ad hoc coordination group [inaudible] is okay. Just let's coordinate I guess is the main objective.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi asks in the chat whether staff should issue the call for membership or will you and I issue the call for membership, bearing in mind At-Large staff don't have access to the NCSG member list.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. I would circulate the call. I just need maybe this information about the workspace and so on. But I will circulate within NCSG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. I note, by the way, that a Wiki page has already been created in the At-Large. [inaudible] At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic coordination workspace. There you go. The answer is already there. So we've got that.

Is the name okay or do you wish to change the name? This is open to everyone, by the way, on the call. You're all very welcome to speak and voice your concerns or agreement. I see a green tick from Fatima on this. Go ahead, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Depending what kind of acronyms we [inaudible] on this, but it should be okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic Coordination, so it's the AHJNWCNCC – no. We're just going to call it NTIA Topic Coordination I think. The long name sounds right. The long name sounds fine. But we'll call it NTIA Coordination between At-Large and NCSG when we want to make it – NTIA Coordination short and formal name.

But you have to be careful, though, Heidi. The official name needs to remain the name that we've had there. If we have just NTIA Coordination and someone reads this, they'll blow up and think, "Hang on, what do At-Large and NCSG have to do with NTIA Coordination?" We don't coordinate that. Anyway. I had to vent this today.

So [inaudible] an open thing, so the At-Large staff will be issuing a call for candidates and for members in the ALAC and At-Large. Who should we send it to for this to be forwarded to the NCSG? I have it forwarded to you, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yeah. In addition, we have now the Wiki space. I guess we need the mailing list, so that's a second thing to have. Mailing list. We have the Wiki space. Having all this, we can circulate the information in one shot and get people directly into the system of discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. And the name of that mailing list, how about having NCSG-ALAC-NTIAC. It's short enough.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I think it's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see NTIAC is suggested by Rudi Vansnick. That looks like NTIA Coordination or NTIAC in one word. Whichever. Do you have any preference, anyone?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, just put something on the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've noticed that. I think the name of the coordination thing is Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group and NTIA Topic Coordination. That's the long name. The short name, just the name of the mailing list, NCSG-ALAC – I'm just trying to think of something. Yeah, we can't have a slash in an e-mail address, I'm afraid, Jean-Jacques, unfortunately, because [inaudible] precludes you from having a slash, so it will need to be ALAC-NCSG and we can't have an "@" of course, ampersand sign.

Okay. We'll find a name for the mailing list. That's fine. Whatever. Something that will work. I don't think we can have brackets in an e-mail address either, so it's just dashes. We'll just confirm on this. Okay, that's one thing. That's another thing.

Now, regarding the first topic, the suggestion was that the first work of this Working Group would need to do is to put together a position paper, the [common] position paper, between the At-Large and – well, between the ALAC and the NCSG. Are we all okay with this first task? I hear no one speak against it. I see a green tick from Rudi Vansnick, one from Rafid Fatani, one from Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

So the first work topic would be the drafting of a common position paper between the NCSG and the ALAC, and the position paper would be of course on the issue of the NTIA oversight. So U.S. government oversight on the NTIA function.

What Jean-Jacques suggested is that we clearly lay out the points that we believe should be pursued in the process and an end solution that will be put forward. It's worth noting that the ccNSO has drafted a position paper that they are sending to the public comment process already, and of course that will be taken on later on. I think that the SSAC also is going to send something, and it's worth [inaudible] that some of the regional Internet registries might be also sending or drafting something as we speak. It certainly makes sense.

We've got a first task, excellent. Is this also in the action items?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

No, Olivier. Could you repeat that action item please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. So first suggested topic, [inaudible]. Drafting of a common position paper on topic of – and then we've got the full thing – U.S. government oversight. How do you call this? Sorry. Take U.S. government out. Transition of [oversight] for IANA function. Transition of U.S. government [oversight] for IANA function – I think that was the official name that was given. I'm sorry if I'm wrong. Can someone just type it in the chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can we use stewardship rather than oversight?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So it's transition of stewardship of U.S. government [oversight] of IANA function or something, isn't it? Whoever drafted this was evil. I have not found one person yet who remembers it by heart. It's changed now, Jean-Jacques. It was transition of stewardship of the IANA function, and now it's another name. It changed. Every week they come up with something a bit more complicated and more of a tongue twister.

Okay. We've got the first suggested topic. Any other topics that would be suggested as first work of this working group? No? Okay.

Now, there was a question as to the number of people on this working group. Do you have any thoughts on that? Yes, Rafik. You have the floor.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, thanks. I guess we are giving first task for this working group, but [inaudible] with a vision statement about what they should do. I mean, [inaudible] end of this process [inaudible] which would be great, so we give them the ability to work on a mission statement. Not the charter, but just a few bullet points what they think that they should do for this process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. So that's another action item for the working group, which is the working group should define its mission statement, bearing in mind

we're really setting work for ourselves here. Excellent. Any other comments, thoughts, suggestions?

Regarding the length of time this working group will work, I think we'll just start it up and we can just say until it is decided jointly by the ALAC and the NCSG to close it down. Obviously I'm reticent in putting in a date for the end of this working group since, at the moment, the target for this IANA transition is sometime in [2016]. October I think [2016]. But yet, when you look at it, it has also been said that if no solution is found by then, then there might be an extension of the initial contract, which means we're looking at further than October [2016].

[inaudible] are reached? It depends what the objective is. for the duration of the exercise, unless the two bodies – NCSG and ALAC – decide otherwise. Should define its membership, yes. That's true as well. So the working group should define its membership. And [inaudible] suggestions are also made in the chat for the duration of the exercise, unless the two bodies – NCSG and ALAC – decide otherwise.

The ALAC, NCSG, NTIA Response Team – the ANNRT. Wow. Avri, well done. That sounds like, wow. This is one step away from the A-Team, isn't it? The ANNRT. Okay, that's a good suggestion from Avri on the name of the working group. Okay, good. I see everyone who likes the ANNRT. Staff, we'll have to replace then the early action item. Perfect!

Okay, anything else? Rafik, you're better than I am on these things. Usually you're thorough on all the things we need to think of here.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Well, I think it looks okay. Just we need to circulate a call and just maybe since we do some housekeeping for this working group, just maybe to set up for them for the next call I guess maybe in two weeks, so then we can move forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Maybe a call in two weeks' time.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Then the working group can decide about frequency, rotation, and so on. But just maybe kind of kick off – a more efficient kick off of the working group of this ad hoc group response team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So that's one thing. Yeah. I see some notes in the chat that say that maybe we should shy away from having working group because it moves a number of things as well. There appears to be good response for the ALAC, NCSG, NTIA Response Team. Is that okay for everyone? I see a green tick from Rudi, Rafik, Fatima, Avri as well. Okay, excellent. So that's the name then. ALAC, NCSG, NTIA Response Team. We'll probably have to then amend the mailing list name as well accordingly to this. Maybe ANN-RT.

Do we have something to plan in London? That's the next question. That's a very good point. London is only 41 days away. Do we want a face-to-face meeting? Do we want this team perhaps to speak to the ALAC and the NCSG when there is a meeting between the ALAC [inaudible]? I don't even know at the moment whether there is a

meeting set up between the ALAC and the NCSG. Heidi, would you be able to help us out on this and tell us if that's the case?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not at the moment. Sorry, maybe I spoke too fast. Not at the moment. There is no joint meeting planned.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. Thank you. That was very fast. At the moment, there isn't a meeting planned between the ALAC and the NCSG. As you know, we have the At-Large Summit taking place in London which is taking a significant amount of time from us.

I wonder, Heidi, is there any free slot or something we might have in London, some space somewhere during our hell of a week?

HEIDI ULLRICH: What I would suggest, Olivier, if you don't mind, is having the NCSG meet or this group meet during the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session which is Monday 14:30 – 17:30, or Tuesday the 24th either within the ALAC Policy Discussion Part One which is 14:30 – 16:00, or the ALAC Policy Discussion Part Two, 16:30 – 18:30.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. I'll tell you what, if we can have the three time slots e-mailed over to Rafik Dammak, then Rafik, you can arrange and find out with your NCSG schedules when that works with you, and then we can

arrange this so we can have a face-to-face meeting, which is not going to be strictly a meeting with the working group, but I think it would be important for the working group to meet with all of the ALAC and all of the NCSG [inaudible] general public.

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Just asking Silvia to correct [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just remember, Rafik and Rafid. Rafid Fatani is Raf. That makes a difference then between the two. Back to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Just [inaudible] to know about the time slot, I think, because the change in Thursday's scheduling, it will create some issues for everybody.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll follow up by e-mail on this. So At-Large staff will e-mail you the different slots that we have available where we're going to have our face-to-face meetings with the ALAC, and then invite you to come over.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. No problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anything else, ladies and gentlemen? It's the top of the hour. Have we missed anything? I don't see anyone put their hand up. It looks like we've made some progress on this call. Thanks to all of you for joining. I look forward to see this working group start moving forward. And of course staff with follow up and the rest hopefully – if I could ask for the action items to be sent to everyone in an e-mail, so we all know what we have to do to move forward, that would be great. Certainly time is of the essence.

Thanks to all of you. Speak to you again soon in two weeks' time I believe where we need to send [inaudible] out and have this meeting in two weeks' time. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]