
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So let's get the recording going and let's get things on the road please. Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. It will be one moment while I start the recording.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad-hoc working group on Transition of US government Stewardship of the IANA Function on Friday, the 8th of August 2014 at 15:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Gordon Chillcott, Roberto Gaetano, David McAuley, Patrik Fälström, Julie Hammer, Tom Lowenhaupt, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Avri Doria, Loris Taylor, Judith Hellerstein, and Aida Noblia.

We have no apologies today. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters for today are Veronica and David.

As a reminder, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Just a couple of housekeeping rules, of course. Say your name before you speak on the call since this call is interpreted in Spanish. And one last

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.

question before we get this call going, have we missed anyone in the roll call?

I don't hear anyone shouting their names out, so I believe we are complete. And now the adoption of the agenda. We've got a review of the NCI stewardship function itself. Which Patrik Fälström is going to be dealing with, and effectively is just going to give us a full review of what the functions are and how these things all work together.

I understand we've got a lot of documents which are linked to the working group page. There is a link in the agenda that actually sends us to the working group page as well. We've got several documents there as well. Then after that, we will have a review of the IANA coordination group discussions, described by Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir, who are our two representatives on that coordination group.

After that, we will be finding out how can we contribute to the discussion. There have been some difficulty of being able to bring our points across to the coordination group, and we might think of ways to improve this whole overall communication. And then afterwards, we'll be able looking at next steps. Does anyone wish to add anything to the agenda at this point in time?

Hearing no one...

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yeah, this is Patrik Fälström. I have nothing to present and I'm not going to lead this call. What I interpreted your question for me to participate was whether I was going to be present to be able to answer

questions in the discussion that ALAC has. As I wrote to you as a separate email this morning, like six hours ago, we in SSAC do not have anything to present whatsoever. We do, might have, two weeks from now, but not today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this Patrik. Yeah, it's Olivier speaking. I don't think we ever asked for a presentation as such, and I do acknowledge that I received your email six hours ago, but felt... Basically this call is open, all of the calls are open, so a presentation isn't ready yet to show out to the rest of the world, probably isn't the best time for it.

But certainly we absolutely acknowledge your presence here, and we are thankful that you were able to join us. In fact, let's get going to agenda item number two and start the discussion with you Patrik. So you're from the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. And the reason why you've been asked to join us today is to provide a little bit of answers, perhaps, on any of the questions that we might have.

And I assume that we have several questions for you. To set the record straight as such, as to how all of these functions actually work. You've been involved with the IETF for many years, you're also involved with the number side of things for a long time. So you probably are a person who can answer these questions and any other questions that we might have on the call, with pretty much authority.

So the first question I was going to ask was really the, we've seen an info graphic which was provided by, I believe it was Verisign, a few weeks ago. There is an online version actually of this, and we've put it in our page, but in fact, you can have a look at the info graphics here and put it in the chat at the moment. That provides the actual function of the NCIA as far as proper root zone management is concerned.

And this, of course, deals with the domain name privacy of the IANA functions. As we know, there is also a protocol side of IANA functions, and there is also an IP address part of the IANA function. And somehow, there is no explanation out there as to how the NCIA relates to that. And certainly, on top of that, I haven't managed to find any kind of contract as such.

Perhaps contracts with regards to the protocols by seeing some of the work that has already started within the IETF, but I've certainly seen nothing regarding, relating to the regional Internet registries and the NRO. And so perhaps it would be helpful for you to take us through that, or let us know how this works.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yeah. There are two answers to that question. First of all, regarding the protocol numbers, that is something that started, this is Patrik Fälström speaking. So what, it all started in 1959...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Go ahead Patrik. There just seems to be a bit of interference on the line somewhere.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Okay. So the protocols, which is like no names, no numbers, where basically all of that started in 1969 already. And that evolved into the IETF created, and the IETF, and also the [ROC] period where the action numbers were recorded, that moved over to NSF, a sort of grant mechanism. And National Science Foundation stopped managing that, that led to, because [inaudible] National Science Foundation [inaudible] US government, that led to everything winding up in the [inaudible], or Department of Commerce.

And that in turn, led to the IANA functions contract that was sort of created October 1, 2000. Regarding the IETF issues, the base document is ROC 2860, which is a MOU between ICANN and IETF, which is then updated in ROC 7132 and 6220, which talks about the various issues.

ROC 2860 is from June 2000, and it's a mutually agreed basis for the administration of the IETF related resources. That talks about the infinite protocol parameters, from domain names for technical purposes, address blocks of special purposes, and some [inaudible] assignments. There are also some similar kind of agreements between ICANN and the RIRs, and that is between ICANN, specifically the ICANN and the ASO from October 2004.

The MOU designates the MRO to fulfill the roles of ICANN's ASO. We should also remember that in the beginning of ICANN, there was a protocol supporting organization that later were closed. So you have those kind of MOUs there and people can, of course, just [inaudible]

whether they are contracts or what kind of leverage those documents have between ICANN and the IETF and the RIRs.

There are also some exchange of letters between ICANN and the root server operators, which is closer to the domain names similar to ICANN and some ccTLD administrators, and then you have the contrast between ICANN and the gTLD administrators, and a few other similar issues.

So those are the documents that access, or paper trace, a part from the agreement between NTIA. The contract between NTIA and ICANN regarding the IANA functions. And all of these things sort of needs to be taken into account, and even the IANA functions contract is something that has evolved during the years, and was, at the beginning, pretty short and crisp document, but has evolved and the latest version there is also some wording regarding protocols and parameters that of course, to some degree, one can say overlaps what the ITF has in its MOU, but that is something that, at least in my interpretation, is that ITF don't see any problem with that. So that's basically a summary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Patrik. It's Olivier speaking. So the first question I have for you, with regards to the contracts, do they include any specific tasks that the NCIA needs to do? Because certainly, the contractual relationship is one thing on the one hand, but [the thing?] with regards to the root zone management, there is an activity that the NCIA performs. Does NCIA perform any activity with regards to the protocols and with regards to the numbers?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

This is Patrik. I think on 10,000 feet level, no there are no activities there. Neither if you read actual, specifically they don't read the mutual agreements between ICANN and the ITF, for example, or ICANN and the RIRs. Now, if you read the actual, read the contract between NTIA and ICANN, just because the NTIA is sort of doing audit of performance of IANA, there is, of course, a little bit of a question, what do you mean by audit?

Does that mean that the NTIA can actually do something if ICANN is not performing, that's one thing, one question. The second thing has to do with certain, for example, domain names that people might not think or part of domain name management, but might be part of the protocol parameters like the top level domain, or certain other domain names, which are sort of part of the protocol management, or domain names.

There is also a little bit of a question, of course, whether NTIA actually do have a role there according to the contract NTIA has. In reality NTIA, has never, they don't, it's not the case that they must do something, as it is for sort of the traditional, crystal clear cases, for domain names where NTIA actually must be involved in the various cases. That is not the case.

It's more the case that they can involve themselves, if it is the case that the performance is not according to what is expected. But all of those cases are managed by, either the ITF or the oversight of the ITF, the MOU, which is the Internet architecture board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this. It's Olivier speaking. Patrik, you've just mentioned actually the oversight of the ITF, which is the Internet architecture board. Certainly, there seems to be a certain amount of accountability going on with regards to the NCIA performing the audit, certainly for the name. This is something that, I think, many of us is linking to the transition of stewardship.

At the same time, there is also a question with regards to the accountability of the ITF and the accountability of the RIR processes. Are you aware of what these accountability mechanisms are?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Patrik Fälström here. I think if we look at the overall ITF architecture of the organization itself, you have ITF and the whole structure of the ITF. Any kind of decision that is made in the ITF, is appealable to the Internet architecture board. If it is the case that people do believe that decision making process in the ITF did violate the process itself, then process issues are appealable to the board of the Internet Society.

So that's the sort of the decision making chain and appeals process. Regarding the performance of the ITF, we have to remember that what the ITF is dealing with are standards, and standards can be developed by any standards organization in the world. [Inaudible] a collaboration between ITF and many other standards organizations like the W3C, ITU, and others, SC, etc.

Anyone that would like to have a standard [inaudible], can go to any of the standards organizations. And on top of that, it might be the case that two different standard organizations working with similar issues

like codex or whatever, which both ITF and ITU is working with. So I would say that the ITF is much, much more sort of bottom up process, where ultimately it is the users of the protocol parameters and the standards that decide whether they want to use the ITF standards or not in a completely different way than domain names.

So I think to start with, we have to remember that it's very difficult to even compare domain names and domain name allocation with protocol parameter allocation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So thank you. It's Olivier speaking. So that's a good start on the ITF. What about the RIRs? Are you aware of the processes by which accountability takes place?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: The RIRs do... They do develop a policy independently, but in a coordinated way, each one of the different RIRs. And each one of the RIRs do have their own mechanism for how to handle both the PDP they're running. And also, the actual later on, the implementation of the PDP that they're having in each one of the RIRs.

So it's a little bit difficult to give a general explanation there, because it depends a little bit on which one of the RIRs you are operating under, because each of them do have sort of their mechanism.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the five regions are separate basically.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: The five regions are separate, but then you have a global policy that is, for example... So the policies are coordinated, but even though the policies sort of are the same, there are still decided upon on each one of the regions independently. So every policy that is sort of used, for example, in the [right?] region where I happen to be, must be accepted according the right PDP.

So some proposals that are global have been blocked because one of the RIRs have not accepted the policy within their PDP. So that's how the coordination is made. So global policies are implemented by having the same policy accepted, but in each one of the PDPs independently.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Olivier speaking. And whether the involvement of the NCIA in these processes.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah, Patrik speaking here. The ITA involvement is absolutely nothing. The only thing that they are doing is that they have a contract with ICANN, ICANN promised ITA that they will fulfill, that ICANN will fulfill the tasks of running the registry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. Well, the floor is opened for questions. I haven't seen anyone put their hands up. So, I'm not really sure. Does anybody have any questions for Patrik? In addition to what we've heard so far.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: This is Patrik speaking. Let me just tell everyone, which I've had the discussion with Olivier the last few days, and this is, of course, something that Julie Hammer, which is the [inaudible] liaison between the two of us, that we are working on a set of documents describing exactly what you have been asking here.

The first document that we hope will be released in a few weeks, because it's now on the last review, will describe what IANA is doing, one can put it that way. The second document we're working on is, what is actually covered by the contract between NTIA and ICANN. And then the third document that we're looking at, whether we should do is the SSAC comments on the whole situation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Patrik. Olivier speaking. So I haven't seen anyone putting their hand up yet, so I guess what we'll be doing is, we'll eagerly await the documents that SSAC are going to be publishing. And I'm glad that we had our short discussion with you today, so as to get a clearer view of the NTIA's involvement on the non-named issues as such.

There is concern in our community with regards to the building of the actual proposals. It appears that the coordination group is just going to coordinate the different proposals that will be received from various parties. That I guess this is part of the discussion we're going to have in the next part of our call today.

So if there are no questions for you from anyone on the call, then it appears that, at the moment, there are none, and I can't see any in the chat either. I thank you very much for joining us Patrik, and if you want to hang around, you're absolutely welcome to do so. If you have other things to do, then it's absolutely fine with dropping off as well.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah, thank you very much. This is Patrik speaking. Thank you very much for inviting me. There is a meeting here in Sweden, so I will actually drop off. Thank you very much. Bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Take care. Thank you. So now the next part of our agenda is reviewing the ICG, so the IANA coordination discussion group with our two representatives, Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohammed El Bashir. I'm not sure who wishes to start, to provide us a quick summary of what's been happening.

I think that most of us on the working group have been very much kept informed of what's been going on. And of course we all have the ability, the [inaudible]. But I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat has put his hand up. So, Jean-Jacques, you now have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, but you might have to speak a little bit further away from your microphone.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Oh, a bit further away. Okay. Is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that sounds great. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good. Right, so I'll try to give an overview, and then I'd be very grateful if Mohamed could drill down into the subject as he feels fit. So the first thing was to say that the first meeting we had in London, a bit more than two weeks ago. And it was all about organizing ourselves in various ways.

First of all, defining the role of this coordination group. And second, getting organized internally. So on the first topic, which is, what is the purpose of the group? There are several aspects. First of all, we needed a drafter charter of our group, to know which way forward we were going. In this respect, very early on in the discussion, some colleagues on the group made a point of insisting that they would have to be three separate approaches, almost corresponding to three separate entities related to the IANA function.

That is to say, numbers, addresses, and protocol parameters. For that reason also, I found as someone who is outside the technical community, that there was a fairly large contingent of the business

community well represented, and also of the technical community, especially with the top people from the Internet architecture board and the IETF, with that engineering taskforce.

And that's quite normal. When we proceeded at the request of the interim chair, we can do without, in other words, with everyone making a self-introduction. I asked that each of us state her or his citizenship or nationality, just to make things clear. And of course, also the enterprise he or she works for, affiliation with an organization, etc.

And this was very gracefully responded to by everyone. So, if we had not asked for all of those details, perhaps we would have had a less clear image of the composition of the group, because we had not been told in the prepared pre-stage before the London meeting, what the group looked like.

So, at that moment, there were only two representatives of the GAC at that stage, so we were at 26, I think, and of the 26 that happened that they were 11 citizens from one nationality, from North America. And the rest was evenly distributed. The closest next one was with three persons from one country or one citizenship.

So, in terms of the tasks. There were some discussion about what the work of the coordination group would be. Some stating that it was purely administrative in some ways, that means collecting the views of the global stakeholder communities, regions and sifting through all of them. And then giving a sort of neutral resume of all of that, upwards.

And it appeared in the discussion [inaudible] that actually, it is more complex than that, and I give you my personal reading of this. I think

that actually, the coordination group will be expected to produce a plan in its own name, to present to the NTIA.

Now that does not mean that ICANN, as a corporation, will not intervene. It can intervene in its own name. But as far as I have understood, and I hope that's correct, that the coordination group will be able to submit to the NTIA a plan, and of course, then there will be discussion about how valid or invalid ICANN happens to be.

Now about the second big topic I wanted to take up, is self-organization. It appeared that there was some hesitation about the format of the leadership team or the structure, as it was called then. Some people were advocating one chair and one vice-chair, others said one chair and two vice-chairs, etc.

So at the end of the day, when it came to a voting procedure, the suggestion of having two co-chairs and three people with equivalent responsibilities, was adopted. And that was taken note of and it was recorded in the report of the London meeting as our choice. Now, I think this because sometime after the London meeting, a group of our colleagues were not satisfied with what had been agreed upon, and they proposed that it was too unweeding, or not efficient, or not whatever.

And they called for a simpler system of one, well simpler in their minds, of one chair, and one or two vice-chairs. I remind all of us that there were several iterations of, in that position of this in the past few days. And finally, with the agreement of Olivier, our chair, I've sent two of my colleagues in the coordination group a proposal on behalf of the ALAC,

about our structure which would solve that problem, at the same time, maintaining the principles we had stated right from the start in London.

That is to say, [inaudible], proper representation of the group of stakeholder communities, etc. That's where we are today, as far as the internal leadership structure is concerned. And there is a group led by, three or four of my US colleagues, who really wish to have one chair or one or two vice-chairs [inaudible]. And there are some other views which have been expressed that actually, especially with the enlargement of the group from 26 to, I think, 30 now.

We should actually have one chair and four vice-chairs. In this way, we would have on the, not board, but actually leadership structure would have five people, which would correspond exactly to the five Internet regions for what they were. And that was the position suggested. So I could go on with other details, but I think it's interesting to focus on these various aspects first, and here what our community has to say about this, whether it has suggestions or questions.

But before I do that, I suggest that we listen to Mohamed on his take of where we are today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Mohamed El Bashir, you have the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much Olivier. Hello everyone. I think Jean-Jacques already talked about particular things. I would like to maybe give you

more details about specific issues currently under discussion within the group. I will start with the secretariat. Within London, a meeting there was an agreement to use ICANN for support and staff, interim secretary to provide support for the [RCT].

Until we finalize a process for, which would be an independent secretariat. And some work currently being doing in [inaudible] required for the secretariat. So that would be in the coming future. RCT is set to have an independent secretariat from ICANN. [Inaudible] as well, still need ICANN logistic support in terms of meetings. [Inaudible] ICANN meetings.

There are two main documents, or two have been produced on a draft format since London meeting. The first one is the charter of the RCT, and the other one is [RC], [inaudible] proposal for the transition. And I can say that the request of the proposal that [inaudible] sent, is one of the documents that has some sort of a [inaudible] from what was required from the transition.

Recently ALAC has put some comments, which I'm planning to submit to RCT, hopefully today. So I don't think our position in terms of the proposals, require information on the proposals, and the importance of the communities to have open, transparent, [progressive] to enable other stakeholders to [inaudible] stakeholders to participate.

And then I just wanted to verify that ICANN's effective communities and [constituency?] communities, basically this two terms have been used in the previous NTIA/ICANN contracts in identifying contracted, [inaudible] contracted parties with IANA, who are called affected parties, affective

community, or customers of IANA. And other stakeholders who are not [inaudible] or have any sort of contractual arrangements with IANA, and those are interested parties or interested stakeholders, who are, ability to satisfy the end user community and government as well, and businesses.

So there were discussions in London about who are the communities who are going to be submitting, [the ALAC?] being submitting proposals, and considered that submit it as well from other communities. I think now that more than ALAC, we discuss that also that we need to have all the stakeholders interested and effective to be allowed to submit proposals, if they wish to do so.

I would also like to speak about the processes within the group. I think that we can see from the mailing list that as members feel, they do not agree on a set of procedures, how we do things, for example, working on consensus, identifying consensus, making decisions. That is currently a specific area that needs to be resolved from one [inaudible] call that there is consensus and we need to proceed on it.

And I think we can see that the chair is also struggling to define that, and it takes some time to move discussions and ideas and proposals to communication. So that's something that needs to be worked out at the committee, at the ICT. Comment processes, [inaudible] comments from the wider community. And I did propose a process that ICT should often comment, short comments periods in the document [inaudible], and one of the current documents [inaudible].

And our focus is, I think we have almost, since last three weeks, there was now agreement about this, or at least how the document is presented. But the community has had a chance...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It appears that we might have lost Mohamed El Bashir. Terri, have we lost Mohamed?

TERRI AGNEW: I'm checking into that Olivier. It will be one moment. I know he was on the telephone. Yes, we have lost him. We are going to...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Whilst we call him up, it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, let's take questions, and then we'll let Mohammed finish his reporting. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you put your hand up and you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I have a question to Jean-Jacques, I have understood from the interim chair, that the rough consensus we have in the group was for one chair and two vice-chairs. Jean-Jacques, is there rough consensus inside the group about that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques responding to Tijani. Well, Tijani, it depends very much on what we call rough consensus. You know, in this group there have been only, what? Maybe half a dozen people really active on

the mailing list. Maybe eight at the most on various subjects. And about this, there have been maybe 10 people intervening about what the leadership structure should look like. And it goes all over the place from one plus one, to one plus four.

So when it is claimed that there is a rough consensus, I think that the interim chair is interpreting this to mean that there is a rough consensus among respondents. And the respondents, as I said, about a third of the membership, of the coordination group. So, I'm willing to go along with that, if that is the instructions I get from this working group we are on today.

But I'd like to have it in writing and clearly. Because from another point of view, considering that we, as the At-Large, represent the global views of the community, I frankly think that is not entirely satisfactory, but after all, it is up to you. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Another question. Do we have support for our position for one plus four? I have seen only one supporting our position. Are there other people who are supporting us?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Tijani. This is Jean-Jacques. Contacts have been taken by the leadership of our ALAC and by myself, in various directions to find out if there is or not any response on that side. I've had one or two responses. At this stage, I don't think it is useful to give their origin,

meaning their affiliation with the group nor their names, because, for the time being, they have not come out in public with that.

So I think we'll have to wait another day or so in order to have a clearer picture of, does our proposal, which I made on behalf of the ALAC, does it fly or does it not fly? At this stage, I cannot say. I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. There was a question in the chat from David McAuley, regarding the ICG, does the group meet in an open manner or an un-open manner, or are all group discussions open to the public?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques responding to Olivier. To the best of my knowledge, and of course, my only experience so far has been the London meeting, and after that, exchange of emails. So the process is that the London meeting was not broadcast, it was online. There was a possibility for people to follow I think.

But since then, the exchange of emails goes into an archive. So maybe it's not instantaneous, but I think it's reasonably documented.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier speaking. Yeah, the archive is public as far as I'm concerned. But it's impossible for people to take part directly in the discussions. I guess they have to go through the representatives.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. This is Jean-Jacques in response to Olivier. Yes, I think that if only for practical reasons, that's a good arrangement because otherwise, we would be swamped with dozens, perhaps scores of interventions from all over, coming at the same time and therefore we would be incapable of keeping up with the flow. I think that the method which is used now is reasonable, it's fairly efficient.

In other words, when a member of any community has a comment, or question, or request, the best is to go through the natural, quote/unquote, natural representative of that person of the community, and there is also a proposal that if someone, let's say from planet Mars, feared that she, or he, or it is not represented by one of those representatives, then they will be at the end of our web page, a means of putting down something directly.

Of course, we'll need an interpreter and a translator for a Martian to understand English. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. We have Fatima Cambronero next in the queue. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. I have a question. I hear the interpreter quite far away, and then I would like to ask Jean-Jacques, and thank them for letting us know about these

coordination group. I know that we will discuss the best way to work with you, but first of all, I would like to thank you for all of your work.

Now I would like to make a question that I personally do not understand. Perhaps it's a very naïve question in this level of discussion, but I would like to know why for ALAC, is so important the structure being adopted by this coordination group in terms of having one president or chair and two vice-chairs, or one chair and one vice-chair.

I understand the nationality is important in terms of our diversity, but I don't see why we are discussing and emphasizing so much, or putting emphasis on the structure of the working group. Could you please clarify that? And once again, I apologize if this question is basic question or a naïve question for the level of discussion that we are having today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Fatima. It's Olivier speaking. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques responding to Fatima. Thank you for an interesting question. We have to understand where our discussion comes from. On the first day in London it became quite clear, and on the second day even more, that there were some people pushing for a certain type of leadership group, very limited in number.

And almost by pure luck, they would have been mostly US citizens. I mean, nothing against them, they're very fine, competent individuals. And among the three or five, there was one candidate who was representing a large US cooperation, whose interests are directly affected by whatever we say about the IANA function.

So, if there had not been this sort of push by businesses and by one nationally, and by technical entities, to sort of hand control of the leadership structure, they would have possibly have been no reaction, including from myself. But because of that, and because of our finding along the way, the composition of the coordination group, the question naturally arose, oh, so that's what it looks like, is it?

In that case, is it normal? Do we agree that if there are three chair positions, whether they are called chair or vice-chair never mind, but there are three positions, or two out of three may be occupied by the same nationality, from the same North American region. So of course, if you come from a technical entity, or from business, so that's fine.

But I think that because we represent the wider, the global user community, it's quite normal that we should have at least that sensitivity, that preoccupation. So, that was the first element. I remind you, what is meant, where do we come from? Well, the first and second day, we found out immediately where we were coming from.

My second point is that, very quickly, there was a request from the GAC that its contingent of representatives should be increased to five. Now I and Mohamed, on behalf of the ALAC were among the first to support

the GAC's request. And it is documented in the report of our two meeting, two day meeting in London, that we gave reasons.

And I remember saying clearly that this would be an excellent way to engage governments more closely in the work of the coordination group. Now, you all knew, and Fatima you know especially well that the GAC has certain ways of working. As you know, no one in the GAC is allowed a common position of the GAC except the chair of the GAC. And as you know, the chair of the GAC cannot make any statement if it is not with complete consensus.

In other words, unanimity. So as a former diplomat, I was aware of these constraints of the GAC, and therefore request, yes, let's go ahead. So that was the second element. So the third element after discussions with Olivier, and Roberto, and others, was that I came to the conclusion that we should put forward an ALAC or an At-Large proposal.

There were two iterations of that, never mind the details, but the last one, which I sent to the coordination group on behalf of the ALAC two days ago, was that we should have a chair structure of five people. Meaning one chair plus four vice-chairs. And in that way, with these five people, we would actually would simply cover all of the Internet regions.

Internet regions in the sense of what they are understood to be in ICANN. So that's where we stand, and that is still on the table. There have been six or seven people responding to say, "No, we don't like that." But as always, I remind you, it's always more or less the same six

people. So it's necessary for myself and Mohamed to have the sense of where our At-Large, ad-hoc working group debate on this subject.

Did I respond to your question Fatima? Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier speaking. It's takes a little while for the interpretation to go across.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay, sorry I was not listening to interpretation. Fatima says that my reply was okay. Thank you Fatima.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now there are a few other questions. There is also Alan Greenberg, who has been patiently waiting. I'll take the question, we'll take Alan Greenberg. We might have to extend this call, we are five minutes before the end of the call, so we'll probably extend it for 15 minutes or so, maybe a little more, we'll see, and then we'll take the question from Seun, who can't speak because the mic doesn't work and has posted a question in the chat. Alan Greenberg you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of comments, not a question. On the issue of, has rough consensus been achieved, I think the principle that's being generally used, and we've used it in ALAC and At-Large also, is that if the chair or acting chair, you know, says, "I think there has

been consensus,” and no one objects, they are deemed having been accepted.

So I... Despite the fact that the result may not be what we like, I think it’s a reasonable call that if no one else has objected, either before or after the fact of the chair saying, “I think we have rough consensus,” then pretty much it is achieved. At least, that’s both we and other groups that I have participated within ICANN tend to have worked.

On the whole issue of leadership, I agree completely on the targets that we’ve raised and what we would like to see. My sense is that we have succeeded and that we need to move on and talk about substance, and having our participants talk about substance on the various mailing lists. Because really, this group has a really difficult job to do.

And some of the recent discussions on whether IANA is going to be subject to court order, and how we would survive in the absence of NTIA, acting as backstop, just to say no we won’t allow something such as a court ordered transfer which is one of the things being discussed, I think these are really difficult questions, and I think we need to get on and start coming up with some ideas.

Thirdly, on terms of the charter, and I don’t think we’ve gone back to Mohamed after he is back on the line and maybe we should let him finish, but I have a real worry that although the charter says any of us, including At-Large can support a proposal, the questions are phrased to say, to imply that you only can answer if you are relying on these services as opposed to having an interest in the services.

And I really have a worry about that. And lastly, it dawned on me, we've been talking about composition of the coordination group, and I realize that the original proposal from ICANN was to have selectors. And we may or may not have liked who the selectors were, but they would have selectors.

The global ICANN community said, "No way. We want to pick our own members." And that's what they did. And the result, of course, of that is there is no way one could balance the membership or even attempt to balance the membership because of that. And so, to some extent, we made a demand and we got what we asked for. It's a sad story that when we get we ask for, we end up with such an imbalance, but there is a relationship. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So as we still have Mohamed El Bashir, who is waiting, I can see more hands up, and I can see more questions. First, a response from Mohamed or Jean-Jacques to Alan?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No, please, go ahead Mohamed. I've spoken [inaudible]...

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. So, Alan the points you've risen are very important, because we initially, on the London meeting, there was [inaudible] of some in the community to push for wholly effective operation [inaudible] ...numbering and protocols, stakeholders submit proposals on this. And that other communities [inaudible] At-Large, civil society, and government, the end users and governments.

They can utilize the [inaudible] and the proposal development [inaudible] that needs to be developed [inaudible] to ensure that community interests are captured, and that was also concerning to us. And so we made a suggestion that all interested and effected parties need to have equal footing and submit a proposal, and also other stakeholders. And now, although the charter states now that not obliged and ICTs to take into account other submissions [inaudible], some communities outside this channel that's already [there].

But that's a good step ahead. So basically At-Large [inaudible] wish to submit a complete proposal, and they should be able to do that, or if they want At-Large to contribute [to the challenges] that At-Large is [inaudible] to other communities that are not also a possibility. I might just quickly to give my opinion of the chair structure.

I think in [inaudible] also...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We might have lost Mohamed again. Olivier speaking. Terri, have we lost Mohamed El Basher?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, I'm verifying, one moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Mohamed mentioned that he got disconnected again. Thank you. Let's take the questions which are on the chat. There is a question from Fiona [inaudible]. I'd like to know the status of establishing the secretariat of the ICG, and how does the ICG expect to engage the chair and vice-chair?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Should I answer that Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, you are the only person remaining on the call on the ICG at the moment. You're very welcome to do so please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. First, secretariat. So there was, shall I call it, a rough consensus in London that we should use actually two separate secretariat functions. One would be about travel and expenses and that sort of administrative and logistic tasks. And that could be performed by ICANN itself.

That is to say the people who are put at the disposal of the coordination group by ICANN, and that group is led by Theresa Swineheart, senior vice president. But there was also a strong push on the part of colleagues to have a quote/unquote, independent secretariat for more

administrative and document related, discussion related, or issue related items. And the idea was to set up a sort of request for proposals for external secretariat.

And this has been under discussion for some time. It must be understood however, and I would like to point this out, that there is a bit of a contradiction, but we all accept it on the coordination group, that in fact however, quote/unquote, independent that secretariat may be, it will in fact be paid for by the ICANN budget, on a piece of budget that is being made available by ICANN for the purposes of the coordination group.

So things are a bit tied up, there is some connection between the two. That's where we stand today. And of course, the various tasks of the future, quote/unquote, independent secretariat have come under discussion. We're pretty close to a conclusion on what that definition should be. In other words, a sort of list of working points. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. So, we can go back to Mohamed El Bashir, since he is back online. Mohamed, you can continue your intervention please.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes. Sorry, I'm not sure why the line is disconnecting. I just wanted to stress on Alan's point, regarding the chair, I think it's, if we didn't have support for our proposal in the coming one or two days, I think we need to proceed with the current proposal that is being put forward. Because

I'm also concerned that we have been seen as, ALAC has been seen as not counter-productive, but it's not moving forward with the consensus.

I think there are some communities, we're working for the feedback. The naming RIRs GAC members, we have one who have expressed certain opinion. So let's hope that the support for our proposal, otherwise I think we need to move on ahead, with what we can achieve I think, because also we're not really supporting voices, enough supporting voices are speaking. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. So the next question is from Lorin asking about the approval, or ratification process, for the ALAC proposal by the ICG. And what are the timelines for the IANA conversion in terms of proposals, the actual proposal itself?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes, thank you. If I might have this one. So there is a discussion about rectifying what is selecting [inaudible] or final support has not been discussed yet in details, and this one of the toughest points to agree, between, within the group. Regarding the timeline, I was going to propose also the discussion about [inaudible]...

Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Mohamed, just keep on talking.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, requesting the current timeframe, so I was requesting proposals to be submitted by end of December, and hopefully ICG to complete its work by end of May or June. And try to submit [inaudible] in agreement before the contract expires in September. That's the current sensitive timeframe that we have now. So it's very squeezed, by the way, it's a very squeezed timeframe. It's very tough [inaudible].... Especially with viewing proposals and agreeing on a proposal forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Mohamed. [Inaudible]... I don't know where the background noise comes from. Okay, thank you. So, effectively we've got more questions. We are already seven minutes past the top of the hour. We can have an extension for us to 30 minutes, so let's continue on the discussion here.

I'm a little concerned with spending a lot of time on the first issues, the chair and the vice chairs. Jean-Jacques wanted to obtain some idea as to what we are able to settle for as far as chair and vice-chairs are concerned, understanding that this issue is just starting to take way too much time in the coordination group. Is that correct Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques responding. Well, if we consider that one third of the membership is correct, because there are those who are giving feedback to the chair, therefore there would be rough

consensus, so there would be no problem. But I'd like to respond to Alan and Glenn also who feel that we are one issue creep.

Although that's not the first, we have an understanding on other things. I have been sending to this working group, this stuff about this chair structure simply because it was the most contentious, but you are assuming the risk of an archive communique. That was one point.

I would like to respond, if I may, to Seun whose question was other specific roles for the chair and vice-chair. At the beginning of the discussion in London, there was a feeling on some parts that one of the co-chairs should have the role of spokesperson even relating with the outside world, meaning media, or other bodies, etc. But finally, this was abandoned, so when there was a vote, and the three co-chair structure was accepted, then there was an understanding that according to the types of questions which would be aimed at the coordination group, well the three co-chairs would huddle together and decide the person among the three who would respond to that, or even someone else from the coordination group.

So my quick answer to Seun is that at this stage, there is no clear decision of leader between chair and co-chairs on paper. However, there is the reality of politics [inaudible], and that is that the chair will have some role in setting the agenda, and the co-chair or the vice-chair also. And that's one of the reasons why some of us have advocated, and the ALAC proposed to have one chair, four vice-chairs, so it would be more balanced in terms of representation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this. It's Olivier speaking. And just to close up on this, and I was going to ask a question for people to actually answer in the chat. So we pushed for one plus four, the current interim chair has mentioned the consensus call that rough consensus was one plus two, the question I wanted to ask for the group was, if we are to have a one plus two, where the two vice chairs would be non-US and would come from different regions of the world...

There is talk, I believe, of Patrik Fälström being one of them, there is talk of Mohamed El Bashir being another. I'm not sure there is talk about the other parts of the world. Are we, as a group, going to push for the one plus four, so one chair and four vice-chairs, or can we effect an one plus two vice-chairs, or maybe a lesser number of vice-chairs than the number that we asked for.

We asked for four, and we set it for three. And that's one to answer in the chat, while I hand the floor over to, we're leading with Alberto Soto who had his hand up. So Alberto, you have the floor, and apologies to you for the time you had to wait for this. [Inaudible] sessions we're having. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Olivier, I put my hand down. For Alan to be able to continue with your comment, I can wait for my comment, or I can post my comment in the chat or by email. No problem for that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alberto. Let's have Alan Greenberg, and then if we have time, we'll come back to you Alberto Soto. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, my comment is not on the subject of leadership, so maybe we need to close on that first.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Alan and Olivier, before we do that, I just wanted to give factual information to you, in answer to these questions, as far as I know, and according to our interim chair, there was a message yesterday which says to go forward with an one plus two structure, one chair and two vice-chairs.

I believe the current list of people who have volunteered to serve these roles are Russ [inaudible], Patrik Fälström, Mohamed El Bashir, Keith [inaudible] and Alissa Cooper. So in answer to Olivier's questions, which was more hypothetical, what can be imagined as a threesome. I think that the way it's going, if we act according to quote/unquote rough consensus, is Alissa Cooper as chair, and the vice-chairs could be Patrik Fälström and Mohamed El Bashir.

I would like to underline that it is interesting, one of the people who was right from the start, a candidate for co-chair is Keith [inaudible], who is a senior vice president of Verisign, and he is still a candidate, and in spite of the fact that there were quite a few stated oppositions to his being a candidate for any chair position considering the role of his

company and the impact that the whole IANA discussion could have on his company. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Oliver speaking. Alan Greenberg you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Somebody, I think it was Fatima, you know, said, "Are we going to submit a proposal?" In the chat. I strongly believe we should submit something, whether it is a full blown proposal, or a statement of some proposals, or a methodology to address some of the issues. I don't believe we should just be silent and critique what comes from other people.

How we come up with that, you know, I don't have a proposal in my back pocket already to, you know, for consideration. But I really do believe that we need a group of people, you know, essentially this working group or a subsection of it, to start discussing the issues and saying, "Do we have any bright ideas which could get us out of this?"

I feel strongly that we need to go through the process, whether we come up with a real proposal or not, I don't know. But I think that we need to make sure that the RFP allows us to do that, and that we at least try to see do we have any answers to the questions.

I think if we believe that users have to have a say in this, then we also have to be participants and try to come up with the answers. So I feel pretty strongly that we need to embark on a process to try to submit

something to the working group, and we need to make sure that the RFP allows us to do that and have it considered, even if it's not a full blown complete proposal. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alan, it's Olivier speaking. And you're already touching on the next part of our discussion, just to close off on the chairing discussion. We've got pretty intense discussion going on in the chat at the moment. It appears that several of the nominees which Jean-Jacques has mentioned earlier have actually withdrawn their nominations. So Keith [inaudible] has withdrawn, [inaudible] has withdrawn, on the other hand, there is also Wolf Ludwig who has been proposed by [inaudible].

So the question really is down to the last few who are remaining on the line. There is also some feedback, Jean-Jacques, with regards to this group being able to settle one plus two. And it looks from the people that have responded in the chat, one plus two is okay for our working group. Any comments or questions Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No. I was just responding to Seun to say actually it is not an open process. Because even in this limited frame of one plus two, actually the game is partly played already, because those who were insisting particularly on having no qualification about nationality, etc. have decided that Alicia was the candidate for chair.

And that was accept by their colleagues. So I think we're going towards a system where Alisa would be chair, and we would, of course, have to continue pushing Mohamed as vice-chair. And the only question we have actually, is from Alan's remark, concrete, is that we have to choose between someone like Patrik Fälström for instance, also [inaudible] be involved further.

And it's your call so I would be listening.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Jean-Jacques. Let's pursue this on the mailing list after this call. Now, of course, we have appointment before, which is how the ALAC working group can conceivably continue the discussion, and this is the point that Alan has raised just now. As Alan said, it looks as though that there might be just one proposal from the directly affected contracted communities.

The IETF, the RIRs, and the ICANN, well, do we settle for this? Do we not settle for this? That's the question. And I think I've heard a number of people saying, "Well, we need to make and build our own proposal." How do we do this? How do we present it? Is this going to affect the answers that we're going to have in the chartering of the group itself? So the floor is open. I see Fatima Cambronero has her hand up, maybe she wishes to respond or add to this. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima. Thank you very much Olivier. I have a comment on item four on the agenda. And I would like to say that I totally agree with

Alan's comment regarding have a proposal. I understand that we need to have a proposal by ALAC, but I am not clear in my mind how we would do this. We are here to discuss this, and of course, we will have to schedule more calls to discuss a topic. And if I may, I would like to make general comments regarding my view in terms of our collaboration with Jean-Jacques and Mohamed.

Because we have several mailing lists, and we have plenty of information, some information might be confusing, and I do understand that we have many questions for Mohamed and Jean-Jacques, but of course, they cannot give us an answer because they are dealing or working with that.

So I would like to suggest that when we ask some questions, we should make the follow up in the mailing list, because this group has worked in the capacity building working group, and we are supposed to have the knowledge and to have the information. And we are here to help them, to contribute to that, or with them, to help them with their task, and not to add more work for them.

So we need to facilitate or make their work easier. And I also see some members of this working group that belong to other lists and they are making comments on other lists. And I believe that do to a question of order, we should take into account that what we discuss here should not be posted on other lists, at least as soon as we do not have a position, and we shouldn't mix up discussions or put those full discussions on other lists because otherwise, we would be delaying the process.

And we would not be able to help Mohamed and Jean-Jacques when they are asking us questions. I volunteer to draft the proposal. As I said before, I'm not sure how we would focus on that or how we would address this, but I am here to help and contribute and I am learning in the process as you are. So thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Fatima. It's Olivier speaking. And you raised a good point, the ability for us to also be members of some of the IETF mailing lists, and some of the RIR mailing lists, that they are going to string up very soon, but there are a couple. So let's have Mohamed El Bashir next.

TERRI AGNEW: And I'm checking to make sure that we still have him on telephone. One moment please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hello? Sorry I was muted. I want to just quickly respond to Alan's point and Fatima. For Alan, yes, I think we need to submit something to RFPG. I would like us to take up the agenda, the business community for example, they're an interested party. They are not able to submit a full-fledged, complete proposal. So they [inaudible] through [inaudible],

to submit comments on the free, let's say, or the one joint to follow, by the effected operational parties.

And to contribute as well the processes. So, it would be my opinion, it would be difficult for ALAC to produce a full proposal. But nearly we can produce comment, principles, guidelines, building a proposal, or at least what we think that is important to be considered for an end user's point of view.

But I agree that we need to do something. Yes, thank you very much Fatima for the comment. I think this is important that we need support, and we need for you to also provide us with input because the process of the RFPG discussion really very [inaudible] ...positions evolve very quickly.

So sometimes we might need a quick response. And also, I think it is important that ALAC gives us the space to react as well, and also be proactive there. But it's definitely [inaudible] and coordinate with the group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Mohamed. And one feedback I had for some members of the IPG, was the need maybe, when we develop proposals to not think of the proposal as the silo and then come up with a fully cooked proposal, and then perhaps, or you and Jean-Jacques to liaise informally even to these other parties in the IPG, to get a sense of what their reaction would be to our proposal.

For instance, I've received an email, a quick reaction to our charter proposal, where we proposed a much shorter, brand new charter actually, then one that was actually worked on by the working group. So the thing was well, why didn't we actually share this thought that as we're working on a shorter charter earlier, why didn't we have to write the whole shorter charter and now basically just [inaudible] for everyone else.

There seems to be some [inaudible] about that. So that was one of the comments, feedback. Any other comments? Mohamed El Bashir, you still have your hand up.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Yeah, I'm here Olivier. I think it's a valid comment Olivier, thank you. And I think we need to learn as well from our [inaudible]. I think this experience of the charter [inaudible] change will not be [inaudible] as such [for the other group] as we are involved in the process, and we updating them.

And I agree. I agree it's [inaudible] the rest of the members that there is a total [inaudible]. I think it was a surprise for some of them. But at the same time, personally I was also waiting that we complete, as ACG, we complete the procedure for submitting comments, which unfortunately up to now is not [inaudible]. So, the community was asked to submit documents, the idea I think we need also to engage more with other members, so they don't see contributions from ALAC to be sudden and predicted, and... So that's my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Mohamed. And I'll close the queue for more people because we are reaching the half hour time. We still have Tijani Ben Jemaa and then another question that Jean-Jacques wanted to check with everyone. So, let's have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Oliver. I have read the short charter by Christopher. I fully support it. I think it's very good contribution that we have to provide to the condition group. I do think that if all of our group has to contribute in the [inaudible] now, now we talked about a lot about the procedure of the [inaudible], and we lost everything in this.

So we have to go more [inaudible]... charter [inaudible]. For me, it's a good contribution, we have to submit it to the group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Tijani for this. Now back to Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. So in concluding, at least on my part, I would like to make a suggestion. It was been discussed in our working group, that many things are happening on various mailing list and in various forums, and I think that it's quite difficult for Mohamed and myself to follow all of it, or even parts of it [inaudible] manner.

My proposal is that volunteers who are members of our working group, should perhaps assign themselves to following more particularly this or that group. For instance, would someone be following more closely the RIRs? Someone else perhaps be the ccNSO, etc. So that we can get feedback from you of the working group.

That would be one of the most valuable contributions for us to keep posted. This would help us in two ways. First of all, to know where the general atmosphere is, and also to enable us to better act more quickly to various positions, because we may have missed quite normally this or that detail on the part of this or that community. So that is my suggestion, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. That was one suggestion, and I also have another suggestion which is to do with the involvement of our members in other working groups. There was a call earlier, just now, actually from Fatima about having some kind of coordination for this, and I'm not quite sure really what to do on that.

Obviously it's important that we are going to be active, and actively involved in these other working groups, and also actively monitoring these working groups. Does anyone have specifics to talk about at the moment? [CROSSTALK] ...the other working group, they're all open. One can take part in them as an individual.

I don't imagine that people would take as an ALAC liaison to the working groups, because I understand that the working groups with individuals inside of them. But do you propose anything else? Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, to go one step further, my [inaudible] as chair, perhaps, put out a call for specific proposals. For instance, one of our colleagues would be willing to follow both online and perhaps to take part in chats, etc. for RIRs. Another person for some other segment which is important to us, rather than leave it completely open.

Wouldn't designate [inaudible] perhaps more productive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. So here is my proposal then. What we can do is to ask for people, in our working group, in the current working group, what other working group that would be ready to follow, or what are the discussions they would be ready to follow. And then we can actually put them on tables, and then we know who is in what working group and who is following what discussion.

That would probably, at that point, make sure at least we're aware of who is in those discussions, and then I guess, once we've got those tables of finding out who is in the other discussions so in the RIR discussions, in the ITF discussions, we might even find out other discussions that we're not in, and at the same time, we could also specifically give tasks for the people who are in those discussions, to pursue and maybe even report back during the future conference calls that we have.

That would probably help with everyone, since I think it's pretty hard for one person to actually follow all of the discussions out there, and keep track of them all. I see some plus one from Jean-Jacques, and well we'll discuss and decide on these afterwards. Right, it is the half hour time again, and the next steps really are going to be when our next call is going to be.

Since this is a very fast, developing situation, I was going to suggest at least, at the moment, a weekly call in those early days until the working group, the ICG itself gets into a more stable situation. I find that discussion seems to be very unstable at the moment, and we certainly need to be very close to our delegates on this working group. So should we have a Doodle poll for some time next week?

Maybe the later part of next week, perhaps avoiding the Friday, although I do see our colleagues from the [inaudible] and from the Pacific Islands on the call at the moment, and I appreciate their presence. It is already the weekend for them. Should we perhaps have it on Wednesday or Thursday? How does that look?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hi Olivier, it's Mohamed. That definitely will be good for me because I'm already in my weekend.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's already in your weekend, yeah, understood. Thank you. Let's have a Doodle poll for Wednesday or Thursday, if staff could send it as soon as possible. Does this sort of time work for all of you? No says Cheryl.

Okay, so it doesn't work for some. Let's try and have it in, and I know Gisella is great for this. Get a Doodle poll out there with, for Wednesday or Thursday at times which would be suitable for the majority of people around the world, since this really is a worldwide discussion we are having here, very important.

Okay, that's one. Jean-Jacques, Mohamed, [inaudible] before we close this call, any last issues or questions you'd like to throw out there for us to follow up on the mailing list? Or action items that you would like to add to this?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques, thank you Olivier. I would like to get from you, but that we can do on Skype or somewhere else, that you give me, once again in clear terms, what we would have to get back to the coordination group about structure, rather than just wait for things to happen, following on today's discussion in our working group. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: It's Mohamed. Nothing from my side. I just think that you need to follow up with the mailing list, asking the mailing list [inaudible], and hopefully I think we need to agree with Jean-Jacques. I think we need to discuss about the way forward to the chair structure. Thank you everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Mohamed. And with this, I thank the interpreters for having stayed with us an additional 30 minutes. And so I thank all of you for having been on this call. The discussion continues on the mailing list, very important that we feed our two delegates with information when they need it.

And so good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night everyone. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]