

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function on Thursday, the 28<sup>th</sup> of August 2014 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Mwendawa Kivuva, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mohamed El Bashir, Alan Greenberg, Yashuichi Kitamura, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Gordon Chillcott.

On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Fatima Cambronero, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Roberto Gaetano.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Kathy Schnitt; and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today will be Veronica.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Kathy. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? We have missed no one. Just one quick note. It appears that the audio is not working on Adobe for Tijani. For me, it is working, so I think there might be a problem on Tijani's computer or Tijani's line. [inaudible] that that's noted.

---

*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.*

---

So today we've got an agenda which consists of having an update regarding the revised request for proposals. The status of the IANA Coordination Group charter, the outcomes of the last ICG conference call that took place a couple of days ago. The we will be looking at the cross-community working group on IANA stewardship transition, which actually has a different name now, but Tijani Ben Jemaa and Leon Sanchez will be taking us through that. I believe only Tijani is on the call at the moment, so he'll be able to take us through it. And then we'll look at next steps. What do we do next? Quite an [open] session for us to be able to discuss what next.

Any additional other topics that somebody would like to add to this agenda or any amendments to the agenda, please? Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I'd just like to suggest that under next steps, item 5 on our agenda, we also look at not only our own agenda and tasks ahead, but also we make sure that we have a clear picture of the next things which are going to happen outside of the ALAC at which we have some relation with the transition work. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. That's an excellent point. What we can do is to call upon our colleagues who have been – well, we will be doing that, but we can also call upon our colleagues who have been monitoring some of the mailing lists out there [inaudible] that's on the list that we have so far in the action items. We'll be able to find out

---

if there's any movement on those lists, and of course I'll call upon everyone to provide an update with regards to what is going on with the other parts of the world on this.

I don't see any other hands up, so let's get going and go directly to agenda item number 2, the review of the action items from our last meeting.

As I've mentioned, we have looked at the different mailing lists that were in place out there. Tijani was to volunteer for signing up for the AFRINIC mailing list, Fatima Cambronero following the LACNIC mailing list, Cheryl Langdon-Orr was to find out if there was going to be an APNIC IANA mailing list in place and I was going to find out if there was a RIPE mailing list.

Now, you've seen the follow up as far as RIPE was concerned. I believe, as far as RIPE, as you saw on the mailing list, they've not made much progress yet so we're still waiting for something to happen. As far as the [ARIN] mailing list is concerned, actually. It's the same case. Still very early days and we will be notified [inaudible] friends and colleagues at RIPE and at [ARIN] in development of these mailing lists.

With regards to the other three – AFRINIC, LACNIC, and APNIC – we can then discuss this at our next steps in agenda item number 5.

Terri Agnew is to create a table in the Wiki with the work group members to indicate who is subscribed to a particular mailing list. Terri, have we got that done?

---

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. It's slowly getting filled in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that's on the homepage, basically, of the working group, I believe. [inaudible] mailing list currently engaged in the discussion [inaudible]. So we've got pretty much all covered except the RIPE mailing list for the time being. We'll go through these in agenda item number 5. That's good. Thank you.

Next we have Gisella to send a Doodle for the conference call next week. That's done as well. Okay, let's go to the next agenda item and that's number 3, update on the ICG.

Starting with the revised RFP – that's the request for proposals – it says here Mohamed, that it can be Mohamed and Jean-Jacques. Of course we both are working on this, but Mohamed had started on this. So let's see who wishes to speak to this. Mohamed El Bashir, perhaps?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Olivier. I have sent to the mailing list yesterday [inaudible] version of the RFP and the charter. [inaudible] charter now has been published. It has some [inaudible] amendments that [inaudible] what exactly what we want, [inaudible] a different language. I've also have [inaudible] options that we have. So this has been changed [inaudible].

The RFP [inaudible] provide more information about the discussions we had with [inaudible] to update the text, and there was [inaudible] following up. There was e-mails [inaudible]—

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Your voice come out muffled, Mohamed. I don't know if others can't discern your words too well. [inaudible] the mic.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay, let me try again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's better, yes. Just the last few sentences. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sure. I was saying regarding the RFP document [inaudible] following on the mailing list a discussion regarding the interested communities [inaudible] proposal and the outcome of the group conference call RFP was a [two day] [inaudible] be given for a small group [inaudible] to come up with a more friendly amended [inaudible] sure you have seen the e-mails on our mailing list as well [inaudible]. So I'll leave [inaudible] to provide input at that.

I think [inaudible] I can give that ICG is preparing for its coming face-to-face meeting in Istanbul the 6<sup>th</sup> of September. There will be an important panel, a workshop in IGF, an IANA transition panel, where I think some of the [inaudible] will be presenting.

And if you are attending the IGF, and I think also there will be lots of discussion about the process as well. So it's a chance as well that we

---

engage with other communities, and it's very critical that we engage with other communities now, at least to influence the process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Mohamed. Any comments? I guess perhaps we can ask Jean-Jacques Subrenat to give us more further updates on this, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. To complement what Mohamed has already indicated, I'd like to concentrate a bit on the draft RFP or community proposal. So as there was quite a clear discrepancy between the spirit of the NTIA statement of last April on the one hand, and the way some of my colleagues on the ICG were wanting to interpret it in a more narrow context, meaning [inaudible] – hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, we cannot hear you. Start again, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. I'm not at my dentist. I'm in a quiet room at home.

I was saying that because of the discrepancy I noticed between the rather open language used in the NTIA statement of April on the one hand, and on the other hand the narrower interpretation which some members of the ICG were giving to that statement, especially wanting

---

to restrict proposals so that they would come only from the so-called operational community. At the outset of the last ICG meeting about a week ago, I underlined that discrepancy. And unfortunately I was very alone in this task, because as we go along since the London meeting almost two months ago, this tendency to sort of sideline the non-technical and non-operational communities has been [confirmed]. So I thought it was time to spell it out and to try to do something about it.

So with that explanation, I suggested that the communities should be placed on an equal footing and that the user community, which Mohamed and I represent on behalf of ALAC, should be allowed to make proposals as well, because in the [inaudible] it was presented to us, it was on the one hand proposals which were to come only from the operational communities, and on the other hand, input which could come from the user community.

So I made a proposal in written form so that there would be [inaudible]. This was not supported on the ALAC At-Large Working Group so I asked Olivier for preferred language, and he said to me the proposal which had been made two or three days ago by Alan – thank you Alan for that.

So we adopted that as the basis, and I said yesterday to the ICG list the following statement: “Dear colleagues, following on [inaudible], the ALAC proposals as a friendly amendment to add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph of the draft RFP: Although full proposals are not expected from non-operational communities, this RFP does not preclude any form of input from the non-operational communities.”

---

So Alan first, and then Olivier, felt that it was difficult to obtain anything more than that from my colleagues [of] the ICG. In perfect transparency, I translated that to the ICG as a joint position.

Now, after that, there was only one reaction from a member of ICG – that’s Joe Alhadeff – who represents the International Chamber of Commerce Business Constituency, who [inaudible] complicated a long drawn-out argument to say that, in fact, my proposal or our proposal would complicate these [inaudible] would actually clarify them.

So I sent a quick reply saying that his comment was a bit complicated and I don’t think that really adds anything to our friendly amendment. So that’s where we stand just now, and I’d be grateful if anyone else has any other [news], especially Mohamed as you are now, Mohamed, in the chair structure of the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I have a question for you. Wasn’t the plan – I listened to the ICG call [inaudible]. I was under the impression was the plan was for the proposed [specs] to first be sent to a small group [inaudible] agree on [inaudible] ICG.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I’ll try to answer that. Well, that’s not at all my understanding. In fact, my position all in all and the one I have proposed that At-Large share with me is that by small incremental steps like this, we will be finally dispossessed of any role at all in the ICG.



---

Right from the start, if you remember, on the first call in London, two or three people from the technical and operational community were already wanting to make a very, very clear cut between their representation and the rest of the ICG members and I had to fight against that in order to make it apparent that that was unfair.

So the proposal – in other words, what is called the plan, which will have to be submitted to the NTIA, in my mind, I suggest that we firmly defend this point of view hence far, that this plan should be viewed by all the members of the ICG, even those who consider that it is difficult for them to really take a position. I'm speaking about the members of the GAC, the five members of the GAC.

But in any case, if we let go on this, then we will have lost really a lot of influence and any possibility of being able to review any part of the final product, which will be sent to the NTIA.

If I may add, Olivier, just a quick note on this. Over the past two weeks I have seen several of our colleagues in this working group who have put the question. Is it true that the final proposal will go directly from the ICG to NTIA? And some seem to think or to suggest that, actually, we would send it to someone in ICANN for vetting, and then ICANN would transmit it to NTIA.

Frankly, this is not at all my understanding, and what has gone on over the past two weeks and the exchange of e-mail through the ICG proves at least, to my understanding, that the ICG in fact did [inaudible] upon to convey its plan directly to NTIA. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. I think I might have not explained my question properly originally just now. I was asking whether our submission for an amendment in the RFP was to be discussed as a small group to find consensus on the amendment with a couple of other people that were interested specifically in this.

I vaguely remember in the ICG that was the thing. Okay. A few people are going to come together and put together the amendment for the RFP, and then afterwards, proposal to the group. I might be wrong on that. Mohamed El Bashir, and then I'll come back to – oh, sorry. Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you, Olivier. In response to your question, I'm sorry I didn't understand it perfectly the first time around. Yes, it was decided at the last meeting of the ICG that a small group of us including especially Yari Arkoo, the chair of IETF and Joe Alhadeff, and myself and maybe one or two others – Milton Mueller also – would be a sort of revision subgroup.

And from that subgroup, I have only had one reaction to the proposal I made yesterday on behalf of the ALAC, which I read to you earlier. So I don't consider that as sufficient to constitute an opposition to our friendly amendment. There was only one reaction, to which I have already replied, by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. I know we had Tijani Ben Jemaa with his hand up. I don't know if he's put his hand down or somebody has touched their

---

hand. Let's go first with Mohamed El Bashir and then – somebody tampered with your hand? Go ahead, Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

On the call, the agreement was to have a small group to work on an amendment and come up with an agreed text [inaudible] again in the mailing list, hence the discussion of the small group, [inaudible] mailing list.

So the recent last e-mail [inaudible] from Milton Mueller [inaudible] have a position [inaudible] he would like to have [inaudible] any form of input from a non-operational community [inaudible].

It seems that currently the [inaudible] an amendment, which [just says] the RFP should have input from all the stakeholders including end users or ALAC, but it does not explicitly say that [inaudible] parties are [inaudible].

I think also we [inaudible], so I hope this could be concluded today [inaudible] tomorrow to move on. I haven't seen any response from the ccTLD community. [inaudible] any response, although I did initially supported the amendment submitted [inaudible]. So I hope that a compromise could be reached [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this, Mohamed. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I raised my hand when you asked the question to Jean-Jacques and it wasn't clear for me. I wanted to ask you a clarifying question, but now it is clear. I have another question now.

I think that the extension of the deadline was [inaudible] 48 hours, and it has already passed. And we don't have reactions. We have only two reactions. I don't know. Shall we wait very long to [inaudible] this or would it be decided on, and when and who we decide on, etc.? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Tijani. Any thoughts about this? So right now—

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Could I respond to Tijani?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sure. Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. So Tijani, yes, in response I'd say that there is a bit of flexibility. I had suggested, and no one had opposed my proposal, that the extension be for two days and that would end this Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> of August end of day UTC, meaning 23:59 UTC which still gives us a few hours.

---

For your information, I have just now a few minutes ago sent a final message to the ICG list saying that I accepted Milton's modification. This is as per the debate we just had right now on this call, and especially on Mohamed's kind reminder of the content of Milton's last message.

I think it is good. It's simpler and it does keep some leeway for the non-operational communities – in other words, for the end user community – we represent.

So I am just now in the process of sending to the list of our working group the copy of my message to the ICG list. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I see Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I had to miss the first part of this call, so I'm probably asking a question which was already discussed. Jean-Jacques, what is in Milton's proposal, was that the original one that essentially said that the operational communities must be open to other contributors, and does that mean that the wording that I had originally proposed, which later got expanded, is no longer needed or is it in addition to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Jean-Jacques?

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Alan, yes, actually the latest [state of play] is that Milton's modification is a modification of your own suggested change. So it's just a shorter version of where we avoid repeating that in addition to the proposal from the operational communities, etc. So we just cut out that first part of the sentence you had proposed.

Let me look at Milton's text. He adds simply "This RFP does not preclude any form of input from the non-operational communities" which I believe is better.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Because it's now inclusive and that's what I have just sent to our list a minute ago. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I haven't seen it yet, but presumably, it's coming.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. I have not seen that on the list either. I don't know. I must say I'm a little bit lost here, because I don't know what Milton's message is. I saw [inaudible] response. That is, your response to Joe's response. [inaudible] the introduction.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone have a pointer to the list archive, so we can look at those messages ourselves?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't have that. Maybe someone is faster than me, but I hope the confirmation that my message to you has left about two minutes ago in form of an e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: Normally the address to the list archive is at the bottom of each e-mail, if the list was set up properly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So in the absence of having that at the moment, I suggest that maybe we go further down our agenda and then come back to this once we actually have the text in front of us. I just can't see anyone being able to follow this discussion without having the text in front of them. It just is a little confusing. I see Mohamed is typing. Perhaps he has a link to the list archives and we can all have a look at the [inaudible] archive link.

So that's the archive of the Internal Coordination Group list. [inaudible] RFP subgroups. If you scroll to the bottom of [inaudible]. By date, you've got first a note, final version of the charter to go out. I think we've seen that already. Then there's a note by Milton Mueller and a response by Jean-Jacques that are both there. And the note by Milton is saying that he doesn't oppose the sentiment behind Jean-Jacques [inaudible], and so he would basically [chop] something up and just say this RFP does

---

not preclude any form of input from the non-operational community. He [refutes] Joe's concerns about capacity.

So are we okay with that? And Jean-Jacques, you've already said that you agree to this. Okay, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. My last version had some extra words on it which essentially said they can't ignore it. I'm willing to take them on good faith at this point and accept what Milton is proposing. So I'm happy with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. I think we're all okay with it. Yes, Jean-Jacques, you were about to say something?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, sorry for interrupting. I was just saying thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. All right, so that's one thing. I gather this is the last chance for any other amendments to the RFP. Just to remind you all the reason why we are in the situation that we are in right now is that the charter itself is actually asking for some of the same proposals from operational communities, so we're kind of constrained already by the charter, and the reason for adding this line that we were just thinking



---

about is in order to try and save the furniture from the flood by actually still being able to bring some input to the discussion.

The big concern being that we're going to see proposals from operational communities on one hand, and soliciting the input while the ALAC's input and the input of any of the other ICG members that are not part of the operational communities [inaudible] likely to be flooded amongst the huge amount of input that might be received by the working group and could be just ignored [inaudible] like that. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you, Olivier. I think this is a good text, although maybe we didn't get what we want in terms of [inaudible] management [inaudible]. But I think also [inaudible] looking at what we have. We can influence other community proposals by providing our end user input across the board, [inaudible] a complete proposal. I think it would be more beneficial to have active engagement from our side [inaudible] community proposal and ensuring that all those [inaudible] joint proposals if the community decided to have one joint operational proposal.

That proposal we need to make sure it already has our statement principles. Our input needs to be there. [inaudible] have a good opportunity to influence any proposal by having a specific [inaudible] input added to that.

And maybe, by the way, our input might also give more weight to whatever proposal that [inaudible]. So I think [inaudible] good opportunity to have a better engagement overall. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Mohamed. We'll be looking at this shortly, a little bit later in the call. So we've done the revised RFP. We've looked at the statements of the ICG charter. I think it's quite simple [inaudible] ICG charter has now gone out as a final charter, and so it will not be able to change. No more amendments to this. That's gone out for publication.

So now we have 3.3, outcomes of the ICG conference call on the 25<sup>th</sup> of August. Any other points that Mohamed or Jean-Jacques would like to bring forward to us or any point that anybody here on the call has noted whilst listening to the call itself? Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I'd like to take this opportunity to make two remarks. The first is the importance of our colleague, Mohamed, on the chair structure of the ICG. As you remember, to begin with, that was not very much in the picture and it was going to be a leadership structure of three North Americans, or at least two. I think that, thanks to Mohamed's presence, there is more diversity.

On the other hand, of course, I would suggest that Mohamed with his much more diplomatic style than I can conjure up should perhaps not waste any opportunity to be very forceful about defending some of our principles or the items which really count for us. Because before it goes on the ICG list in the form of any e-mail, of course the choice of items for meetings, the way that these are worded and presented will depend to a very large extent on the chair structure, meaning the three people.

---

So we must really count on him, and I would personally thank him for the work he's already doing, but also to suggest that when necessary, [inaudible] very forceful about some of his principles, because we saw in the early stages how difficult it was to present our views and to have them considered, and unfortunately, it will not become easier. It will just become more difficult, so it requires a very forceful attitude. Thanks.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Mohamed, can I put you on the spot and ask now with this structure of a chair and vice chairs, have the three of you been discussing on how you are going to share the work?

**MOHAMED EL BASHIR:** That has been already done on the first conference call we had last week. There's a weekly conference call already set up [inaudible] on a weekly basis. For example, the RFP – every vice chair and also the chair is following us with the [inaudible] document trying to ensure that [inaudible] deliver the outcome on time. Also looking at and reviewing, following up the whole discussion, as well as in the planning for the next meeting.

Perfect example, I'm responsible for the [inaudible] communication, as well IGF coordination. That's something that was in the background currently [inaudible] ICG mission.

What I noticed after [inaudible] how to proceed with things. I think that's very useful. It seems there's differences between how the

---

different members conduct their work and express themselves and also the cultural differences among the group. I think [inaudible] be careful [inaudible] ensuring that everyone has the ability to raise their opinions, all of these are taken into consideration.

So [inaudible] division of admin work between the chairs [inaudible] with the staff, just because they're [inaudible] focus the last few days is following up the documents and ensuring that things are delivered on time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Sorry for cramping you up. Keep on going, Mohamed. Apologies, I thought you had finished.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I'm finished, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, you have. Okay, thanks. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible] Mohamed is very poor. He's not speaking loudly. I didn't really hear him and I don't understand everything he said. I understood the overall context, but I am afraid I missed a lot of the case of what he said. I think this is a problem and we have to address it, either the line or Mohamed to speak louder. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I must say, I had to strain a little bit to hear Mohamed. I don't know whether it's the line or something else. Could Adigo please check with Mohamed? Maybe the voice quality is bad. Okay. Back to you Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hello. Sorry, I'm using a [inaudible] phone. This time it's not the mobile. I thought it might have a better voice quality, but I'll try to raise my voice. Maybe the issue is with me, not with the channel.

To summarize, work has been divided between the three chairs after I joined with [Patrik] and it's involved coordination with the [inaudible] document follow-up, and actually each one of the vice chairs and the chair also has a specific document they need to follow with the [inaudible] to ensure that everyone's delivering on time and that the deadlines are met.

Also, besides that, following up the discussion, to ensure that people are less [inaudible] in terms of [inaudible] or at least majority of the views are being considered in drafting the document.

In my [slide], for example, on the last couple of days, I was working on IGF awareness, examples, trying to speak opportunities for ICG members to speak in main sessions, especially in the first day, and we succeeded to have that. I'm also looking at the [inaudible], for example. It is one of the things that are currently of a concern. The [inaudible] is really very difficult to navigate, and the information is not clearly displayed. So I'll be looking at that trying to resolve this issue with the staff, for example.

---

[Patrik], for example, is handling the meeting logistics [inaudible], and what I can see that [inaudible] from us in different issues and how to, for example, how to handle some responses or even advice and how to respond in some cases. So there is a weekly conference call between us to try to coordinate and follow up the work.

Then the chairs – the vice chairs – has [inaudible] express their views and I will continue doing that. On the last few days [inaudible] was taking the lead in terms of the RFP regarding the discussion [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Mohamed. We have to move on to the next part of our agenda. I think that's good feedback from both of you on the ICG call. When is the next call supposed to take place? Because one concern I have is we were only told 48 hours – or in fact 24 hours – in advance when the ICG call was going to take place. Is there a calendar of these calls or...? Mohamed or Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I suggest Mohamed respond.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hi. There will be no conference calls planned currently until the face-to-face meeting, which will be on 6<sup>th</sup> of September. But if there is a conference call, it will be announced and the details to the links in Adobe Connect is already public.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Mohamed. Is this going to be part of the IGF in Istanbul or is this a separate meeting outside the IGF in Istanbul?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: No, it's not part of the IGF. It's a separate meeting. One full day face-to-face meeting. It will be on Saturday after the IGF, the details, it will be announced soon after an agenda to be proposed and agreed between ICG members. [inaudible] will be available. Silent observers are allowed to the room, as usual. But in this case, the room is small, so it's in one of the hotels near the venue but it will be small, so there will be no announcement regarding silent observers just to make sure that it isn't over crowded.

For the LA meeting, there has been discussion in the mailing list about having the meeting itself [inaudible] at the end of the meeting [inaudible] members to participate in an ICG panel workshop that will be in [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Next, now go to the next agenda item. That's going to be the review of the charter. If staff could please put a copy of the charter up. I'll hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa. Now we're not speaking about the ICG charter anymore. We're now moving on to the names part of the discussion, the cross-community working group on IANA stewardship transition which now probably will have another name. We've had Tijani Ben Jemaa and Leon Sanchez working

---

on the charter drafting team. And the first – maybe not even the first – the draft open for the communities to comment on that draft is now on the screen.

I'll give the floor to Tijani Ben Jemaa to take us through this and to take us through any of the specific points which we might wish to comment on. I think there is still time for us to comment on, although it really is the very last moment, and so we would be looking at having input within the next 24 hours or so. Maybe 48 hours maximum. I understand that other parts of ICANN have actually now sign and ratify the charter, although not all SOs and ACs have so far. Most of them – well, some of them have. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. This is the charter that has been drafted by the drafting team from the community. I was, with Leon Sanchez, the two [ALAC] members on this drafting team. There was also Julie Hammer, but she was appointed by the [SSAC] group.

The first draft was done by all of the naming system, people of GNSO and the ccNSO. It was [inaudible] and we managed to have something more or less – it is not fully acceptable, but it is more or less acceptable. The main thing that I want you to know that this working group, this cross-community working group, will be dealing with the mailing function of IANA only. [inaudible] function, but to be mainly addressing this function. Any other issue can be discussed also, but mainly to be about the naming function of the IANA.



---

We raise this point because we don't see where the user community can comment on the other functions, on protocol function, on the numbering function other than here [inaudible] cross-community working group. So normally all the community has to be represented there and it must address all the functions, but the reality is not that. It will address mainly the naming function of IANA and it will be open to discuss any other issue. So this is the solution we've found and [Avri] helped a lot in finding the right text to be accepted by the others because it is not easy to convince people.

There is also this point of accountability. There was a long discussion about that. People said accountability is out of the scope of this working group – cross-community working group – and others said, no, it is tightly linked to and we have to include it in the charter.

Finally we included it in the charter, and I think now we have something that we can accept regarding the accountability to be linked to the IANA function transition.

What else? I think that in general the overall text is acceptable. There is already the ccNSO who accepted it, who approved it. There is also the SSAC who accepted it. They made a remark. They said, "We can propose this friendly amendment to be done, but if it is not possible to do it, we accept it as it is." So we have now at least two groups that accepted it. [inaudible] yet to vote on it, but this is the suggestion now.

What is the [choices] for our community? I think if there is a big concern about one point we can perhaps think about it and perhaps we can not

---

adopt it. But if there is not major objection or a major issue, a major concern, I think we have to adopt the charter.

If we have a friendly amendment, if there is something light to do, perhaps we may propose it and it may be included. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'd like to talk about the non-naming issues. Two questions, really. The first is let us say, as an example – I'm not saying it's going to happen – that the addressing community comes out and says, "We believe that the current IANA function should be given over to [inaudible], a French national. After due consideration, we think he's trustworthy and that's how it's going to go," which essentially says it's not going to be an ICANN function or not ICANN related, which is right now.

Was this kind of issue discussed? That is, since ICANN right now is in the midst of we don't tend to make the policy recommendations, we are in the process, was this discussed at all? That's question number one.

Question number two is, to some extent, I'm less worried about the numbering and protocol issues as I am about the things that aren't in any of the baskets. One of them that was raised the other day by Christopher on our list was charges. Is this now going to be a for-charge function that the various operational units will have to pay for or is it

---

still going to be a free service operated by someone out of their goodwill, which is currently what the situation is.

Were either of these things discussed? I'm presuming the latter one is within our scope because it's other stuff, but I'm just wondering to what extent were either of these kinds of things discussed in the drafting team? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. [inaudible] function, which is now done by VeriSign. At first, there was refusal by VeriSign to include it in the charter, to include it in the scope of the cross-community working group, but I opposed and I said it is exactly where we have to discuss it. They said there's no contract between VeriSign and ICANN. Yes, that's right, but there is a [contract] between the NTIA and VeriSign. So this issue must be included and it is now included.

Also, thanks to Avri's drafting and the text proposed, I think now the first question. This is exactly why we asked to give the possibility to discuss not only the naming function, but any other issue that the cross-community working group wants to discuss.

As you said, [inaudible] give it to XYZ and I don't know [inaudible]. I think that the cross-community working group has to address this question and has to give the point of view of the community. [inaudible] cross-community working group.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Tijani. I have a couple of questions for you. First, regarding the membership of the working group itself, is this restricted to ICANN parties or does it allow for people who are not in any way part of any of the ICANN community? Are they able to take part?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, the cross-community working group, the cross-ICANN community working group. It is not like the Coordination Group where you can find people that are not from ICANN. This is the cross-community, the ICANN Cross Community Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] follows.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There will be [charter] organization and those are the organizations of ICANN. And the membership will come from the [charter] organization.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I'm going to tell you why I'm asking the question. It's because in the interest of openness, we now have a charter in the ICG and a request for proposals in the ICG that asks for operational community to send in their proposals. We now are told within the ICG, "Oh, well, the ALAC and all those that are not operational community have to actually go to those operational communities and take part in those operational communities to bring their input."

---

So admittedly, we would have some of our working group members – our IANA Issues Working Group members – that would have to go on the IETF mailing list and the RIR mailing list, and we would have to argue that the discussions have to be open over there for the point of view of our members to be taken into account at face value on the same level as their regular members and their regular contributors.

Now, if we turn the tables the other way around and look at the naming side of things, we now have a cross-community working group that seems to be restricted, as you just said, now to the SOs and ACs and SGs of ICANN, how would someone who is in the IETF, for example, or who is not in ICANN, how would they be able to take part in the operational community for the names part of the discussion? Or are [inaudible]? I just have a concern on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, Olivier. You are right to have this concern. First of all, you have to know that the IETF will make its own work and they will [inaudible] directly their proposals. So they will not go through the cross-community working group. And so we do also the numbering people.

I understand your concern, but this is done [and] the cross-community working group [and] ICANN cross-community working group and it will be driven by some chartering organizations and the number will come from those chartering organizations.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Tijani. So in your view, is this transparent and is it open?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not my view. It is what is on the table. The conception of the cross-community working group is like this, or we have to oppose to this conception from the beginning. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tijani. I'm raising the point because I think that this is one point that is going to be raised at some point or might be raised at some point by people that are not taking part in or are not part of the usual suspect.

The primary thing we have to be really concerned about is the actual viability and legitimacy of those plans that are going to come out of the various communities, bearing in mind the NTIA has asked for a global multi-stakeholder process, and has not asked for small [inaudible] to be proposing plans. And I might be – I'm using provocative words on this, but to an external view, an external eye, this might end up being accused of being just some [inaudible] of people.

So Mohamed El Bashir and then Alan Greenberg. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: A question here for Tijani. Will the group be working, for example, to [inaudible] one proposal at least [inaudible] between the [inaudible] naming, the gTLD and the ccTLD community?

---

Currently, if you look at the operational community, the number of proposals either will be three or four. Either we'll have one [inaudible] proposal for naming or two separate proposals for naming [inaudible] discussion within the group regarding this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Mohamed. Has someone heard well what Mohamed said?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed was saying that there was a discussion with regards to the naming functions that there could be a proposal by the GNSO and a proposal by the ccNSO, so separate proposals for the generic names and the country code names. Has this been thought of?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that the objective is to issue a transition plan, one transition plan. I don't think it is possible to have two. I think they have to work together to have one single transition plan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I guess it probably is a bit early to find out at the moment. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On that latter thing, it's conceivable there will be a single plan which handles the two differently. I think that's less than optimal, but maybe one could come up with – Olivier, on your original issue of

---

openness to other participants, the charter does allow for the concept of observers who have full speaking and interaction rights, if I read it correctly, but do not have voting rights should anything come to a vote. So it's not because that they're completely locked out. It's just that, clearly, they must be able to convince the majority of the inside people of a case if it's going to win.

I dare say that even if that was not the case, the majority of the active group is likely to be people from the ACs and SOs, so even if they had voting rights, it might not really change the situation.

It's not optimal in my mind, but it's perhaps manageable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Another quick question before we move on to the next task of our agenda. With the SSAC friendly amendment, do we have the wording of the SSAC friendly amendment and is this something that we could support?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will find it out. I think it is not important. It is very – in the same e-mail Patrik's had, [inaudible] possible to make it, we agree on the charter as is. So it is not a very important point. I have to find it. One moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. In the meantime, while you look for it, Tijani, are there any comments on the charter or points that we should make on this or are we okay with signing this charter off and proposing it to the ALAC for



---

ratification? In other words proposing it for an online vote by the ALAC?  
Or do we need more time?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

If the question is asked for me, I would say that it is the maximum we can have in this cross-community working group. After the long discussion we had, after the long weeks we met and we discussed, I think this is more or less the most acceptable, I have to say, consensus.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Tijani. So I'm asking now everyone else on the working group here, since it's our job to make a recommendation to the ALAC and then get the ALAC to vote on it. So anyone else has a view on this? Should we give it another 24 hours for everyone to have a final read through it? I realize that it's just been 24 hours – just over 24 hours – that we've sent this out to the list. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. I'll be candid. I have not read it as thoroughly as I would've wanted to, but I have a question. Let's say that I or you or someone else come up with something that we perceive as an absolute necessity. What are we going to do, put an option in our vote to say we demand – we will not accept it without this change? I'm not quite sure what we'd do if someone comes up with an idea.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I believe at the moment, it's open still for comments and voting. And you've seen that the SSAC has come up with ratification of the charter, yet they've also proposed a friendly amendment. What we could do would be, before ratifying it, we could propose a friendly amendment to whatever we found that we absolutely wish to change. The only issue is that of time. That's all. We need to get this thing done as soon as possible and that's why we just need to make decisions quickly. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Then certainly for my personal point of view, I would prefer the time because I haven't had a chance to look at it as thoroughly as I want. I don't know how many other people are in that situation. If it's only me, then let's go ahead, but if there are other people, I think we should give people a bit of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I suggest two things. We give this another 24-hour opening period for our own comments within our working group here. So 24 hours makes it exactly 24 hours until tomorrow, and tomorrow if there are no further questions or comments from us, then we can provide the ALAC with a green light for the ALAC to move on it, and therefore the vote can then start before the weekend, the whole point being that we just don't want to – and we probably would have to go for a three-day vote, three working day vote. Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I would suggest if anyone does come up with something, that we add an extra question. Do you believe we should push for this friendly amendment or non-friendly amendment or whatever?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So this is it, yeah. This is then the next thing is, with regards to any friendly amendments, if anyone believes there should be an amendment in this group, then please send it to our own mailing list. I would like to make sure everyone else comments on that and says, “Yes, let’s go on,” or “No, let’s not go.” Because obviously if we are going to ask for an amendment we need to be moving on this.

I cannot give you, Heidi, any opening day for the vote because I don’t know if there are going to be amendments. If there are going to be amendments, we can’t start a vote. But if we do proceed forward with a vote, then we could have a three-day vote, have it start on Monday the 1<sup>st</sup>, finish on Wednesday. So Monday the 1<sup>st</sup> at 00:00 UTC, finish on Wednesday at 23:59 UTC which means that by Wednesday, the 4<sup>th</sup> of September or Thursday the 5<sup>th</sup>, we would be able to come back to the chartering process and [inaudible] we’ve ratified this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I would suggest that if anyone does come up with any amendments that they, number one, provide wording not just a concept; and number two, other members of the IANA transitions mailing list should either say yes or no but don’t just be silent within 24 hours or so.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks for this, Alan. So let's do this then. Action item: all members of the IANA Issues Working Group to review the CWGDC draft charter until 15:00 UTC on Friday, the 29<sup>th</sup> of August. That's the one. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Alan said more or less what I wanted to say before. We need a proposal. We [inaudible] raising the point. We need text.

And second point, I think that we can vote on the charter and the friendly amendment if we agree that if the [inaudible] is not agreed we can accept the charter, because timing is of the essence. We are losing time and it is better to have the agreement of the ALAC and we can [inaudible] we have the friendly amendment. We propose it. If it accepted, [inaudible]. If it's not accepted, we agree on the charter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. If we propose an amendment – if we, by tomorrow, spend time tomorrow, we have an amendment that you can propose directly back to the [DC], how quickly would you be able to get an answer back from the [design team]?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not know, but I'm sure we'll have a quick reply. But it's [inaudible]. I cannot be affirmative. People may be traveling because we have two chairs of this drafting team and they normally respond very quickly. But I don't know. Perhaps they are [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Well, we'll leave it at that [inaudible]. Second thing, second action item, for Tijani Ben Jemaa to ask our IANA Issues Working Group on the mailing list if we can approve the friendly amendment or if we can support the friendly amendment from the SSAC.

Alan, you still have your hand up, but I also saw Cheryl putting her hand up after you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There is another action item. Tijani to send to the list the friendly amendment of the SSAC to the list so that people will know what is proposed by the SSAC. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I would imagine – we’re speaking about the same thing. You’re sending the SSAC friendly amendment to the IANA Issues, and [inaudible] asking whether we can support the friendly amendment from the SSAC. And the second here is not the mailing list. It’s the ALAC can support. It’s the IANA Issues. So the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group can support the friendly amendment.

Over to you Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, and I hope you can hear me clearly. The question I wanted to raise is – and this is not to counter the action item at all. The action item is important and [inaudible] done within the next 24 hours, absolutely.

But for those of us who have gone through, at least on an initial read-through, of the charter [inaudible] and currently supported by SSAC, etc., and indeed have no issues with the friendly amendment [inaudible]. It is our intention to be very clear and recommend to the ALAC that is approved?

I think we should give really clear advice with time pressure being what it is. I just want to make sure that we give an affirmative recommendation – or not. I personally [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible] just to be clear. But I don’t want it just to be we’ve discussed and we haven’t made any additional amendment suggestions and I don’t see that we need to. [inaudible] clear on that as well. But we are going to be [inaudible] very clearly to the ALAC that this advice to the [inaudible] that there is a good reason for them to accept and agree to

---

this charter. Otherwise I just see it risking another [inaudible] discussion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Quick answer, Cheryl, yes. So let's move on to the next part of our agenda and the next part is how the ALAC will participate in the IANA development, and these are just the next steps. And this is primarily for Mohamed and Jean-Jacques to let us know what the next steps are with regards to the IANA, the ICG, what they need from us and what we need to tell them next. What are the next things we need to work on?

So first I'll open the floor for Jean-Jacques Subrenat to ask us that question of what he needs from us specifically, and we can take it from there.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I was just about to suggest that Mohamed reply to this, but I do have a quick remark. It's that it depends on the time which Mohamed will remind us of just now. But I would say also that the sooner we get it well-structured, the more time we will have among ourselves to improve it before sending it to the ICG. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Mohamed?

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. I think it's important we have a clear plan how we're going to contribute to the different community panels for developing the proposals.

If you can see, for example, this numbering community, each RIR currently has its own process, which [inaudible] will be consolidated or input will be bottom-up after the level of the NRO, and then they will, at level, come up with a proposal.

So, for example, AfriNIC, they have ALSes part of AFRALO who are members in AfriNIC [inaudible] as a participant. And we can have other members who are interested who participate at the higher level [inaudible].

So I think it's important that our member [inaudible] ALSes to be active in participation, but the question will be what our objectives are. What are we going to say? What are the principles or what are the end user issues we need to raise that proposal? And I think that's a discussion that needs to be done within this group and within the At-Large community about what are the issues that they need us to raise or need to be considered in the [inaudible]. I think that's [inaudible] point now.

Then we have to come up with a structured way how to [inaudible] those issues to different community channels. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mohamed. So at the moment we have a list of mailing lists on the IANA issues homepage. Following the RIR discussion so far, we have the AfriNIC IANA Oversight mailing list, Tijani Ben Jemaa and



---

Alberto Soto. In the APNIC IANA Oversight, we have Yashuichi Kitamura and Alberto Soto. The [ARIN] PPML, which is the public policy mailing list – and this is very likely not going to be the place where the IANA issues discussions are going to take place, but at the moment it's there temporarily. We have Gordon Chillcott and Alberto Soto [inaudible] LACNIC IANA Oversight discussion, we have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto. The RIPE IANA Oversight mailing list has not been created yet. On the IETF and IAB side of things, the only person who is actually in all of these at the moment appears to be Alberto Soto, although I know [inaudible] is also I think on some of these mailing lists, because I've seen him write e-mails and so on.

I totally get your point that we need to be putting together a strategy of what are our objectives for each of the operational communities. That will definitely help. Maybe this is the next [inaudible] to the point. Tijani

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. For the IETF, Avri Doria is on the list and she is working with them. So I think we have a good [inaudible] who is following. As for the AfriNIC mailing list, it is silent – absolutely silent – and I plan to write to them to [inaudible] ask him about that. Why is he silent Is there no discussion? Are they planning to discuss the IANA transition on this list or why this list was created? So this is what I am planning to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Tijani. It's very helpful to know. It could be that it's caused by the fact the RFP hasn't been sent out yet. I mean, there might

---

be some movement after the RFP is signed to the different RIRs and so on. But yeah, it is strange. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just as the expected activities [inaudible] expected activities from APNIC, we should note that [inaudible] probably be in a position to report rather than predict. After we have a look at the final agenda [inaudible] APNIC meeting held face to face in Brisbane in the second and third week of September immediately after the [inaudible] workshop and then there's an APTLD meeting and an APNIC meeting following. That is where I predict a reasonable amount of discussion and [inaudible] both formally and informally occur. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, your voice came out a little bit muffled. What I understood from what you've said is there will be some movement. There's likely to be more movement in the APNIC face to face meeting, and also after IGF in Istanbul. Is this correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is the APNIC meeting taking place in Istanbul? No?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, in Brisbane.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's in Brisbane, okay. Okay, so there's going to be some movement at that point. Okay, next is [inaudible]. We can't hear you at the moment.

Okay, let's move on to Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I want to make a suggestion. Apparently we were not able to propose or give a proposal within the ICG and we have little probability of being heard because we need to provide input through the operational communities. But I believe that someone drafting the ICG document forgot to put a comma somewhere because the document named all the operational parts, but it also says some other worldwide stakeholders.

So taking this into account, I would suggest to make a request to those appointing the members or to those drafting the document for several reasons. Because we do not have representation. I mean, in fact, we cannot provide our input and we are talking about the ICG document and this document will be submitted [inaudible] to the NTIA. I would say that the ICG has no legal ground or legal standing to submit the document because it is ICANN the one who has signed the contract. And if the ICG delivers the document and end users have any problem that was not foreseen, it was wrongly foreseen, it would be ICANN the one who has the possibility of making the necessary amendment. And of course these modifications wouldn't be made on the operational

---

communities and the ICG is devoted to operational communities. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. That's a very good point. I'm afraid, though, that it opens a brand new chapter here which will require us to have another 20 minutes to discuss this. It's a fair point that you have raised.

Mohamed, can you give us some feedback as to why it was decided by the ICG that they would submit this proposal directly to the NTIA? If I recall correctly in the first instance of the ICANN [inaudible] proposing the process, and then fortunately, that has quickly disappeared from the website, by the way. It shows that the ICG would be passing this proposal to the ICANN Board and the ICANN Board will pass it to NTIA.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Just to confirm that there was no decision from ICG regarding submitting [inaudible] proposal to NTIA directly. I think maybe this could be assumptions or some members thought that this is the case, but it [inaudible] been discussed as a group and I'm sure it will be definitely one of the issues that need to be [inaudible] end of the process, how that is going to be done.

The focus now was on getting the proposal, [inaudible] the proposal for [inaudible] requirements for the proposal, but the submission of the proposal has not been extensively discussed yet. That's my opinion this. I don't think I can be able to [inaudible] from ICG to NTIA.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Mohamed. Any other points? I was going to add, if that's the case, then we need to be very vigilant about this discussion, because it certainly is going to make some difference to the process, and I certainly have also seen some [inaudible] totally independent.

With regards to the point that was raised by Alberto on our involvement in our different communities, in the different operational communities, I don't think we have very much of a choice at the moment. It looks as though we need to be involved both in the operational community and also as our own working group to our two representatives on the ICG. Bearing in mind, it's not going to be an easy talk.

Let's think positively and see that we can probably influence in many ways. Certainly as far as names are concerned, we are going to have a prime seat at the table and I can see that many of us on this working group will be involved in the working group – the overall cross-community working group that is being put together. That's one step forward. On the other two, we'll just have to go to those operational communities.

I take your point here that we need to define a strategy. We need to define what we want. What are our objectives for each one of those operational communities? And maybe the right way to do it would be to perhaps put people in charge of developing a plan or at least – I think the least thing we could do would be to lift our objective for each of the operational communities. That then we'll make sure that we can all sing the same tune when we take part in those mailing lists. Alan Greenberg?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the issue of submission path, my recollection is what ICANN committed to was that the proposal would be submitted to them and they would pass it on unchanged, but with comments.

So the only real difference is perhaps timing. I'm happy to let the various bodies, the NTIA and the IANA Board thresh that out – not the IANA the ICANN Board thresh that out. I don't see any substantive difference other than perhaps a delay waiting for ICANN's comments. And NTIA certainly would not act without ICANN's comments anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Olivier, I was doing some research, and [inaudible] investigation or research, but I have read in some document that it reads ICANN – and I imagine it is the Board – that ICANN will not submit the document to voting the final document, the ICG final document, to voting but that there is a firm or a study that will agree on certain topics.

So based on that, the document should go from the ICG to the one who created this, and I think it is the Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Alberto. I don't see how much of a difference that makes, depending on what you said and what Alan just said now.

---

Ultimately, if it goes to the Board and the Board passes it on to the NTIA unchanged but just having comments – commenting on it – that doesn't make that much of a difference [than] the Board has to vote on it. Of course the vote could just put negative comments on it, about every single point that is [inaudible]. That's a different view.

Okay. We are past the end of our call. We're eight minutes past the end. Maybe our next steps it looks are going to be developing objectives for each one of the operational communities. I think that came out quite clearly with that, that more people joined the operational community mailing list. I thank Tijani and Alberto and those who have been on the mailing list so far being able to report back to us.

It appears that the IETF is moving faster than others at the moment in that they have drafted a final charter for their own working group that will be submitting the proposal from the IETF. I'm not sure whether I've forwarded this over to our IANA Issues Working Group, but they might wish to look at this because it will basically show the scope of the work that is going to take place in the IETF with regards to the protocol, and [they] might wish to comment on this before they proceed forward with it. Though I think, again, it's very, very late for us to comment on it. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Olivier, I'd like to know if Avri Doria is on the mailing list of this group, because we need to be here and to report more or less what is happening in the IETF and she's always with them. She knows

---

everything about what they are doing. So if she's not on the mailing list, please add her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I am looking at the list of members of this working group and I see Avri Doria listed, so I believe she is on the mailing list, yes. But one has to remember, she also acts for the [inaudible] as well, so there might be conflicts for her, depending on what the issue is. But if it's just reporting about what's going on in the IETF, I absolutely [inaudible] I hope she will be able to report to us on what's going on there.

I'll also remind you all there is a small coordination group between the NCSG and the ALAC on the IANA issues. I [inaudible] both Mohamed and Jean-Jacques are on that list. Avri is on that list as well and the chair of the NCSG is on that list. If you have anything to pass on over to the NCSG, any comments, [inaudible] channel [inaudible] as well.

I think that's the end of the call. We have to be mindful the interpreter has been working for a long time. So I thank you all for this. We have a couple of action items. Let's follow up on the mailing list with our objectives for each one of the operational communities and start moving on that. The charter is behind us. The RFP is soon going to be behind us. Please have a quick look [inaudible] of the IANA and cross-community working group charter by tomorrow, the same time as today, and we'll proceed forward after that.



---

And with this Good morning, good afternoon, goodnight. This call is adjourned. Thanks, everyone. Thanks to Veronica. Thanks to staff. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has adjourned. Thank you very much for joining.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**