TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad-hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function, on Thursday the 14th of August 2014 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Mohamed El Bashier, Roberto Gaetano, Yashuichi Kitamura, Gordon Chillcott, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Eduardo Diaz, and Avri Doria. Looks like Aida Noblia just joined us as well.

We also have on the Spanish channel Alberto Soto and Fatima Cambronero. We have apologies from [inaudible] and Judith Hellerstein.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

As a reminder, please make sure to 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. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I'm going to first off, did we miss any names in our roll call? Hearing no one speak out, so we've got the full roll call. And now we have got to adopt the agenda. Today we've got review of the action items, then we'll have an update on the ICG by Jean-Jacques and Mohamed, and then a good amount of time being spent also on the next steps.

There are a number of issues which were flagged, one was the due process, lots of time nominations on the ICG, a charter update from Mohamed on the [inaudible] is an important thing, since there, the charter deadline is tomorrow. Charter comments deadline. And then we've got participation in other forums, and what I wanted to discuss was to see if we could actually select people, or at least, get people to take responsibility for going on these lists and at least monitoring what's going on and being able to report back to us during our call, or even on our mailing list, about the discussion taking place.

Especially with a concern that this is for the charter, at the moment, points towards the work of each one of the communities to do the deciding work for the end result. In other words, a bit of a problem with having the ALAC submit a plan, as you know. So we will come down to this in a moment. I wanted to ask if there was any other business or anything that you wanted to add on this.

Okay. So the agenda is adopted. Did I just hear a voice? No? I just heard myself, okay. Now review of action items, agenda item number two. And we had a meeting on the 8th of August last week, so there was only one action item and that was for Terri. Sorry, for Gisella to find a Doodle. So that's done and we can immediately go to number three, with an update on the ICG. Jean-Jacques, Mohamed, I don't know who wishes to start. I leave the floor over to you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jean-Jacques, you can start, please proceed.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening all. This is Jean-Jacques. Thank you Olivier, thank you Mohamed. So, as for Mohamed has followed very closely, and has sent in the comments on behalf about the charter, I leave him to that. I won't go through all the little bits and pieces which are being discussed, but I would like to concentrate on one or two things.

The first one is about process. Over the past week or so, I have sent to you on this list, several examples of messages we've received or that I've sent, and I would like to express here quite clearly my concern, because in the name of speeding ahead, which we are not, actually process has been quite slip shot, and I measure my words, slip shot.

It's all very well to say, "Well, you know, that's how we can go forward faster." And we're all very nice people and we know what we're doing. The inconvenience, of course, is that if there is such a slip shot process, then occasionally you come up against a real problem. And this occurred on one subject, which is not my pet subject but it happens to be an important one, and that was the selection of the chair process.

And the thing which made me really sit up and realize that we were perhaps in a dangerous situation, is that after the deadline, by the way the deadline was the one chosen and announced by interim chair, after that deadline had been gone, a member of the ICG put in a new name as a nomination for the chair structure, never mind who it is, it really doesn't matter, it's just the principle.

And so, I sent an email to my colleagues on the ICG saying, "Okay, there is a problem because the delay has been gone, and now there is a new proposal. So I would like some clarity on this. I don't think this is acceptable." So I haven't had any direct response to that, except some rather harsh comments by some colleagues, who think, provided, of course, with the suggestion to change, delay comes from them. That's not it at all.

So, this is not the only case. There have been other cases of process not being respected. I reported… I took the trouble to report to, in a very accurate and precise way, a few days ago, the, my message was entitled "Process," I believe. And I was not just analyzing and complaining, I also made some specific proposals and have not received very specific answers to those proposals.

So this is to express my concern that process may become a real problem in the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. And thank you for pointing this out, and indeed, I think I think it was Roberto also have noted, have flagged it, as being a problem. I admit that the ICG follow up on the mailing list basically, and so far there appears to have been responses from people nominating others, submitting their nominations and I've seen the response, I think, from Daniel [Karenberg], who has said that he will [head] back with voting.

And so, [inaudible] or Joe have had a chance to respond to Jean-Jacque's challenge process regarding the late addition of Keith Davidson to the slate. And I'm concerned that this is seen as a challenge. It's not a challenge, it's a point of order. And I'm quite concerned, in fact, that whatever the ALAC points out, and I don't know whether it's in the form that the ALAC points things out on this working group, or whether it actually goes more deeply than this, and it could be point made to have anything that comes from the ALAC looking to it as a challenge.

But I'm concerned that this is seen as a challenge rather than a procedural point, which is absolutely correct and which, in theory, the chair should respond to and say, "Oh yes, you're right. Thank you for pointing this out. Unfortunately yes, we cannot accept the nomination that arise after the time." Or, the chair could have answered and said, "Well, what does everyone think about this? Should we allow this? Should we be flexible on this and allow this to happen?"

Bearing in mind, and Jean-Jacques you've very well pointed this out as well, that the person who was nominated did not even respond to accept the nomination either. And I don't know whether this messiness is due to the other parts of ICANN and that the working group doing things in a different way than we do in At-Large, but in general, we follow processes which are well-known and which we have to [inaudible]. Any thoughts on this Jean-Jacques? I see you putting your hand up as a follow up on this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I would gladly respond to that. I think the problem is, as I've mentioned a little bit earlier, quite serious. It's becoming serious because there is a sense of either being unconscious on the part of certain, who happen to be [affluent] societies and who can react, or they are from the mobile phones.

There is never a problem with connectivity, etc. And the rest of us. I don't mean that I am in a poor country. I happen to be in California just now. But there is a sense that some people just can't get onto caring for others and listening to what might be their [afflictions]. My objection was not responded to.

It was not a protest. It was termed in very clear but polite terms. You know, I've been in this business before. Anyone of us on the lists, so trust me, it was not a challenge. The people who use the word challenge may find it rather convenient actually, to accuse the messenger of being dirty, you see? Of not having shaven after the long travel, and maybe it's a good idea to shoot the messenger.

So how would you shoot a messenger? Well you have to say that he is uncouth, or that message that he's bearing is unacceptable. And that's why you resort to such a challenge. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. So are there any comments or questions on this? I mean, questions that the message, if you want, to see and [inaudible]… So the message that Jean-Jacques sent is the one that I'm putting now in the chat. So the responses so far have been to ignore the messages.

You've not received any private response from Alisa on this, have you? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. No, I've not received any response. The only ones have been the ones you have seen that are on the ICG list, which are, well, blunt and which seem to consider things coming like this are not welcome, because they sort of slow down the process and don't agree with them. That is regrettable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. It is worth noting that in the meantime, the other responses we have received, well that [inaudible] call for votes, the public responses have asked, have proposed at least, Alissa Cooper's chair and the, [inaudible] some are saying co-chair, and some are saying vice-chairs. But also with [inaudible] and Mohamed El Bashir as the co-chairs or vice-chairs.

So, I'm not sure whether it's worth pushing or perhaps even sending an email, I could send an email, perhaps, to Alissa and raise the point with her. I see Tijani Ben Jemaa with his hand up, so Tijani you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. The [inaudible] today is the result of the process. The result of something that started from the start, from the beginning, of the whole process. You remember we raised the point of the imbalanced composition of the group, and we proposed that since changing the composition of the group is not easy to do, we proposed that the chairmanship must be, how do you say, more balancing the whole group.

And we had some proposals. I remember very well that I wasn't as [inaudible] as most of the group members. I said that this is our proposal, but we have to have a plan B. We have to have an alternative solution, and we have to be more or less flexible about that. But I think that most of the group was for [vertical] solution.

Unfortunately, very, very soon we reverted, we changed everything. We said, "You know, we will accept… Okay, no problem, we will accept." I said, "Why we have to give a solution? They have a problem, we don't have. We have principles." We raised the principles, they said our principles are wrong, okay, but they don't say that.

So we are proposing solutions. Let them tell us, let them come to us and we can negotiate, we can be flexible. No, we didn't do that, we gave them what they want, and we are happy with everything, with everything, with everything. Until the last point, we are happy. This composition, a chair from the same region, two co-chairs, two vice-chairs and now we have the problem of the nomination of the selection of those vice-chairs.

So this is the result of the whole process. I think that we didn't do the right thing when we changed from [vertical] position to a position that gave everything. We don't want to be seen as people who are breaking the system. We weren't breaking the system. We gave, we raised the problem and we gave solutions. We weren't breaking out all.

So I don't think that if we continue this way, we will impact anything. And the result of all of this, will be that people will see the process, the transition, as something organized by the same region, to keep the [inaudible] and other thing, and this is something that will happen. Why that was [inaudible] against the ICANN, it was because that people thought that a single country, or a single region, is controlling the Internet.

We are giving them now other reasons to fight more, and to shoot us, to shoot ICANN. So I am really sad about that. I think that we have to change our strategy working on this point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Just a follow on question for you. The current selection or voting that is taking place, irrespective of the nomination that was received after the deadline, this process seems to be favoring, so far, having seen some of the public votes. It seems to be favoring Mohamed El Basher, who is one of the ALAC candidates.

I mean, do you see this as being a process that was meant to take place like this? Or… Because we have to, on the one hand, way the fact that yes, there is a deadline, and we can certainly point this out, that there was a late nomination. On the other hand, I thought we had accepted that we could proceed forward now with the process of the chair and the vice-chairs.

I made some suggestions on our list for asking for a consensus call, rather than having a vote. I see that wasn't really embraced. So we'll just have the chair and the vice-chairs vote. The vote certainly has stopped now. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, if you're asking me about that, I will tell you that having Mohamed El Bashir as vice-chair is only a [make up] to make the process more or less [better], if you want. Because who has the [inaudible] on the decision making? It is the chair. The vice-chair is there to replace the chair only.

If he is given any task, anything, it has to go through the chair after that. So the decision will always through the chair. So I don't think that it is something that will give us anything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. The next is the man himself, Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed El Bashir for the transcript. Before I provide my comments on the activities of the ICG last week, I would just like just to comment on the current discussion regarding the chair. And I guess the way the chair certainly conducts, at least the way she is making calls for consensus, and the way she considers that there is some consensus, I think that is something that needs to be noted by us, because it's clearly, as Roberto I think in one of the emails has noted, that she wait for comments coming from the different communities.

And whenever there are two, three, four people supporting that action, and there is a period of silence, one or two days, and then she proceeds with a call for consensus based on the comments received. So I think it's important that besides [inaudible] our, let's say, principles issues in terms of the process, following up the process, we need also to try to gain support from the other communities.

And there was some support as well in some of the emails we are proposing. But I think the problem is now, overall within the group, there might be an impression that there is no support at all to what we're proposing. And then all our discussion now is about the process, which is very important definitely. I'm not disputing that. Daniel [inaudible] email, although there, currently there is a debate about the challenger or not. It was a very good valid point about, the chair needs to [open] and consider the opinions, a response to the counter-opinions before proceeding.

The current status is now, [inaudible] and there some members already have submitting a voting email to Joseph, and copying the mailing list. So I think it's… Looking at the process here, is one thing. We have this issue about the deadline. It needs to be resolved, at least the chair needs to know that. And I think private email from Olivier to Alissa on this specific point might definitely be useful, because I think it's a very clear point about the chair needs to provide a response when there is a point like the one for [inaudible].

And she needs to provide a clarification where we're heading. I hope that this issue of the chair and vice-chair, that the chair will resolve soon. The chair also supposed to be an administrative role. So… And I think it's, we also need to ensure that there will be an update of the chair and vice-chair responsibilities, the document that we're currently working to update.

We need to ensure that what roles our responsibilities will be, will be conducted by the vice-chairs. So I think we ensure along the process that the chair is an administrative role, and ensure that they're following the process along the way. We have lots of critical conflicts and issues to be resolved. Many members currently seeming… They haven't really just discuss a general discussion with the chair, because they think that discussion has been going on for a long time.

So that's my comment regarding how the current chair is conducting work, and giving calls for consensus, and how we can influence that. I think if this incident is a good point to ensure that the chair listens to ALAC, and I think a private email from Olivier might be useful at this point.

I will provide my comments regarding the chapter at a later point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Mohamed for this. Next we have Alan Greenberg, but in the meantime, I also draw your attention to the chat going in regarding the process by which the current interim chair is reaching rough consensus. And it might well be that she is leading the ITF working group process, which understandably is slightly different from the ICANN working group processes. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I just want to make one comment with regard to something Tijani said. I have no real knowledge of how Alissa will act as a formal chair with vice-chairs, but I don't think you can presume that vice-chairs are just there to replace the chair when the chair isn't available, and other than that, have no real role.

The fact that there is more than one vice-chair would tend to indicate that the vice-chairs will have other responsibilities. Whether that proves out or not, I'm not going to try to predict. But I know, for instance, in the ATRT 2 operation where there were a number of vice-chairs, the chair often, you know, will poll the vice-chairs and then, you know, make a ruling based on what the vice-chairs thought and things like that.

So I don't think you can presume the vice-chairs are just there to replace the chair when the chair is absent and have no other responsibility or authority other than that. That may turn out to be the [inaudible] valid, but I don't think we [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Next we have Alberto Soto. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Olivier. [Inaudible] consensus, when we were in big groups like the groups we had, especially LACRALO is an excellent example, we have 42 organizations, and many times, actually not many times but always, there is very little participation. And so, the consensus used in this manner is to have the only way we have to proceed forward and to work, otherwise we would just [stay on].

That this [trick] is that, when I say we have consensus, what I mean is, of the 42 organizations, only two, only eight participate, two are in favor, and the rest are against. So I am trying to provide clarity with respect to the concept of consensus and how it is developed nowadays. I see that there is, consensus is being mentioned all of the time, consensus here, consensus there, but we don't really clarify how many have said yes or no, for example.

If we do not do it this way, and we remove [inaudible] from the process, then this is when we start saying there has to be a vote, and not just saying, saying from a chair to reach consensus. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alberto. Mohamed, Jean-Jacques, Alberto made a point there, a very interesting point, on this. What was the process by which Alissa declared consensus? Did she provide details as to who has said what, or what the points were, and as far as the numbers were concerned? Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. No. That's part of the problem. It's, as I indicated earlier, it's a problem of people who work very well together, and of course that is very precious, but they do not necessarily represent the reality of the whole ICG. And often it goes through, it seems, a phone call from one to another, or offline consultation, mainly three, four, maybe five people.

I have already indicated on our list, meaning the At-Large working group list, that I feel way out, which is to propose some stability, give and take, on each side. I had suggested that we reserve the full voting procedure, to items which we consider are of crucial, and even of similar importance. So in the early stages of the work of the ICG. And of course, the chair structure and the composition of the chair structure, should be one of them.

I made very specific proposals for that, saying that there should be call for candidacies, but there should be no preemptive position of chair, or vice-chair, or co-chair, or whatever it is. On a clean slate, we should know clearly who are all of the candidates. And then we proceed to a vote. But of course, before doing that, we have to settle what is the chair structure we want. One plus one plus one? Or one plus two? Or one plus three? Or whatever.

Once that has been settled, then we hold the vote for the composition of the group. And what I suggested is that the person garnering the largest number of votes would become automatically the chair. Now for the vice-chairs, or whatever else you call it, I suggested that the interim chair, that means the new chair, would suggest the composition of the rest of the group, by looking not only at the number of votes counted.

For instance, if Mohamed happened to be the person with the second greatest number of votes after whoever has been elected chair, then that would of course be a very, very strong indication. But, I suggested that there should also be some consideration given to other elements such as region and also affiliation.

And in the case of Mohamed, of course that would be very clear in favor of himself and of the At-Large, which is because he comes from Africa, etc. So, in my suggestion, to distinguish between the very crucial and early stages of the ICG work, which would require voting, compulsory voting by all of the members, on the one hand. And on the other hand, I suggested that for other items such as, you know, who actually does what in the secretariat, and what about the final third chapter of the draft charter, etc.

That can be left to some sort of consensus. That is what I have proposed and I have a feeling, although I've been reading carefully, I have a feeling that I've not really gotten a response to that suggestion. I've received responses from people saying, "Look, stop this fooling around. We've wasted enough time on this. Let's go forward." The solution of let's go forward has really been a problem because it has impeded us in looking at some of the real problems of process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. We'll come back, I'll come back to what you just mentioned here. Next, I have Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you Olivier. This is Fatima for the record. Once again, I would like to thank for the work that Mohamed and Jean-Jacques are doing in this group. And all of these huge amounts of emails that we need to read and answer and [inaudible]. Then what I find a bit strange, probably because I have not participated in similar processes before, is that we are making decisions, and this is sent for voting without having previously approved the charter for this coordination group, where we define what is consensus for this group.

Because, as it was said earlier, there are different kinds of consensus in different [status] or area. And so, that's, I believe, the role of ALAC so that we do not… I do not say that we are, but so that we do not think that we are complaining all of the time about our positions being made. That's a word, I would rather be, to talk about this, and to show the charter, how is it that we're going to work and then to start making decisions.

Because we will always have these loopholes or the fact that we have incorporated a person as a candidate after the deadline, and nowhere does it say how this is defined, and what are we going to use to support our decisions and say that this is not right. This is just a suggestion, because I feel we are going around the bush all of the time, and perhaps this issue has not been dealt with very much in this group.

But it is as if we are working in circles all of the time so we are not making any decisions. That's all, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fatima. It's Olivier speaking. So coming back to the points that Jean-Jacques made, Jean-Jacques you mentioned that the process was not followed properly and effectively there was no rule as to what the process was going to be for the selection of the chair as such. It was just made up as the group went along.

Now we have a process by which there has been a call for a candidate. We have candidates put forward. We have someone else on the, start the vote. I'm not sure what Joe's position, Joe [inaudible] position is there, but that was sent by him. And I would have thought that it would have been the chair that had to launch the vote after the end of the nomination period.

Are you suggesting that we ask for a reboot of the whole process? Or are we going to move forward with what we have now and yeah. What would your point of view be? And of course, I'm opening the floor for everyone else as well. What should we do? I hear from Fatima that maybe we should move forward. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor, and then we'll have Mohamed El Basher.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Olivier, I want to be in the queue also. [CROSSTALK] This is Eduardo. I want to be in the queue, I'm not in the computer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Eduardo. Welcome Eduardo. Okay, I'll put you in the queue after Mohamed. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat first.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. First, a very important point is that I will do exactly what our chair, Olivier, and the members of this working group decide. I will not push any private sort of solution. I have made my analysis known to you, and I have made specific suggestions.

Now it's up to you to tell me what you want. If you ask me simply for my own analysis at this stage of our discussion this morning, this morning because I'm in California, well frankly, I think that if we go on with this slip shot method right now, we will come up against other problems due to the same reasons.

Meaning that there will be a lack of clarity on process, on agreed rules. So I did make a very specific proposal to separate two things. On the one hand, important things which have to be settled in the early stages of the work of the ICG, and certainly chair structure and chair composition belong to that group. And on the other hand, things which we can settle for a rough consensus, or whatever kind of consensus is agreed on.

So I'm afraid that my personal analysis, if that's what you're asking for now, is that to be faithful to our global community of Internet users, I think we owe it to them, and for the sake of clarity and transparency, to point out once again, the inconsistencies that have been existing so far, and to ask for formal and proper process.

Now, whether this pleases people or not is completely beside the point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. Next is Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed speaking. I think just looking at the recent exchanges of email and where we are currently, I mean, we… There is a call for vote that has been put forward by the chair. And after that, at the deadline, the nomination has been done. And the chair has already concluded that we're proceeding with one plus two, a chair and vice-chair proposal currently.

And within the mailing list, there were some supporters for that. So, frankly, currently, I think the best what we can do now, to raise the point that, point of concern and I think… I look at it as a challenge as also, in terms of the process currently what we have, and because currently we have a nomination that has been put after the deadline, and I think if we use this incident, there is other incidents where proper process has not been conducted.

I mean, within ALAC, we have clearly defined procedures, at least processes that we are, as the group, adhere to. Unfortunately, if you look to ICG, ICG is those procedures have not been developed. And actually the chair, Alissa as well, she's not able to throw those procedures or processes, and put that process.

She is… Other colleagues from ITF, they were using a different way of managing group, which is definitely, to this level of formality that requires by the ICG, that's a different role completely maybe for them. I think maybe we need to stress this point. And again, I make the suggestion that this needs to be addressed again privately to Alissa from the ALAC chair.

And that we have a big concern about this incident, we think the chair should act this way, because that's a breach of process, because the chair themselves, she declared that we're going to vote on the deadline for the nomination, and then we are seeing that there is a nomination accepted and put forward.

So we are, the principles that she needs to speak to the process. That's already been put forward. Frankly I don't think getting back with a new proposal, and re-stressing our proposal will be helpful at this point, but because it seems there is no one listening to what we are saying. Unfortunately, this a group of 30 people, and usually the people who are active are responding are less than five and seven.

So we have a situation where there is a majority who are not saying anything, and there is a few people who are either supporting a position, [inaudible] felt as well, their position is not clear, although we may know very good friends over there Paul and [inaudible]. They are already experienced in terms of process and procedures. So I think the best way to move forward, try to ensure that our point of view is clearly heard and listened to by the chair.

And that this is the way I see to do, change what is happening now. Because I don't think anyone really come forward even to challenge. I have seen two or three voting submissions, but even with about the rest, no one is really responding. So I think the concern is that if the chair continues this approach of un-clarity of procedures and processes, I think we will be in a deadlock. And that deadlock could not be resolved unless we sit in a face to face meeting in the next meeting, we can talk about this and agree on a way forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. Do you think a reboot of the vote should be done? In other words, stopping it, restart the process, asking for candidates? Or do you think just the email would do okay, as long as no one, at the moment, has nominated the person that was brought into the process after the end of the nomination period?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Mohamed here. I don't think stopping, requesting for stopping the process might get the result, because we might be also in deadlock again. We need to just to talk to Alissa very quickly and see the response really. And if she's willing to listen and we hear an argument, and also a response back, then we can react. But I think the [inaudible] we're not [stealing] anything from her, although she is very responsive.

So we need to raise the issue directly to her now, of [inaudible], of the group, and saying that our representatives has raised this point, this is a very valid point, respond back to you on this case, in this nomination. So then [this and that?], I think we can proceed, but I don't think stopping the vote now with the current dynamics in the group might be useful or [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Mohamed. Next we have Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair, this is Eduardo Diaz. Having reading all of the emails, and having hearing all of these conversations, and I think, you know, the group has to have a clear [inaudible] to understand what consensus means, and within this group. And I'm talking about the group that we're talking about. And procedures on how to go about that.

But the other thing that I see, that I believe is needed, and I haven't seen anywhere is what are the roles of the vice-chairs, or co-chairs, or whatever you call it, the roles and responsibilities of those positions? Because I don't think…. And I'm talking about my experience, is you know, I can imagine what a co-chair can do in this group, or a vice-chair, but really, I don't know what the roles are.

So I don't know how important it is to be a vice-chair or a co-chair in terms of the [inaudible] decisions are going to be done by this group. That's my comment. Should I think the group should conduct here, defining and agreeing what those roles and responsibilities are. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Eduardo. So I've heard a number of things here. It looks like the way forward is to, is for me to write to Alissa, making a point of order supporting Jean-Jacque's message to the ICG. And letting her know that procedurally, the position of the candidate after the deadline is not [reputable], thus that candidate should not be taken into account and a list of candidates that is there.

At the same time, we should not act for the vote to be suspended or stopped in any way, so as to not delay the process any further, and show that we are not very pleased to challenge the process. I don't like this word challenge. I think challenge is something that usually is a political case, not a point of order which is a procedural thing.

And that said, I think that mentioning we wish the process to go through smoothly, and the next work of the working group should really be to focus on the rules for consensus. And once the chairs and the vice-chairs are selected, the roles of the chair and vice-chairs is the next big job that the group should be perusing. Mohamed, you have your hand up. Do you wish to add to this?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: No, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You put your hand down. Okay. So, that's probably the sort of way forward, so I would write to Alissa immediately after this call, with a point of order asking for a fast response, bearing in mind that at the moment, somebody will nominate the person, or will vote for the person that was nominated after the deadline, we've got a more major problem at that point because we can't just remove that person from the ballot.

And that, at that point, would need the election to start again if we were to press our point. Now, on the other hand, if the chair, the interim chair, decides that well, there is consensus, that rules can be changed, then we do have to also warn her that this is not a good procedural way forward. And that is a rule that's set, otherwise we just don't have rules anymore.

If it can just be changed like this when one or two people not being happy with the rules as they are. That's the concern. As soon as there is consensus on a rule, we can't just go back. And I understand that we have now seen this happen twice. The other time being the three co-chair consensus that was changed later on. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you've put your hand up.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. If you're right to the interim chair, Olivier, may I suggest that you do so off list? Because otherwise it could be a bit embarrassing for your two representatives on the ICG, because there would be a sort of upper level approval or disapproval of what your representatives do or say. It may be slightly embarrassing.

I don't know if the interim chair would see it like that, but some others perhaps, who are less attentive, may see it like that. So this is just a request on my part. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. Yes, and I didn't mention this, of course, I would be writing to her off list. I don't have any posting rights for the ICG, but I would be carbon copying both you, Jean-Jacques, and Mohamed, since you are our representatives on the working group. So I'd write a private message that you would be totally off the record, that has to be something where you need to be in the loop.

And I would probably also need to have a copy of this going to Heidi, since this will be an official ALAC thing. I think it needs to be recorded like this, it's not entirely off list, if you want. Okay, so that's the problem with the voting. Now the next, well I guess that was the update. Jean-Jacques, do you have any other things to update us with?

Because of course, we already now touched into the other parts of the next, due process. We've already touched on that. We also got a charter update from Mohamed that will come as well. But back to you first, for the rest of your feedback on the ICG. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Jean-Jacques. Just a short word about the secretariat. The way it's moving now seems to be the ICG will be asking ICANN, in other words, Theresa Swineheart and her little team, to look for an independent secretariat to do some of the work, related more with the content of the ICG work. While the ICANN secretariat would remain in charge of logistics and anything financial and travel.

So that's the way we're going. I say this because there may have been some confusion of the past week on the ICG list about who was going to look for and quote/unquote an independent secretariat. Earlier on, some people had suggested that even that stage should be independent from ICANN, but finally, Patrik and some others suggested that that was not important, because we're getting ourselves into a lot of unnecessary work, trying to look for secretariat.

So I think we're heading towards a solution where we would ask ICANN staff to look for a secretariat, on a fair basis, transparency and all of that, and they'll do it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. Any comments on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Certainly the [inaudible] of secretariat, and it's Olivier speaking for the transcript. The matter of secretariat is important. One of the side discussions I had with some people regarding the secretariat, I literally felt was that it was the people arranging the calls and straightforward things, [inaudible] there was much of an independence required to it.

Now what some have explained to me by email list, they would be looking at the secretariat to actually hold the pen on any of the editorial work that might need to be done connecting the different [inaudible] of the report together. And that is of concern to me in two ways. The first way is that we have been told that the ICG is just going to make sure that it was cut and paste and put into the report that it received together, and now it seems that there will be some editorial work that will involve some decisions.

And secondly, it looks like now the decisions will be framed by the secretariat putting the reports together and asking the questions in a certain way, which is… Then I would understand, of course, that the secretariat would need to be independent, but independent of who and of what? It could be independent of ICANN, but totally in the hands of another party in the overall, in the stakeholder's hands.

So, I'm not quite sure how to play this one. Jean-Jacques, you're mentioning in the chat that this part of the secretariat's work would be under the sole control of the ICG. Can you elaborate on this please?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, gladly Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. That's where the lack of clarity is the same as in process. We're killing ourselves because actually the independence will be proclaimed, but the secretarial work will be paid for and [inaudible] by ICANN on its budget. I don't mind actually, but it's simply underlying the fact that some people are willing to kill themselves with words.

That's what's worrying me, you see? So the secretarial work will be yes, doing research, drafting because it is felt that some of the drafting talents of some of our members are not absolutely well trust. And that's a good thing. What the word under the sole control of the ICG means, is that there was a fear on the part of certain of my colleagues, that if the secretariat was suggested say by some large corporation, or by I don't know what, there were would not be true independence.

That's why there was all of this exchange of messages about the fact that although the independent secretariat would be paid for by the ICANN budget, it would remain accountable solely o the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques. Any comments or questions on this? And if not, then I don't think we have any decisions to make on this topic, as such. We just have to continue having reports from you Jean-Jacques. Anything else that you can report on?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. No, I'm very keen to listen to Mohamed's report now. I think it's really crucial to know exactly where we are with the draft. So I'll be listening. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. And over to Mohamed El Basher.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Thank you very much Olivier. Mohamed El Basher for the transcript. I will just, first I will talk about the chapter. I'm sure, as you know, there is a draft chapter that has been circulated earlier within the ICG mailing list. And we had a round of discussion on the mailing list about this. And I prefer that a draft, updated charter. And highlighted a main issue on the initial draft, which is the definition of communities, plus the communities that will be allowed to submit proposals.

So on that draft, I just propose that will extend the communities to be, to include the non-operational community, which basically the end users and governments. And they could submit proposals if they wish to do so, because end user's community, ALAC, and GAC, they could either participate within the other community processes, submit a proposal to ICG, or within that, they should give an opportunity to submit their own proposals.

So after that draft internally we have received another charter, and within the group, we are going to submit that charter, which was a summary of the current charter, but it was made in a one stage summarized document. Unfortunately, our proposed charter was not well received, and we have colleagues making frankly valid points regarding our approach in terms of doing a complete rework of the text, other than focusing on the main issues that need to be addressed actually and raised to the ICG on the current draft that was there.

So this was drawn, that draft charter. And since then, ICG has publically announced a comment period for the current draft, which will be ending tomorrow, I guess, the 15th. And the thinking of the ICG was that the public comment period was to receive any major objections or any major concerns on the current draft that was still under discussion within the ICG.

So, we as a community, we can submit through the process, through the one, [inaudible] tomorrow, or I can carry that to the ICG. Basically I will comment on the draft. I think it's yesterday evening Norton has submitted, Norton Miller, has submitted to the mailing list an updated version of the charter. When reviewing that version, this is version seven of the charter.

He made some changes in the formatting of the document. For example, the required proposal elements, or at least the communities have clearly now been identified as three in Milton's version, name community, which is basically ccTLDs, TLDs, and numbers, and [basically?] RIRs and the protocol community, IETF and IAB.

So we need to review this version…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed, sorry, it's Olivier jumping in. Do you have a version that we can put on the screen so that we can actually have a look at it whilst you talk about it?

MOHAMED EL BASHER: I have, yes, I have the Word document in my computer. I'm not sure how I can integrate [inaudible]. Should I send this to you…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Who should Mohamed send this to?

MOHAMED EL BASHER: I can quickly do that to [inaudible], or someone from the staff.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have no idea. Staff is not answering at the moment, hello?

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Okay.

TERRI AGNEW: I can private chat with Mohamed, or I can make him a presenter as well. Mohamed, if you want to do it yourself.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: That's fine, you can make me a presenter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would really help. It's Olivier speaking. That would really help, because I don't think that we all have the latest version of the charter with the comments and so on, on it. So that would be great. So now you're a presenter, and I gather you know how to share the documents.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: So currently… Are you able to see my, okay. That's started now, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is Alan. I put a link in the chat for anyone who wants to look at it themselves.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Thanks for this. I see the document is also loading on screen. So back to you Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's in Arabic. [Laughter]

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Okay, which document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You were sharing your screen, you have to share the document.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: You can bear with me for a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the meantime, is the document you're mentioning, is sharing the screen then.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Yeah, here you go, you can see it. Yeah. This is the latest version that we're talking about, version seven. This basically has some updates, some notes. And one of these main updates is first paragraph about having the difference to the operational communities, which is name and numbering and protocol. I think the previous version was [differentiating] in communities.

And on this version, I think one of the major changes is that specifically there is identification to, a request to associate the proposal to one of the three communities. So basically if you want to submit a proposal, you have to be one of the identified communities, the three operations communities. So this is a point that I would like to raise to the attention of ALAC, which is basically…

I'm planning to propose that on the document, we add a reference to the interested communities, or non-operational communities, which is basically end users and government. And those communities have been referenced in the current IANA, for NTIA/ICANN contract, and I think it's plus C 1.3, which is basically a request for ICANN to consult with IANA interested and affected, let's say, stakeholders.

And identify the list of stakeholder's names, numbering, and first of all communities plus end users and government. Adding to that, I'm proposing to add the text that if they wish to do so, so basically although we're opening up the communities, but basically if ALAC…

This would be something to be… This will give a change to ALAC in the future, if it wants to submit a proposal, they can able to do so. If the decision of ALAC is to decide which way to go, either contributing to a proposal by one of the other communities, or maybe also contributing to a joint proposal, and that could be proposed by the cross-community working group.

At least having reference to the interested communities, that would be a good thing. I would like to hear your comments on this. The rest of the document, I don't think we have major issues about, but I'm happy to receive comments from them as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Mohamed. And now we have, the floor is open for comments and questions, and I see Alan Greenberg has his hand up and then Jean-Jacques. So Alan first, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll make the same comment that I made before in the document, and it's all the more important given Milton's proposed changed. I think it is somewhat, use a number of words, arrogant is one, presumptuous is another, to presume that only the interested communities might come up with good ideas.

Yes, they're the ones who are going to be, perhaps largest and most immediately impacted by whatever the outcome of this is, but to presume they're the only ones with ideas, puts in question, why were the rest of us added to this group?

You know, why is Joe from the ICC there at all? Why is ISOC there? If indeed, we have no real input. Now, whether we're going to come up with a proposal, or a partial proposal or anything, I can't say. But to be prohibited from doing that, I think sends a message and implicitly prohibiting governments from submitting anything to this process, I think puts the whole process in question.

I think we must be able to allow, any one of the communities who are at the table, and for that matter, others, I believe should be able to make proposals. They can be rejected out of hand, but I don't believe we should be prohibited from doing it. And my earlier comments were focused on the specific subsections where they were implied that you can only answer if you are only affected by it directly, when you rely on the services, and I specifically said, rely or have interest in.

And this stuff up at the top, just makes it all the more relevant. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. The counterpoint, it's Olivier speaking. The counterpoint that I read was read that the ICG should not deal with 100 different submissions from 100 different stakeholders, and then have to tie in the 100 different submissions. That's the counterpoint I've read as to why it would be restricted to the operational communities.

And of course, then the point in saying, "Well, but how do the ALAC and the ICC, and these communities giving their input in the process?" The answer was, "Well, you have to do that upstream. You already have your voice in the names, in the ICANN cross-community working group on NCIA stewardship transition, which is about to be formed. And on the other hand, you have full opening of the IETF processes, and the RIR processes that you can take part in, in each one of these discussions.

So it will be ill-fated for you to come in twice." Do you have a response to this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes I do. The chance of you lone voice, who has not been part of the establishment of those groups, suddenly not only being able to participate on an equal basis, but get the ear of people is really very low. I'm sorry. I live in the real world, not in an ideal one, and I just don't think that's practical.

Now, I don't think there is going to be 1,000 submissions. We rarely get 1,000 submissions to anything, and when we do, most of them can be either rejected or summarized pretty simply. I doubt if they're going to get hundreds of detailed submissions, and they may in fact get very few from those three groups, but the optics of prohibiting anyone else from saying anything, which might be of value, I think taints the whole process. Thank you.

And personally, I think that taints the process far more than our discussions on chairs and things like that, because it gets down to the substance of the question and what it is we're going to be deciding and what the outcome is going to be. And I think it's absolutely fruitful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan Greenberg. And you mentioned the [optic], you're well aware that the ICG is not positively good on updates, it takes quite a while to get the updates right.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that, but we're now having a discussion on the substance of how they're going to decide, and how they're going to… If they're not going to be the ones that are inventing the idea, it all comes down to the opportunities people to present ideas to them, and now we're switching that. This is not on process anymore, where you can say, "They may do it wrong, ultimately."

This says they're excluding input from the substantive process. I think it's not an order of magnitude more important, but I think it's far more important than the previous discussions as important as those were. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Olivier, I would like to come to what you mentioned a couple of minutes ago, which is to say that, for the sake for efficiency, it had been decided, not everyone could come in, otherwise we'd end up with an unmanageable thing. The difference, of course, and this I would like to underline in agreement with Alan, is that we're not just anyone. We are an immediate part of the ICG with two members, Mohamed and myself.

So that gives, if nothing else, a degree of legitimacy which would allow us to convey the concerns or the requirements of the global user community. So if only for that reason, I would say yes, we should insist on having that expression in the charter. Something like, I'm sorry about the noise. Something like the concerns on the impacted global user communities. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. Any other comments? Alan, you have your hand up again, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just in response to that. I don't think restricting it to people who are part of the ICG, or represented on the ICG, is sane, but it's certainly an awful lot better than proposed. So that is a fallback position I would accept, although [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Are you suggesting then that the, that all, that anyone should be able to propose a, make a proposal for the ICG? Anyone as in, irrespective of whether they are represented or not represented on the ICG itself?

ALAN GREENBERG: I specifically used the term, those who rely on the services, or have a specific, I don't remember the word I used, perhaps interested in the services. I've written it several times already. And yet that is subject to interpretation, which may make it very open. I don't think we're going to get thousands of comments.

But as I said, I would be willing to accept what Jean-Jacques was talking about, as a fallback, in the absence of something more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Mohamed El Basher.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Yes, thank you Olivier. I would like… In terms of exactly the word we can use, the current [CCIA?] ICANN contract [inaudible] interested communities, including users and governments, and affected communities, or some of the documents refer to customer [inaudible]… of IANA, or of operational communities, which is [inaudible].

So, I think the proposal in the middle could be, anyone could submit a proposal or comment, or even participate in a proposal that they developed, within one of those communities. So if GAC is interested to submit a proposal, they are supposed to have a process where every government belongs with that community, should be able to submit their opinions and comments to GAC. If ALAC wants to do the same, submit a proposal, we just have a process that enables users, whether individually or represented users, to be able to participate in that process.

So it will link, as a [inaudible] our submission of proposal, to the communities that will be better. So ccTLD needs to go for ccNSO, and a registrar or a gTLD registry needs to go with the GNSO. By channeling the proposition to the relevant communities, I think that will add value to the process, and it will be manageable by ICG because we will get the filtered proposals, or at least the consensus [inaudible] proposals. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. In effect, it sounds as though you're agreeing with Jean-Jacques, in being able to allow proposals from any of the people sitting at the table of the coordinating group. Because you mentioned the GAC, you mentioned the ALAC, but what do you make of the ICC basis?

MOHAMED EL BASHER: For the ICC, [inaudible] Joseph has already declared their position. They're not interested to submit a proposal. Their principle position is to participate in processes through our community, to [inaudible] their, let's say, issues or [inaudible]…

So they're not planning to submit any or defend a proposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Mohamed. Olivier speaking. So it looks to me as though the amendments which you are suggesting on the charter, it seems to be accepted by this group. At least that's the way I understood it to be. I think it is definitely a very important point, because if the ALAC lets only the operational communities, in other words, the RIRs, the ccNSO, the GNSO, and the IETF, or IAD comment, or make a proposal, it's very clear from what both of you have said, and others here, that it's going to be very hard.

What Alan mentioned, is that it's going to be very hard to be heard in these other groups. It seems on our agenda, we've got an item at the end of this call, looking at participation in other forums, that obviously each one of these forums are going to be their own little places, with their own super styles, and people that basically say something and everyone else follows, as being the dissenting voice here.

It's going to be a very [inaudible] exercise, or might be a [inaudible] exercise in some cases. So are there any other comments about the amendments that Mohamed is suggesting to the charter? I don't see anyone put their hand up on this. Mohamed, do you have enough to be able to put this and send this as soon as possible?

I have a feeling that we shouldn't be waiting for the deadline of the 15th because once again, and we are already seeing some notes by Alissa in the ICG mailing list, that oh consensus is going to be reached before they process is done. Seeing that there is consensus on the charter where there wasn't, now it's out for public comment, I would insist that the ALAC, sorry that you submit this as an ICG member, not as a comment from the ALAC.

Or would you say that we both need a comment by the ALAC and also this being filed by you as an ICG member?

And Roberto mentioned that someone has to address the overarching issue, and indeed that's something I think I totally agree with. Overarching issues seems to be falling through the cracks at the moment. Back to you Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Yeah. I think there are… I can send it as a representative of ALAC, saying this is the view of the ALAC currently accepted [inaudible]… And I think it's also, we [inaudible] that we can engage in [this position] as well. And I hope everyone to follow up on the mailing list. But I think it might be useful to be sent directly from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Mohamed. Any other comments on this? Right, so let's move forward with it. I see Seun Ojedeji has put his hand up. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun Ojedeji. Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, you have the floor, we can hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Mohamed had just mentioned something about the [inaudible]… So are you saying that ALAC [inaudible]… Because I'm not sure…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, can you say that again please Seun? It's Olivier speaking. I couldn't hear….

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, yeah. This is for Mohamed, Mohamed mentioned that we could present this [bill] to ICG or ALAC [inaudible] on chatter. Do we have a deal already?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this very, very good point Seun. No, there isn't a view at the moment that is cast in stone or drafted as such. And this is one of the questions, the follow up questions for us. Should we develop an ALAC view on the points that are, on the different points? Or should we develop an ALAC position paper to start a view like this?

And this is a question that's an open question to the group. Because there isn't one at the moment. Mohamed? Back to you.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Yeah. I think it's, the discussion now could enable me to submit something before the deadline. I think currently the whole group is almost in agreement regarding the issues that have been raised in terms of, the ability of the communities to submit a proposal, if they wish to do so, and different thing the communities…

So I have not shared that, but I think that's the current views of most of the people on the call now. That's also the, we had an earlier discussion on the draft as well, and there was always support on the mailing list for this approach. So this is the only issue currently I see, and I think we already have support on that.

Because the time is really pressing, and we don't have the luxury to spend more time on this view on the deadline. And also discussion on the mailing list is moving fast. I think it's important that if you're on the call, give me approval and the authority to just proceed with this approach, and then that will enable to take me to the group this document, so we can move forward and see the responses and other member's as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. Next we have Roberto Gaetano. Roberto, you have the floor.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, thank you. I hope you can hear me because I have had lately problems with my microphone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you perfectly well Roberto. You're loud and clear.

ROBERTO GAETANO: The old phone works better than the new technology in this case. I agree completely with Mohamed. I just want to say a quick two things. First of all, that I have been thinking about the charter later, and I think that there are some very substantial problems with the charter, and it's not just a matter of work [inaudible]. But there is no time to come to a full discussion on this.

And then secondly, ALAC has been already pointed at as the bad guy, raising issues. And so I will submit a comment on my personal behalf, speaking only for myself. But the second point is that, what I have been thinking lately, is that this slipping everything in the three communities, and using the ICG only for sort of pasting together things, and then as they say in the charter, to send it back to the three originating communities if there are things don't work properly is a really bad thing to do, because there is no guarantee on how the three different communities will develop their procedures, their processes, if they are inclusive or not, if they are conflict of interest or not.

And there is absolutely no overall control on that. And that worries me very much, but what worries me more is that by accepting the fact that the problem is not an overall problem in the NTIA transition, that is just a technical problem on how we deal with domain names, with numbers, and with Internet parameters, it creates a logical split, even in the IANA function.

So the next step is going to be, why do we have one IANA if we have three different independent functions? One for the root, one for the assignment of addresses, distribution of addresses, and one of the for the finishing of the Internet parameters. Why don't we have three IANAs?

And I think that this is the first step to kill what we are trying to build, which is the global, equal Internet community. One important for this, what is the advantage of splitting this for some actors? Follow the money. The money comes from the generic domain names. And that's where the money goes in. And instead of using this money, for instance, for funding, granting better participation to our IETF conferences by removing the fees and having [some mention], for instance, so that IETF can conduct three conferences like ICANN does, or other organizations do.

If we separate these things, we are going to create a separation between what happens in the domain name system, and what happens elsewhere in the global equal Internet community. And the temptation to make the most out of it, and to control the task, where the money comes from, and to keep the money for the GNSO, to speak bluntly, instead of funding other parts of the global equal Internet community, is something that is extremely, extremely dangerous.

Last comment. I'm not coming from a developing world. I'm deeply rooted in the Western culture, but I still can recognize that this idea of splitting a complex problem in just different pieces into things that we can manage, forgetting the global picture, is something that is typical of the technical community, but it's typical also of us as Westerners. And we have the unique ability of solving specific local problems, but completely losing sight of the global picture.

And I think that this is another way in which the charter and the approach of the ICG is completely wrong. As I said, I'm providing these comments here just as food for thought. I'm not suggesting that we include radical things in our, in the ALAC proposal, because there is enough finger pointing at ALAC, that we don't need an additional problem. So I will put those comments by myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Roberto. And I must say, I have heard some real push for these functions to be separated and split. There appears to be a political will in some parts, to split the functions. And the explanation that you've given here is certainly food for thought on this point.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed is still up, so I'll revert to you after Jean-Jacques. Jean-Jacques, and we are beyond the end of this call and we need to move on. So Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I have to agree with the testimony of someone who was at the first meeting of the ICG in London. And I must say that Roberto is right. It was practically one of the most important things that was said right at the beginning, from various members of the community, especially the technical community and also two or three large corporations, this idea of breaking down into three, or even two, separate entities.

Which was another way of trying to prepare results, meaning a transition plan, which would be as close as possible to their interests. I'm afraid I have to say this very clearly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. So, we are at the 90 plus minutes more for this call. As of agenda item number four, the next steps, we have covered the essential parts. We still have the question of participation in other forums. What I was going to suggest, since we are not there yet, was for you all who are on the call, and also of course, people who are going to be listening to the recording and on our mailing list, to check those other mailing lists out, and perhaps consider volunteering to monitor or play a part on those mailing lists.

I know that Seun, for example, is on several of these. I know that others here are on a couple of the mailing lists. So it would begin as a first step to be able to see this. And I see [inaudible] will be going into LANIC process, good because that gives… There is likely to be some Spanish, bilingual [leads] on this list. But maybe we can move this over to next week's call.

In the meantime, I think Mohamed, you've got a clear set of things to do. I certainly have the action item to pursue immediately after this. I note that you've mentioned there with the response from Alissa, that Keith has indeed confirmed to her, Joe, and Martin that he was willing to serve.

His nomination came into some hours late, as Martin was on leave prior to the deadline. And her thinking was that, it should give people the benefit of the doubt who seem to be acting in good faith. So, that's her response. Mohamed, is that a response to the ICG list?

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Yeah, that's a response to the ICG list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I'll be monitoring the responses to that for a couple of hours, and I'll be still drafting a note to Alissa on the point of order on this, and making sure that we make our point known on that. Again, it seems to be very, very flexible chairing at the moment, and certainly a bending of the rules, which doesn't bode well for the future.

If there is any contention in the future, usually rules are there to protect everyone rather than to help on this. Now with this, any other business? [Part number]… I mean, we've gone from four to six in our agenda. I don't see anyone ask the floor for any other business. So next call is just the last thing we need to discuss.

Should we have another call next week? Are we all okay with another call next week? I don't see anyone move anyway. I guess that's [inaudible]… So the next call, yes, I see some green ticks from the attendees list. So call next week, we can ask Gisella to send another Doodle again, just to make sure that our timings are fine. Similar sort of timings, same sort of Doodle for Thursday or Friday.

The fact that Gisella can send it right away, we can probably include Wednesday on this. Maybe Wednesday and Thursday, I think Friday usually is not [inaudible]… since they're in their weekend already. So Wednesday or Thursday. And if Gisella could do that immediately afterwards, that would be great.

And I can see Cheryl smiling, well great to see Cheryl happy today. Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor. Fatima Cambronero, clear your [faces] okay, sorry. No problem. And with this, I thank you all for being on this call. I think this has been very helpful. Thanks very much Jean-Jacques and Mohamed for your hard work on the ICG. It's not an easy task, and it certainly is not going to be a piece of cake.

We've got a lot more coming up. This is just the beginning, but you have the support of this working group. And I hope that, at the same time whilst you should be able to have your [levity] and being able to answer questions quickly on the ICG mailing list, there also needs to be all the help for you to be able to respond. And I hope you're finding the support you get good, and that you will get more as the topic starts rolling out.

And with this, I thank you all for this call. And I therefore adjourn the call. Thanks to our interpreters, by the way. It's great that you managed to spend a few more minutes with us today than originally anticipated. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]