TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function on Thursday, the 18th of September, 2014 at 14:30 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Thomas Lowenhaupt, Gordon Chillcott, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Glenn McKnight, and Carlton Samuels. Hoping to join us a little later will be Fatima Cambronero.
	We have apologies from Alan Greenberg, Mohamed El Bashier, Roberto Gaetano, Alberto Soto, and Judith Hellerstein.
	From staff, we have myself, Terri Agnew. But joining us shortly should be Heidi Ullrich and Silvia Vivanco.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anyone in our roll call? Has anybody's name not been mentioned? I don't see anybody shouting out, so next we have to adopt the agenda.

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.

Today we are going to be looking at the action items of our last call. Then we will be looking at the review of the ICG, the IANA Coordinating Group call that took place for some of us yesterday – most of us yesterday – the 17th of October. And for some of us, earlier today I think. Then we'll finally go into the review of activity of the operational communities, just looking at what's been happening on those mailing lists of the operational communities. Finally, we will be spending some time preparing our ICANN meeting in Los Angeles, our face-to-face meeting.

Any other business that anybody wishes to add to this agenda? Or any amendments to the agenda are welcome. Hearing no one ask for the floor, let's go to agenda item number 2, the agenda being adopted.

Agenda item number 2 is the review of the action items that we have from the 11th of September. We can go very quickly through those. There was the first action item, which was to make sure that the time table that we had step zero, step one, step, two, step three, step four, etc. The time table should be put out on our home page. I believe that's been done. Terri, is that correct?

TERRI AGNEW: Correct. It has been done and I'm waiting for verification of the dates and we'll adjust accordingly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, that's great. Thank you. Those dates were taken from what Jean-Jacques had told us during the last call. So Jean-Jacques, if you could be so kind to have a look at the data and make sure the time table is correct, that would be very helpful.
	Then the only one that's left here as undone action item is the chair of the working group will be e-mailing the RALO leaders to ensure that there is at least one person from each RALO. That's of course one person from each RALO on the current Coordination Group.
	We certainly have people from enough – as many people from NARALO, a few from EURALO, a lot of people from APRALO and quite a few people as well from AFRALO. Maybe NARALO and EURALO might wish to be [inaudible], although I think we're all fine on that.
	Okay, let's go on then. The next thing on our agenda is going to be the review of the ICG call of the 17th – yes, it is not October. Of course it's September. We're not that far forward. I see that Fatima has now joined us on the call. I invite Jean-Jacques Subrenat to speak to us about what happened yesterday. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.
JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:	Thank you, Olivier. So the agenda had three items on it. First was the approval of the minutes, the reporting of two previous meetings of the Coordination Group and that was agreed upon after some [tweaks], some minor changes of language by a representative of the GAC and one other person I think.

And then number two on the agenda was the most important, which was a review of the draft document on reaching consensus, or consensus decisions. I must say that there was a very thorough review [inaudible] looking at the whole thing altogether to see whether there were any striking mistakes or inadequacies and then going through paragraph by paragraph.

There were some changes brought about at the request of one member of the GAC and by yours truly, and I think that was about all. Nothing of great consequence. I won't go into the detail here, but if you have any questions, I'd be glad to respond.

This was adopted, so that this would be written into a clean copy by the chair or one of the vice chairs of the Coordination Group and sent around – at least the link will be sent around to our members for approval, and that would be it for that.

And the third item was a discussion about whom or what groups or what parts of the community of the ICANN community we should, as a Coordination Group, meet in the margins of ICANN 51 or during ICANN 51. I'd like to remind you that in a previous discussion of the Coordination Group, there had been opposing views. Some felt that it was not appropriate to have further meetings with parts of the constituencies' rationale was that these entities we are talking about are already represented in the Coordination Group by each of their members. And that's the case of the GAC, the ALAC, and some others.

And another group of colleagues who felt that it was worthwhile, even though it may seem a bit redundant, it was worthwhile going through the trouble of meeting the communities together or separately as a public relations exercise. But also, more importantly, to make sure that everything is well-understood and that we're not missing anything important.

And [inaudible] of the GAC, I found [inaudible] chair of the GAC quite interesting. She said that it would be really worthwhile reaching out to the GAC in order for [inaudible] on the GAC to have a better understanding of what it's all about, and therefore to be less in opposition mode and more willing to understand and discuss the later work of the Coordination Group in the months to come. That I found was a valuable argument.

In any case, after this discussion, it was decided that there would indeed be a series of meetings. I don't have the detail here, but as far as we are concerned, the ALAC will be meeting the Coordination Group on the Tuesday – sorry, I've forgotten the date. 14th, is it? The 13th or 14th. Tuesday, the 14th of October in the afternoon. Venue is not known and the exact time has not been decided yet. This has been checked through. There is levels of staff of ICANN. So we are ensured of that meeting, which will be for ALAC alone.

Now, at this stage, I'm not quite clear whether there will be some other opportunity, perhaps more collectively – several ACs and SOs together. That I've not followed as closely, but I can keep you posted through e-mail when I do find that as a reliable information.

So those are the three things which were discussed at the call starting from [inaudible] at 23:13 last night and lasting until about 1:00 in the morning. Now I'd like to give – after these more factual elements, I'd like to propose a few more personal impressions or remarks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, perhaps we could just stop here for a second and ask if there are any questions on the factual discussion that you just put there, and then we can launch into the second part, if that's okay with you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So are there any questions on this first part of the meeting? Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I can speak?

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Jean-Jacques, I heard you saying that since we are represented by two members, there is – we need to meet with the Coordination Group as a whole. I don't think there is any opposition or any problem with having a meeting with the Coordination Group, despite the fact that we are [inaudible] by you and Mohamed. This meeting will make the [inaudible] group as a whole see how we are [inaudible], how ALAC has a very important commitment or very important concern about some points.

I think that this can help the [inaudible] group in the future to take into consideration the position of ALAC members [inaudible] of you and Mohamed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I don't think there was any question of us thinking that it wouldn't be helpful. I think it's more a case of some ICG members that felt it was not helpful.

I have a question for you, Jean-Jacques. You concluded that the ALAC will have its meeting with the ICG on the Tuesday afternoon, which is actually the time that we have offered to the ICG for meeting with them. I was on the call yesterday. I didn't quite reach the same conclusion. Was there a follow-up discussion after the call? Because during the call, [Alyssa] went through some length in trying to find some kind of consensus, which at the end of the day, I was quite confused with. She managed to I think confuse a lot of people, but she said in a very lengthy way that some people were for meeting with the different

constituencies of ICANN. Some people were against meeting with the different constituencies of ICANN, and so she would look into having groups of people go to speak to the constituency. So we would probably have some members of the ICG coming to speak to the ALAC, but not the full ICG. And I think she left it at that and didn't actually go into the determination of how she would say who was going where, and basically just left it to the individual members.

She, aside from this, had promised to come back to me yesterday at 23:59 UTC, immediately after the call, to provide us, the ALAC, with the confirmation on whether the ICG would meet with us or not, and I have not heard from her.

Of course, before following up with her, wearing my ALAC chair hat, I would've hoped that there was a bit more knowledge as to what direction she was going to go into. And I note that Cheryl also felt that – yeah, some members felt that going to meet both with the different bodies of ICANN, plus having the big public meeting on the Thursday was too much, so they were just advocating that they might just want to have the public meeting on Thursday or even increase the length of the public meeting on Thursday.

Now, as someone who has been involved with the overall scheduling of meetings, I can already tell you now that making the Thursday meeting longer than the time that has been allocated so far is not going to happen. It's a no-go. There is no more time. There's only 24 hours in a day, unfortunately. So that's not going to take place.

I'm a little concerned that the ICG thinks that they can delay this further, and then at the very last moment, schedule their meetings or lack of meetings or whatever, when really, the schedule has been pretty much firmed up at the moment. It's a "take it or leave it" situation.

So I don't know how you would be able to respond to that or whether I need to take this up with [Alyssa] directly, and of course I would look to your council and everyone here, actually, as to how to now follow-up with [Alyssa] knowing of the concerns that some of the members on the ICG don't wish to meet with anyone else. They just think that they're going to repeat the same things many, many times.

And I have a feeling in some way, if I could just finish, that it's the lack of understanding of how different the different parts of ICANN are that makes them think that they're just going to repeat themselves and are going to go through this traveling road show just coming up with a presentation of something and take the same questions from around.

I see Cheryl has also put her hand up. Maybe I should let Cheryl speak, and then back to you, Jean-Jacques.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. I was particularly unimpressed with that part of the listening experience as well. But not only does it give a serious lack of understanding. This road show to date consists of a request from the GAC, and I would think even those on the call from the ICG would've understand after I saw Heather's excellent explanation as to why that would be a good idea, and Jean-Jacques did cover that off for us here in

this call to some extent how the unique situation of the GAC would be benefitted by an interaction.

The only other requesting body is the ALAC, so it's not exactly an onerous task for two meetings. However, I think there's a real risk that what we'll end up with is Mohamed, Jean-Jacques, [Alyssa] probably and one or two select others if we're lucky and that's really not the aim of the game. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. And I reiterate then, does anyone have a proposal for a solution on this? And over to you, Jean-Jacques, to respond and react to what we just mentioned.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. So I propose to respond to one set of questions first from Olivier, and remarks from Cheryl, and then respond to Tijani's remark.

So on the first point which was brought up just now, here's my understanding. The idea of having only bits and pieces of the Coordination Group go to this or that constituency was just an idea. Some people are playing with it because they may find it not very productive or [inaudible] to be as a body in front of this and that constituency.

To my knowledge, there is a clear will on the part of some or many of the ICG members to go as a group. Now, it is correct that this was not

crystal clear at the end of the call. And in response to your question, Olivier, about whether there was any further discussion after the call had been officially terminated, the answer is no. It ended when you heard it end. There were no further discussions and no exchanges of e-mails as far as I'm aware on that particular topic.

So what is currently my understanding? My understanding is that, initially, the requests as Cheryl pointed out correctly, were from two quarters – the GAC and the ALAC. And I think that there is a majority view that we should satisfy these two requests also because they have a particular coloring. The GAC obvious political reasons buying into socializing, etc., acceptance. And the ALAC because it was felt right from the start, and Mohamed and I made it clear and underlined that point all along that whereas industry – the domain name industry – and some parts of the world were particularly well-represented, the interests of the user community, the global user community, were less represented.

So that's my understanding. Now, where do we go from here?

Immediately after our current conversation or At-Large IANA Issues call, I will send an e-mail to my colleagues on the ICG in order to underline several things. First of all, to remind them that there was an official request from ALAC and GAC – but in any case, ALAC – and that, for various reasons, which I will remind them of, I think we should consider that as an important feature of our performance or our presence during ICANN 51, and therefore go along with the proposed and preprogrammed, in fact, meeting between ICG and ALAC on the Tuesday afternoon.

The second thing I will do in that e-mail is to underline the danger of adopting a different formula. For instance, checking [inaudible] myself plus one or two others simply because we can't wiggle away into the ALAC meeting. I think I will underline the fact that we have as much to learn from that kind of meeting as our communities could learn from the ICG. So this I will do immediately after our call.

I hope I've answered both Olivier's and Cheryl's concerns on this. But before going on to comment on Tijani's remark, I'd like to know if Olivier and Cheryl are okay with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can but try, Jean-Jacques. You can but try.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: That sounds unusually pessimistic on the part of Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll be delighted to be surprised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, you will have to remember that we have someone who sees the future since she is several hours ahead of us and the future is

not very bright at the moment, judging from her voice. Some more notes on this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, maybe you know about my philosophical position. The future is what we make of it. It's not written in advance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very good. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Just one small point. Cheryl mentioned that only the ALAC and GAC have asked for a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles. I thought I had heard that some of the GNSO constituencies had asked for a face-to-face meeting too. Was I mistaken?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, at the beginning of my response, I did say I believe that I was not aware of everything. I may have missed something, but to the best of my knowledge, that is the situation [inaudible]. I can't guarantee that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I had heard that the BC was interested in a meeting as well, for example. And it's understandable. Again, end users that are business-related. And of course they have their seat through the ICC on the ICG and their representative has not really been able to do that much these days, because of course we're now dealing with operational communities. So our concern [inaudible] that they would be interested.

Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, you make an interesting point, but that's also one of the reasons why I intend to write to my colleagues on the Coordination Group very quickly in order to, as we say in French, [inaudible], meaning to put a marker on our own request and underline the importance we attach to our request.

May I go on to responding to Tijani, perhaps?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I believe so. I haven't seen anybody else put their hand up on this topic, so please go forward.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Whilst I'm trying to ward of [inaudible] and that response to Tijani's comment, otherwise I may forget. Tijani, you're right. It's not that we in the ALAC believe that it would be an inconvenience or inappropriate or anything. I was just stating earlier on that some members of the Coordination Group have felt and had expressed that it was a bit odd to go and see the communities which were already represented directly in the Coordination Group and I also did say that some others felt that, on the contrary, one did not preclude or exclude the other.

I must admit that initially I was not entirely favorable to this idea of the ICG meeting with bits and pieces of community because I thought that

indeed these should go through the representatives of the represented communities. In our case, Mohamed and yours truly. But I have changed. I don't at all mind admitting that I have changed my mind. And the arguments you have produced, Tijani, are exactly those which brought me to the realization that it works both ways, that we as a group should take this opportunity to impress upon the members of the Coordination Group, how important some issues are to us as people who represent the interests of the global Internet user. So I [inaudible] with that very much and now I wholeheartedly support the idea, but also the plan, of a separate meeting if possible between the ALAC and the Coordination Group?

Does that [inaudible] concern and your question, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Jean-Jacques, you did. Thank you very much.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I think we can now proceed with the next part of your report and that's your personal thoughts now, which you were going to share with us.

EN

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you so much. I've made it a duty for myself each time I had called upon to report to you to first state the facts how the meeting unfolded, what were the agenda items, what the discussion brought out, etc. And second, to give you my own appraisal of where we stand and where we are headed for.

So, two or three things. First, the chair of the GAC was much more present in this meeting. She took the floor on several occasions and it was interesting. However, I feel that my analysis of the last two times we spoke here on the ALAC Adobe Connect was there is still valid. In other words, it remains difficult – perhaps a bit improbable – that the GAC will be able to make coordinated statements or to take coordination positions of some of the more important issues.

That does not depend on the personalities so much as on the reality of how the GAC operates. Consensus is only full consensus for them, and if there's the slightest hesitation or opposition, then there is no GAC position, simply.

So I think that we have to accept it. Now, they are very widely represented Coordination Group with five people. And what I said one and two weeks ago remains valid. There is mainly one person who is extremely present discussing draft documents and intervening in a very powerful way. That is the representative from Iran, and to a lesser extent for the time being, but she may wish to become more vocal in the future – I don't know – but the representative from Egypt. The others have been much more silent, not totally silent. So much for the GAC.

The other thing I wanted to share with you is that now the modus operandi of the Coordination Group, the working method seems to go into a smoother phase. There's less argument about the fundamental positions and all over [inaudible] smoother process.

But I would like to suggest [unfortunately] it'll become Olympic sports again further along the line when we come to examining the content, which is presented to us by the communities. Remember that there was an RFP which was published calling upon all the constituencies and all the communities to submit to us by the 15th of June next year their input in the form of proposals or comments.

And I think that the first difficult phase really will be examining all of this and deciding what is worthy to be retained in the future transition plan and what has to be scrapped.

So that will be a first difficult phase and I think that there will be several [inaudible] according to whether it's [big] business or not, whether it's more protection of what some consider as abstract and not very workable [rights] and the user community in general. I think we have to be very careful to observe that and to help guide it through.

And the third thing is we will have to watch closely on how and if the US administration between now and the moment when we submit to the NTIA our transition plan if there are any major shifts about Internet governance, about the whole business of transition in Congress, House of Representatives and the Upper House between now and then, which is sometime in July.

So those are my personal thoughts, and on that, too, I'd appreciate your comments and perhaps questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I'll open the floor for questions or comments on Jean-Jacque's feedback/personal thoughts. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, Jean-Jacques. I certainly have I would say similar understanding as yours on what is currently happening. I have also seen the dynamics in [inaudible] on the group that yesterday was I hope not the example of how future calls will go. I felt that there was [inaudible] agreement between people, yet misunderstanding on where to put the commas on the document just on that little section, which was dealing with the input from community – sorry, the input about public comments, basically. I felt that it was a little bit long-winded to just resolve a small thing like this.

Certainly on the dynamics of the GAC it's still going to be a headache I think for the GAC chair to be able to coordinate its representatives on the ICG. I'm glad that we are able to coordinate ours. Back to you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, yes. Thank you, Olivier. Since you mentioned this, I'd like to take this opportunity to give you my further impression that of course I don't follow all the groups, but since London I've had quite a few opportunities to look at this closely, and frankly I think that now ALAC is one of the better coordination communities as far as both reporting

back to the community, which I'm doing just now, but also getting feedback and ideas and positions as concerned.

I think that now we are fairly well-organized with this weekly call, at least from my point of view, as one of your two representatives. I think this is really useful.

In addition, during the call we had yesterday and all the other times, the fact that I'm reminded each time by you, by Alan, by others I should keep on the Skype page of our group is helpful to you no doubt, but also to me because I can ask for last-minute ideas or changes if need be, and that's how I operated yesterday.

So all in all, my judgment is that it's useful to have this [inaudible]. I had some misgivings about its efficiency at the beginning, but now I feel it's working better. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I was going to also note the good improvement, thanks to Mohamed now being one of the vice chairs. I understand that [Alyssa] frequently consults both her vice chairs, Patrik Falstrom and Mohamed El Bashir, and therefore there appears to be more – well, things appear to be more in tune, especially with regards to announcements and communications.

One question on this ICG meeting yesterday. Does the ICG have an advanced calendar of its meetings or do you also learn about a call 24 hours in advance?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: That's a wicked giggle I hear, but justified. No doubt, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to make sure the giggle doesn't get attributed to Olivier, that giggle is from Cheryl. And that's Olivier's giggle.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: An entirely different giggle, yes.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Apart from the giggle part, I think that you're right, Olivier. So if there are no other questions to me, then I'll just – why don't we go on with the meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, that was an actual question. Were you told 24 hours in advance or was this set up in advance? Because if the calendar of calls is known in advance, it would be worth sharing it with us, then at least we can make arrangements for being on the call.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I've taken note of that for myself. Okay, I'll do that. We have a principal, which is call I think it's every two weeks, but I'll have to check. Sorry, I don't have it right off the top of my head, but I have taken note that I

should communicate to you or Mohamed should communicate to you, especially as vice chair – it's easier for him – this calendar thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So let's then see – anything else that you wish to add on the ICG call yesterday? Any other feedback from anyone else? I know there were several people who were on the call yesterday. Do you have any different impressions, additional impressions? I know we're also missing a few people who were on the call yesterday, but no doubt they will be listening to this recording. Seeing no one putting their hand up, let's move on now to the next part of our call. That's the review of the activity in the operational communities.

I sent an e-mail out to the people that were listed on the table of participants in other communities. That's of course our homepage, which I can give a link to. That I believe is our homepage. Further down the homepage, we've got the different mailing lists, the ICANN-wide discussion, which has already been very, very busy. The IAB discussion list, the Internet Society discussion list, and of course all of the RIR discussion lists.

Now, several people have responded to my e-mail and sent the summary of what's been happening in those different arenas outside. So I now open the floor, first to find out regarding the IETF mailing list and I guess I could say both IETF, but also the Internet Society discussion and the ICANN-wide discussion. These three are I would say somehow related, but they're all the non-RIR lists. Does anyone wish to share any

points which we should absolutely address now? In other words, has anything stood out that needs to be addressed by us?

I received a report from Cheryl and a report from Alberto Soto as well, and it seems that there are things happening on these mailing lists, but nothing of great importance for us to be involved in. Any other points? Cheryl, did you want to say a couple of words maybe?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fatima and Tijani both have their hands up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so let's have Fatima and Tijani first. So Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. Actually, this is just to make a comment regarding what you were saying. I am following the LACNIC mailing list as I told you. We created a specific list for this issue, and three people from the community were appointed to guide this process. Actually, nothing has happened – nothing related to the RIR at least.

The most relevant issue in this list was a message from Carlos Alsonso who resent the e-mail that [inaudible] has already sent to other mailing lists calling or asking them to assume a more active [inaudible] and specifically criticizing [inaudible] which is not adopting an opening process in these transition issues. The answer was that there was a

EN

specific e-mail list for this mail, so it was sent to that e-mail list and then there were no more comments.

And then there was also an e-mail that was resent from Richard. It was resent to [other lists] regarding the lack of a more active role of RIRs in this transition. That's basically nothing is really happening, or at least nothing focused on the region or nothing focused on the RIRs of our region. If you want, I can send a short summary to the mailing list so that I can clarify all these situations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much for this update, Fatima. Being on those lists, I absolutely agree with what you've mentioned here. When you said Richard, of course it's Richard Hill, the person who used to work for the ITE but is now retired and is spending a copious amount of time – significant, should I say, amount of time – on these issues and is apparently on all of the mailing lists.

With regards to the point that Milton has made, he has indeed criticized ARIN, the North American RIR, for not opening the process up. There appears to be that there will be a face-to-face meeting of the next ARIN meeting and some are saying, "Oh, that's plenty enough. We don't need any more than that." But I've also e-mailed [John] [inaudible] and let him know that if every other RIR has had a special mailing list for this, there might be something good that the other RIRs are doing that ARIN might wish to also pursue.

But Milton has also followed on and said there's no coordinated-ness between the RIRS. There appears to be coordination behind the scenes between the RIRs, but there's no open coordination list where the issues – or all of the RIRs could be discussed. And so far, I haven't seen any more movement on that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I am following the AfriNIC IANA transition list, and as I told you, as [I said] on the list, there was only one post on this list. It was done by Adiel, the CEO of AfriNIC and it was only an introduction. He explained the procedure they are using, how they intend to make a discussion useful [inaudible], and he asked for two people to [inaudible].

My surprise is that there wasn't any comment on the list, except that there people volunteered to be moderating the list.

And yesterday Adiel, the CEO of AfriNIC, announced his [intention] to leave AfriNIC next January. And this may explain why things are not going as I thought, as I supposed, as I expected. Moreover, [inaudible] most everywhere and is very busy. Anne-Rachel just left AfriNIC.

So I think that in AfriNIC now there is a problem of [inaudible], and perhaps this is the reason of this silence or of this lack of activity on the list. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Did you say Adiel was going to leave next January? Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Was he going to leave AfriNIC altogether?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Anne-Rachel [inaudible]. She is working with ICANN now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anne-Rachel, but I thought you mentioned Adiel Akplogan. No, Adiel is remaining with AfriNIC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. Adiel will leave AfriNIC in January. He stepping back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh. So then there's a question of him as an ICG member, but that's something we don't need to be concerned of at the moment. But thank you for your report on AfriNIC. Any other things to report with regardless to AfriNIC in addition to that?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Nothing through the list at least. AfriNIC is [inaudible] 21st meeting [inaudible] in November and they are very busy in preparing this also. So it is [inaudible].
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Tijani. I understand that there will be, I'm sure, a session on this that will take place at the AfriNIC face-to-face session, and I understand that some people from AFRALO are going to be going there. It might be a good idea to attend that meeting dealing specifically with those things.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I will attend it, Olivier. I will attend it for outreach. And we have two other people [inaudible] for the CROPP to attend this meeting for a specific training organized by AfriNIC for the APRALO leadership. This is something that I asked for with Adiel and Adiel agreed and he proposed to make it in [inaudible] during this meeting. Now the applications for the CROPP are on the table now.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you for this, Tijani. Next is Avri Doria.
AVRI DORIA:	Strangely enough, I want to add something about the AfriNIC. If this is the meeting [inaudible], I will also be there because I'm part of the – APC is organizing with others in Africa. One of those – African school on

Internet governance like the one done in Latin America and originally in [inaudible]. So I'll actually be there, too. Although we're not focusing on this issue, I'm sure there will be discussions.

What I wanted to bring up is, as I said at one point, I am sort of undifferentiatedly reading all the lists. I have them all coming in and I read them. And I'm looking for trends and things that are going on. Within both the numbers and protocols area, I'm seeing more realization of this may be more complicated than some of the "if it ain't broke, don't fix people" have been claiming. I'm starting to see little bits of conversation, looking at what is the implication of the IETF changing conditions of protocol parameters or what happens if somebody other than one of the RIRs wants to get a [V6] allocation? And what about some of the cross effects?

Well, if IETF with protocol activities can affect the policies discussions in ICANN and in the RIRs, how do we keep this separate?

There started to be also some realization by people that seem to have a more legal type of background that it may never have gone wrong before and we may have the nuclear option but (a) how does that nuclear option really work? And (b) do we really want to have to get there and perhaps should we have some sort of framework that defines how we deal with issues?

Now, it's not fully-developed. And as I say, I can go digging into it and find specific places where the conversations are happening, but it might

resonate with others who are reading specific lists. But that's been sort of a general.

But the Earth seems to be shifting, though there are those that are still arguing quite strongly "it's not broke, don't fix it." So that's my impression. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Avri. Just one quick question for you, a follow-up question. On the IETF mailing list, there was a discussion that went on about putting together the charter for the IETF working groups that would be dealing with this. It was very bare-bones to start with. Are you saying this is now slowly getting expanded? Because I thought they had set up a deadline for that.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. And this is where I'd have to go back and check specifically. Certainly that discussion is going on. In fact, I was looking for it the other day. I was looking for the latest copy of the charter and where it was at and I couldn't find it before I got distracted by something else. So I'm not really sure. It's something – thanks for reminding me – that I did want to check for specifically and didn't manage to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:　　Thank you. I posted a couple of small points in the chat, and more importantly, because it's got links in it, not all operating systems but the Adobe Connect rooms will be able to open. I've sent it to staff already so they can put up my little brief report from APNIC here in Brisbane at the moment. So people can follow links and look at the Slide Share and all that sort of thing without cutting and pasting.

Again, this is, I will hasten to add, not a report on list activity as such, because there is very little of that. But I did say at the last meeting that there was agenda activities at this meeting number 38 for APNIC on the topic and I've popped some links to quite detailed reports and presentations and things in my notes for you.

What I wanted to say that I thought was also of interest, and it may be that this will come out of the AfriNIC and ARIN meetings as well, and that is of course that the [inaudible] community, that the [numbering] community has kind of been ruminating on a lot of this for quite some time, certainly with every reissue of contract, etc., between NTIA and the IANA service providers, for example. This has sort of been discussed.

It may be that what I think is the presented fairly well-formed and certainly not particularly debated or discussed draft that I've put a link to as well, which has a couple of principles and a few drill-downs from those principles. That may be why we're not seeing [inaudible] of "What do we think about this?" because they've been thinking for quite some time, and that that's being reflected by now having a draft set of principles that certainly APNIC has put out for a first reading and discussion at the meeting on Wednesday, and when the call from the

floor for any objections or concerns came, it was really resounding silence. Now, that is all [inaudible] only a first reading. There will be other readings and discussions, and indeed perhaps there may be some modifications and perhaps [inaudible] activity will come out of it as well.

So I just wanted to make that point, that as a community, they've probably been thinking about how operationally they would like to see things for quite some time. Certainly that's what I'll take home from some of the APNIC experiences.

I did, however, want to raise that from the floor in the meeting – and now I'm going to say meetings, because the AP TLD, which of course is the naming as opposed to the numbering community has also held its meeting here in Brisbane in parallel for the first couple of days of the APNIC meeting and on their agenda was also some IANA transition discussions and work.

In that particular meeting, it was rather more trying to not only give the background and base information that we've all heard at just about every show and tell on the topic, but also trying to engender a sense of you need to be involved with the regional ccTLD operators because I suspect there was a little bit of a fear of some complacency, so hopefully the discussions at the AP TLD meeting and some follow-up from that will also see a little bit more actually from that naming community as opposed to numbering community.

But in both those meetings from the floor was I think well-heard plea to ensure that they don't operate in isolation and they take a watching

EN

brief on what's happening in the other areas, and so I thought that was worthwhile, picking up from what Avri was just saying, that whilst, certainly in the case of this draft proposal that's discussed here at APNIC, it could be seen as [inaudible] ain't broke don't fix it type approach.

There was very much a you cannot just rest on that where the community need to look at what is going on in naming in protocols and in general and make sure that when it comes to stitching all these component parts together that there are particular bits that are going to be critical or break or simply not work together. So that's it from me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Thanks for this feedback from the floor, I guess we could say, since you were at the APNIC meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Still am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And you still are. Well, there you go. So really from the floor itself. You could tell us you're on the first row of the floor. Just a few notes here. I think, as you've head, the AfriNIC meeting will also have some people who are going to be there. I know an ARIN meeting is coming up. I gather, Avri, will you be going to the ARIN meeting?

I don't hear Avri back. So maybe she will be, or maybe others will be able to make it to the ARIN meeting.

AVRI DORIA: I'm going remotely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then of course we have the RIPE meeting. Oh, remotely. Okay, thank you, Avri. And then of course we've got the other meeting – the RIPE meeting – which I believe will take place in London. I might not be able to make it myself. I think it hinges on a couple of days that – I'll find out – we might have some people here who will be able to go locally and report back to us on this. Then of course the LACNIC meeting is also I think in place. We probably will have some people in the LACNIC meeting as well.

I guess these issues are going to be discussed in each one of these face-to-face meetings. How far they go into the issues I have a feeling that it's not going to go far at all because the issue itself seems to be quite alien to most people attending these meetings.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to make a point when you were talking about the other meetings coming up and just make really clear to this meeting that we're teleconferencing now that at this APNIC meeting that I'm

EN

currently attending, there are representatives from every other RIR. So every single RIR is represented in the room and on the floor, so a little bit of cross-pollination may hopefully already be happening. Okay, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this. The cross-pollination – and I've heard from several sources that cross-pollination between the RIRs is obviously happening. But it seems to be behind the scenes, so the request that Milton has made was for a public list to be also put there for everyone to be able to discuss those issues.

Now, of course, we face the same thing when people decide to then send one e-mail that they carbon copy to every single list, so my mailbox has often seen three or four instances of the same message, and I gather it's probably the same with a number of people. But that's where we are now.

Any other updates on what's currently going on outside in the other discussion lists, other fora, etc.? I must say, I'm quite pleased with all the feedback that we have here. Do you feel we have the right way forward now? We're well-coordinated on this? I'm quite pleased that we have people that can report back and basically raise the flag. If something happens there, raise a flag when and need be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I don't think we'll be having too much by surprise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good. I'm glad this is the case, Cheryl. So let's just do one last thing before we move on. If we can scroll down – now, you've got the review. I don't know, is the scrolling enabled for everyone or am I scrolling the link at the moment for everybody?

TERRI AGNEW: You're scrolling at the moment for everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm scrolling for everyone? Okay, excellent. I was just going to take you. If you go further down this page, you'll have the monthly reports which of course aren't filled in yet. I've done one small report for the ALAC so far and I'll be drafting a very small report again for the ALAC on this occasion. But we have those resources underneath on that same page. Some basic resources, and then documents from the different – well, different documents that we've managed to add there. Contracts, NTIA-ICANN contracts, etc. Then we have all of the IETF and IAB related contracts.

Would the initial work that is now taking place in the different operational communities, such as, for example, the presentation that Cheryl has attended in APNIC, such as maybe some of the working documents at the moment in the IETF like a copy of the charter of the work, for example. I wondered whether it would be of help to actually also have a section that points to those.

The question then becomes how do we manage this information? The more documents we put in there, the more likely we are not going to find any documents anymore. I open the floor for suggestions on this, and of course for comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Yeah. Of the three links I put in my little brief update, one of those in particular is a link to a master page which is an APNIC page which is their resource collection for background materials, etc. So I would suggest that if we put links in our resource collection, which are high enough level like that one, so when that page gets updated, then our link is still valid, that would be a very good idea. But I would certainly see no reason why all three of the links that I put into the explanatory blog to the presentation and to this primary landing page – resource landing page – shouldn't be added. But I'd encourage us to link more to the higher level when one exists page than some lower-level page in a tree that, if somebody moves it, we've lost it forever. And obviously have it classified by "this is an APNIC resource" and have them listed underneath.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Cheryl. Terri, I hope you have your ears wide open. Terri Agnew is the staff member who is in charge of that page and who has been diligently updating it recently. Did you catch this, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: I did. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terri knows where to get me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: She knows how to find you, yes. Are there any other comments on this document store? One suggestion I was going to make was to actually put it on a separate Wiki rather than putting it on our home Wiki page, just because the home Wiki page was starting to get longer and longer. So I don't know if anybody has any views on that.

And then, of course, how do we want to sub-organize the documentation? Because I understand pointing to the top-level hierarchy in each one of the sources is a good way forward, but we might also wish to have specific links for particularly important documents in case those document stores also grow in size.

Okay. Well, I'll take it that, for the time being, we're working well on this, and therefore we can go to the next part of our call and that's the preparation of the working group meeting at ICANN 51 in LA. Kelly is very kindly changing the page and is taking us over to the schedule of the ALAC meetings in Los Angeles and we're looking here at Tuesday

EN

afternoon. Tuesday afternoon. There we go. Terri is being faster than me in typing.

So Tuesday afternoon, effectively. Oh, this thing doesn't show very well. Sorry, there seems to be a problem with the display.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh boy, that's tiny.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Something is going to have to be done on this one. Okay, whilst you fix this one, I invite you to have a look at the actual agenda itself, the Wiki itself. Terri has put a link in the chat.

What we have is first ALAC Work Part 2 from 15:15 to 17:00 and that will have three parts to it. First, a discussion with the ASO address council and the ASO number resource organization. I have no idea what the discussion will be about, but it's highly likely that there might be some elements of this IANA stewardship transition in there. I'm also hoping that we will be able to have an update on the RALO RIR activities, because that's something which has started a few years ago now and I'm very glad to have seen it flourish, so we obviously need to keep track of it and see what can be done to improve this interaction, but also recognize success when we see it, particularly when one notices MOUs being signed, etc. It's really exciting times. That's the first thing.

But then we'll have the update on the IANA stewardship transition. That's the meeting with the ICG. We have a full hour with them, and during that time I gather we will probably most likely be having a lot of questions to ask and a few points to make. I don't know whether you wish to prepare any set of questions beforehand, so we have some kind of coordination in meeting the Coordination Group. And I leave this very open to you all, so suggestions are welcome.

Then, immediately after that, from 17:00 to 18:30 we have one-and-a-half hours face-to-face as a working group to work on our next steps. Having just met with the ICG, we will have had fresh ideas about what we've heard and we will then be able to debrief between ourselves. Of course, it is a public meeting, so anyone is invited. Anyone is allowed to attend. But primarily working group members to be able to first hear the feedback that we have from our ICG members on the one hand, but also from each other who attended the meeting before that.

Then, really, that's the time for us to put together a strategy for an ALAC proposal. Should there be an ALAC proposal? What should be in an ALAC proposal if there is one? Therefore, identification of issues, main goals, conflict management, and end user perspective.

I've put these four as very open ideas. They're up for changes and we still have time today to change them because the agendas are firmed up tomorrow. Do we wish to change that agenda, how, and with what? I open the floor now. You are all encouraged to participate. We have until tomorrow to change this. Any feedback?

Terri, the page is not coming up on the Adobe Connect at the moment, unfortunately. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Just to underline the importance of that crucial meeting [inaudible] Coordination Group, because as I mentioned in one of our last meetings, I think it was last week, this is really the moment when we will have sufficient indications about the difficulties [on the] prospects ahead to get our act together and to start on relating a strategy from the user point of view.

I also said I think last week that right now perhaps was a bit too early to do that, because we don't have all those indications, but [inaudible] at the time [inaudible] indicate that would [inaudible] be very important. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Do you see anything wrong with our agenda? Do you think that agenda is fine?

As we can't seem to be putting it on the screen, I'm going to put it on the action items. There we go. We'll have to delete this afterwards. Bottom right-hand side of the screen. So the agenda introduction, then feedback from our ICG members, and then discussion on strategy for an ALAC proposal with identification of issues, main goals, conflict management, and user perspective, and then finishing with next steps. The agenda is up for amendment now.

	Cheryl Langdon-Orr?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Well, I was actually hoping to hold until you had finished doing the agenda amendments, so go to anyone else first please.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you. I note a question from Fatima Cambronero. "Should we prepare any proposal or strategy in anticipation to the LA meeting?"

I'll let Jean-Jacques perhaps answer that. Jean-Jacques? |
| JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: | Thank you, Olivier. Which is now on the screen under "Action Items." I would say on your last point which is end user perspective, actually it traverses the whole of the agenda, so I'd say identification of issues and perhaps in brackets end user perspective or [inaudible] end user perspective, something like that. Thanks. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I've just added this. So maybe we can get rid of "end user perspective" at the bottom. There we go. Main goals, conflict management. Cheryl, do you wish to chime in or should we still wait for others? |

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wait for anyone else first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So just a response to Fatima Cambronero. My personal feeling at the moment is we are still very early on to actually formulate any proposal in anticipation to the LA meeting. Judging from what we've seen so far, we are still in listening mode.

Now, that said, for all of us collectively to think of this and arrive at the LA meeting with some ideas for the different issues that we now are seeing, the main goal that we have, that's something which we all have to do individually so that we will have a very successful workshop in Los Angeles. That's the way I thought about it. I don't know. Does anyone think we should send our ideas in advance to the mailing list maybe? [inaudible] working. I see both Fatima and Gordon typing. It probably would be faster for you to speak. Let me hand the floor over to Fatima Cambronero, if you could just confirm please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I was typing, and you're right, it is faster to speak. I was asking that because I have that doubt whether we should, as a group, create something or whether we should have an individual thinking so that we can [inaudible] that. But I do agree with you. I believe that a previous preparation is of an individual nature, and then during the meeting, we may share our perspectives to see how we would [inaudible]. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. Next we have – I wonder, Gordon, would you be able to speak or are you unable to speak? You also said a few words on the chat.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: It's Gordon speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome, Gordon. You were basically mentioning discussion on the mailing list. Are you saying formulating positions or already appointing some consensus?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I think finding some consensus. It may be useful for some of us to bounce an idea or two off the rest of the group. That is what is going to happen at Los Angeles anyway, but a little prior discussion might be helpful. And this is purely kind of an ad hoc sort of thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Gordon. So what I would suggest then as an action item for me to circulate on the mailing list, circulate our agenda for Los Angeles, and in anticipation of our meeting in Los Angeles ask for people to start bringing forward their issues with regards to identification of issues, main goals, so that the discussion – or at least the starting point of all of the members of this working group can

already be for all to be able to read and share, and there could even be a little discussion starting on the mailing list. How does that sound?

There's absolutely no sound on here. There's a green tick from Fatima. Let's do this, then, because I know the time is ticking and we're soon reaching the end of this call. Let's do that action item for Olivier to follow-up on the mailing list sending a copy of the provisional agenda that we have now and to stimulate conversation on the list regarding the agenda and regarding the actual – not regarding the agenda, sorry. Stimulate conversation on the list regarding the topics themselves.

Okay, any other questions or comments on this number five, preparation of working group meeting? Nothing? Cheryl, were you going to comment on any other business or still [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I'm coming in on number five, but at the end of number five.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then we're at the end of number five, then you can come in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yay, thank you, sir! I just wanted to report – well, record. I had too many reports in my day for today – to record that being Tuesday and my dance card was I'm still chair of the Nominating Committee, we will be chockablock full of going to see every single constituency that can fit us into their schedule on Tuesday. The likelihood of me being at any of the

Tuesday activities, but certainly this one, and indeed probably the meetings with the ICG is very, very small. I will take my usual approach of if I'm not otherwise occupied, I will be in the ALAC room. But if you could sort of list me as a standing apology unless you actually see me in the room, I would greatly appreciate it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's recorded. Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. And indeed we will be meeting you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And also Stephan Van Gelder from 11:35 to 12:00, so for 25 minutes earlier on that day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am guaranteed at that point in time. Beyond that…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Beyond that, we don't know where you will be. Excellent, thank you. So let's go now – oh, I see. There's the ALAC meeting schedule has finally come up. Apologies. Just spending another 30 seconds on this. Tuesday the 14th of October. So we've got the update from the IANA stewardship transition. A little green arrow. So we've got this update over here, and

EN

then immediately afterwards after – I don't even think there is a break between the two. Where are we now? Someone has moved [inaudible]. Sorry for this.

Okay. So we've got that until 17:00, and then from 17:00 to 18:30, we will have our thing. And of course we'll change the agenda as per the discussion we just had now, and of course afterwards, we'll have music night on that night. So that will be great. No gala this year, but there is still a music night.

Now, we can move to the any other business part of our call today. Does anyone have any other business? No? Okay. Well, I thank all of you for being on this call. Oh, I hear Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, sorry. I just saw on the screen ten seconds ago that there was still four items in the proposed agenda, so I just wanted to make sure that staff has corrected it. But now it's gone, so I can't comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. That agenda is on the Wiki at the moment. That will be updated. It hasn't been updated yet because we've just made the change, but I believe that Terri – will you be amending this or is it going to be Gisella who will have to amend that? Because I know that Gisella deals with the overall schedules.

TERRI AGNEW:	Gisella will be amending.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Gisella will be amending. Okay, excellent. So Gisella will be amending with the agenda that we now have in the action items corner, so that removes one bit and changes identification of issues and in brackets "end user perspectives."

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:	Okay. Good, thank you.

| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | And maybe I can even make it with big end, and big user, and big perspective. There you go.

All right, so any other business?

Seeing no one put their hand up – and on time, I'm pleased to say – I would like to thank all of you for being all of you on this call and thank the Spanish interpreters for being able to have people on the Spanish channel follow and take part in this discussion.

With this, I would like to wish you all – a weekend is coming up soon for some of us, so have a good weekend. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and goodnight. This call is now adjourned. Thanks, bye-bye. |
|---|---|

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]