

October 2014

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc Working Group call on transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function, on Tuesday, October 7, 2014 at 15:00 UTC.

On the English channel we have Matthew Rantanen, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gordon Chillcott, Loris Tylor, Tom Lowenhaupt, and Mohamed El Bashir.

On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Roberto Gaetano, and Alan Greenberg.

From staff, joining us shortly will be Heidi Ullrich. Currently on is Silvia Vivanco and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Veronica.

If we can speak slowly for Veronica for Spanish interpretation during the conference call. Also, 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. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the first thing we have to do is to adopt the agenda. I must apologize for having updating it very late. It's basically a repeat of the agenda we

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.

October 2014

had last week, primarily a review of any of the activities that would be ICG, and then quick updates on any activity in the RIRs. So the Regional Internet Registry, and on the IETF, etc. An update on the, well perhaps an update on the cross-community working group chartering. I've actually moved this over to agenda item number four.

So we'll do that separately. And then we will also have to prepare for the ALAC, well the preparation of the cross-community working group meeting in Los Angeles. We have two meetings that will be of importance to us, specifically one which is our working group meeting, and just before that, we have a meeting with the ICG. And then of course, there are a number of other wider meetings. I believe there is one on Thursday where the cross-community working group will meet with the community, etc.

But first, let's put up the agenda and see if any amendments are required. So anybody wishes to make any amendments, please ask for them now, or add anything to the agenda. Is there anything that you wish to speak about that is missing? I don't see anyone put their hand up, so the agenda is adopted.

And let's first start with the review of the action items, as they currently are. That's on our last call, on the 25th of September, and the AIs are as follows. The first one is for Olivier to send an email to Jonathon, that's Jonathon Robertson, Byron Holland, and Alissa Cooper to make such a suggestion if the ICT could meet with the cross-community working group in Los Angeles, during the cross-community working group session.

October 2014

I have asked everyone by email. The answer was that there would be a question asked of the cross-community working group itself. I understand that the question was asked yesterday on the cross-community working group call. And there did not appear to have been that much movement or agreement on this in any way, and so as far as I understand at the moment, the ICG will not be meeting with the cross-community working group.

Does anyone have any different information than this? This is my current assessment at the moment. Mohamed, it's Olivier speaking. Is this also what you've heard then? So the ICG will not be meeting with the cross-community working group in LA.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed, if I can give an update, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please go ahead. Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you Olivier. I don't recall a request that has been received for a specific RTT WCT meeting. But there was later received from CWEG regarding timeline, but a specific meeting? No. There is a tendency from the ICG that to use the [inaudible] ...community as a follow up to have meetings with different communities, non-dedicated, one to one, with specific community.

October 2014

I think there is, RCG received ALAC request, and that request, I'm not sure about this request and who send it, frankly. I should have details about [inaudible], I maybe can explain it to the Chair, but I'm not aware of a request received by RCG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Mohamed. That's what I meant. It's Olivier speaking. There wasn't a request made because, well this was suggested yesterday, no one picked it up. So it doesn't look at the moment then that the ICG would meet with the CWG. Okay. So that one is done as an action item.

Now, next Mohamed El Bashir and Jean-Jacques Subrenat are to coordinate getting in touch with other component CWG on naming issues, and find out if there is a problem with the timing of the proposals. Has there been any follow up? First I see Alberto Soto and then Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Before I ask the question Mohammed and Jean-Jacques let me just give the floor to Alberto Soto and then to Tijani. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. If I'm not wrong, the ICG had informed that any community that would like to proactive, to communicate with them, then that community should send an email. I am trying to find that email, but they would be taking this into account. Thank you.

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much for this Alberto. That's correct. So, we'll see if they receive emails from the CWG, but it doesn't look like it at the moment. Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I am a bit worried because the CWG is not yet constituted. I don't know the representatives of ALAC or At-Large, we have five representatives who have to be appointed there. So the CWG is not yet functioning. So it is normal that there is no planned joint meetings with the ICG in Los Angeles. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I think you might have missed this in your emails, because the TWG had a call yesterday, had its first call yesterday. And the four current representatives as selected by the RALOs, were agreed on, they all took part in that. So the...

Yeah, so...

[CROSSTALK]

October 2014

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, okay. But what I mean, Olivier, the CWG is just has been contributed. The first call was yesterday, so it is not possible that ICG agreed on a meeting, a joint meeting, with this group, since this group just started.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Tijani, so it's Olivier speaking. So let me just repeat what I said earlier. The question was asked yesterday, during the call, whether the CWG should ask for a meeting with the ICG, there was no response, no follow up on this. And because I had asked the current co-chairs of the CWG, Byron Holland and Jonathon Robinson, they had said, "Well, we'll just leave it to the group to decide."

As a result, there is no request that will be sent to the ICG for the CWG to meet with them. That's the bottom line.

Okay? Right. So let's just then follow up. So coming back to then the next action item, Mohamed El Bashir and Jean-Jacques Subrenat, to coordinate getting in touch with other component CCWG on naming issues and finding out if there is a problem with the timing of these proposals. Jean-Jacques or Mohamed, did you ask the question and what has the feedback been?

Hello? Let's ask with Jean-Jacques. Mohamed first?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, hi. Sorry. I was in [inaudible]... to ensure that we've captured the question. Regard the proposal timeline, and ensuring that the naming

October 2014

[securities?] are able to travel [inaudible] difficult or on time? So that's [inaudible] the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. Okay Mohamed, it's Olivier speaking. So let's start again. Mohamed El Bashir and Jean-Jacques Subrenat, are to coordinate getting in touch with other components of the cross-community working group on naming issues, and find out if there is a problem with the timing for the proposals.

The reason, let me just provide the background, the reason being that at the moment, the cross-community working group on the naming issues has to provide a proposal by, I believe, mid to end of January, which effectively means that it's the only time when it will meet, will be next week. And it has just been formed.

And I'm just very surprised that there would not be any further face to face meetings. I did ask yesterday on the call, whether any face to face meetings are planned. At the moment, none are planned. And so it looks like the proposal for the, by the CCWG on naming issues will take place by, I gather by having conference calls and emails, no additional face to face meeting past the meeting next week.

So the question was, does this introduce a problem with the timing for the proposals? That was the question that needed to be asked to the other component parts.

October 2014

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Just on this issue, there was a letter from Byron and [inaudible], regarding challenges of the naming community to come up with a proposal with the current timeline. Just to respond quickly, the other communities [is of its first] issue of timing. I think they're very asked, more meetings. There is maybe before they finalized the proposals.

From the ICG, this has been discussed with the members, and actually the majority of the members think that naming community really should seek options to ensure that they have, they could still fill the timeline and have the proposal ready either...

...and if required, can you hear me? Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes we can hear you Mohamed. Yes, you're fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, go ahead. You just cut out for a short while.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So it's, the RCG members think that the naming community should find options for themselves in terms of how they could, [really?] have the word, the challenge is shared by other communities as well, on numbering and protocols. But, it's up to them to see that we need to prioritize its work, have [inaudible] is making. See what other venues that they could ensure to complete the work.

October 2014

Actually, the fine line has been shifted already to... On the discussion, when we made the decision 15 January, that was to give people some time and avoid the holidays. And after [inaudible] ...the proposal, review and finalization [inaudible] ...NTIA would be at risk, which is that's an issue everyone finds that [void?].

So from the [RTT?] levels, I think it's, people are pushing to the CWG to get, to be active and start working on the proposals. Many members of the RCG, so they know initially the timelines that have been discussed, they can post their concern at various stages. But also RCG has responded back to CWG emails by Jonathon and Byron by getting that. If you're facing that a bit of your progress, and alert us in due time if there is an issue that ends the ability of CWG [inaudible] long time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this full update Mohamed. That was very good, and we'll therefore leave it in the hands of ICG and the CWG to find out if they're able to progress forward with the current timeline. I gather that this might pop up during the meeting in Los Angeles, and we will therefore have a clearer idea at that point.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Can I have a word?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Jean-Jacques.

October 2014

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Just to add to what Mohamed has very accurately described. I think we should be aware that it's not the ICG's job to micromanage sub-groups, or any parts of the community which will be giving input to the ICG. Of course, if there is a major problem, as Mohamed pointed out, then we will have to adjust. But we believe the timeline, which was setup and advertised very widely, did not bring up major problems. So we leave it up to each group, such as the CWG to do what is necessary to meet the deadline.

And if there is a major problem, we'll be warned. But for the time being, that's how we're looking at it in the ICG. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. So now we can proceed forward with the next action item, which was that all members of the IANA issues group were, have got questions to ask the ICG. And we will be able to discuss this shortly in the preparation for the working group meeting.

Let's go to agenda item number three. And we've got various sub-topics in there. First the quick review of what has been going on this week in the ICG. Then we'll have a quick review on the different components... Well, different communities and then we will finish this section by preparing for Los Angeles.

October 2014

So starting with the view of the ICG, Mohamed or Jean-Jacques, would you like to. Yeah, okay. I see Mohamed, I suggest you start. So Mohamed El Bashir, quick summary of what's been happening this week on the ICG progress report.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thanks Olivier. [Inaudible]... couple of issues under discussion. [Inaudible] ...that's under [inaudible] ...on that. The agenda which is being finalized and shared soon. So this was [inaudible]... the RCG and community, and we have to ensure [inaudible] of RCG, which is basically the evaluation impact, come up with two preferred vendors [inaudible] ...company called [inaudible] ...company [inaudible] ... There was [inaudible] evaluation. For example, one member couldn't evaluate the proposal, so I haven't seen them all.

And I will be reflecting that member in terms of the evaluating the [inaudible] received proposals. To move ahead, hopefully, maybe, before the evaluation could be finalized or submitted to ICANN procurement. So the RCG could have an independent secretariat as soon as possible. I think those are, from my point of view, the main issues. Maybe Jean-Jacques could add another discussion that's also going on in terms of proposal evaluation discussion as well.

But I was not following that [inaudible].

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much for this Mohamed, it's Olivier speaking. Your line wasn't that great. Did you say that the proper evaluation of the secretariat RFP is reaching its end? And so how soon do you believe that ICG secretariat can be selected?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: There is two sets on this proposals. One is the RCG internal evaluation, and the second is [inaudible] finalization and at least proceeding with the procurement and awarding the [inaudible] for the selected. For RCG evaluation, I said that there is, currently [inaudible] is considering some points by the members. Including a point [inaudible]... raised by Kavous and Joe, regarding ISOC chapter in Singapore [inaudible]...

...put forth. And the concern was once the members did not fully evaluate, fully review or evaluate the proposals. So, myself I'm going to replace that member. Daniel, I think, you have issues in timing, and we need to review the proposal. So [inaudible] ...to evaluate the proposals. So, the [inaudible] is hopefully that this [inaudible] could be from [inaudible] in order to be forwarded to ICANN to complete the process.

And unfortunately it seems that maybe the outcome would not be able to do anything until after the meeting [inaudible] ...looking to a target of maybe end of October [inaudible] to have another member to add to their selected...

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. Excluding the secretariat, is there anything else to report from the ICG?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: There was, okay, the FAQ document is being finalized. There was emails about for the evaluation. Unfortunately, I was not able to read all emails about that discussion. [Inaudible] ...an update on this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Mohamed. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, do you have anything to add?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: ...frequently asked questions. So first about the secretariat. I can confirm what Mohamed just has located. In fact, the difficulty which should have been recognized earlier on, was that a part from anything we may be doing in the ICG about setting the proper criteria for the selection of an independent secretariat, etc. there would be, in any case, the process within ICANN staff for the procurement.

So, the person on staff in ICANN in charge of procurement, has been in touch with the ICG sub-committee, of which I'm a member. And has made it extremely clear in a very accurate and precise way, the steps which had to be taken and how long it would take. So, yes, I agree with Mohamed. We're looking now more like the end of October, or the beginning of an independent secretariat, provided that we lose no time between now and then.

October 2014

I confirm also that out of the, I think, five or six proposals we received, we had identified two frontrunners who are ISOC Singapore and another one, which is a small group in New Zealand. They came up with the highest marks. I'd like to point out that several weeks ago, I had existed in the sub-committee, this selection sub-committee, I had insisted that we should have a proper system to avoid conflict of interest.

A company which could be an offshoot or have some links with some member of the ICG. And so that is being cleared. In fact, now things are clear. So now we are going to set up an interview process with the two finalists. And once we have done that, then ICANN staff takes over entirely, for the contracting, etc. And ICANN staff will then tell us, once that is done, then we will be in touch directly with the chosen entity to perform the secretariat's tasks. I hope that touches all of the questions.

But Olivier, maybe, before going to the next point, you would like to see if there are other remarks or questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So the floor is open for questions by everyone on the call.

It looks like both of you have been very complete in your updates, so thanks very much for this. I have one question just for you, is there any action by the ALAC or indeed by this working group here, necessary

October 2014

before we meet in Los Angeles? [CROSSTALK] ...input or any feedback or anything before LA?

Because we're all going to be off in 48 hours' time, or some of us are going to be off in 48 hours' time, and this is your last chance for having a quick answer.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes, thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Let's see what Mohamed has to say in a few comments, but on my part, I don't see anything urgent that is required from our working group. On the other hand, I had not finished reporting to you on the question and answers from the ICG.

As you know, there will be a session, a public session, during ICANN 51. And during that session, the ICG will be at the disposal of our communities, to answer questions or remarks. Now the interesting thing from a point of view of organizational sociology, is that it was decided by everyone that we should have a very clear mandate given to those who will be answering.

In other words, all the probable topics have been taken care of, and the agreed language has been debated. So this is interesting because there was a sense of there was not enough commonality, or how should I say? Natural agreement between all of the members of the ICG to be able to trust anyone of us to give answers in a spontaneous way. And instead of that, there was a set of questions and proposed answers. All of these

October 2014

answers were vetted and finally, we have a fairly large list of things, and the way responses are supposed to be made.

There is nothing wrong with that. Actually being descriptive, I'm saying that it is interesting that in a group like this, we chose this very elaborate method. Hello? Am I on? Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you still are.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay. So I'm just saying that it's interesting to note that the ICG chose to be explicit in the type of answers which would be deliberate to certain questions. So those are the two main things that I wanted to report on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update Jean-Jacques. Any other questions or comment?

Okay. So that's the update that we have on the ICG. Let's go to the next part of our call, and that's the update on the regional Internet registries, and on the IETF mailing list. And we will start with the discussion on any of the regional Internet registries. And that, of course, because there is a concern that some of the RIRs have started their process, or have not even started the process yet.

October 2014

Has there been any movement so far? And let's start, well I already see Gordon has put his hand up. So let's start with Gordon Chillcott, and I gather you will be speaking about any progress in the AARON region. Gordon, you have the floor.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thank you Olivier. Gordon Chillcott for the record. The only small thing I have to report is that ARRON's meeting in Baltimore starts day after tomorrow. They have a session on Thursday morning at 11 on this topic of the IANA transition. That session is one hour. I suspect it is simply a presentation. Whether anything will come of that, I don't know.

I will let you know sometime during the meeting in LA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Gordon. It's Olivier speaking. So are you saying you'll be able to follow that session remotely, or are you going to be at the session yourself?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Gordon Chillcott for the record. No, I will be following that remotely, and I'll be at LA remotely as well. I will... I am going to attempt to connect to the session in Baltimore, yes.

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's great, Gordon. Thanks very much. So we have someone there, even if virtually there, but we definitely have someone there. That's good. Anything else to report on ARRON?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Not at present Olivier. Gordon again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Gordon. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I believe she might be speaking to us about the Asia-Pacific region. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And yes, you are correct. And there is nothing to report this week. I did double check just in case I had missed something, I've been distracted a little bit this week, but indeed, nope, nothing to report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. Just a quick follow up question, is the APNIC region going to be meeting until, in the next months or so? Are there plans for this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. Cheryl for the record. The very short answer is no. We will be meeting next in February in Japan.

October 2014

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In February you say?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did. Cheryl for the record again. And I thought I pointed out in one of my more extensive reports, that of course, that will be shortly after the conveniently mid-January close off date, so there you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. So it will be interesting to see how that pans out. We might wish to be discussing this issue with some of the members of the ICG when we meet with them. Although, I'm well aware of what Jean-Jacques has said earlier, which is that the ICG will not dictate how different components parts and operational communities will be doing their business. That will be interesting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. As each of the [inaudible] meetings, and ours coming up this week. Once each of them have chewed the fat on the issues, which will happen before the end of the calendar year, then we'll see a change in this activity. But as I've also said before, these are topics that the Internet registries have been talking about for near a decade. There is really no rush. There is also no particular pressure for extraordinary change.

October 2014

There is for specific issues like service, etc. But these are things that have come forward, from the RIRs, every time their contract has been renewed. So it's not an "oh my God, we need to rush [inaudible]", it's, you know. We've said all of this before. We'll modify it slightly, and we'll say it again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. Let's [inaudible] from Alberto Soto. If there has been any progress in the LACNIC mailing list. Alberto? Sorry to be putting you on the floor, but I gathered you have followed what has been going on in that region, so we look forward to hearing from you. You have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Olivier. No, I have no update so far. The only emails that have received are the ones that have been circulated in the email list. This is the ICG document that has been approved, and the information regarding the meeting. But this is just informative, for information only. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Alberto. It's Olivier speaking. And so the only thing that I can provide you with as far as the European region, and the RIPE NCC is concerned, is what have forwarded to the mailing list, which is that the RIPE NCC and CENTRE, the European Country Code Top Level Domain Organization, held a meeting on the 1st

October 2014

of October and had... It was a joint meeting with some governments, and all that is mentioned on that press release was that the panel was followed with vibrant discussion, with many government and other attendees contributing.

But that was extremely helpful. And we wouldn't have thought it would be any different than this. But there was, there were a set of presentation slides delivered by the RIPE NCC, but so far, it does not look like any kind of progress or proposal was worked on, or any detailed work being undertaken in this region.

And that, I think, goes around all of the RIRs at the moment. So then the next question is to do with the, with any of the ICANN mailing lists or the ISOC mailing lists. I don't know if anyone has any update on this.

It doesn't look like there is any at the moment. Okay. Having also been on those mailing lists, I must admit I've also not seen very much particularly important discussion on this. There has certainly been a lot of discussion to and fro with regards to managing IANA operator change. A few slight decks currently being passed in preparation for the meetings that will take place in various forum, but nothing particularly...

I mean, on the ITF, of course, there was a slide deck which has been forwarded to prepare for the next IETF meeting. But no other information. It looks as though much of the discussion will take place, face to face, at the meeting, at the IETF meeting. And I believe that Avri Doria will be present there. I don't know if we have anyone else from

October 2014

our working group that will be present on the ground. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. It's Cheryl for the record. Am I muted? No. I'm okay. The [inaudible] IETF, I put my hand up just to say, on another face to face catching up, that the ccNSO meeting on the Tuesday and Wednesday during the ICANN meeting, has a session on each of those days. One is at 2:00 and one at four. I could get the details if need be. But it would be listed on the main ICANN agenda anyway, looking at the stewardship issue, so there would be some further interaction between the ccTLD members of the ccNSO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. And a quick question for you with regards to the ccNSO, are there any indications that any non-members of the ccNSO might be working now? Has there been any resolve as to how to get the non-members of the ccNSO, the ccTLDs that are not members to work with the ones that are?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, there is two ways of looking at that question. Cheryl for the record. If you're referring specifically to their ability to the names and listed as various work group activity members, I can say that the previous vote, which included non-ccNSO members as part of the

October 2014

appointment, did have some further discussion on the ccNSO council list, and has gone out for another rerun.

I haven't checked that list today, but it should be closing off very shortly. But in terms of non-ccNSO members engaging in face to face meetings and ccNSO activity, we've always had open meetings, and non-members have always not only been welcomed but engaged, and in fact, that's a long standing issue of the ccNSO. So it's a two-part answer, because it depends on whether you're talking about the formality of appointments, and that is having another little tweak, but it certainly something that has seen been specifically addressed.

If you're talking about the in general interaction at face to face meetings, it happens anyway, as it does in the, certainly does in the AP naming organization meetings. I would suggest it probably does in all of these regional naming organization meetings as well, in the RIR meetings. Local nobs do what local nobs do.

You'll also have a ccTLD operator there whether or not they're a member of the ccNSO. Does that help Olivier or have I confused you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, Cheryl, that's fine. Thank you for this update. It's probably more than I was expecting, as far as the question was concerned. So then we can move on to the next part of our call, since it appears that so far there has been, all parts, all discussions that have been taking place are very quiet so far. And I understand that Jean-Jacques will have to leave pretty soon.

October 2014

I was going to suggest that we have a quick review of the call that took place yesterday, the cross-community working group to develop an IANA stewardship proposal on naming related functions. That's the one where we have five seats as whole members, and then we have an unlimited number of positions, of [inaudible] as observers. I'm not sure whether all members of this working group here are registered as observers, because one of the concerns that has been forwarded to me was that there were a number of people on the call that were not observers that attended.

Not necessarily people from our working group, but if you are thinking of listening to the calls, then it would be appreciated by the people in charge of that working group, if you could register as an observer. As I said, there are no upper limits as to how many observers we have. If staff could please type the address, or at least the page which mentions the ability to register as an observer, that would be great.

And in the meantime, I should just say that the agenda itself, it's linked from our agenda page, and our agenda page, there we go. So, where are we? So meetings? Sorry. So meeting number one is the one that we are linked to. And you can see here that the first discussions were to do with the support to have co-chairs for the ccNSO and the GNSO, further consideration to be given to ideas of having additional chairs and/or vice chairs.

That discussion came to no consensus, so that was left aside. I think the majority of the call was actually on the discussion of co-chairs and vice-chairs, and we were pretty quiet on this in particular. Then afterwards,

October 2014

there was a call for all participants to actively encourage and facilitate participation and input, as there was a... I can see here, all we have is the action items and things. We don't even have the agenda, which was really helpful.

I'm sorry, but I do have a problem with the way this meeting has been recorded, and the action items and all of these things have put together so far. It doesn't follow any kind of normal order. I would probably ask the co-chairs of this working group to clarify this, because at the moment, it doesn't look very good. Anyway, the action items are saying that the support for the letter to the ICG to seek assistance and cooperation from ICG to reach out beyond the ICANN community.

So there certainly is a support for that. And then Chuck, and I believe that is not Chuck Norris, but that would be Chuck [inaudible], and Alan, Alan being probably Alan Greenberg, or which Alan? There is more than one Alan. No, there is just one Alan. So I think, Alan to submit suggestions to the list to commence work and work plan, which is interesting. And then, I thought there was another Alan.

Alan [inaudible], the other Alan. And staff to aggregate all relevant documents regarding policy issues contained in IANA contract. I see also ICG RFP, that's the action items for the call. Are there any questions or comments to add to this? Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I was on the drafting team of the charter. And I remember that after the charter was adopted and

October 2014

accepted, there was a discussion on the mailing list regarding appointment of the observers. And some, I would say, a few, not a few, a lot of representatives of consensus in this group, proposed that the [inaudible] propose their observers.

I think it is not a bad idea because, for example, for ALAC, it will make those people that are appointed by ALAC, or are proposed by ALAC, would be... It has more or less a responsibility, not as the members of the group, but also they can have essentially been following the discussion in having, at present, participating in the discussion. So I think that if we... What I [inaudible] this position second point, the co-chairs are from the mailing organizations [inaudible].

And I remember when we started drafting the charter, there was, how do you say? A trained [inaudible] to make it a group of the naming function of IANA only. And it was not easy to include that this group can address other things than the naming functions. So having two co-chairs from the naming organizations, with the idea that people thought at the beginning, that it will only be about the naming functions.

I am afraid this will perhaps make the group go exactly into this direction, and wouldn't address it other [inaudible]. So it would be better... I am sorry, I didn't attend the call of yesterday, but I think that it will be good to put one co-chair from the naming organizations, and the other from outside. Or keep the two co-chairs and add at least one or two vice-chairs or something like this, so that the leadership of this group can be more [inaudible], and not only from the naming organizations. Thank you.

October 2014

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. And so what I heard on this call was that there was insistence that the co-chairs could be from the two directly operational communities, so the GNSO and the ccNSO, but certainly encouragement for vice-chairs to be, maybe from other parties. And so, as I mentioned, the issue did not come to a conclusion.

And so it looks like we will have further discussion on this cross-community working group, probably to take place over in Los Angeles. Sorry, I just had a blank just now, but essentially we're all going to LA, in Los Angeles. We'll see where that leads us to. Any other concerns or questions from those people who were or who were not on the call yesterday?

So I had a concern. It's Olivier speaking. So I had a concern that the call was not interpreted in any other language. And I'm not quite sure how to handle this. Whether we should be that the calls should be interpreted in other languages, or whether we should not bother about this. Obviously, the ICG calls or interpreted. The calls or processes which involve the regional Internet registries, so which will be involving the parameters and the numbers, don't appear to be interpreted.

Unless I'm wrong on this, and I would expect to be corrected if they are indeed interpreted. And so the question is, should we ask for a higher level internationalization, or should we say globalization, with ICANN than the other organizations? Or are we just wasting time, resources, etc.? Any comments on this?

October 2014

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed here Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes, thank you Olivier. Mohamed for the record. Olivier, it's very important that we in At-Large should insist that the calls are translated to our standards of translation, in terms of our calls. That's very important. The naming community proposal development process will be the most focused for this, from the other two communities, due to the nature of the importance of the mailing list of ICANN internationalization. [Inaudible] ...let's say surroundings of ICANN.

So I think it's very difficult to ensure as [inaudible] or contributing, to ensure that a successful [inaudible] ...and people are able [inaudible] ...and understand at least, what is there. I mean, any small, let's say, [inaudible] of, in the process could have [inaudible]...future. In fact, the assistance on the whole [inaudible]... has been using the word observer, and there was some concern that it was also brought about, talking about [inaudible] ...participants in time. It is important that this is a valued in At-Large and ALAC process.

To ensure that this wasn't really something internationalized [inaudible] ...participate. Thank you.

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Mohamed, again, your line was a little muddled on some of the things that you said. It's Olivier speaking. Are you saying we should be insisting on having interpretation on these calls?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes. Mohamed back for the record. Yes, I think we should have interpretation. And we should be the stakeholder that [inaudible] ...the word of the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. Any other thoughts on the call regarding this? Does anything think we shouldn't? Is there any opposition to us asking for those stewardship, sorry, IANA naming issues calls to be interpreted?

Now, I have a question actually, which I was going to ask. I'm not quite sure whether Heidi would be the right person to ask, and it's to do with working group calls in ICANN. GNSO and ccNSO working group calls. Do the GNSO and ccNSO work exclusively in English?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Terri, are you able to answer that? I know you support GNSO calls.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, all GNSO calls currently are English.

October 2014

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Terri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I believe that all the ccNSO working group calls are in English. I stand to be corrected, there may be some local languages used for some smaller study groups, etc., particularly those involved in IDNs. But to the best of my knowledge, all of them are in English.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl. So I really think the question... It's Olivier speaking. This is the question, are there any objections to the ALAC asking for these calls to be interpreted? And also, what languages should we ask for the calls to be interpreted? Bearing in mind that this is a cost for ICANN as well.

I don't see any objections for asking for the calls to be interpreted. Maybe I should ask the other way around then. What languages should the calls be interpreted in? I'm begging for an answer, ladies and gentlemen. I think it's an important issue. I'm not quite sure whether I'm barking up the wrong tree, and that's the main concern that I have at the moment.

October 2014

Being seen as a nuisance is always a concern, but if it's a nuisance for the fact that the process should be done right, I'm happy at being seen as a nuisance at that point. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. As ALAC community, as At-Large community, I think that French and Spanish would be [inaudible], so we cannot ask for something which is not our need. I think we can ask for at least English and Spanish on the interpretation, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. Any other thoughts? I noticed in the chat, Gordon Chillcott suggesting the six UN languages as a base.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl hear. If we're going to bark up this tree, and I must say I am somewhat... Yes. You see my ambivalence, don't you? Because the cc and the GTLD operate in English in ICANN, but we are trying to be beyond ICANN in some of this. So picking up on Mohamed's point, if we do request, and I'm more than happy to request, to support the requesting of the languages.

I think we should, as Gordon has supported, go for the six UN ones, that is in keeping with the ICANN language policy. And I think to do less than that, would be seen as somewhat self-serving to only the bulk of the existing language speakers in just one section of ICANN, i.e. At-Large, and that is not what we're trying to do here. We're trying to suggest

October 2014

that it needs to be thought of beyond ICANN, and help to become more generally globalized.

So I think if you're going to bark up this tree, you bark up the tree in keeping with the published languages policy, and I think the expectation of the six UN languages is a base line. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. So let's then have an action item on this. And it's for Olivier to email the, and I hope someone is taking notes. Is someone from staff taking notes? Ah, excellent. This is coming up magically.

For Olivier to send an email to the cross-community working group on IANA naming issues, requesting interpretation in the six UN languages, in line with ICANN language policies. And I think that's a good start. Of course, we could always fall back to the three languages, so French, Spanish, and English, since that would be following then the ICG standard, I think.

I think the ICG is translated in those...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, I think you... Sorry, Cheryl for the record. By using the language is coached into the language policy statement, the existing ICANN language policy statement, in many cases, the ability for interpretation to be approved, does depend on having people state that there is a critical mass, which I think is often three or more people engaged.

October 2014

So it might be safer to not drill down into too many gory details, because it also needs to be a value question, which I think is also outlined in the language and policy, language services and policy, which does say that even in the absence of interpretation being desired for people engaged in the actual call, there is sometimes good reason to have interpretation for [inaudible] of translation to capture for written record.

So I don't think we should get too detailed. I think we just leave at the language policies language, and language services policy language, because there is a whole bunch of really good thinking that went into that policy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl. So we'll just leave it as such. Are you okay with the action item as such? As it is? OCL to send an email to the CCWG on IANA naming issues, requesting interpretation in the six UN languages in line with ICANN language policy. Okay. I can see agreement from Cheryl, Gordon, Yasuichi. Okay thank you.

Let's then move on. Are there any other comments on this cross-community working group discussion? Do we have anything else to discuss on this? And I thought that it was going to be a short call, we still have a discussion needed then on our working group meeting.

And I refer you all to our meetings on Tuesday the 14th of October. So we have two meetings. First we have a meeting with the ICG members. Update from the IANA stewardship transition coordinating group with

October 2014

EN

ICG chair Alissa Cooper. That's a full hour we have with the ICG, from 15:45 to 16:45. And then we have our own meeting from 17:00 to 18:30 for 90 minutes, a full 90 minutes.

Our own meeting already has the full agenda of what we need. So, we already have introduction, feedback from ICG members. There will of course be the feedback from the previous meetings that the ICG will have had already by then. And then discussion on strategy for any ALAC proposal, identification of issues, main goals, conflict management, end user perspective and next steps.

I would like to ask whether we have any plan as to what we would like to talk about with the IANA stewardship transition coordination group, the ICG. And for this, I might ask specifically Mohamed El Bashir who could help us on what he thinks would be important for us to speak to the ICG about. What questions we should be asking.

I'm hoping, since we are one of the two communities that have asked for a meeting with the ICG, that we can make good use of our meeting with them. And therefore we need to have a set of either questions or topics we would like to touch on. And then, we can spend 10 minutes, if we can, on this topic, to try and brainstorm a little bit on the type of topics, or on any specific questions we would like to ask. Mohamed, could you just first...

I know that Jean-Jacques has left unfortunately, but would you have any suggestion as to the type of questions we could be asking or that would be of help in our meeting?

October 2014

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Olivier. I think it's an important chance to have an update from ICG about the future, what the ICG will conduct in terms of proposal evaluations, and how the evaluation will be submitted, how decisions are made. I think that would be the issue in the future for ICG.

How to consider their proposals, and how to make decisions about the final proposal, and how to submit that. I think just maybe giving an update about ICG, let's say, [inaudible] how to contribute, and that's the thing that could be asked by us in the meeting. I think the concern about the timeline, yes, it's legitimate but I think everyone knows that the pressure of time that opportunities have.

Unfortunately, this is a one chance that shouldn't be missed, the deadline is there. [Inaudible] deadline is there and everyone should be working hard to achieve it. So I don't think pushing ICG in this direction would make much help because there is lots of, I think the majority view is that within the ICG that the communities really need to take up this occasion and charge. So I think that's from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Mohamed. The three questions I picked up from what you said, it's Olivier speaking for the transcript. The three questions are an update from the ICG about how evaluations will be submitted. How will decisions be made at the ICG level? And how will proposals be consolidated?

October 2014

Would these not be the sort of updates that the ICG would be giving to the general ICANN community though, in their meeting with the public?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Yes. Like I said, also there is going to be [inaudible] ...where a timeline will be discussed. It will be [inaudible] ...so yes. It's included there. Timeline is included, but Olivier, this one to one chance, this also could be asked, we'd have the chair and some selected members as well.

So it's also our chance to ask follow up questions, and then we'll [inaudible]... The wider community meeting will be almost [inaudible], any questions, given an update, the type of update will be given already [inaudible]. And there were also be Q&A the majority of the time. Either Q&A, like an open mic for everyone to just talk about what they see and what their concern is.

I think it's [inaudible]... That's in my opinion, the questions for the next year.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this Mohamed. It's Olivier speaking. To everyone, are there any other topics or questions maybe more At-Large influenced, or more relating specifically to At-Large with regards to the ICG that we should be asking? Give you a few minutes, a few seconds to think about.

Are there any burning questions that we should ask the ICG? Not that we will have them in front of this. One suggestion I was going to make

October 2014

was to make it quite clear to the ICG what the concerns of the ALAC are, and of the At-Large community are, particularly focusing on the topic of accountability, and making sure that, well not making sure but hoping that there would be an accountability component for all of the proposals that will be sent to the ICG?

Are there any thoughts about this? I see agreement from Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Okay. I certainly hope that there will be more involvement and more discussion when we meet with the ICG, because listening to, well watching, we will be face to face, just watching each other will really not be a good thing. Anything else that you would like to add at this point in time?

Mohamed, as our representative on the ICG, is there, I mean how do you see that meeting with the ICG? At the moment, you mention that there was going to be a mix of people coming to that meeting. Are there any specifics that the ICG might wish to ask from our community?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Mohamed here for the transcript. I don't think that there were discussions on questions to the community to [inaudible] ...but [inaudible]... to participate on different proposal development. And that is something that could be a good to give an update to ICG in our approach. I think this is also a chance for us to present to ICG what our work we have actively working on this.

October 2014

A working group that is me, and so [inaudible] ...that information is going to be shared with them. But, no concerns from the ICG to this community, as I know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Mohamed. And then finally, I have one more question, which is a potential question for the ICG, and was there any open issues that do not fit in one or another operational community proposal. And if that's the case, how does the ICG suggest handling those? Would you say that's a worthy question?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed here for the transcript. Yes, but I think it is a very good question to ask. If you look to the chart [inaudible] ...basically, in terms of the requirements of the communities of, the issues really are not clear and of how we're going to quantify. For example, I'll give you an example.

There was a request that the community should have documented evidence that they have taken into consideration to receive other, when their processes are in, how that is going to be quantified and... Or even, put in a proposal that's something that's really not clear how we go through that.

Are we going to list evaluate list on mailing list, on [inaudible]... So I think yes, those are areas that can't be unfamiliar, this will be

October 2014

developed along the way. Not until December. But I think it's worth to ask and have at least further question on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Mohamed. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. As you know, in the charter, it was clearly my sense that it would be the operating parties that will propose proposals, and the others can give inputs. And the understanding of these inputs that it would be a comment on the proposals of the operating parties.

But during this discussion of the, to further the discussion on this point, it was said that any input, or any [inaudible] ...any input, I think, from any party is welcome. So I'd like to ask the following question. Are we obliged to only comment on the proposal of the operating parties? Or can the other parties make inputs outside the proposals of the operating parties? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. The sentence was cut in the middle, of course what you said. I think you mentioned, you said, can input be received on... Well, can input be any input? Is that correct? If you could repeat your question.

October 2014

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Yes. My question is, can the other parties give inputs outside the proposals of the operating parties? Or are they obliged to only comment on the proposals of those parties?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. That's also a discussion that I had whilst meeting with, in Istanbul, and you're absolutely right. This is a question we need to ask on the record from the ICG, whether... So proposals versus input. Proposals will be received from the operational communities, and then inputs will be received from others. Can those, please confirm that those other inputs can be any type of input?

And I think that the question here also is to link up with the fact that you could have input from communities that are not on the ICG, but you could also have inputs from communities that are a part of the ICG, that are directly represented on the ICG. And therefore, we partly should be asking for confirmation that if you are on the ICG, you can make any type of input, and those would be considered in the same way as proposals are.

Is this the way that you understood it?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Absolutely Olivier, absolutely.

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well thank you very much for this Tijani. And next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted, this is Cheryl for the record. I wanted to come in behind Tijani's point there, because that's a really important thing to have clarified. I think it might be certainly [inaudible], I think that is one of the questions I'm interested in the answer to most of all. And I wouldn't be predicting which way the ICG will answer it, because it might very well be that despite what our community responses are, and indeed, probably what the charter drafting, as Tijani has pointed out, intended.

It may not be the answer. I think it's a really important question to ask. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. So, I think we have the questions. We are reaching the end of this call. I will now read through the questions. The first one is, requests... Actually, it's not questions, but it's a little bit like...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Discussion points.

October 2014

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...the discussion points, yeah. And I'm going to put them into here. So, I'm currently typing in the action items box, I hope you can all see that. I've made a few notes which are not very good, but they're quickly typed. So we've got updates from the ICG about how evaluations will be submitted, how decisions are made, how will proposals being consolidated, or if issues that do not fit in one or another operational community proposal.

How does the ICG suggest handling those? Back. Viola. That's more like it. I'm sorry, this was just writing as we speak basically. And then proposals versus input. Will inputs only be comments on the proposals. Can inputs be any types of inputs? Will input from ICG inputs from ICG members be considered on the same level as proposals? Is this correct?

Agreement from Cheryl. Tijani, does this reflect your question? [Inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Okay. Excellent. Agreement from Tijani as well. And then finally, note that the accountability component is needed for all proposals. I'm sorry, I'm just typing as we're on the call. Accountability component is needed for all proposals to the ICG.

I think we certainly have a plan. So with this, I think we've reached the end of this call. Is there any other business to discuss on the call?

October 2014

Certainly now has a plan with our meeting of the ICG, and that's what I was hoping we would have. So we did a lot today. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I raise the point of observers on the CWG, and no comment was made on it. I think that it was better for us to propose observers for the CWG, because when ALAC, when At-Large proposed those observers, those observers will have responsibility to present and perhaps to give feedback to the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. So, just to get this right, so you have asked for ALAC to send observers to the CWG. I understand though that anyone can be an observer on the CWG, or whatever it's called now, but I think they're called observers. So are you saying this...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Olivier, what was discussed on the list of the drafting team, was that GNSO, ccNSO, all part of this, all charting organizations to send

October 2014

their observers. And I found it a good idea because when we, At-Large appoint or send observers to the group, those observers will have the duty to report to us, that would have the duty to follow and to be more involved.

If we don't do, perhaps nobody will observe from our community. Perhaps even if we have observers, they will not be as committed as they are appointed or designated by the At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. So, I am losing track of what requests we have sent out. I think that staff has forwarded a request to the ALAC, and to the ALAC announce mailing list, which was inviting four observers from our community. Can this be confirmed? I'm not sure whether Silvia or Terry or Heidi remember this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, I didn't see it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Didn't see it. Okay. It's Olivier speaking. So we can have an action item then to send the request, forward the request for observers in the cross-community working group to the ALAC Announce mailing list. But first let us check that this hasn't already been sent. I was under the impression that it had been sent.

October 2014

Maybe it hasn't. There has been so much going on this past week. There certainly was a public request that was sent out to anybody who is not in on this, who is registered on the system. I think also we should send an email to the members of the IANA issues working group, asking for all of us to become observers on this mailing list as well.

It's always good to have more people to follow. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. May I have a more precise action item, asking the IANA issue working group members to be observers on this cross-community working group, and ask them to confirm their meaning, so that we know who will be observer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. So, thank you Tijani. So asking for them to confirm that they have become observers. So I think that we will be able to find out from the list that is kept by the cross-community working group, but that's fine. Yeah, we'll do that. They're called members and participants now, it's not called observers any more.

So the members we have, we will receive one more member from NARALO, and then we will have participants that will come from the rest of the At-Large community, including people from this working group. So, just to recap. I notice these action items. Staff to check if request for observers have been sent, send the request to the CWG to the ALAC Announce mailing list, yes. And then sending an email to the IANA

October 2014

issues working group asking for people to become participants in that mailing list.

I'm sorry, participants in the cross-community working group on naming issues. The names are just too long for this group, so just call it naming issues. I think we'll know what it is.

TERRI AGNEW: Olivier, this is Terri.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Terri, go ahead.

TERRI AGNEW: And I believe a news alert was sent to the ALAC list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There was, wasn't there?

TERRI AGNEW: It came out of the news alert.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. Yeah, indeed. That was the ICANN news alert that was forwarded to the ALAC mailing, so I'm not going crazy after all.

October 2014

I think we can just send the emails to the IANA issues working group. Tijani, did you hear this? The news alert?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't. I am sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You didn't receive it. So, we might have to check if this was sent, or maybe we resend again a second time for the news alert. Okay. Thank you very much everyone. We are eight minutes beyond the end of this call. I realize we have an interpreter with us. Thanks very much for the interpretation, thank you Veronica.

And it's a long hour and a half for you, so we are very thankful for this. And I would like to thank everyone on this call. And now we will meet in Los Angeles, maybe not all of us, but we will also meet online, and with it, I think that the call is adjourned. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]