

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. Welcome to today's At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function on Thursday, 11 September 2014, at 14:30 UTC.

On today's call on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Vanda Scartezini, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gordon Chillcott, Roberto Gaetano, Sam Lafranco, and Glenn McKnight. On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero. Apologies noted from Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will be joining us shortly. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisela Gruber. Our interpreters today are Veronica and David on the Spanish channel.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel and also to speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you.

Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Gisella. Have we missed anybody's name in the roll call? It doesn't sound like we have, so the roll call is complete.

Now, I'll ask for the adoption of the agenda where today we will be reviewing our action items.

---

*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.*

---

Then we will be having an update from Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir, our two representatives on the IANA coordinating group who had the meeting in Istanbul. One of whom had the meeting face-to-face in Istanbul, and the other one following the meeting remotely.

Then we'll have very quick update on the Cross-Community Working Group charter for IANA stewardship.

Then finally we'll be working on our next steps, first looking at the different activities that have taken place in the different regional Internet registry lists and IETF mailing lists and also discussing whether we wish to be putting together a proposal, what kind of ALAC input we would like to put there.

I'll also be providing details in that part of the call about my activities during the IGF in Istanbul last week and the various meetings that I've had with various people.

Going back to Agenda Item 1, we need to adopt the agenda. Is there any additional business? Anything that anybody on the call would like to add to this agenda? Seeing no one put their hand up, the agenda is adopted.

We go to Number 2, review of the action items on the last call 28 August. There are two action items there. They're both complete. Tijani was to send the SSAC-friendly amendment to the IANA Ad Hoc Working Group on the U.S. Government Transition of the IANA Function Working Group mailing list. That was done. Tijani was to ask the IANA Issues Working Group on the mailing list if the ALAC can support the friendly amendment from the SSAC. This was also complete.

---

We can move now to Number 3. Number 3 is the update on the ICG. For this, we have Jean-Jacques and Mohamed. They were, as I just mentioned, in Istanbul last week. Or Mohamed was in Istanbul last week, and Jean-Jacques attended the meeting remotely. Let's hear from them as to what the highlights of the meeting were and whether we need to provide input and what we need to do now. Who wishes to start, Mohamed or Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Whichever. Mohamed, are you on the line?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think Mohamed has just joined the bridge.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's on the bridge. Yes, go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry to interrupt you. Mohamed is only able to stay on the call for 30 minutes, so you may wish to start with Mohamed. Sorry for interrupting.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. Okay, thank you. I did not see this, so thanks. Let's have Mohamed then speak first and provide his report as to what has been happening in Istanbul. Mohamed El Bashir, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Mohamed has just disconnected, so we're just calling him back straight away.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, that's not very helpful. Thank you, Gisella. Let's swap people around. Let's have Jean-Jacques, since Jean-Jacques has not disconnected. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Hello, all. It's nice to be back with you. Waiting for Mohamed to be connected again, perhaps I could offer this overview of what I saw as the results of the Istanbul meeting of the ICG. I won't go into any of the details because I'm sure that Mohamed will give us an accurate account of that.

By the way, I did attend the whole meeting remotely, if that's the technical word, but not to be construed as I remotely remember something. I was remotely connected, but I did attend very fully that meeting.

My first remark is about the way it was organized. It was good. The chair, Alisa Cooper, was also connected remotely. She didn't turn up in that meeting because of family commitments, but the morning session

---

was chaired very well by Mohamed and the afternoon session very well chaired by Patrick.

I think the most important thing which came out of that meeting was the timeline. I would like to repeat this to you just in case some of you did not take note of all the dates. I'll go through them one-by-one. There are nine steps.

Step 0 was coming up with the RFP for the input. Step 1 was community to develop proposals and to send them to the ICG by 15 January 2015. Step 2 is with the ICG draft. It has to be ready by 13 March 2015. Step 3, review the draft response, and the target date is 15 May 2015. Step 4 is testing, and there the target date is 7 July 2015. Step 5 is ICG final responses to be sent to the NTIA on 19 June 2015. Step 6, a review of the final response on 17 July 2015. Step 7, proposals delivery target is 31 July 2015. Hopefully, but that doesn't depend on the ICG, Step 8 will be the NTIA approval or reaction at least on 30 September 2015.

I'd like to underline that all these dates which are dependent on the ICG, we will of course be working on that. Some of these dates are not entirely dependent on us. For instance, the testing phase because we're not alone. That's Step 4. Also, Step 8, NTIA approval or reaction 30 September 2015. That will depend on domestic U.S. policies. It will depend on a lot of things. That's for the timeline which I've read out to you.

Another few remarks I would like to offer is that we also had approval or agreement on several things: on the charter, on the request for proposals regarding secretarial services. Now that has been published,

---

and we're already receiving submissions from interested candidates to carry out the secretarial function for the ICG.

I'd like to remind us that whoever is chosen, in fact, it will be paid for on the ICANN budget. I say this just to keep a sense of reality as to the word independence. I think it should work out alright.

There was also an RFP for the contributions of communities. There was a lot of work done on this. I think now with the various amendments, including the one that had been suggested on our part – thank you, Alan and others – that has been taken into account. Now this does not exclude anyone from sending contributions for the final draft.

Hello? Is someone interrupting?

I insist on this on because in this way contributions are not restricted to so-called operational communities only. In that way, At-Large through Mohamed and myself can contribute, of course, to this.

Another remark I would like to make is that now we're a good two months into the ICG exercise, and you remember that very early on the GAC had requested five instead of two seats. The ALAC representatives were the first to approve of that and vote in favor of that change. But I must say that as a body the GAC is nonexistent in this meeting so far. There have been very valuable contributions by [Manel] from but also from – hello? Hello? Is someone interrupting?

Kavous Arasteh, the representative of I think Iran at the GAC, he as an individual contributor has made some very important remarks. I would just like to highlight the very great difference between the GAC as a

---

body, as I said, almost inexistent on the one hand and an individual contributor, the representative from Iran, who has been extremely active.

Now this brings me to a more personal evaluation I would like to offer to you. It's that over the years in the ICANN environment, I've heard things being said about individuals. For instance, it's very easy to crack a joke about Milton, for instance, but this neglects his real contribution. I must say that in the ICG, he's certainly one of those who is making a valuable contribution.

In the same way, I've heard over the years some things which are not always very kind about this or that representative of the GAC. This time, I must say that although he has been nitpicking and certainly not a convenient person, occasionally he has put his foot down on some very important principles. Frankly, I say this because I have felt occasionally quite alone in defending principles, and this he has done in wording, in the fact of saying that you cannot put in a draft that someone is wrong or someone is right. They are simply options, etc. Some very basic stuff.

My last remark is about something important is – hello? Hello? Is there someone interrupting?

I'll take that again. I have a sense of something important which is looming on the horizon and that as we get along in the work in the ICG and the little stuff is being settled, there is something much more portentous, much wider, and much more important in the long run that is building up. It is that there will be a rift of opinion among members of the ICG as to the limits we should impose upon ourselves to our plan.

---

In other words, for instance, the debate these past two days on our ICG list has been whether we would go so far as to question or claim that we should keep open the possibility of an IANA [?] contract which would be outside of the ICANN system. Some people would feel uncomfortable; others claim that it is as a matter of principle also open to discussion.

By the way, as you may have guessed, I am in the second category. I think that this is the opportunity to put everything on the table and to examine all avenues without excluding any and without unnecessary self-censorship on the part of the ICG.

I presented to you just now over the past few minutes my personal overview of what was done and what needs to be done or what lies ahead. This was not the detailed account, but I'll refer now to Mohamed to do that if he wishes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. This is very helpful, indeed, and that certainly was a very good summary of what has happened. One quick question for you: has the ICG worked on the issue of conflict resolution if the different proposals do not agree with each other? Are there procedures for the ICG to follow to find out how they will resolve this?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, in response to your question, this is still under discussion, but as far as I'm aware, there is no resolution yet. Several things have been



---

discussed and, in fact, documents exchanged over our ICG list over the past few days and, in fact, during the Istanbul meeting. For instance, the current conflict of interest documents or guidelines as used in ICANN and other things like that, but there is no set formula for the time being on that.

I think that some people amongst my colleagues are expecting that the chair and vice chairs will as a matter of authority and because it's their role manage to iron out major differences. But to answer truthfully to your question, Olivier, that is not engraved in the marble as yet. Does that answer your question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. Yes, I totally understand.

Now I know that Mohamed El Bashir has joined us again, and he has to leave quite soon. Perhaps let's first have him produce his feedback on the meeting, and then we'll open the floor for questions and comments from everyone. Mohamed, you have the floor. Mohamed El Bashir? I could hear him a bit earlier, and now he seems to have gotten muted, which is exactly the opposite of what we want. Gisella, come to the rescue. Yes, thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

It did sound as though he was having a side conversation, and he is unmuted and hopefully he will hear us. Mohamed? Mohamed?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, in the absence of Mohamed at the moment, let's open the floor for questions to Jean-Jacques about his very useful report. Certainly have learned a number of things here. I'm glad to hear that the dynamics of the group are slowly working out and putting themselves in place, which is certainly good news. The floor is open. No questions from anyone? Okay.

I had a quick question for you, Jean-Jacques. I've done a cut-and-paste. I took very quick notes about the difficult steps which you mentioned for the proposals, etc. The first step really, the first deadline is for the communities to develop proposals by 15 January. These, I believe, are the operational communities to develop the proposals. Is that correct – 15 January 2015?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. Well, there are two things. You remember that part of our argument and what we as representatives of the At-Large were negotiating was that there should not be any exclusion as to the contributions. They should come from all sectors.

Now some in the operational community especially would argue that the formal "proposals" should come only from them, but because of all the arguing and the negotiating, I think it is accepted now that the community – that is to say also us – we have to send in our proposals by 15 January 2015.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Jean-Jacques. For this I understand now because you did mention earlier the RFP for contributions of communities, so not only contributions from operational communities. That's correct, isn't it?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Excuse me. I just missed something. Could you repeat that? Oliver, could you please repeat that? I'm sorry. I just missed it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, contributions from communities. So the RFP is being drafted for receiving contributions from communities, not just from operational communities. You mentioned this does not exclude the ALAC, for example. Is that correct?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No, it does not say specifically the ALAC or this or that other body, but that's the whole point. We negotiated so that there would not be any exclusions. As far as my understanding of it is concerned, yes, we as the ALAC should send in a proposal by 15 January 2015 at the latest.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Jean-Jacques.

Next, there is also the question looking at the list you've seen on the Adobe Connect, I'm not quite sure. It says review of the draft response and the target is 15 May. I believe that's a review by the NTIA of the

---

draft response. Or is that review by the ICG of the whole response? Or is that perhaps a public comments review?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I think that is not just inside the ICG. That is wider. Since Mohamed is back on the call, I think we should now give him a chance to speak and ask him also to reply to this specific question. Mohamed? Mohamed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This has not been working very well. We can hear Mohamed when he speaks, and now we can't hear him.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I heard him speak to his neighbors, but unfortunately I can't get him. Well, waiting for Mohamed to come online, if I may, Olivier, say that looking again at this timetable, it is not absolutely definite, but I think it makes sense in this way.

We took into account several factors. First of all, the reasonable time it would take for communities to react but also toward the end the time it would be necessary for the U.S. authorities to act.

I think I heard Mohamed. Mohamed, can you come online?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is becoming a gag, isn't it? In search of Mohamed El Bashir. Right, it's not working at the moment, I'm afraid. There was a question over in

---

the chat. Do we have a written document that summarizes your comment? Is there going to be a written document from the ICG that will summarize the meeting resolutions, etc.?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. If I may here again answer whilst we're trying to connect Mohamed back. Yes, there will be, but it usually takes a few days, maybe a week, for whoever is ensuring the secretarial function just now to come out with a résumé of the points agreed and the action items for the future, so we will be able to see this.

This morning or yesterday, I sent to our IANA transition, etc., etc., Working Group mailing list something which was circulated yesterday on the ICG list with all the documents as published. There's the timeline. There's the RFP for the secretariat and all the rest. In the same spirit, I'll send around to you the report on the meeting itself in Istanbul when that is available.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That will be great. Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. There's a question in the chat from Evan who doesn't have voice.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, may I?

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

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'd like to take up Evan's point. For those who cannot see the screen, I'll just read his comment briefly: "I don't have voice into the call. My question to JJS is about the GAC. If there was such a push to expand the number of GAC members but so far we have been ineffective, said one individual, this works badly for both sides. What can be done so that there is a more satisfying level of participation from governments?" Very good question.

I think I answered it partly earlier on, Evan, but I'm glad to repeat this. First of all, I think that we were right as ALAC to support the call by the GAC to have an enlarged membership. That was done, and I think that our role in calling for this solution was not neglected or negligent.

The second thing is that we knew beforehand that it's always difficult for the GAC to speak with one voice simply because of its working methods. Its internal discipline is such that when they do not have consensus, they simply cannot voice a GAC opinion, so that's understandable.

What I'm disappointed by is not that because I know about that, especially as a former diplomat. What I'm disappointed at is that they have not gone to the trouble, or at least have not managed, to express a joint position on some of the questions. For instance, on the RFP for the secretarial function, on various things we did not have a GAC position, which is quite unfortunate.

This is in no way compensated for by the fact that one of the GAC members is very present and very vocal. It's two separate things. My

---

goodness, we have one GAC member who is vocal, but that does not dispensate the GAC as a body to get its act together. That's what I'm actually referring to. My own judgment at this stage at least is that the GAC has not got its act together in the ICG.

Does that answer your question, Evan? Could you just type yes or no or something? Ah, may I follow up on that? Yes, thank you, Olivier. I saw Evan's remark.

I will not pass any judgment on any individual member of the ICG. I don't know about his "hostility to the [MSN]." At least in the ICG – and that's where I'm working – I have not had the opportunity to read anything of that ilk from him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Jean-Jacques. Let's just take a few more questions. I see there are two questions from Seun. The first one is in the chat. It says, "Has it been discussed within the ICG how they intend to handle the proposal submission with the external secretariat as of today?"

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: "Without." May I correct you? That was "without the external secretariat as of today?"

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh. It doesn't say "without" here; it says "with." But perhaps the question is without. Yes, you are correct, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, I can see in the chat what Seun said was “without.” Well, I’ll try to answer that. “Has it been discussed within the ICG how they intend to handle the proposal submission without...?”

Well, there is a timeline for the secretariat. In fact, this will go quite fast. We have about I think it’s a bit more than a week, maybe two weeks, to get in all the applications from candidate firms or candidates to perform the secretarial function, and we’ll go on from there.

By the way, what I forgot to report on is that I insisted when I saw how the choice of secretarial service was going along and how it had been formulated, I was a bit concerned and I demanded that I be added to the group of two or three people who were self-appointed as the selection committee for the selection of the secretarial service. This was voted upon unanimously, and I am now part of that little group.

Why did I do this? Well, because I wanted to make sure that, first of all, the message about the RFP for secretarial service would go out all over the world, and second, that in the selection process it would not be restricted or slanted toward this or that nation or toward this or that type of group.

There was also some concern voiced not only by myself but by colleagues on the ICG that those with vested interests – in other words, corporations represented or not on the ICG – should refrain from responding to the RFP. Now as a new member of the selection committee, I want to make sure that all this is respected.



---

That was the question from Seun. I hope I have answered it. His second question is: “What is the level of discussion about how the ICG view the current ICANN accountability process? Was there any discussion in that direction?”

Well, accountability was touched upon many times, but not as a standalone chapter. It popped up in conversations about all sorts of things, but there is not one chapter alone about accountability, for instance, in the agenda of the meeting which took place in Istanbul.

Seun, would you care to perhaps be more specific in your next question about that, or have I more or less answered your question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Let’s give the floor to Seun, and then I want to try Mohamed El Bashir again. I hear that he is back on the line. Seun Ojedeji?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? Can you hear me?

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can't hear you. Louder, please. Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, you sound a little bit far.

SEUN OJEDEJI: What I was referring to was mainly about the process [inaudible]. Some people have been saying that ICG [inaudible] accountability aspect [inaudible].

My first question in regards to the [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello?

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] you mentioned that the [inaudible] within the ICG that members of the ICG should not make comments in regard to the RFP. However, also on the different mailing lists, I've observed [inaudible] making some comment about the [inaudible] processes which are not actually [inaudible] positive or negative. I'm just thinking isn't it going to be [inaudible] to be useful? And then why actually ICG decided not to allow its members to make comments on the RFP? [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, Olivier. May I answer?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, do you wish to...?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: But before doing that, I really think we should give Mohamed a chance to come in before he has to leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Okay, let's get Mohamed El Bashir on there. I note, Jean-Jacques, that you wanted the question to be typed out. You weren't quite sure. I'll put that in the chat, what I heard from Seun. Let's have Mohamed El Bashir. Mohamed, you have the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Olivier. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Hello, everyone. Sorry. I have a bad connection today, and part of the call I was away driving.

---

I would like just to summarize very quickly. I'm sure Jean-Jacques has given that summary of the last [inaudible]. I would just like to give my observation as well.

I think we had a good, successful meeting for ICG. There were many outcomes analyzed. The RFP, [inaudible], and the timeline document which has been published. A document is already published with the RFP.

I think, unfortunately, this is the first meeting where there haven't been five staff members present in the face-to-face meeting with the ICG. I think their participation was positive, and within the meeting they were also contributing in the discussion.

I think we are progressing ahead, and the work now is [inaudible] to the communities to start developing the proposals, working on the solutions and what they need to see on [inaudible]. That's general observations [inaudible] the meeting. Now I would be happy to answer any specific questions. I have chaired the first part of the meeting [inaudible], and then Patrik took over the afternoon part of the meeting. But overall I think we had [inaudible] outcomes to enable the communities to start working [inaudible] transition. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mohamed. You mentioned the requests for the proposals from the communities. I just want to make sure: the operational communities? Or is it expected that the ALAC would be submitting a proposal?

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: The text does not block interested communities [inaudible], but it's considered unlikely. I think it is not. The [inaudible] does not say anything about not allowing [inaudible], but maybe there is an expectation that the operational communities are the ones who are going to submit [inaudible] proposals because they are the ones considered as [inaudible] impacted. They are the ones who are having processes to develop proposals. [inaudible] multi-stakeholders [inaudible] and they are required [inaudible] input from other interested communities are taken into consideration.

[inaudible] from ALAC and also even in our area discussion about will ALAC be able to submit a complete proposal or submit a position that reflects the interest of the end users. And that could be [something] to all communities that [ensures] that our position is already clear in the different [inaudible] communities, which is I think personally the best approach.

That's my summary. There is nothing prohibiting ALAC to submit a full proposal, but it's not expected and is also a lot of work as well. It's best for us to focus on ensuring that our positions are already captured within the [inaudible] communities.

I'm not sure yet what will happen [inaudible] the cross-community IANA transition working group. If there is a plan to submit a joint, one combined proposal or not ALAC might have a better chance [inaudible] this approach.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Mohamed. I see that Jean-Jacques has put his hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, but I see that Seun's hand was up before mine. Would you want to have him come in first?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I'm not sure whether Seun's hand was on the previous question. Seun has put his hand down.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Back to you, Jean-Jacques, and then we'll refresh Seun's question. If you haven't got them, I've taken note of them. Back to you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Well, regarding your question and Mohamed's answer, I would like to say that, yes, there is some if not uncertainty at least there is some ambiguity about who is really expected to contribute input, etc. But that's the understanding of the text. I think that it is our duty toward our communities to actually take the initiative.

Our concern on the ICG and as members of the At-Large was to make sure that it was not forbidden or excluded. Now that we have obtained

---

that, it would make no sense if the ALAC or the At-Large simply let that date go by and not take that opportunity to give input.

Now it is then our duty, especially Mohamed's because he is vice chair, to make sure that our input is in fact considered at the right moment at the appropriate level. But I think we should not now go on too long skewering ourselves over the charcoals about whether we are really invited or not or only half invited to contribute input. That was my first remark, and I'll wait for your reactions on that before going to Seun's second question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. Are there any other questions or remarks on what Jean-Jacques or Mohamed have just spoken to us about? I see Avri Doria has put her hand up. Avri, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Avri, I'm afraid you're not coming through at the moment. I heard you very distant, and it doesn't work. It seems we have connection problems today. Avri Doria? No?

AVRI DORIA: Have you heard it? If not...

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you very far away.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can you type, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Never mind.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've heard a "never mind" in the distance. "Never mind." Okay, let's see if in the meantime staff can check out with Adobe or Adigo what the problem is with Avri's connection. More questions for Jean-Jacques and Mohamed?

So then coming back to Seun's questions earlier. The first one was: "Has the ICG discussed the issue of the IANA accountability process and its link up with the IANA accountability process?" I think that's what I understood from Seun's question.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: As I mentioned earlier, I don't remember that on the agenda for the meeting in Istanbul there was a separate topic or item about accountability. However, it did come up on several occasions in the discussion as something of interest or as a matter of fact. But there was not a position taken – as far as I can remember – not a position taken on behalf of the ICG nor any position pronounced or called for at this stage.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Okay, thank you. That was when – yes, go ahead, Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:            On the meeting actually there was a discussion about the request from ICANN to appoint a liaison from ICG to ICANN accountability [inaudible] group. The discussion ended with a conclusion that it's really early for ICG to appoint a liaison because we are not clear yet about the relationship [inaudible] link between accountability group work and the ICG and accountability group work is currently not clear to everyone as well because it's not clear yet about the mandate for the extent of the work [inaudible].

So the decision was that ICG would wait until there is [inaudible] more about the accountability work and some type of relationship between the groups and if there is any link on the work. [inaudible] is not clear yet. [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Thank you, Mohamed. Has there been actually a question as to whether any liaison from the ICG to the accountability coordination group would be an additional person in the ICG, or would it be one of the current members of the ICG?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:            [inaudible] current members.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Current members, okay. Okay, thank you. I saw that Jean-Jacques Subrenat had put his hand up a little bit earlier.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you. This was in order to try to answer Avri's question. She said, "What is the situation with the fact that other submissions will be offered? Will they be ignored?"

That's the whole point, I think. The current texts in the ICG do not exclude anyone, actually. Of course, they do favor in a way the so-called operational communities, but after a lot of haggling no one is excluded. I think now it's really up to the communities. It is an ambiguity. I think people are aware of that in the ICG, and that's now up to the communities to make the most of it.

That's why I said a few minutes ago that whatever way we interpret the current writing, never mind. Let's just go ahead. Since we know that it's not forbidden, then we just have to go ahead and give our input by the prescribed date.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Jean-Jacques. I note another question from Avri here.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, we can hear you, Avri, now. We can hear you very well. Do you want to ask your other question? Avri Doria? For a second we could hear Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, basically it's the same question. I just typed it in not knowing whether the first question had been understood. Thanks for the reply.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Avri. You are very loud now, which at least we could hear you which was good.

AVRI DORIA: The problem was the microphone hadn't been in front of my mouth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, that's always more helpful when it is close to one's mouth.

The next thing we need to do, I guess, is to move on into our agenda. Just responding to Seun's question, there was a second question which I think I decrypted from what he had said which was: "Are members of the ICG able to take part in the proposals submitted to the ICG themselves?" In other words, would a member of the ICG like you for example, Jean-Jacques, be able to take part in the discussion and draft part of the proposal of the ICANN accountability part of things, let's say?

---

The accountability part with regards to the names and addresses?  
There's a discussion around that.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. At least in my presence, nothing has been said which would indicate that any ICG member would be excluded. Now, there may be things afoot of which I am not party. For instance, members of the so-called operational communities may consider that they're the only competent ones and they know all the right words and all that, and maybe they'll start drafting stuff even upstream.

But as far as I can make out, every member of the ICG will be able to – in fact in my opinion should – take part in vetting the community input from all the communities. It'll be a lot of work. There will probably be some task allocation because not everyone will be able to follow everything. But it should remain an open process so that every member of the ICG should at his or her request be able to see every input or contribution. That's a matter of principle for me, and until I'm shot out of the sky that's what I'll do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for your answer, but the question is slightly different. Would a member of the ICG be able to be the penholder for a proposal that comes into the ICG? I think that was the gist of the question.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Ah, okay. Thank you, Olivier. Well, since the inception of the ICG, there has been a discussion about vocabulary. In other words, is the ICG the

---

actual proposer, or is it just a facilitator? In other words, the argument was about, is it up to the ICG to actually draft a sort of first draft of what will become the proposal or the plan for transition, or do we have to wait for all the input to come in and then starting with that the ICG will start drafting?

I think that now my understanding of it, and in fact it has been discussed for several weeks now, is that we will await for input to come in and we will start with that. So, yes, there will be a possibly for various ICG members who are willing and capable to work on the basis of the input which will have been received. Does that answer the question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Partly, and I do realize I'm just probably throwing us in a direction which we don't really need to go into. But it's just to find out whether it had been discussed. If a member of the ICG is going to be involved in the proposal of their community and is going to be drafting something in there, but of course knowing fully well that it would be very difficult to find that out anyway if that person decides to just channel the input via someone else. Anyway, it's no big deal. I think that we need to move on then now to the next part of our call, but I thank you both for your update on the ICCG

We'll go into the next part of our call, which is a quick round up of the Cross-Community Working Group charter drafting team follow up. As ALAC members on this call will have noticed, there was a vote that took

---

place. I'm going to ask staff to quickly swap the document that's on the Adobe Connect so you can have a look at the results of the vote.

There was drafting team that put together the charter for the Cross-Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. That really is the ICANN part of the Cross-Community Working Group that will be providing the input and the proposal on the names part of the IANA contract.

The first vote was as follows: it should be Charter for a Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions developed by the CWG Charter Design Team and be accepted. The advice from the At-Large Ad Hoc Committee on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function – this very committee – was to accept the charter. With 13 votes in favor, this charter was accepted.

But then there were two amendments. One was an amendment from the SSAC which asked for the words “for the root zone” to be added at the end of Item 4 in the Section titled Scope. That was meant to improve clarity. Again, that amendment was supported by the ALAC with 13 votes in favor.

Then finally a second proposed amendment by the ALAC to add at the end of Section 2 the following text: “the issues related to ensuring IANA’s viability and effectiveness are also within scope of the CWG. Such issues could include, but are not limited to, charging structure or the lack thereof and languages that IANA can function in.” That is a

---

proposed amendment by the ALAC, which was ratified by the ALAC with 13 votes in favor of this.

Therefore as next steps, I shall be writing to the draft working group the process that deals with this charter drafting and I will be providing the details of our votes. I think that we are one of the first supporting organizations and advisory committees that are moving forward with this charter.

I for sure think that the SSAC amendment has already been accepted by the majority of people in the discussion. I don't know whether the ALAC amendment will be agreed, but at least the vote gives it more weight.

Any questions or comments on this vote? I see Tijani Ben Jemaa has his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. It's not a comment on the vote; the vote is clear. It's a unanimity of the people who voted, so it's clear the vote. But I wanted to say that regarding the Cross-Community Working Group on the IANA transition, a call for membership is already open and we need to nominate five people from ALAC to be on this cross-community working group and we have to do it now.

Also, we have to propose observers because observers are low too. We can propose observers from our community either if they are in the structures of the At-Large or even if they are not in the structures.

So two things: we have to nominate our members for official members, and also we have to propose observers. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Tijani. Let's follow up by e-mail on this because I was not personally aware that we had to move forward with nominating members and propose people on this. As you know, we went through an external process to select our representatives on the ICG.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a feeling it's a bit of a heavy process to start nominating members to go on this cross-community working group, and certainly it might be a good idea for this group here to just nominate members. You mentioned is it five members?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And how many observers? Is there any number of observers really?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. it's not a problem. The observers can be – there is not a limitation for the observers. But for the members, we have to nominate five only.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Okay, thank you, Tijani. Please follow up on the mailing list, so we'll be able to do that by next week.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:              Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Next, Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA:                      Hi. Hopefully, I can be heard and I'm not too loud. Hopefully, I got it just right. I just wanted to let you know that at its last council meeting the GNSO council did approve the charter. It approved the SSAC change. It did not, though, approve the ALAC change because the ALAC change had not been put in the text that we were voting on so it would have been complicated and we just wanted to approve.

We also had understood that text hadn't necessarily been put forward by others, so it's probably going to be – at least for the GNSO council – an amendment that we'll have to make to bring everybody these charters into line. I don't see an issue with it except for process.

[inaudible] what the GNSO has started doing already is having the SGs come up with the name of their representative and just saying observership was open. I don't know whether this group or whomever within ALAC At-Large wants to consider having each of the RALOs pick someone or something like that. That was in part the intent, I thought, of having a sufficient number so that were the At-Large to want to do

---

that, it would be able to, but certainly no forcing of doing that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. That's very helpful. I think I certainly agree with you on this. Certainly, the group that we should send to this since we have five representatives, I would fully support having at least one from each RALO. What I would then, though, say is that the source of these appointees should really come from our own working group here. I don't see any sense in having people appointed from outside this working group into the accountability process where we are the people that are mostly dealing with this topic. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Olivier, thank you. It was intended to have five as the number because of the five regions. Because there was another proposal during the drafting of seven people, but I was one of the people who said five is better because we have five regions. So it was intended.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's perfect. Thanks very much, Tijani. We have a list of our membership that is currently on our working group's homepage, the At-Large Ad-hoc Working Group on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function. I'm going to ask for a consensus call on this call then that we proceed forward with asking the RALOs to appoint their one person as taken from the list of members on this working group.

---

Does this make sense? Or does anyone have comments on this? Or does anybody actually oppose this? I can think of reasons why this could be opposed as well. Avri Doria, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA:

I obviously don't oppose it, but out of curiosity, is there a member of every RALO in this group? I haven't looked at the list. You may also want to allow people to enroll for this before the RALO makes a notice. You may want to do something slightly more general as "we are doing this, the RALOs will do that, and you still have a chance to sign up for the group." Don't know if you want to do that, but it's a thought.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Avri. On the page, which is on the Adobe Connect or shown in the chat, I see I think there are 23 – or is it 33? One, two.... I think it's 22 or 23 people. I've just made a very quick count. The RALO which is the most poorly represented is EURALO with only two members, but all of the other RALOs have more than one member. I note AFRALO has two. APRALO has large number of people. LACRALO has four, and NARALO has a large number of people as well. It looks like every region is there, so that's fine. Any other comments on this?

Now just a few days ago, there was a call for more people. I sent a note to the ALAC list and I think to the At-Large list as well pleading for more people to be interested in this topic because we now have the need to fill spaces on the working group, but also we need to fill spaces on some of the other working groups.

---

Certainly, we should have people in the RIR discussion list. We should have people in the IETF discussion list about the topic. If want to be involved at the generation level of those proposals, we need people there as soon as we can and as early as we can. The problem is it's a lot of work. There's going to be a lot of parallel threads to follow.

At the moment, we have some people following some threads, but they are the only point of contact and I would certainly feel a lot more confident that we are able and we are functional by having at least two or three people on each list who can monitor the list and who can even contribute as a general contributor to these lists, bearing in mind that whilst on the ICANN list we can operate as members of this working group and therefore make it known that we are of the At-Large community.

On the RIR mailing list and on the IETF mailing list, people generally contribute as individuals so we would all be individuals on these lists and therefore not be saying that we relay the ALAC opinion. In fact, there are questions as to whether the ALAC would be able to really participate as the ALAC into these external lists. It might fall outside our mandate, so let's not even go in that direction.

Okay, so seeing no objections from this, let's have an action item then that I as the chair of this working group will be e-mailing the RALO leaders to appoint people to this working group. Actually, first step really is for staff to make sure that with any new arrivals that list which we have on our working group page is up-to-date. If that's the case, then I will have to e-mail the RALO leaders and ask them for

---

nominations of one person from their RALO to be on that cross-community working group.

Then, of course, with regards to the observers, I think we can just do it as an internal thing where we can just draw up a list of all of the people who would like to be observers on that cross-community working group. I can imagine the majority of us will probably want to be there as observers as well.

Evan asks: “What is outside our mandate?” Just briefly, and that actually ties into the next steps, some believe that with the ALAC going into other fora outside of ICANN and commenting on things as the ALAC is outside our mandate. The At-Large Advisory Committee comments on ICANN-related processes and on the ICANN. And only on very few occasions – I think only on one occasion when it was due to the actual IANA contracts, would you believe it – did the ALAC actually submit an official response outside of the immediate ICANN sphere. Certainly, the coffee that Fadi serves in the cafeteria is arguably for some people outside our mandate, although we have commented in the past about the coffee. Well, more than the coffee; about accommodation altogether.

Without any further ado, let’s move on to the next thing. The next part of our agenda is the next steps. We’ve just actually already spoken about the updates on the RIR and IETF mailing list activity. I’d be interested in finding out from people who are on the call and who have been monitoring the discussions on other channels how the discussion is moving forward.

---

If you look at our homepage, you will find scrolling further down the different mailing lists that are there. There's an ICANN-wide discussion. There is an IAB discussion within the IETF. There is an Internet Society discussion taking place. Then there are five lists at the moment for each one of the RIRs. There is an AFRINIC IANA Oversight. There's an APNIC IANA Oversight. ARIN PPML for the time being for the public policy mailing list. Then there is an Internet Governance IANA Oversight in LACNIC and also IANA Oversight list on RIPE which has started which was just added yesterday.

Let's see if we first start with the LACRALO discussion. Sorry, not LACRALO. The ICANN-wide discussion at the moment is seen as being followed just by Alberto Soto. Can we have other volunteers for this, please? Who else? In fact, let's do a show of hands. Who else is on that mailing list and follows that mailing list? Maybe we can just add this.

No, let's start again. The ICANN-wide discussion – that's the first thing in the table that's currently on the Adobe Connect – ICANN-wide discussion. It's called IANA transition at ICANN.org. Who currently is on that mailing list? I don't see anyone put their hand up. Okay, I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr is on it. So let's have anyone who is on there, please put a green tick. Anyone who wishes to go and to be subscribed to that mailing list and to be listed as being part of that mailing list, please put a red cross.

I see Fatima Cambronero has put her hand up. Fatima, you have the floor. Okay, I'm not seeing any of this. Fatima is just saying that she is on that mailing list on the ICANN-wide discussion. At the moment, we've

---

got Cheryl and Fatima on the ICANN-wide discussion. Could I have another volunteer for this, please?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor in the meantime. You might be muted, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Indeed. Is this better? Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Please go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Yes. Whilst we are waiting for colleagues to pop up on the list, I'd like to make a remark and a suggestion. The remark is that seen from the ICG where Mohamed and I are working, it would not be very useful – in fact it would be quite time-consuming – to follow these lists and also even what our representatives who are following each of those lists have to say. It would be too detailed.

I'd like to suggest that in fact the place where all of us can come together is in fact the ad hoc working group where we are meeting just now. It would be nice if that could be brought together by staff, for instance, who would make a weekly résumé of input from our various members on these lists – for instance, Alberto Soto for LACRALO, etc. – to send to staff in a very résumé style that staff would make available to us just before each meeting, maybe the day before the meeting of our ad hoc working group.

---

It would say, for instance, from Alberto or from Avri, etc. regarding this list there are only two points which have been discussed and which are interesting. One is this and two is this. Then when we come to our next working group meeting, Mohamed and I already know about that. Maybe we have questions. Maybe we have suggestions. In that way, we'd get the thing rolling rather than just passively following the various lists. I hope I made myself understood. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. You've read my mind as to the next steps on this. The reason why I'm hoping we can populate each one of these lists is that before each one of our weekly calls, our people that are on each one of these lists would be able to submit five lines on what they've been up to or what's been happening on that list and maybe raise the points that are important and for this working group to then decide on which way to go.

Because as you absolutely are correct, there are so many lists here. We've got eight lists in parallel plus the one that is, of course, going to be the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition. That's going to be nine lists in parallel. We really need to share the load here and have summaries being drafted.

Having a single point of contact, though, in these lists I think is a bit of a burden since, of course, there might be cases of people not being able to make it to one of our calls. In the case, for example, today Alberto Soto was not able to make it to the call. With Alberto being the single point of contact for at least two of these mailing lists at the moment, it's



---

very difficult to get any kind of feedback as to what has been happening on these two mailing lists. Hence, if we have three people, that will always ensure someone will be able to speak to us.

I take your note about drafting a few words before. Definitely a good idea to have a few words as to what has been happening. I don't think that staff will be able to do anything as far as drafting is concerned. The most they could do would be to take the input from the different people and put them in one document as in a cut-and-paste, but not more than that.

I know that people are saying here they don't have time to do this. I'm not quite sure what the "not time to do this" is. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Well, fine. If the best we can do is cut-and-paste, no problem. That's better than nothing. Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I'm not sure. I might be reading Cheryl's note out of context. She might have said "count me out of that" earlier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor. You might be muted because I'm not able to hear you at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Is that better?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, that's a lot better. Welcome.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just saying I'm in a vast number of working groups and a lot of committees. With attending these weekly meetings, I'm keeping a watching brief and finding out what our representatives are doing on our behalf. I was talking to Narelle because of the association of what she's doing for ISOC on exactly this topic today at 7:00 PM local time.

I've got my plan to [inaudible]. I'm not going to contribute to a weekly report. I am spread too thin for that, so count me out of that. I will stay as a watching brief, but I'm not going to be a sub-unit reporting into these weekly meetings. It just won't happen, so it's not worthwhile listing me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Cheryl, for this. Any other comments on that? Really, the difficulty for us is to be able to coordinate in between all of the different lists as to what is going on and to allocate to basically get us to start focusing maybe on some of the work. We're not only going to be dealing with things at the top level as in we'll wait for the input from those operational communities to come in and then comment on it, but we're actually active in the making up and the drafting of those proposals. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I want to make sure that I was not misunderstood. I'm not some sort of control freak who is suggesting that everything

---

should be reported on and little slips of paper passed around and all that. That's not at all the idea I was fielding.

It's more coming back to the initial idea. Why did I suggest that we call for volunteers to follow these lists and let names be given so that at least we know who is following what list. Well, from the point of view of situation who is in the ICG, frankly the important thing is to be able to be told, if possible in advance, of something which is going to explode or pop up in this or that community.

Because certainly they are having [inaudible] about I don't know what – accountability in the ICG or something. It's a sort of early warning system I was advocating. It's not some complete reporting. It's just to say if and when you do something which is interesting or of concern to any one of you, just to let us know.

But rather than writing directly to Mohamed or me, I was suggesting that it go through this working group on whose meeting we are just now which is presided over very ably by Olivier. He with you would decide whether that is of sufficient concern to be signaled to Mohamed and me or not. That's all.

I was not suggesting that we set up some sort of yet another level of administrative junk. It was just to have an early warning system both for good ideas and for dangerous things which might pop up. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. I note that both Avri and Cheryl have said they will sound the alarm if they see something alarming. Since we

---

are running out of time, I believe that we are at what we can do then. I'll just remind you all to go onto the working group's homepage. There's the working group's homepage again. I think that's the one that works. Go on the working group's homepage and type in your details if you are on one of the mailing lists because at the moment, we've got single point of presence. Oh, I see some people have now put their names up. Certainly, Avri's name has popped everywhere. Avri is on all the lists. Okay. There's someone who likes e-mail.

I have noticed by the way, Avri, because I have seen you take part in some of the battles already on some of those mailing lists, so well done. I'm just staying in the corner in a cowardly way not saying anything at the moment, but who know? I might wake up at some point.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are reaching the end of this call. The last item on the agenda was to discuss briefly how this community here is going to work with regards to proposals – creation of ALAC input and are we going to be coming up with a proposal. This is something we need to think about now. We have seen that the deadline for the proposals is in January and so if we are going to draft a proposal, then we need to first focus on what topic, what etc.

Therefore, I would open the floor here for a couple of minutes. We probably have to spend more time on this during the next call that we'll have next week. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I think we should remember what the general calendar looks like now. ICANN 51 in Los Angeles will be from 12-16

---

October. The ICG meeting will be on 17 October, meaning just after ICANN 51. But before that, we will probably have one other ICG meeting just as a telephone conference. Two dates are being discussed for that. One of them could be around 18 September. So it's just for you to keep that in mind that we will have to adapt to all of this.

Now I don't think that your last question, Olivier, needs to be responded to immediately. I think that we should give ourselves some time to assess where the whole train is moving and how it is moving with what passengers, etc. As we will all have the opportunity of being in Los Angeles and seeing how it unfolds, I think that toward the end of the At-Large meetings in Los Angeles, then we should structure our own contribution and make our own timeline.

I think that there will also be one other event in ICANN 51 which may be of interest to all of us, which is that there will be a public presentation of the ICG work by its members. I suppose chair, vice chair, and perhaps a few others. That will be in a public session during ICANN 51. There, you will be able to put questions as well.

I suggest that after all that input, then in the summing up or in the concluding session of the ALAC then we should really set up a timeline and an action plan or a way forward for the At-Large contribution to the ICG transition plan. Thanks.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Staff and I have been working on the Los Angeles agendas. We are looking at two different things. The first, the wrap-up is going to be very stretched because

---

ICANN is now making use of Thursday as being a day for lots of public discussions. So our usual Thursday is going to be crunched just like it was in London.

However, we have worked on two things. One, having this working group meet in a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles. I believe it is for 90 minutes. Gisella, could you please confirm?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, yes, I can confirm it is for 90 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Gisella. So that would be one thing. The other meeting is we're trying to find out if we could actually have as the ALAC a meeting with the ICG, which would certainly be interesting I think for all parties. This is where I need to send the ICG a request for this. Of course, I would copy you on that. Jean-Jacques, you have your hand up.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you, Olivier. That was discussed briefly in the Istanbul meeting, and the majority feeling was that it was a bit contradictory to have separate meetings with the communities who are in fact already represented in the ICG, and that's certainly the case of the GAC and it's certainly the case of the ALAC. There was in fact even a sense of puzzlement that such a request could even pop up because then the next question was, "Oh, but don't you keep in touch with your community as a member of the ICG?" Of course, we do, but that's how it was felt.

---

I think that the general feeling today in the ICG is that we could do something. In fact we will be doing something collectively, and that is the public session using the public space in ICANN 51 responding to everyone. At this stage, that's about it. However, we are leaving it open for the time being and also leaving it open for contact with communities which maybe are not represented in the ICG. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. The reason for this suggestion was actually a discussion that I had with the chair of the ICG and [former] members of the ICG in Istanbul, and they suggested that. So my response was, "Oh, that would be an excellent idea." Thank you for providing us with the further details that at the end of the day it was decided that this would not be happening.

One last question then is to do with the session which you just alluded to. I was going to ask Gisella since she is aware of all of the schedules, is this currently tabled anywhere? A session of the ICG with the community? Would that be happening on the Monday perhaps?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, I believe it is scheduled, and off the top of my head I was going to say on the Thursday morning. Just bear with me. Community discussion with the ICG is scheduled for 90 minutes on Thursday morning from 10:30-12:00.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So then, Jean-Jacques, that would mean that we would have our working group meeting before that community discussion. But unfortunately, due to the scheduling, we would have absolutely no chance of having our working group meeting afterwards or having the ALAC even discuss the findings of that public session before the end of the ICANN meeting, unfortunately.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. A quick remark on that. I was not suggesting that the input from any one of the meetings in the margins of ICANN 51 would be decisive. I was simply suggesting that because of the time flow, instead of making the decision right now as to how and with what timeline we want to create the ALAC input for the ICG plan, I was simply saying that we should make the most of ICANN 51, including the session I just signaled which Gisella has kindly pointed out as being on the Thursday, so that you as chair or your successor as chair on the ALAC should then in the concluding remarks either decide, or if it's not possible for you, then at least to suggest that this is an important point which has to be taken up in the very first meeting after Los Angeles.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. That's noted. I will proceed with this, and no doubt Alan will be present at the time. Alan Greenberg who is seen to be probably our next ALAC chair. So he will be able to pick up the ball at that point.

Now we are reaching the end of this call. We are eight minutes beyond the end. I was just going to add a couple of things as to my activities in



---

Istanbul. I met up with Paul Wilson of APNIC and had an extensive discussion on the RIR – Regional Internet Registry – specifically looking at the accountability side of things. You will have seen a recent e-mail onto the list pointing you all to the current process where the RIRs have been reviewing their accountability mechanism.

I also had meetings with Alisa Cooper, the chair of the ICG, of course with Mohamed El Bashir. In fact, on several occasions I spoke to Mohamed and closely coordinated with him and also with Lynn St. Amour, who is now with the IAD I believe plus with the Jari Arkko, the chair of the IETF. We discussed certainly the accountability side of the proposal of the IETF that will be coming forward.

Of course, Paul Wilson and the others from the IETF have said they absolutely welcome input from At-Large participants to come and be active in the working groups [inaudible] those proposals. This is an open process, and I would say happy to hear that there was absolutely no concern about people from At-Large to take part as individuals in those processes.

That's just quickly my feedback on the processes. I also had a meeting with – let's see; who else? With Sally Wentworth from ISOC on these issues and coordinating on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and then we'll have to close afterwards. Cheryl, you have the floor.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] throughout all of next week, including during this timeslot conveniently at now 2:15 in the morning, I will be attending the APNIC, APTLD, and AP\* meetings in Brisbane, so it may be that I have a little more input based on any conversations and interactions with that community that go on relating to this topic next week. That's all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. That's very helpful, indeed, and I'm sure that topic is going to [inaudible] quite highly in the list of topics that [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we do actually have other things, not just this, on the agenda of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Certainly, the IGF had a lot of other things as well, but this thing came up again and again as a recurring discussion. A lot of people are getting up in a frenzy.

Oh, I forgot to mention I also had a meeting with Fiona Alexander and with Larry Strickling, the people who are the source of this whole thing who drafted the letter from the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was good to obtain clarification from them.

And just to let you know, Fiona and Larry and the department have not just thrown this out there into the wild. They are watching what's going

---

on out there, and they would be ready to step in if they saw anything that went totally off the rails and did not actually make sense. Because they reminded everyone in a public session that ultimately the proposal will have to satisfy NTIA. And if it doesn't satisfy NTIA, they're ready to throw it back in our face and say, "Try again." So it's better to get an early warning from them as well in case things start going in the wrong direction.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry. It is, as Cheryl mentioned, 2:15 AM in Australia and certainly also 15 minutes past the top of the hour elsewhere in the world. This call has been very helpful. Thanks for attending.

Next call, as I mentioned, we're going to be looking at our next steps, and we're going to be preparing for our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles so that we actually make good use of that face-to-face 90 minutes.

With this, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and goodnight. This call is adjourned. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**