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 21st of August, 2014, at 14:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Mwendawa Kivuva, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Gordon Chillcott, Alan Greenberg, Roberto Gaetano, Avri Doria, Judith Hellerstein, and Yashuichi Kitamura.
	On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Kathy Schnitt; an myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and Sabrina.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And quick [inaudible]. Mohamed just joined us as well. I would now like to turn the call back over to you, Olivier Crepin-Leblond.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much. Thanks for all this, Terri. Have we missed anyone on the call? Have we not mentioned somebody's name? Okay, I think everyone is accounted for, so let's go directly to agenda item number 1, the second part of the agenda, [inaudible] to adopt the agenda. We've

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.

got a review of the action items as usual, an update on the revised RFP, the status of the ICG charter, outcomes of the ICG conference call that took place two days ago on the 19th of August, and then agenda item number 4, next steps. And we will be looking at our participation in other fora – IETF, RIR, ISOC, etc. And then any other business.

So, any amendments to the agenda, any additions? I'm giving it a couple of seconds more because we are interpreted in Spanish as well. Sometimes it takes a little while for the interpretation. I don't see anyone putting their hand up or shouting their names out, so the agenda is adopted and we'll go directly to agenda item number 2, a review of the action items from our last call. There are two action items. One is for Olivier, myself, to write to Alissa of just making a point [inaudible] procedure [inaudible] candidate after the deadline is not possible. The vote shall not be suspended or delayed so as to not delay the process, which [I'll] go smoothly.

Okay. Well, this effectively means – I've sent an e-mail to Alissa. In the meantime, the candidate that was added or that was suggested after the closing of the nominating time basically decided to retreat their candidature. They were basically not on the short list, and as a result, the selection went ahead and the results are Alissa as chair and vice chair we have Patrik Falstrom and Mohamed El Bashir. We will obviously be talking about this in a moment.

I received a reply from Alissa that was also off list where she expressed her concern that our understanding of consensus was not her understanding of consensus and that her understanding of the flexibility

needed on that working group was maybe a little bit different from what some of the members of the working group had. And I think that we need to stick of our line from what occurred in this working group here, that we need to stick to our line that the ICG needs to run according to specific rules and not any kind of flexibility that might make it look as though it's not run properly.

Anyway, that was the only action item. That's just a sidebar. So we can move directly to agenda item number 3 in the absence of anyone wishing to comment on the action item. No comments on the action item, so with the update on the ICG with Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir, our two representatives. First we'll have a revision of the RFP with Mohamed taking us through the RFP. And that's, of course, the RFP for the secretariat services, which are likely to be external secretariat services. But anyway, I'll hand the floor over to Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Olivier. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I think [inaudible] RFP document for the proposal, which is [inaudible] submitted RFP. And there's the issue of the independent secretariat and [inaudible].

So I will start with the proposal RFP. It's still under discussion. Initially, we had an issue regarding communities who are able submit proposals and extending that to entrusted communities which is [inaudible] end

users and governments. The current documents mentioned, operational communities only are able to submit their proposals.

So there was initial support e-mails from the cc communities from [inaudible]—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed, sorry to interrupt you. Is it possible for you to speak slightly closer to the microphone? I know several people have said that they have difficulty in hearing you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay, no problem. Can you hear me well now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that probably is better. Another quick question. Do you have a copy of the latest RFP that could be displayed on the Adobe Connect?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Let me just check the box and try to retrieve it while I'm speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the future, it probably would be easier to have what we're talking about on the screen, because it's a bit difficult to get an idea of it without being able to scope for it. But back to you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sorry, I wasn't had early preparation [inaudible] try to retrieve the document and maybe also share it with you shortly.

Regarding the proposal RFP, we raised at ALAC a concern regarding non-operational communities ability to submit a proposal. But we suggested that end users and governments should be able to submit a proposal to ICG.

We have received an initial support from cc community. Martin Boyle has responded and raised an issue they are having. Some of the ccTLDs are not ccNSO members and they might not be able to even participate through ICANN processes. They might be interested to submit proposals or [inaudible]. And [Manal] [inaudible] submitted also an e-mail indicating the same regarding [inaudible].

Then there was many e-mails from the colleagues from the GNSO not supporting that approach. We didn't receive support from [RIR] [inaudible] the numbering community. So far, no one put their support for this approach. So we are in—

Then later on, as you know, GAC has submitted an official letter – GAC chair to ICG chair – [inaudible] indicating that the GAC intention is to participate in the operational communities processes to submit input through that process.

Our initial position might not be [inaudible] get the support required from other communities. [Position] has been noted for ALAC [inaudible] we need to have a discussion about how we're going to participate and

how we're going to influence proposal development and actively engage with other communities as well.

So this is, in a nutshell, regarding the RFP proposal. There's some work on the independent secretariat. Currently it's not clear the required timeframe to complete an RFP process within ICANN just to select an independent secretariat. That's a question ICANN staff will respond to ICG. But for the time being, ICG will rely on ICANN logistic support for the work of the ICG until the RFP is [inaudible]. This is from my side. I'm happy to answer any questions and I will provide the document shortly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mohamed, for this review. Are there any questions or comments from anyone on the call? Any questions or comments on this review? Okay, I don't hear anyone shout their name out or put their hand up, so thanks for this feedback.

Just a quick question for you, Mohamed. What's the next steps on this? What do you expect the next steps to be on that? Is there any specific input that you would require from us?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think for the RFP proposal, I think it's [inaudible] now. We need just to follow-up [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Keep on going, Mohamed. Sorry.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sorry, the line. I was saying that regarding the proposal RFP, we just need to keep a close eye on the finalization of the document. It seems now [inaudible] no consensus regarding even from the government – no consensus to add interested parties. The government and the GAC recent letter, I think it's an open indication that they will be concentrating on the current processes. So I think it's important for us as ALAC to ensure that the operation community processes enable us to voice our input and ensure that end users' comments and inputs are recognized through that process.

Later on we'll still have the ability to submit individual input to ICG taking into consideration end users' perspective on the proposal, which is something that will be definitely welcomed. But I think we need to start working from now [inaudible] to engage in the other processes carefully to be developed for the proposal development.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Thanks very much for this, Mohamed. Any questions? Any comments? I see Alan Greenberg. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Although that's not the outcome I would have preferred, I don't think there's a real issue at this point. Should we actually come up

EN

with some part of the proposal, and our proposals are not likely to be directly related to the operational aspects.

If we come up with something and submit it, I'll be rather blunt, I dare them to not consider it at least. If it's directly at odds with something operational units, operational organizations have requested or feel strongly about, then we're not likely to win regardless of what the path is that we submit it. And hopefully if we have a good idea, it will be considered. So I think we'd go ahead and work with the other organizations, and at the same time, not be afraid to come up with ideas that are independent of them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Any comments, Mohamed? Agreement from Mohamed El Bashir on this. A question from me. Assuming that the ICG would only be requesting for proposals from the operational communities, does that explicitly mean that if there is to be any user input of some sort it would have to come from within those operational communities? In other words, At-Large members would have to engage in each one of these operational communities?

ALAN GREENBERG: Terri said Mohamed is disconnected. He's [drawing] back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, has disconnected.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I'm back. Olivier, if you can just please repeat the question. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mohamed. Assuming that the RFP contains text to the effect that only the IANA operational community will be able to submit proposals, does this effectively mean that our community of Internet end users, the At-Large community, would have to engage in each one of these operational communities to make their voices heard? We would not be able to make our voices heard in any kind of proposal on the ICG?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think there is an agreement within the ICG that ICG will not tend to reject [inaudible] input coming to it. But clearly, the proposal that will be reviewed and, let's say, have the priorities and consider the proposal from the operational community.

Currently, discussion about are there three operational communities or four? Naming and numbering, and protocol – and especially naming. The ccNSO individually or the GNSO or combined together they will submit a proposal.

So the current option for ALAC, if the three or four communities decided that separately they are going to submit proposals, that will mean that ALAC needs to provide input in the three or provide the same statement or same guidance to the three or four proposals that will be

EN

submitted. If the current operational communities agreed to have a joined proposal, that will make it easier for ALAC to contribute in that single process.

So it's not clear yet how the operational community is going to do something, proposals individually or trying to have a combined proposal done by all the communities [inaudible] ICG.

Still, ALAC and others will have the opportunity to submit the comments. And actually, myself and some ICG members, they're pushing that either we try to have the text more neutral or going to say that communities without maybe referring to operational [although] in other parts of the document there's [inaudible] of this proposal coming from which community, which is [inaudible] operational communities.

And also, there's a text that ensures that the process of those communities are open to other stakeholders. They could contribute. And they need, in their proposals, submitted to show evidence that the proposal itself is developed in a consultative way with other communities, they have consensus and there's input from interested parties as well.

So I think there is no clear answer about if it's one channel or multiple channels. ALAC needs to work on it, but definitely we need to ensure that our input is available in the different channels, if that has been decided, or the final one combined proposal if that has been decided. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Mohamed. I saw Jean-Jacques Subrenat's hand go up a little bit earlier, but it appears that he has put it down. Jean-Jacques, did you wish to add something?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Yes, I was going to add something, but Mohamed has said this quite completely. I agree. But beyond just agreeing, I'd like to underline one point which I find is becoming more important, except it's a technical matter but also there is a political slant to it which is that we have to make your members of the ICG aware that of course we will coordinate on majority views but we do have specific requirements, and that's why the remark Carlton has just made on the chat I think is important. He says, "Mohamed [press one] on how ALAC could engage. My preference is for an approach that, one, ALAC establish a position on operational matters that it would wish to see emerge [inaudible] for that." I'm waiting for two, but it will certainly come.

What I mean is that if we do not very specifically give input on all the aspects through the three branches, as it were, which Mohamed has just mentioned, then our thing will get lost or it will be discounted or rejected. So I think this is very important. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. Now we have Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:	Good morning, everyone. I came late, and I know I have lots of feedback. When it comes to Olivier's comment, I was trying to find the document about the [creating] or the [inaudible] for the [ICG]. The document that I found is not a [inaudible] in the scope of the document, we have the operating principles, but that document also states that the [inaudible] should have [inaudible] something that I don't [inaudible].

Fadi said once [inaudible] he said that there is [inaudible] of end users [inaudible]. He answered that we're all end users. And I don't like this, because it is clear that a GAC representative is an Internet user, but at the time of giving opinion, they will ask and they will speak on behalf of their government, not as end users. The same applies for us.

So we all know that end users are influenced by different parts of ICANN. We are ALAC and we are end users and we have to solve our problems. The measures and policies delivered by government may also affect end users, but of course, in many cases, they are not covering all the concerns of end users. That's my point of comment. Thank you. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much, Alberto. Point absolutely taken. Any other comments or questions on that? For those that haven't heard Alberto's point too well, first to the interpreter, you sounded a little bit faint on the line. Albert's point was, effectively, that he didn't believe that the – or he doesn't believe that the operational communities as such have very much interest of end users and we really need to make sure that |

[all voices] is actually being heard. I see that being echoed as well by the people, this concern.

So we basically have this crossroad in a way that we have to look at at the moment. The floor is still open for other comments. I have questions [inaudible], actually. The next question I was going to ask with regards to the RFP is why would the RFP be restricted to operational communities when the IANA stewardship contract itself includes more than the operational communities? It actually mentions the end users in there.

Mohamed, Jean-Jacques? I don't hear any answer. The reason I'm asking the question is because I just wonder what is the rationale being given on the ICG for [sticking to] the operational communities? I'll tell you why.

The concern I have here is that we are now restricting something to operational communities when the US Department of Commerce asked for a multi-stakeholder process that was worldwide that included both ICANN and non-ICANN players and we can see through the composition of the ICG group that we have the ICC in there, we have other organizations that are out there. And now what we're doing is effectively restricting to specific communities to be able to submit something. The concern then being that even within these specific communities, there appears to be problem to be able to [inaudible] those that are not directly from that community.

I'm speaking, for example, of the four cc country code representatives. Two would be from the ccNSO, and I believe that two of them are actually country codes that are not from the ccNSO. We've seen that the GAC has sent a note that they would have a real problem being able to contribute ad hoc to some types of voting taking place on the ICG.

The international Chamber of Commerce on the one hand is also in none of those operational communities as such. Why do we have such a large ICG when really we could have just had the IETF, the RIRs and the ICANN GNSO and ccNSO in a small group of five people writing a plan and sending it to the US Department of Commerce. Forgive me for being provocative. I'm trying to play devil's advocate here and say, "Hang on, are we just letting something by a bit too easily?"

I'm not sure who put his hand up on there. I see Jean-Jacques, Mohamed, and Carlton. Let's go from the list on there. Let's start with Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. In answer to your very direct question, Olivier, I think that two responses or two answers, two reasons. The first is what I have mentioned already more than once. It is the principle keep the kids happy and out of mischief. So that's been done in ICANN for many, many years and some of the silo structures were conceived of precisely for that purpose.

It's a nice way to keep the areas part of the community be whilst keeping the decision [inaudible] on a different plane, and that is the border only. That's the first explanation.

The second explanation is very political. As I already remarked, the whole thing about the US government showing willingness to transition the oversight of the stewardship function [inaudible] stewardship, it could've happened three years ago or it could happen only five years from now. Why did it happen just at that moment? It is because of the Snowden Revelations. So there is a political [inaudible] to this.

And I would like to underline this by saying that it is a way for those authorities concerned to show that actually they have engaged with a vast community, with everyone. And frankly, I think that is why those who are leading the formation of the ICG, there again as I have pointed out more than once, were very keen and very capable actually – it was very clever on their part – to right at the start come out with the idea that it was all about the operational communities.

Some even use the word clients of IANA and we have to fight against that to show that it is more complex than that. So I think it's really those two reasons which led to the eminent position of the client communities, and the rest is being tolerated, but certainly not in a leadership position, whoever and whatever the representatives may be for those various parts of the community. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. I saw that Mohamed El Bashir had his hand up a little bit earlier. He appears to have put his hand down, so let's go for Carlton Samuels next.
TERRI AGNEW:	I am in the middle of a [inaudible]. My Internet just went down. If you could kindly unmute Carlton.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	I think I've got it.
TERRI AGNEW:	Thank you, Carlton.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Carlton. You have the floor.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Thank you, Olivier. I want to endorse what Jean-Jacques explanation is, because quite frankly, that's what I think is happening. You must make a distinction between participation and decision-making. So long as you have a [fig leaf] that you have widespread participation, then the hope is that decision-making would not be controversial. It would not be at all looked at.

From the first day when you heard [Rick] comment that it was only for operational matters, there was to me the [inaudible] for the political element. And let me tell you why.

There are a number of contacts, companion contracts, that are related to this IANA function and those contracts somehow seem to disappear from the equation. If they are material, if they were not material, there would not be any contracts. That's the first thing.

And so you begin to wonder how is it that these contracts, these companion contracts, are now a part of a framework are not inside the issue if you're [scoping]? And when I saw that, I thought, hmmm, okay, well I need to find out why, because it is clear to me that the only reason you have contracts is because somebody thinks it's material.

And when you look at what came out of the conversation, it was clear that there was a concerted effort to leave this matter with the grown-ups and there was a concerted effort to exclude people that they thought would be [inaudible]. That is my position. That's my analysis of it and I would dare anyone to contradict it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Carlton. Whilst you were explaining you point – which by the way, I think you're quite spot-on – I had put the Section C.1.3 which is the actual final award contract that NTIA has where the concerned parties in which case here it is with IANA to run the services. And C.1.3 mentions the background, the contractor, and who the interested and affected parties [inaudible] governments and

the Internet user community. That's the concern. That's why I'm particularly concerned about the direction we're going in. I see Mohamed is back on, and then back to you, Carlton. Your hand is still up. So Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: One of the arguments as well that was raised to me on this topic—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed, we lost you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hello? Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Now we can hear you. Go ahead.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So I was saying one of the arguments that has been raised to me – I was pointing our point regarding including the interested non-operational communities – that the current contract between NTIA and ICANN includes interested parties, and [inaudible] operational and not operational, because ICANN has a policy development process. So it's not the technical operation of IANA. That's one of the arguments that I heard from the other ICG members, that because ICANN include the

policy development and the management of the IANA function which is the technical coordination. That's why the NTIA has put both.

Saying that, I just wanted to update you as well on the reason the [operation] of the RFP, which hopefully I can share it with you here. I just sent a request to Giselle and staff to be able to present it here. The [PIC] has been updated I think after the last call – ICG last call – to be I think more accepted, because now that that's [inaudible] ICG issuing a request for an RFP for consideration by all parties with interest in or effective by the functions of the IANA. All parties may comment to the ICG related to this RFP all related processes as per transparency [inaudible] and appropriate measures.

Then there's another [inaudible] ICG is [inaudible] formal responses from the operational communities of IANA, which is [inaudible] mailing names, numbers and protocols, parameters, communities. Other interested and [inaudible] parties are strongly encouraged to provide input to those communities or those channels, but may provide community comments on [inaudible] may be covered by proposals, which may be of significant interest to them or reviewed by ICG [inaudible].

So this is almost [inaudible] which is something in paragraph one. It says that "effective and interested communities can submit their proposals." The second paragraph is encourage contributions and engagement on the operational communities processes to develop their proposal.

So I think [inaudible] for us, for ALAC, we have two options that is open for us. ALAC should consider what is really beneficial in terms of our engagement. As Alan said, do we have a set of comments or at least guidelines that need to be considered by all operational communities? What exactly [inaudible]? That's something that needs to be discussed [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Mohamed. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things. I know this meeting is scheduled for two-and-a-half hours, but I think we need to get off of the rhetoric and going over the same issues again. As Mohamed points out, although the individual sections still ask "What is your interested community?" the overall request does not disallow us from responding. I think we need to move off of rhetoric and start talking about substance of what are the issues that we think we have real input on that may in fact differ from operational communities?

I suspect the things that we're going to feel strongest about are not going to be the operational aspects, but the oversight aspects which may or may not – we still don't know exactly to what extent this group is going to be looking at that or differing to the accountability group. But clearly, the oversight is of interest. Who's going to actually do the work? There is a division within various communities whether this is a de facto

going to go to ICANN or it must be a contract that someone puts out to tender periodically, which ICANN may bid on like it has with the NTIA.

This is the really substantive things that I think we may differ or we may have unique ideas that merit consideration by all communities. If I understood Carlton properly, he was basically referring to the VeriSign contract to manage the root zone, to do the physical implementation of it, and it's still not clear to me who is going to be issuing the contract with Verisign or the replacement if it's not NTIA. It's not clear whether that's now going to be an IANA function wherever IANA sits, or is this with some new super body? It doesn't seem to be on anyone's plate, as Carlton has said, and I think it's important that we understand who is going to be discussing it because it is a salient point of the overall function. It's not an IANA function, but it could well be an IANA function to issue that contract in some world, and I think we need more clarity on that. So I think we need to move off of the discussion of we need to have a say and start discussing what we're going to say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Alan. Mohamed, you still have your hand up.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just in response to Alan, the discussion on overall accountability and overarching accountability is one which is already

being rejected by two of the three operational communities, both participants from the RIRs and participates from the IETF have rejected outright any kind of overall accountability, and in fact some of the comments that were made about the so-called [Mison] proposal were such that they basically – the [Mison] proposal was still informed and, thus, completely out of scope. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: And I think those communities have much less concern, because they can take their parameters or whatever and walk. The name community is in a somewhat different position, certainly as the attempt to get that [IR] has shown. It's of much more importance.

So, yes, I understand that some of the communities, it's not an issue. They have far more flexibility in resolving some perceived failure to be accountable or to do things properly. I'm not surprised that they're saying it's not an issue. I think it is going to be an issue for part of the overall community.

And whether it's an ICG issue or not, I'm not 100% sure, but it will be an issue essentially in who has responsibility for overseeing the IANA function or the various parts of the IANA function if they are broken up. Therefore, I don't think we can ignore it. They may choose to ignore it and they may validly ignore it in some cases. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. The feedback I've had so far from several participates it seems that it would be for the ICANN cross-community working group on IANA stewardship tradition that would be dealing with accountability. But it would be solely restricted to the naming accountability and the parts that have to deal with ICANN, because of the fact of the charter for this IANA stewardship transition cross-community working group appears to have been targeted suddenly or specifically at the name.

I would think that Tijani would probably know more about it. Oh, there you go. Our minds meet. Tijani was on the drafting team for that cross-community working group. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I'm sorry to be late. Yes, Olivier. At the beginning, the first draft, the charter [inaudible] the naming function of IANA. I complained. I said, no, we have to see to all the functions or it is not [inaudible] cross-community working group to look at the other functions.

What I managed to add was that this working group will work mainly on the naming function, but it could address the other functions. This was added in the charter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Tijani. So there's an answer, Alan. Does that answer your question or is this…?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't really asking a question I didn't think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just that we need to first look at what is going to affect the registrants, whether it's going to affect end users as such. I'm concerned that we're using running past the registrant, because again we're just looking at the end result of a domain name and ICANN deals with numbers as well and protocol parameters, and I do have concerns about the other two.

ALAN GREENBERG: I definitely think when we talk about users, we're talking about users. Registrants are an important subset of those users, but we shouldn't be looking exclusively at those issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, bearing in mind we're just discussing the RFP at the moment, are there any other questions or comments on the RFP? Then we'll have to move over to the ICG charter.

So no more comments on the RFP, so let's go over to the charter, please. For this, is it Mohamed again?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Regarding the charter, there were, on the call Jari went through the comments received on the charter and [inaudible] he went through the comments that have been submitted by some colleagues from ALAC. [Alberto] [inaudible] comments [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed, could you speak a little louder again, please? We can't hear you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Regarding the charter on the last conference call, Jari from IETF who was handling the charter drafting provided us with a summary of the comments that have been received. [inaudible] ALAC members as well can [produce] it. I think Alberto has submitted some comments to ICG [inaudible] have submitted some comments. And he was reviewing those documents and some of the comments will be taken into consideration. The majority of the comments are editorial. I think the revised text might also. We just haven't seen it yet [inaudible] but it might be [inaudible] community.

EN

I also made a note that this needs to be consistent with [inaudible] of the document as well. Jean-Jacques I'm sure, maybe he will [inaudible] what I can explain. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Mohamed. Jean-Jacques, did you wish to make any comments on the charter?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, Olivier. No. Unfortunately, the last minute of Mohamed's intervention, I could not hear clearly enough. I'm sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I must say it was a little muffled, unfortunately. Can you just repeat the last few points that you made, Mohamed? Sorry to ask you again, but it seems your line is not very clear.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I was saying that on the last call, the drafter of the charter document that Jari presented us with an analysis of the responses received or a summary of the comments received. I'm glad to say that, as ALAC, we have some ALAC members, At-Large members have contributed and submitted to comments. We have Alberto and we have as well [inaudible].

There will be an updated document out of the comments submitted, and also the comments [inaudible] editorials. We even noticed some very good comments coming from [Roberto]. For example, [Roberto] commented regarding ICG created to represent the multi-stakeholder community and [inaudible] value has been considered by Jari as a major [inaudible].

So the contribution submitted by ALAC was I think [inaudible]. I think that the [inaudible] will be balanced in the definition of communities. I have not seen the latest version, but I'll update you if there are any major changes from the previous version. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mohamed. What's the next step for the charter? Because the ICG has collected comments. Will it then just incorporate the comments and then say the charter goes? What's the next? Or will there be a chance for the ICG members to go back to their community – in other words, to us as well – and to have a final look over it if we have a total dissatisfaction about the charter itself?

I see Jean-Jacques has put his hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, there will be an opportunity for all the ICG members to react. One of the members will be fielding or putting out a sort of consolidated version with corrections and additions, and that will be at the disposal of the members of the ICG for comments. So that's

when we will be able to come back to it. Other than that, I don't see any specific process. But of course what Mohamed and I will be doing, especially Mohamed as he's the one who has been dealing with the charter since several weeks ago now – I think that we have to be very vigilant at that moment to see that our input has effectively been taken care of. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. Any more comments on the charter? I had a question with regards to the submitting of comments, but I guess it's too early because we haven't seen an updated version of the charter. I wasn't sure how the comments were going to be integrated with the ICG, with the charter itself. Is this going to be staff integrating this or the chair or the vice chair? Is there a subgroup or is the whole ICG discussing this? What's the process for this, Mohamed?

Mohamed, you're probably muted. We cannot hear you. Mohamed, I'm afraid we cannot hear you at the moment. You might have been dropped. Okay, let's then move on and go over to the next agenda item and that's—

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Excuse me, Olivier. In the absence of Mohamed on his microphone, perhaps I can answer that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Mohamed would have told you this better than I can, but there was an e-mail from the chair of the ICG, Alissa Cooper, to all members of the ICG about the distribution of work among the chair and the vice chairs. So as far as I can see, the work items will be shepherded by various people. For instance, communities RFP, Mohamed will be in the lead. Secretariats documents, it will be Patrik. Consensus documents, it will be Alissa. The charter, it will be Alissa. The timeline, Alissa. IGF statement will be Mohamed, etc.

So the distribution of roles within the chair structure of the ICG is already decided and that was not submitted to the community, but that's fair enough. I mean, it's up to chair and vice chairs to decide among themselves how they distribute their work. I do notice that chair is alone in the lead on three of the very important items we have just been talking about for a few minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Very helpful, Jean-Jacques.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Olivier, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Mohamed, you're back with us. We can hear you. Go ahead, please.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So sorry for the technical issues. Okay. Just to clarify a point. [inaudible] the particular document, the charter, there's a person who's leaving the drafting who is Jari from IETF. He's the IETF chair. And he will continue the work in the document up to finalizing that. So he already completed it [inaudible] responses received and he's supposed to produce the final draft charter document for ICG.

The chairs, we had a quick call, a half-an-hour call, yesterday. The idea was to distribute the work between us and see how we can work together. So myself and Patrik and Alissa, we divided the work between us. I suggested as well, has been accepted by Patrik and Alissa, that although one of us will be following up on those documents, but the drafter will take the lead work.

So my responsibility as [inaudible] items [inaudible] I need to follow-up. The person is in charge of the document is already taken the input received and an analysis document has been produced. A final draft has already been put. Timeframes has already been – are [expected]. In that regard, I will be following up. But there will be individual ICG members who are taking the lead on those. For example, the secretariat is currently the lead person, Adiel from AFRINIC. That's the model the work, how it's going to be.

The next step is for the drafter, the person in charge of the document [inaudible] to produce a final version, a final draft, for consideration. Again, as Jean-Jacques said, [inaudible] again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you, Mohamed. And when will input be needed, then, from our community for this? Is this a continuous thing or are we going to be solicited at any specific point?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think in the coming – we need to finalize this [inaudible] next week. I think hopefully he will be finalizing the document soon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then we'll know better. Okay, thank you. Tijani, you had your hand up earlier. It's back down.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Olivier. Thank you, Olivier. It was fortunate that Mohamed answered. I don't have anything additional.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Item 3.3: outcomes of the ICG conference call of the 19th of August. We've already touched on some of it. We touched on another call in which the co-chairs, the chairs and the vice chairs, have had. Is there anything else to add? Jean-Jacques, you mentioned a couple of things.

EN

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I don't know if people are interested. We've touched on several of the points. What I'm suggesting is to provide an overview, because the ICG has been working for exactly one month now. The London meeting was a month ago and it may be useful to see lessons learned from this one month if people are interested. Otherwise, let's go on to the next topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is there any interest for this, lessons learned? So far, I don't see very much movement on the call. Let's proceed forward. Can you summarize in about five or ten minutes on the lessons learned and maybe engage in a small dialogue? Then we can go to the next part of our call, which is the next steps on the engagement of our community. From the first part of this call, I noted from the chat there were a number of suggestions that our community takes part already now in the discussing that are happening in the operational communities. So this is probably going to be a major chunk of what we need to decide on today. Back to you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. So looking back on [inaudible], I'd like to give my view of what we should be drilling down on now. The first thing is that the meeting of two days ago, the 19th of August, which was the second real meeting of the ICG, was efficient. It was carried out in a good, constructive mood and there were no hitches. It went very well.

Now that I've said that, I think that we have to realize what really happened is that those who were in charge of pushing forward the agenda of some enterprises and some technical communities were very capable and made a point right at the beginning of underlining or emphasizing the difference between the technical communities directly interested in the IANA functions. In other words, the IANA clients, as it were, and the rest.

So we managed, Mohamed and I, to soften this somewhat and to bring back the affected communities notion into the picture, but not completely as you are aware.

So what we'll take away from this very brief analysis, several things. First of all, the fuss I made about process was I hope you realize now not a personal [hangover]. It was really because, in the early stages of the ICG, process would be – and still is, to an extent – the determining factor.

For instance, there was a call right from the start that there should be no voting at all and that's where we got the current chair structure, which is working well it seems, but it would have had more impact if we had had a different process.

What are some of the other things I would see as notable developments in the past month? The plan, Alan remarked maybe half-an-hour ago that the plan would be submitted in two [inaudible]. He didn't say it this way, but there was clearly on one hand the client community and the others. I think that now will be the general trend. It is up to us to be

vigilant and to make sure that the input from our community is taken care of.

So far, the most recent developments are encouraging, as Mohamed has just pointed out. I would like to point out also the role of Jari Arkko, the chair of the IETF, who is in charge of bringing together the threads on this and he is doing a remarkable job. So I think that, with that, we should find more of our [inaudible] since Roberto's remarks, etc., in the final charter.

Another thing I would like to underline is what I would call the GAC paradox. You remember that, right from the start, the GAC has asked for its representation on the ICG to be increased. We, on the ALAC or the At-Large, had supported that call, so we went from two to five representatives.

But on the other hand, now they're back-peddling and being extremely cautious about what their input can be. Trust me, I know how governments operate so I know what are the limitations of GAC input because they have to have an absolute consensus on anything they put out.

But it's also a question of how they're organized within the GAC, and so far I can say that the input to the ICG has been minimal, if not even a bit less.

So what conclusions may we draw from that as At-Large? Two things. First of all, can they be our allies on some subjects? My quick answer is, unfortunately, no. We tried that. As Olivier knows, we tried that on

EN

process and chair structure. We received encouraging individual remarks, but that got nowhere simply because the chair of GAC, or at least the structure, did not result in any clear position. And I'm afraid that [inaudible] from now on.

The second conclusion I draw from this is that we will not even have a competition between the GAC and the ALAC about representing the global public interest because there is no expression of a way forward on the point of the GAC so far. Of course, this may change. I don't know. But for the time being, I must underline the extraordinary absence of the GAC whose individual members have [inaudible] e-mails I've seen some interesting stuff. But altogether, they're not acting as a group.

Finally, I'd like to point out that Alan a bit earlier on the same – I'm sorry if I misquote you, Alan, but I think the idea was let's get out of the rhetoric once and for all, and it's all about [contact] and efficiency. True. But again, I must underline that it is because there was a clear intention by some of the technical community right from the start of the ICG that we are where we are today for chair structure, for process, etc.

For instance, voting was turned down. After the 19th of August telephone conference, I insisted that we put that into the charter, something along the lines of a member may request voting on any [specific] important item. Because, you see, the thing about the ICG, now that we've worked in it for a month is the phenomenon of silence is golden. In other words, even if it's not underlined in that way, actually it is a very diverse group with a minority of people who are really active and the other simply are tiding along.

So, in other words, when they remain silent, two-thirds remain silent, their position is construed as [inaudible] acceptance or approval, and that's precisely why I insisted on reintroducing the notion [inaudible] the possibility of voting when things become really serious.

I hope you'll support me on that. I know I was in the minority position on the ALAC on that, but I just want to underline that we should preserve that possibility.

So that's an overview of [inaudible] work on the ICG and I'm open to questions or remark, if you allow that, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Just a quick point before I hand the floor to Tijani. You mentioned the suggestion that the ALAC should really push for the possibility of voting, but if one does the calculations and adds up the numbers, does that not just weaken the ALAC's point of view rather than being able to argue a point by consensus. Clearly, we're not doing very well on the numbers. We only have two people on the ICG.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: In response to your question, you may remember that about two weeks ago I sent an e-mail to this group, to the working group, making a proposal that on certain very limited items of great importance, especially in the early phases, the first few weeks of the ICG, we should require compulsory voting – that makes the difference – of all the

members of the ICG, because that is the only way to get over the phenomenon of silence is gold.

In that way, people would be obliged to vote either yes or no or abstain. Now, if they abstain, they have the choice of either giving an explanation of their abstention or not giving an explanation. But at least when we can count numbers, we can say out of the 30 voting members, the compulsory vote gave the following result, rather than simply relying on the interpretation of consensus by the chair, which has been the case all along.

Olivier, I must point out that your message off list to the interim chair, you saw a reply which was, "Oh, that's very kind of you, Olivier, but no, we're doing it another way," because precisely, there is no technical possibility of checking on the numbers. Does that answer your question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible] Jean-Jacques. I don't know if [inaudible]. Coming back to what Jean-Jacques said, why I was silent when you asked me to [inaudible] speak about the [inaudible] our position. Because at the beginning, we were very radical in our position and then we lost [inaudible]. And this is not good for our [community]. So now, let's go. Let's go to the [inaudible] are already don't. Let's continue.

As for the voting, you know, Jean-Jacques, there is a lot of problems on voting. The first one is that when you vote, you have a loser and it is very bad for the group. Second, yes, I understand that the silence people may [inaudible], but the silent people, when the chair decides on a consensus, if they are not happy with it, they will speak up.

So I [inaudible] they agree more with the chair than with us. So, yes, perhaps it may give us something, but I'm not sure [inaudible]. The more we have consensus, because consensus will make the chair [inaudible] have someone in the chairmanship who can push for that, who will continue discussion the issue until we reach consensus. It's not only speak about the issue and then say, "Yes, I see there is a consensus." If there are people who are objecting, we have to discuss more to reach the consensus. This is the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Is my line clear? Can you hear me well?

TERRI AGNEW: Your line is really cracky. Do you mind if we try to redial back out to you to get a better connection?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] listen to Adobe and I'll give the floor to Alan Greenberg. If I don't come back within two minutes, just keep [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I was given the floor, although Olivier faded out badly. If anyone tells me I'm wrong, I'll stop talking.

I understand Jean-Jacques' desire for voting, but I find it really problematic for a number of reasons. Specifically, since the GAC says they will not vote and since the representation on this group is disproportionate and not necessarily in our favor, I think voting is problematic. Voting in a group like this would almost certainly require waiting, and that becomes a really messy issue. If you don't have some level of waiting, then some groups have more say than others and I think that's problematic.

However, there is discussion going on in the ICG on what consensus means and they are using, at this point – how it's going to come out, I'm not sure. But at this point, it looks like they are using a stronger version of consensus than we do. Our version of consensus, for instance, is 80% agreeing is a done deal, whereas they're talking about something closer to unanimity, at least on certain types of issues. I think we need to let that play out and see where it goes. It may not be as bad a situation as some people think. I have real concerns that voting could be used as a tool to quiet people as opposed to settle issues. Thank you.

Do we have a chair?

TERRI AGNEW: Not yet, Alan. A few more moments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]. Let me try and work something out. This is terrible. Let me just hand the chairing over to someone else whilst I work out a problem with my phone at the moment. Can I ask, perhaps, Alan to take over just for the next three or four minutes while we try and work out the bad connection?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will try. Is there anyone else who wants to speak at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you can still hear me, my point on this I think I have a feeling that insisting on the voting issue is probably not going to bring us any friends on that ICG. Certainly leaving the point to the chair and the vice chairs to choose on when they want to vote and when they want to go on to the vote is probably better than putting some hardwired process by which voting needs to be instigated. I'll ask for a redial now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's exactly what Jean-Jacques is asking. [inaudible] let the possibly of voting exist. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't think anyone has said that voting cannot exist. There does seem to be a push for consensus, but the definition of consensus is still moving. Carlton, you have your hand up.

CARLTON SAMUELS:	Yes. Thank you, Alan. I wanted to, as I pointed out in the chat, I would probably vote a [blanket] voting arrangement for the reasons that you [vote]. One of them is [inaudible] membership, because then you would need to start assessing whether or not the membership should not be waited for a vote and so on. And all these other problems.

But I do endorse Jean-Jacques' suggestion that, for some items, you might wish to take what I call a sense of the room vote. So if we have a charter that does not explicitly or probably explicitly make [room] for the sense of the room voting mechanisms. I don't know how we would want to frame that in the charter. To me, [inaudible] what Jean-Jacques is saying and I can support that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I'm back. Can you hear me well now?

CARLTON SAMUELS:	Yes, that's better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, excellent. Thank you. Back to you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. In answer to someone's question – was it Alan, perhaps? Yes, the whole thing came up because I saw in an exchange or in a draft one of the members of the ICG saying that voting would not be part of our system, so that's where I reacted. I've listened to your comments very carefully. I just want to make the point that I was not suggesting voting as the default mechanism, but on a very limited number of topics, and when necessary, that at least we have that option.

But, frankly, I think [inaudible] given the sense of this room and the majority feeling in the ICG, we can rest assured that there will never be any voting. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. Any more thoughts or questions? We have ten minutes until the end of this call. I was going to touch on the next [inaudible] and I think that's quite important. We have a list of other [fora] – IETF, RIR, ISOC, etc. Earlier in this call there was some discussion regarding our community getting involved at an early stage in each one of these discussing. It's been quite clear that the different proposals are going to be developed in those communities.

What I'd like to try and see today is whether we can have people volunteering to go on the mailing list, depending on what their aspirations are and [inaudible] start by doing some [inaudible] to them and monitoring what's going on there, being able to report back to us

during our weekly calls. That would be a first step forward to being aware at least to what's going on in each one of these different fora.

I don't know what the most efficient way of doing it is. What I could do would be to go to each one of these different names and ask you to put your hand up when you want to be on that or put a green tick or something. But first I open the floor for comments and question. In order, I have Fatima Cambronaro, then Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. First, Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. As I said on the list and on our prior call, I volunteer to follow up the discussing in LACNIC. Last Friday they held their first call to launch this follow-up process to follow-up on the IANA stewardship transition and they explained the [inaudible] of the situation and they dealt with current debates going on in the ICG so as to have all the participants on the same level. And different members of their community will be leading different aspects of this process.

They do not have guidelines for the debate or for the process. It is open to their community, so they will be open and they will receive the input from their community and they will send that to the NRO because LACNIC will not be making comments or contributions directly. I will continue engaging in these discussing, and my understanding is that nothing has taken place on their list. There's going to be a full LACNIC call tomorrow to see how they'll move forward regarding this process because there has been no discussion on the list so far. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Fatima. Quick question. With LACNIC providing its input to the NRO is it providing the input in English or will it be providing it in Spanish? Just looking at the process and how responsive or how [quick] the LACNIC would be able to [inaudible] in the process.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This hasn't been addressed yet. In my point of view, this is not very orderly or their process is not going along in a very orderly fashion. Tomorrow they will have or they will hold this call with some community coordinators and probably they will decide on these operational procedures or [inaudible].

Regarding the language of the comments or input, that hasn't been decided yet. However, the LACNIC list is on the three languages of the region: Spanish, English, and Portuguese. I may give you an update on this once I get the latest news. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be great. Thank you very much, Fatima. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I volunteer to follow the AFRINIC [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you, Tijani. So Tijani is [down] for AFRNIC. LACNIC is followed by Fatima. People in the AP region, APNIC, are you aware of any local discussion taking place at APNIC level or could I ask you, if you are not aware, to try and find out? I'm looking here specifically, if I look at our list, we have Cheryl and Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I'll take that as an action item to specifically find out, because I'm not in all the lists. But I'll follow up on that.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thanks very much. So action item for Cheryl to find out if there is an APNIC IANA oversight mailing list or working group in place.
	In the ARIN region, I'm not aware of a mailing list either. Perhaps somebody on the call is. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?
JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:	Thank you, Olivier. A general remark. From [inaudible] and myself, it would be really useful if our colleagues who are volunteering for following these various groups could write directly on the mailing list of our working group without waiting for a possible telephone conference or anything else, so that we get it in real time, because sometimes that makes a difference if we get it immediately. That's a first remark.

EN

The second remark is that in the list we have on the agenda on the screen, participation in other fora, it's firstly the ICANN IANA transition mailing list which I suppose is the mailing list that Mohamed and I are on. If that's the case, of course we'll do that – we have done that all along – to send [inaudible] to this working group whatever we consider to be important either for your input or just as a warning or as an information [inaudible]. I'm very confident that on that mailing list, everything is covered.

ISOC IANA transfer mailing list, is anyone volunteering for that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, you mentioned that you are on the ICANN IANA transition mailing list. I know you're on the Coordination Group mailing list, but can you please confirm then that both Mohamed on you are on the IANA transition mailing list of ICANN?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry, that's my mistake. You're absolutely right. I am on the Coordination Group mailing list, so it would be interesting to have people on ICANN IANA transition mailing list – ISOC IANA transfer mailing list and IAB Internet [inaudible].

So the best would be, of course, to have people who are following that in any case for other reasons, which is not my case. It's as important as having the regional oversight mailing lists, which you have just a call to candidates or volunteers for. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Anyone else? We go down the list, ARIN IANA oversight mailing list. Could I task someone in the ARIN region to find out if there is an oversight mailing list there? Perhaps, looking at the list, we have Tom Lowenhaupt or Avri. Avri, you're well connected. Are you? Avri is more connected with the IETF. Alan, Gordon, Judith. Someone volunteer, please, to go and inquire and find out. Alternatively, I can do it, but I'm not in the ARIN region.

Okay. I note from the chat that Avri will be [inaudible] in the IETF Working Group. So you're speaking about which one? The IANA Internet Gov and the Tech mailing list? Sorry, IAB Internet [inaudible] Tech mailing list. Is that the one? Okay. So Avri is on all of the mailing lists. Okay, fine. That's okay.

There is no one who has volunteered for finding out the ARIN IANA oversight mailing list. I shall be drafting a note to ARIN and finding out.

Then, for LACNIC, we've got Fatima Cambronero for the RIPE and oversight mailing list and we have a volunteer for this. I don't see anyone jumping up and down to try and find out where the RIPE mailing list is. I'll first find out where it is and then we can follow-up on that as well.

Regarding the other three, what I would suggest rather than waiting on this call is for staff to just do a quick table with the names or for people to just subscribe to the list and let us know on the mailing list that they have subscribed to those list. It is vitally important that we have at least

one [main] person to be able to come back to us each week letting us know what's going on. Or even, as Jean-Jacques said, in between when there's something important that goes on that mailing list, then they can forward it over to our own working group's mailing list.

I see Alberto Soto and then Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. I dropped for a little while. I volunteer, but I missed the names of the lists you were mentioning. You mentioned two lists.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alberto. So all of the mailing lists are in the agenda on the agenda page. What I said was for you to be able to subscribe to these. I think that the agenda page actually links to each one of those mailing lists so you can subscribe directly.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you're next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Two final remarks from me on this. The first is, as the person who proposed to start with I think two weeks ago that we have specific persons following specific lists, I'm very satisfied that this has come to a head. We now have volunteers for almost all those lists.

The second thing, I repeat that for Mohamed and I, it will be really useful if you can sort of summarize – don't give us long things – but to

bullet point, no sentences, just say, for instance, LACNIC the following concern was brought up and this is our suggestion [inaudible] so that we have that immediately and we can see how to put that into the ICG. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. So the next thing I was going to suggest was that we all make each other aware of what mailing lists we're on. In other words, we could have a note here where the – let's have a table of this working group's members and [inaudible] to find out what mailing lists we're on, so then we're aware of that. Any objection to this? I don't see objection; I see a green tick from Jean-Jacques. It's just about communication and finding out who is where and who is in charge of what.

The concern I have is that we might drop the ball and something might fall between the cracks. Something might be cooked up somewhere in one of these mailing lists, we will not be aware of it and it will come to head in the ICG and we will be very upset. So obviously we need to have very early – what the GAC would call early warning, but what we would call just have people in those places and being able to let us know and also being able to respond locally as well if anything outrageous gets developed in those places.

Everyone, it's 15 minutes behind our official closing time. We have interpreters with us, so I think we have to finish the call. Any other business? I guess the first point of any other business is when should we

have our next call? What I was going to suggest was another Doodle or are you fine with the current timing? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know about anyone else. I have a conflict next week at 10:00. The THICK WHOIS Review Implementation Team meets at 10:00 on Thursdays on the last Thursday of the month. So I would prefer a different time next time, but I may be the only one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I prefer having a Doodle. I'm going to leave California in a few hours. I need to be back in Europe to check my stuff and I'd rather have a Doodle. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I note also Fatima has also asked for a Doodle. Some people are okay with the slot. Easiest – Gordon Chillcott has mentioned Doodle. Let's go for a Doodle to be sent ASAP for Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. In fact, we try and avoid Friday, so mostly for Wednesday and Thursday.

Fantastic. This is the end of our call. I hope it was helpful for our two ICG members and we will meet up sometime next week. In the meantime, get on to these mailing lists and volunteer. We will follow-up by e-mail

until then. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, goodnight. This call is now adjourned.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone, for joining.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]