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 on the IANA functions, on Tuesday the 28th of October 2014 at 14:00 UTC.
	On the call today we have Mwendwa Kiuva, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Yasuichi Kitamura, Eduardo Diaz, Gordon Chillcott, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sivasubramanian M, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, and Seun Ojedeji.
	On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto.
	We have apologies form Fatima Cambronero.
	From staff, we will have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.
	I would like to remind all participants to state their name, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Terri. Have we missed anyone? It doesn't appear that we have. So welcome everybody. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And so we have an agenda today that will start with a review of the IANA coordination group activities. Where we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat will be able to tell us about the last meeting that took place in Los

Angeles. Then we'll have a review of the actual CWG to develop an IANA stewardship proposal on naming related functions.

We'll be looking at the last meeting that took place, the IANA CWG meeting that was on the 22nd of October. Then we will plan for our own working items with our subgroups, and I'll just take you to the Google spreadsheet that have these subgroups. These are the subgroups that cross-community working group members are encouraged to join, to develop a naming related function proposal.

And then finally, we'll be looking at our own positions, the At-Large positions, with the follow up from our brainstorming that we had in Los Angeles. Do you wish to add anything? Does anybody wish to amend the agenda in any way?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques, may I say a word?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please, proceed forward, Jean-Jacques, you have the floor. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I may have to leave this call in about half an hour, or 40 minutes, so in advance, I wish to be excused, but of course, I will do my part about the ICANN 51 meeting, and responding to questions, or if there are any.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Jean-Jacques, I think we will probably will just have to deal with the ICG at the beginning of the call anyway, so if you have to drop it, and you can obviously listen to the recording later on. Next, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a quick comment. I don't know if you were chairing this group before as chair, or as the person who is doing it anyway, but I am quite delighted to have you continue. Just for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Yeah, I was interim chair, and the interim sometimes takes a little while to settle. I'm happy with continuing running those calls obviously, and if there is an interest in having another chair, I'm fine with that as well. So we can think of this.

But in the interest of time, I think that these procedural issues, and so on, we can deal with on the mailing list, perhaps, and I think we can just plough straight into the work that we have, and my goodness do we have a mountain that has approached us rather fast. And that is not easy to negotiate….

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just confirming that you were not usurping a role that I wanted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. So thanks Alan. You've got plenty of work, I'm sure. So I guess with no other comments, the agenda is adopted. And we can have a very quick look at the action items from our last call. Now, of course, in the meantime, between our last call today, we met face to face, many people met face to face in Los Angeles. There were no direct action items from the LA meeting, apart from the charts, which we will be looking at a little bit later on.

The actions from the 7th of November, sorry, 7th of October meeting, were just, the various discussion points we're going to have with the IANA coordination group, and basically preparing for our meeting in Los Angeles, also staff to resend the news alert for observers in the cross-community working group, and also an email asking for people to be participants on the cross-community working group on mailing issues. I gather those two are probably the same thing.

The CCWG is the one on naming issues they were referring to. So that's all done. I don't think there is any comments on the action item, so we can go straight to the review of the ICG. And as I mentioned earlier, there was a meeting of the ICG that took place in London. On your agenda, there is a link to the ICG meeting itself, which is on the Friday, 17th of October for the whole day, and that itself has a link to the agenda of the meeting itself, with several topics contained in there. The ICG relationship to enhancing ICANN accountability model.

The community transition proposal process of dates. The proposal finalization process, and then frequently asked questions document,

future conference call and meeting schedule, and then it says here, parking lot for items we want to return to. So we will be very shortly, finding out how that meeting went, and what took place.

[Inaudible] London, the last meeting in London, goodness, I am in London. That's probably why the slip, and of course, I meant Los Angeles, thank you very much Alan for this. So I hand the floor over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat who was at that meeting in Los Angeles. Jean-Jacques, if you can take us through what happened there, that would be absolutely great. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. So, as usual, I propose to do this in two parts. The first part is a factual account of what was discussed and where we are, and the second part, if I may offer a few private, rather personal, appraisals of where we stand and what lies ahead.

So first part, the factual things. The process was actually quite an interesting a long discussion, because that's where we realize that there was some falling out in the level of understanding about what was expected by ICANN, by ICG, perhaps by NTIA also. So this was about how the tracking plan would be proposed or sent to NTIA. I put the question sometime before the Los Angeles meeting on an internal email list to the chair of the ICG, because she had sent out a copy of the email from NTIA, reminding us that the transition plan would be passed on to NTIA through ICANN.

So, I brought up the question, well in that case, I hope it's true for everyone that will be simply a transmission, and therefore there should be no alternation on our transition planned by anyone, and certainly not by ICANN. So, some of my colleagues thought that that was a rude question, others thought it was interesting. So in any case, to make a long story short, it was felt useful, given the ICG to actually put this in writing, actually in the frequently asked questions, which we were dealing with in any case.

And there, the language is now almost definitive. And it says that the transition plan shall be sent to NTIA through ICANN, but at the same time, it would be made public at the same time. Still, this is a way of underlying the fact that the ICG is independent of ICANN. That there is no, well, subordination of the ICG. So that was about process, and it was a very useful discussion actually.

And then, the other important thing was the FAQ. And that was led by a member of the GAC from Egypt [inaudible], and now we have something which is, I think, pretty final, and I think that answers just about any question that the public or the communities can put about the ICG's organization, it's work, or its relationship to the others.

Now, for the future conference call and meeting schedule, this was taken care of by Patrik Fältström, with all of us. And now it looks like we're going to have a meeting every, at least every other week, and more if necessary. And face to face meetings, for the time being, we're thinking of having them back to back with the ICANN meetings, but that may change. At least for the time being, that's what it looks like.

And finally, there was a German colleague of ours who had suggested potential outreach from the part of the ICG to IANA staff. His reasoning was, and that was the last item on the agenda. His feeling was that all of this discussion may have perturbed some of the IANA staff. And he is proposing that a group of the ICG, go and visit, or at least have a telephone conference, with the IANA staff to sort of placate them, give them an oral sedative, and I expressed a contrary view to that. That is really only up to the person from the IANA staff who is a liaison with us, that's Elise [inaudible].

And she would be the only one to know if it is appropriate or not for her to talk about this to her colleagues, but we should not meddle with that. So finally, that view was adopted, that we should not go [inaudible]… So that is the agenda. If I may, still under my point one, which is factual, I'd like to say that the really important things were two or three of the following.

First, there was really a large discussion about the interconnection of the articulation between accountability, which we had to deal with in the framework of the IANA transition oversight, on the one hand, and the wider question of accountability in the ICANN framework, and the fact that the ICG was meeting also in Los Angeles, gave rise to some very interesting comments and questions, which you all know about.

I just wanted to remind you that was an important element of the Los Angeles discussions. Same for the notion of transition of the stewardship itself, which gave rise to meetings elsewhere in the ICG. Now if I may bring up part two very briefly, which is my personal takeaway from all of this. There are several things. First, the GAC, as

you know, changed its leadership, the chair and the vice-chairs. And it's too early to say about whether this will bring about a change in style, probably yes.

Perhaps a little bit more hands on, but frankly I think that it's in the nature of the GAC, and because of the way it works, that the content will not change hugely. In other words, the GAC is still bound by its rule of unanimity. When there is not unanimity in the GAC on any subject, they cannot issue a statement, for instance, regarding the transition of stewardship. So that will not change. However, I do notice that there is no engagement on some part of some members of the GAC, around Egypt mainly.

Another personal impression I would like to share is that the atmosphere of this ICG meeting time in Los Angeles, showed that we had built a higher level of trust with each other. And it's simply to be more in contact and implement more smoothly than all the other meetings, prior to this one. And perhaps another impression is that the touchy subject, which is what is the relationship of the articulation between ICG and ICANN? Was brought up in a very clear way, and it was thoroughly debated in the ICG.

And to my agreeable surprise, it was not brushed aside from some of our friends from another continent. It was really impressed, and the result actually, I think was quite good, which says in no uncertain terms, but there is no subordination, and that for practical purposes, the transition plan will be sent to IANA through ICANN, but it is the expectation of the ICG that this will not give rise to any modification of the content.

So, Olivier and my colleagues, that's my report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have Alan Greenberg in the queue. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Jean-Jacques, what you outline is the conclusion, in the terms of the processes submitted, was pretty much what I understood at the beginning. That is, it would be submitted through the ICANN Board, they may add comments, but they would not change the substance.

However, in Los Angeles, the ICANN Board did outline a procedure that was far more convoluted, and that is if they did not like the substance, they would pass it back to the ICG. So you're saying that was not accepted. Has that message been sent to the Board and what's their response?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alan. Interesting remark and question. This is Jean-Jacques. So, that is being discussed. I cannot go into the detail of that, but yes, it was made known to the Board, to our chair, that we collectively considered that the suggestion made, I think, on the morning of the, was it the Monday? That the Board would send to us the same sort of document that our transition, that it had about some other topic, was it GAC advice or something, was not appropriate.

And that we, as the ICG, continued that we are not going to go into that stuff of having our transition plan reviewed or somehow altered. I personally made the proposal to certain people, that a way out would be for the Board of ICANN to transmit the ICG transition plan with a letter, and in the letter, of course, the Board [inaudible] thinks that point A or point B is [inaudible]. The important point I think, also in terms of perception is that the IANA plan, sorry, the transition plan, set up by the ICG on behalf of the communities, should not be altered.

And this is important because it's an absolutely unanimous [inaudible] that we are not to invent transit plan, we are simply stitching together a transition plan based entirely on input from the community. Does that answer your question Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think so. So you're standing your ground, and you have not had a formal reply from the Board on that yet. So that's where it stands. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Not that I'm aware, yes.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hi, it's Mohamed, if I can add to that, Olivier please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Mohamed, it's Olivier speaking. If I can turn back to, unmute my phone, I've unmuted it now, I believe. Mohamed El Bashir you have the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much Olivier. I would like to just also answer the question of Alan. As well, this the ICG has raised concerns, as Jean-Jacques has explained, exactly what the issues that have been raised. ICG has requested the Board to contribute and monitor the process. So that means that if the Board have any issues within the outcome of the ICG, as [inaudible] stated, the Board has a liaison within the ICG, and the Board can send back any comment, any opinion to ICG, on any issues they see related to the public interest, or to the accountability to the IANA transition.

So instead of waiting, let's say to the final submission, and then raising concerns or issues, the Board have a liaison to channel any concerns [inaudible], and also to contribute as part of the community and the process of the ICG. And I'll also share the same response by Jean-Jacques in terms of concern of the Board altering or updating any feedback final proposal from ICG, which is to be submitted only to NCIS. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Mohamed El Bashir. We have Jean-Jacques Subrenat in the queue. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. If I may, a point to Mohamed's valuable comment, is that the wording he chose about this transmission by ICANN is, in itself, quite interesting. He says, ICANN, like any other member of the Internet community, may at any time, etc. etc. So, I think that is the indication of the mood, and also the firmness of the ICG's position.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. Olivier speaking. And I have a question with regards to the meeting that the ALAC had with the ICG. Was there any feedback, based on the meeting with the ALAC and with the At-Large community? Was there any feedback or questions that arose from that meeting?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. May I answer that briefly?

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

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. I'm sure Mohamed remembered that, actually as well as I do, it was interesting that there was this remark made, oh, you the ICG are meeting only with two communities, the ALAC and GAC. But the chair of the ICG was very quick to put out that that was only because we received two requests, the GAC and the ALAC. But this being said, I

think it was a very… …parts, on your part. I'm no longer a member of the ALAC.

But it was a very good move to be very quick in this [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello? Jean-Jacques, I might have missed the last few words.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Oh, sorry. This is Jean-Jacques. I was simply saying that in any case, I think it was a good move on the part of the ALAC to have requested quite early on, a separate meeting between the ALAC and the… And certainly, it gave added visibility to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this feedback Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And so, that is not a question… I don't see anyone in the queue, but my question is to do with what is next. What is the ICG…? What is next for the ICG? I believe the next meeting is in a week's time, so what's the next plan?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yeah, I think Mohamed as vice-chair should answer this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Mohamed?

[CROSSTALK]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: If Mohamed is not available…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed, we're having a few technical difficulties in hearing you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Go ahead Mohamed El Bashir.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I was muted. But, so I was saying that, despite the internal work of the ICG, in terms of finalizing independent secretariat, and the ICG will… I think although the progress of the different communities in how [inaudible], there is not much to be done when ICG in this period. There

will be [inaudible] community in terms of producing some material to explain the process more visually, for example, info graph.

There are ideas about working with the Secretariat to increase awareness [inaudible] different communities about the process as well. We have a document that needs to be finalized, which is really how the ICG would work internally to solicit, agree, on the components on the final proposal. That's the document that needs to be finalized as well.

So the majority of the work is [inaudible] for the ICG, finalize those two issues, an independent secretariat as well, completing the documents about the process for analyzing, collecting the final proposal internally. So that needs to be finalized.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mohamed. We have Eduardo Diaz in the queue. I was going to come back to Jean-Jacques afterwards. So Eduardo first.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. This is Eduardo for the record. Mohamed, this is Eduardo. I suggest also that, you know, so you're going to have a meeting every two weeks, that somehow you get an update from each of the groups, like TWG, IETF, and so forth, so you get a sense of how work is being done, and you will get a sense if, if these groups are going to be able to generate [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Eduardo. Back to Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Just to add something to what Mohamed was indicating. Small things. One is that you remember, around Los Angeles, there was a discussion about the timeline, and the fear that was expressed that we would never make it. So it was decided that, although we may wish to show a certain flexibility, by next spring or next summer, at this stage it is decided that we stick to our announced published agenda.

The second thing I would like to point out is that we are very near completion of the selection of our independent secretariat. We had our last selection process with one of the candidates last night [inaudible], and we should be reporting this to the full ICG at its meeting, at its telephone meeting tomorrow, that is the 29th of October. And shortly after that, we will have indicated to ICANN staff, what is our preference, and from there on it is ICANN procurement staff that they negotiate conditions and finalize as a contract.

So, in concrete terms, in practical terms, I think that means that the ICG will have a secretariat up and running early November. I hope. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And so I propose that we now move to the next part of the same agenda item, and that was, as it was mentioned, updated status of the different community IANA proposal development. I don't know if we have someone from each one of the other working groups on the call, but looking at the various

mailing lists for the ICANN wide discussion, the IAD discussion, the Internet society, and of course, the RIR, regional Internet registry mailing list.

There certainly has been some movement, and I wonder if we could go on a quick roundup of these. I'll call on people who are listed as being on those mailing lists. I note, ah yes. I know that Jean-Jacques has to sign off now. So Jean-Jacques, you'll be able to listen to the call that will be recorded, and of course, read the transcript in a few days' time.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you very much. Goodbye all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Goodbye Jean-Jacques. So regarding the mailing lists, first the ICANN-wide discussion. I have Alberto Soto, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fatima Cambronero, and Avri Doria on this overall mailing list as the ICANN IANA transition mailing list. Has there been any movement on this recently? I can see both Alberto and Cheryl being on the call. So would someone wish to say anything to this?

[CROSSTALK]

ALBERTO SOTO: Olivier, this is Alberto Soto for the record. I would like to take the floor. I was making a summary, unfortunately I didn't have a lot of time

because I have been traveling. I've been seeing which is the mailing list and which, actually I'm involved in all of them, so which of the lists are you referring to?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alberto. Olivier speaking. Let's start first with the ICANN wide IANA transition mailing list. And I guess, since you are on many of them, maybe you can report on all of the ones that you are on, and then that will save us some time. Back to you Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Olivier. This is Alberto Soto for the record. So with respect to the RIRs, we are looking for qualified individuals for the [inaudible], which is the committee that needs to work on the document by the RIRs, that is the ICG needs to prepare this on the 15th of January. It will have 15 members, and the way of working is the same with the RIRs.

Now with respect to the IANA, Milton Mueller has published the same that you, Olivier, have mentioned, two or three days ago in the [inaudible] blog. This is published there as well. Now also within this list, there are some discussions on these days. There are pretty frequent, we are not really reaching any conclusions but we are discussing a lot about protocols and numbers, of whether…

I mean, there are actually proposals for policy changes being discussed. And there are some others who oppose, such as a network operator who says no to institutional changes, because this would create stability and continuity changes, since we have not had them so far. So that is

my part on the mailing list. Sorry I didn't have any more time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alberto. That's very helpful, and that's a very good summary of what's been going on. I have a question with regards the splitting of functions, or the keeping together of the IANA functions. As you've mentioned, Milton's proposal, or rather the ICT, I think, IGP, Internet Governance Project is the name of it, that there is a mention in there of splitting of the functions, and certainly a splitting on the part of the names, the policy from the implementation.

Has this splitting of the function gained any traction with the IAD or the RIR discussions?

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto speaking. With respect to the RIRs, yes, but with respect to the rest, I haven't really noticed that. In general, the RIRs, or at least, at the operator's level, they oppose to any splitting to any divisions. However, there are some individuals who are supporting this region.

I just posted on, for Milton Mueller's website on the chat room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alberto. We've got that.

ALBERTO SOTO: …does not coincide with the one that you mentioned the other day.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alberto. Any other updates on the mailing list? I mean, that's been a very good summary on the different work that has taken place. Cheryl, you were about to say a few words. I see you've put your hand up. I anticipated this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I just wanted to pick up just a couple of [inaudible], but I am just going through the regional digest, and there is still a lot of fiddling about with process and discussion on how we build the car as opposed to starting the car. But, that's not, I'm not overly concerned about that. I think what that is, in terms of list activity, is actually responsive to input which is perhaps list widely informed within the region.

Now you'll have somebody who puts forth a question or two, to the list, [inaudible] very procedural on the AP list. Now that might be the case in other RIRs, I don't know. But put these in the regional lists, if one just look at the digest traffic, one would think, good heavens about what [inaudible] actually happening. [Inaudible] list traffic is reflecting the agreement or otherwise, the group thinking or consensus, that is happening when humans gather together and talk.

So I just wanted to warn all of us to be a little cautious without doing just a quick audit of something like digest list traffic, and seeing to or fro between one or two people, which seems to be rather process driven. And fearing that progress is not happening. I do believe that it should be RIRs that should come together in a relatively harmonized, there

might be a few different shades of a proposal, but there are very confident [inaudible] on the numbering community is happening.

Not enormously different to the draft that they discussed previously, will actually go ahead. I just wanted to go ahead and caution those of us who might just look at list traffic, and say, well good heavens, what's going on? [Inaudible]… I don't agree that is the case, I just think that digest list traffic is not the only [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And indeed, I think that some of the work with regards to the RIRs is taking place when they are meeting face to face. I know suddenly that in a couple of weeks' time, RIPE will be meeting in London, and it has also been the case of all of the other RIRs. So some measure of movement will obviously take place, then when they meet face to face.

And if I recall, I'm just doing this from memory, I think a global [inaudible] coordination list for RIRs has been created. Is that correct Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct. The [Crisp team?], the executive committee of the various RIRs have been called for people to go forward [inaudible] on this global coordination team, and certainly [inaudible]… part of that, just be clear, the team will be responsible for producing the number community proposal's for IANA transition for [inaudible]… And I will, if you'd like, put a link to the chat about that. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl. Olivier speaking. The link you're going to put, is that to do with the mailing list that is now created between the RIRs? Is this a public mailing list?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the background and details. I don't have a specific mailing list only for [Crisp], I'm going to see what I sort. You're going to send me back to my list now, I shall return.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl. I notice another great acronym, the [Crisp] team. Please. Alberto Soto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto. Olivier, two comments. [Inaudible] is finishing a document yesterday, they were finishing a document, the did on October the 27th, but this document is not published yet. So once it is published, I will make it available to you. Now, when it comes to [Crisp], the response for this would be available at IANA dot NIC. I don't know if this link is open yet, but I will let you know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alberto. Olivier speaking. And I'll let you type it into the chat for reference. Next is Eduardo Diaz. You have the floor Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier, this is Eduardo for the record. Olivier, I have a question, because I'm kind of lost. On the question about why the RIRs and the other communities, you know, why is their reaction to Milton's paper, Milton's paper, the way I read it, is only for names, for the name functions that is played out, but not the other functions.

I know why a RIRs are maybe concerned about that. So I'm lost, if you could [inaudible] thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Eduardo. It's Olivier speaking. And yes, I leave it to Milton's paper with regards to splitting, because I wondered whether there is any discussion in the RIR community, or on the protocols community, where splitting of the naming functions would affect any of the other functions in any way, because obviously you're starting to split the IANA functions with having the name treated in one direction, and the others treated elsewhere.

You split one up, maybe you can split all three off to go in different directions. Maybe some might wish to have everything to be independent of each other. And so that's the reason that I asked whether there was any traction with regards to splitting things off, but it appears that the response has been so far that, a split might be introducing too many changes, and certainly it's threatening any continuity, or might threaten any continuity on this.

I see Alberto Soto has put his hand up. Maybe Alberto would like to add a few words. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record.   Well, what I have seen, and [inaudible] as well, they mentioned the root zone, or the root zone was mentioned, this splitting of functions within IANA. So we should take into account root zone as well. And in the [inaudible] discussion, they say that they track that root zone. But if there is a change in the root zone, well perhaps there would be certain stability issues, or continuity issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alberto.   Any other questions on these issues? Just a question for those of who are following those discussions, is there any intervention required now at the moment specifically, any question that you would like to ask on a question that is being asked on one of these mailing lists at the moment, anything that should be done that would affect end users in a negative way that we might need to address.

Seeing no one put their hand up, if you do have any thoughts about this before the end of this call, I will deal with it at the end of the call. I see, oh, now I see a couple of people.   So Alberto Soto first, and then Eduardo Diaz afterwards. Alberto, you have the floor.

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Well, as it was said before, this is a super complex topic, and ICANN is somehow being attacked in certain aspects. For example, like on accountability. And this transition would imply a change, and [inaudible] comment saying that ICANN is not suitable for that transition. So these comments are posted on certain blogs, in some groups, and here I think we have some participants from one of these groups.

So I believe that this is a very important topic, but perhaps we should face this by seeing where ICANN is being attacked, and we need to audit this [inaudible] somehow. Audit may audit to verify trends on the weak point that they have, once this is [inaudible], they continue working. So if we know why or where ICANN is being attacked, well we should verify that, and then we should decide if there is reason for being attacked or not.

And I say attacked because that is the word they are using, or that is the method they're using. Perhaps there are certain weaknesses that should be dealt with and we need to focus on that, and then transition would be much easier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alberto. Did they think of a stress test by any chance, the [inaudible] called?

Okay. No hearing. Okay, next is Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I was muted. It's Eduardo for the record. I just wanted to say, when I look at this, I agree with Alberto that, and I think most of you, that this is a very complex issue, and you see all kinds of [inaudible] here, and coming there, and papers. But, you know, when I look at the whole thing, the main issue here and the main discussion that I see, mostly here.

We spread [inaudible] of ICANN [inaudible] ICANN is going to be accountable for. So far, you know, when I look at all of the documents I have seen, there is Milton's paper, that he just put out there, he supported all of this, he made a proposal that is [inaudible] whatever research he did, and basically saying, "We should split this." And my feeling is, that that is what is going, CWG, talking about the DNS now here, that's where things are going to be pushed on that committee.

And I think ALAC should discuss that, in the sense, why or what is the appropriate thing? Because most people are talking from their experience, but the only one that I have seen, this research, this post by Milton, maybe we want to do something [inaudible] whatever we want to support, so we can have a better idea of what we want to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this Eduardo. And in fact, you are taking us straight into agenda item four, the review of the last coordination working group meeting. I think this is where we can take it from, and to concentrate on the work that we have with the coordination working

group, sorry the cross-community working group, that is, that took place, that had already three calls.

The fourth call is on this Thursday, the last call was last week on Wednesday the 22nd of October. And I wondered whether there was any feedback on this discussion. Eduardo, you quite rightly mentioned that part of the discussion was to whether there should be a split or no split, and that is certainly something we can discuss today and gain the point of view of people on the call today.

But with regards to, first agenda item four, the last cross-community working group meeting. Are there…? Is there any feedback or any thoughts in addition to Eduardo's on this call, or about this call? I hope that you've all been able to attend it. It was quite a long-ish call. It started out with much discussion on structure, and process. The action items really are the ones that we are topically focused on.

Obviously the first is to deal with the draft principles document, which has been put together. And I'm not sure a draft principles document is something we should really concentrate on. These are usually quite straightforward, and then the group members and participants are to identify which subgroups they would like to volunteer, and we're going to be touching on this in a moment, in our next agenda item, to see if we got any gifts that we need to fill in, and whether there has been some movement in those subgroups.

Then there are also, well the other action items are to do also with the volunteering for those subgroups, including a triage effort, as they call it. And that's to include a separate work item on the effort and update

slides accordingly. I guess this is what we're going to see in the next meeting. And we've got agenda, I think, number five, staff to send details about face to face meetings as soon as possible.

As we know now, it's meeting every Thursday at two different times on the Thursday, rotating between one and the other. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl for the transcript record. I was going to wait until later in the agenda, but I just wanted to let you know that the, God I've lost the word, Google spreadsheet that you have, the Excel spreadsheet, on who has volunteered for what sub work teams, needing updating in line with recently now that [inaudible]. So I've taken the liberty of updating that, that's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. I haven't seen the updated spreadsheet yet. I'm just about to think on that and found out, that is great. I mean, the reason why it was put in the Google was for everyone to be able to update automatically and type in the details, etc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I wasn't sure who was in charge with editing that document, and because [inaudible] there had been some changes, [inaudible] volunteering for some of those things, and it wasn't reflected in that [inaudible] and updated it [inaudible] apologies, to most recent list did come out today, including the workspaces. So

perhaps [inaudible] reflect those [inaudible] or updates, it be a very [inaudible] a very…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much for this Cheryl. Very good point. So Terri, after the call, if you can cross check these update on the working groups themselves, and our Google spreadsheet, make sure that the two are coordinated with each other, so we have a true reflection on who is on what working group, that would be helpful.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, this is Terri. I will do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Cheryl, just to come back to you on the updating of the Google spreadsheet. It was put up as a Google for everyone to be able to update automatically. You you've done very well indeed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …I'll just [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There you go. If you don't believe the whole thing, that's fine. So, coming back to our agenda items then. We are discussing the last conference call meeting number three. As you know, there is meeting number four on the 30th, so far, looking at the agenda of meeting number four, it doesn't look like there has been any… Well, there are

updates, but there is very, very [inaudible] second reason for proposal on how to structure the work, principles, new draft, status and work subgroups, and any other business.

I gather the most important part of the call will be the status of the work in the subgroups, and perhaps we can already do that if some of you have been involved with the subgroups. I heard someone say my name earlier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, that's me Tijani. I am not on the Adobe Connect, so I cannot raise my hand. I am sorry Olivier, I have to leave because I have a teleconference now, now, now. So I have to tell you two words about the drafting team on the accountability cross-community working group….

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be great, please go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you Olivier. So the drafting team of the cross-community working group, about accountability, met two times. The first time was only an introduction, more or less. We didn't have really a productive call, but the second meeting was better. We had [inaudible] more. The most important points raised, and where there is a long discussion, group discussion, was…

So I can give you what we are working on, it is some sections of our charter, such as the purpose statement, goals and objectives, scope. The scope has taken a lot of time for us, because there is similar point of view, especially because, especially from GNSO, to make the scope better detained. So that I oppose because I think we don't have to decide, instead of the working group. We have only to put the mission of the working group, and the timeline, and the working methods, etc.

We have not mandated to define what are the issues that we have to discuss. We can say what is the scope, the missions, the scope of their work. Some wanted to give a list of questions or issues that they have to discuss, that they have to work on. With consensus on giving them a broad or a large guidelines for the issues to be discussed, because [inaudible]… we put, we keep [inaudible].

When I opposed, I had a lot of support in the group. Anyway, this is a point. The other questions were about [inaudible], because this working group, we work in two work teams. One is about accountability related, if you want, to the IANA transition, and the other, about the other accountability, the rest of the issues of accountability.

And this separation wasn't clear for everyone. And now we ended by finding a way to make everything clear for everyone. So the first thing we work on the issues on the accountability issues, to be addressed before the transition. And the second stream would be for the issues to be discussed after the transition. So this is the final separation, because any text that you put, there is explanation, which is different. Also there is a big discussion about the accountability related to the

EN

operation of the functions of the IANA, and those are given to the cross-community working group [inaudible]….

So we need it clear that it is not in the scope of this working group. For the composition, we are about to agree on two members by charting organization, two to five. So you may nominate or you may appoint 2, 4, 5 members to this cross-community working group, by charting organizations. So ALAC can appoint up to five members. This is more or less what, to which extent we work this charter. I sent the latest version, after the meeting of yesterday, we will meet again on Thursday.

So we are working very hard because we want to provide this charter to the chartering organization before the meeting next month. And unfortunately, one of the chartering organization, the GNSO, will meet on 3 of November. So we are really in a hurry and we are working very hard. Thank you. If you have any questions, I can answer it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. Olivier speaking. So the floor is open for any questions regarding the charting of the cross-community working group on accountability. Well, there are no questions. Thanks for this very extensive and productive update. And good luck for the rest of the drafting of the charter. It looks like you're in the right direction. I certainly am very pleased to see the points here pushing along. So I think we're fine on this.

So I leave the floor open. If there are any more questions on the charter, or questions on the IANA coordination working group meeting, sorry. Cross-community working group meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I actually will leave now because I have a teleconference now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks very much for the update Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, bye-bye. So we're back to agenda item number four, the last working group meeting. As I mentioned, one of the main points was to start the work in the various subgroups. So in our agenda, we've got the spreadsheet that Cheryl alluded to earlier. We've also got a link to the different working groups, subgroup, wiki pages.

The RFP 1 is the description of the communities use of IANA function. RFP 2A is the existing pre-transition agreement quality source. RFP 2B is the existing pre-transition arrangements, oversight and accountability. RFP 2C, existing pre-transition arrangements, NCIA, IANA functions, contract triage. RFP 3 is the proposed post-transition oversight and

accountability arrangements. RFP 4 is the transition implications, and then five NTIA requirements validation of, validation of NTIA requirements and six, summary of community process.

As we know, I would say that four, five, and six are probably due to take place later. And one, two, and three, in fact, one and two, whether 2A, 2B, and 2C are the immediate ones to be tackled, with RFP 3 considering the bulk of the work here, proposed post-transition oversight and accountability arrangements. I wonder if there was any movement in these sub working groups so far. I recall from listening to the call, that the work was supposed to take place, either by direct email, or was supposed to take place on the mailing list.

And therefore, I haven't seen very much going on RFP 1 and 2. I wondered if anyone else has a different view of this, or has seen something. I haven't. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Eduardo for the record. So far, I have seen some traffic within the RFP to be the triage, the triage of the contract. And the conversation that I have seen, I have seen Milton pushing for not doing too much of that work because he's started going and look what we have now, and then work on that.

He said, no. Say what we want, and then go back to the contract and see what things are there that needs to be changed. So, this triage thing might be put on hold if people didn't have some traction, as you say, with all of this. The other thing that I see on the overall hand is,

these groups were put together, but there is no really someone to chair there. I mean, that's not there.

It's everybody talking about everything. So hopefully this meeting we will have some more structure to it, so there is more order, somehow we're going to have to put something together, and somehow somebody has to direct that, one way or the other. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this Eduardo. Olivier speaking. Indeed, you are in RFP 2C, which deals with the triage. So thanks for the feedback on this. I'm also looking at the various discussion that I think [inaudible], that there might be some of it that is taking place by direct email, hence the questioning of this. I wondered with regards to RFP 1, which is the very description of the community's use of IANA's functions, whether anyone here, person on the call, has any feedback on whether anything has happened on that.

I note that both Sean and [inaudible] are being listed as being in this group, I'm not sure whether they are on the call.

TERRI AGNEW: Neither are on the call. This is Terri for the transcript.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Terri. Okay, anyone else that has followed this? No, okay. And then on 2A and 2B, I'm following both of these, I haven't seen much going on to the extent that I'm even about to look at the list of people

that are on this, the sub working group and actually to email them, and ask them the question, and say effectively, what's going on? What's happening?

I'm not sure if something is happening behind the scenes by email, or whether there is actually proper movement. I note that, for 2A both Sean and myself are on this. And for 2B, then we have [inaudible], Olivier, Sean, Holly is on this as well.

So we've got quite a few people from At-Large on this, on 2B. I haven't seen anything happen on this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl for the record. And I agree with you, I certainly haven't been on the list, the change has happened directly [inaudible]… drill down and ask people about, that I would frankly think that on the list would be the smart place to operate anyway. But I did want to point out, of course, that I up until recently, that we were allowed six hours if not 24. There are still clarification questions, Olivier, just on the general work plan as well.

So, what this simple questions, and I'm thinking about the email here [inaudible], and they will be sorted out into various editing and qualifications that are required by [inaudible] or text change will happen. That seems to be all I've really seen, out of all them lining up and saying who is going to be what we're seeing.

But it does bring me back to the view workspaces, and so I will go and find that email and see that there are not any activities going on [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Olivier speaking. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. This is Eduardo. I just wanted to point out that the, mailing lists are being created, or they are just created this week, so that might be another issue with this conversation on the mailing list. I think once they are created, a lot more specific work will be… We'll be able to tell more about specific work for each of the groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Eduardo. Olivier speaking. What I would suggest then, in the meantime, since time is of the essence, especially for RFP 1, 2A, 2B, and 2C. If you go onto the wiki pages for each one of these, you will see a list of the volunteers. So for example, RFP 2A has Alan, [inaudible], Jeff Gomez, [inaudible] McCarthy, Sean [inaudible] and myself.

And what I was going to do is just drop an email to the other members of this list to find out what's happening, in a nice way of course, but try to get a status update on this, knowing full well that the first two volunteers on that list had volunteered to move forward quite quickly. So, with the delivery being the next meeting of the coordination, of the

cross-community working group, the 30th, with two days remaining, there is still time to be involved and to find out what's going on.

I was going to suggest that this was an action item, we've got enough people who are on the different mailing lists. Well, covering all the different RFPs. So it would have to be either [inaudible] or Sean for RFP 1. RFP 2A, I will send an email out. RFP 2B, I'll just do the same as well. 2C, Eduardo, if you could check the status of the triage, that would be great. On… Yes, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I was confirming.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent, okay, thanks. On three, who do we have? I think that, Cheryl, because the thing that is online is not updated, no. Cheryl you didn't go for three. On three, I've got [Shiva], Desiree, Olivier, [inaudible], and Eduardo. Since you are on the call, Eduardo, do you wish to also inquire about three yet, on the status?

I gather three is probably unlikely to have even started work yet.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. Yes, we have to… I haven't heard anything, but I will, certainly can inform on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And then 4, 5, and 6 are for later, I don't even think it's worth yet asking on a status. I think [CROSSTALK]… Yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should be noted that while it's later, it's not much later [inaudible]… contingent on some of the earlier pieces, but we're still talking, the deadline is November 17th, you know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's not [inaudible]… We need more people engaged in all of those, and I personally think that fall is critical and [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Definitely official, but obviously it's all about timing, but yeah, I agree with you Cheryl. Doesn't the RFP 4…? We were saying later, we just might be saying a few days later. If I can just ask, in fact, I'll follow up with those people who have not volunteered for RFP groups, or at least have not volunteered openly on any of the RFP groups, and find out which ones they would be interested in joining.

I certainly see that the triage might need more people, RFP 2C, we've only got one person so far, that's Eduardo. And I think that obviously five and six, is going to have to be populated as well, and with people who are involved with this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actual workers will be good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. So [inaudible] to follow up with people that haven't signed up to the RFP groups. Okay. Any other questions or comments with regards to these RFP groups?

No, I don't see anyone put their hand up. So let's move to the next agenda item, and that's the building of the At-Large position. As you know, in Los Angeles, we met face to face and had a bit of, in fact, very much of a brainstorming session. And so, it was just to let you know we've got the notes from the flip chart that are on the agenda, and also we have that the notes that Heidi took, in docx and also in PDF format, that she took about the brainstorming, and the points which were brought forward.

The question now is really, where do we want to go from here? The way that things are currently drafted, obviously there is going to be a proposal made from the names community, and proposals made by the other two communities. We still have a question then, do we want to build our own proposal? And I gather if we do, then we have various points that we would like to, or that we could expand on.

So, what I was going to suggest then, the first question that she has, everyone here read the, not only the notes from the flipchart, but also the brainstorming outcome document, which Heidi has very kindly put online. I see Alan Greenberg with his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to whether we plan to build a proposal or not, I've heard very little of substance, other than on accountability issues, where we have substantially different positions from what are being proposed. Now I may have missed them, but I think we need to articulate that before we decide to embark on what is a relatively complex process [inaudible]… Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I think we have someone in the background, I'm not sure…

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a crosstalk of some sort.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. [Inaudible] to please find out. I don't think it comes in from the, and I think that might be Mohamed actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe we can mute him.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible].

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. We've isolated the line, we'll get it muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Terri. Right. So, back to this. Indeed, yes, Alan. Olivier speaking. It doesn't look as though, at the moment, there is that much… I guess two points really. It's just the accountability part on the one side, and also I think there is also this question onto splitting or non-splitting, which is going to be an interesting one.

And I'm not sure, I don't know whether we've reached 100% agreement as far as we're concerned. I certainly heard a lot of voices in the At-Large community asking for the functions to not be split, simply due to the difficulty in being able for end users, and being able to track accountability for entirely separate organizations.

But then the big question, then comes to whether there should be some kind of accountability body that would be created, and that would have various stakeholders on there. I certainly have seen some discussion as to the number of GAC stakeholders, or GAC representatives on such a committee, what would be the makeup of this committee, if any.

Are there any thoughts or suggestions in this community about this? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. My understanding is the accountability at that level is the responsibility of the accountability group, not the IANA transition

CWG. Maybe I'm mistaken, but that's my understanding of it. That the only accountability issues within the IANA transition CWG are accountability, related to enforcing the specific details that is of a process. So I don't think that's part of our overall job, of this group, and in terms of a statement saying, "We would like to see it all stay together," that's a completely reasonable statement that ALAC could make, and presumably make through our five representatives in force.

But that's different from submitting a formal proposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Alan. Thank you for this input. Any other thoughts on this? You're quite right Alan, obviously defending some positions is a different thing from actually putting together a proposal. And I must be quite frank with you all, right now I don't know. I think it might be a little premature to decide on whether we want to put a proposal in, an independent proposal in, or just for the time being, if we want to work on the CWG subgroups.

I certainly haven't seen enough. I'm speaking here personally, I have not seen much, enough movement so far on concrete proposals on those CWG subgroups, to proceed forward with having our own position and our own statements, and our own input, and sorry, our own proposal. I'm checking, searching for the term. So at the moment, what I would suggest then, is that we continue being involved in the CWG subgroups, whilst we refine those draft notes that Heidi has taken during our face to face meeting in Los Angeles, and, you know, we have that document on the screen at the moment.

I don't know if anybody wanted to raise our attention or point out anything that kind of stood out during that meeting, moving back the discussion. Certainly, one of the points that was made, appears to have been this continuity, confidence in the root zone, no change to current IP policies. There seems to be a lot of interest in continuity and in no changes to take place. And that's something that I've certainly seen reflected in the other discussions, even in the RIR and in the protocols discussion, as being the most significant input that has been received so far.

So, I'm not sure that we should really proceed forward with anything at the moment. Does anyone think otherwise? I mean, should we immediately start work on our own proposal? I see a green tick from Eduardo, and maybe a hand up from Eduardo. Eduardo, you have the floor to explain your green tick.

EDUARDO DIAZ: My green tick was for, not doing this right now and get more information, work on the proposal right now. Because there is too much information flow, and I don't think we're prepared to put something out yet. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Eduardo. So, seeing no one else put their hand up, I think this is the process forward, which means that so far, aside from taking part in the RFP subgroup work, we are waiting for more information, and I was going to ask therefore, in any other business, what our structure was in regards to future conference calls. Do we

wish to have a call weekly, so as to be able to work in line with the cross-community working group calls?

Or should we have them ad-hoc? Or should we have them every two weeks? Bi-weekly, I think they call it. Is there any, are there any suggestions here? Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: My suggestion is that we keep it on an ad-hoc basis for now, and if things get more defined, then we might decide at that time to go weekly or biweekly [inaudible]… Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Eduardo. So, any opposing point of view of this? Or agreeing point of view. Alan Greenberg, I saw you put your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought you were going to be asking for other issues. My hand is up under any other business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any other issues, okay. So we'll first deal with the meeting. So next meeting, let's see. We have a meeting of the cross-community working group that will take place this Thursday, and then the one after that, takes place, is it one week or two weeks from now? I'm a little lost on this.

EDUARDO DIAZ: One week. [Inaudible] every week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's every week. Okay. Thank you Eduardo. So I would suggest then that we have another call on Tuesday next week, so as to prepare and have an update, specifically on the RFPs. Is there going to be a meeting of the ICG before next week? I don't think that there is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, that's my topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's your topic. Okay. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jean-Jacques did say, before he left, that there was a talk later this week, to talk about the RFP. So, I don't know whether Mohamed has any more information. I went to the ICANN microsite on the transition coordinating group, and the entries for meetings stopped at the end of September, the one that was held in LA isn't even mentioned there. So I don't know. Someone seems to have not, is not updating that site, so I have no idea when the next meeting is scheduled.

                                [CROSSTALK] …problematic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely.   It's Olivier speaking.   I certainly also had a few problems to find where the next call of the ICG was. The site is a little bit to navigate. Could we perhaps ask Terri to follow up with Grace and find out, I don't even know.   Is it Grace who is dealing with this? Because I know Grace deals with the CWG, I don't know whether she deals with the ICG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Mohamed still on the call?

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I believe that's [Alan] who deals with ICW.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND;   ICW?...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, Heidi. You're confusing me now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just seeing if you're on your toes. Just seeing if you're on your toes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not on my toes, I'm bouncing on my toes at the moment. Olivier speaking. Suddenly it has transformed to Alan to follow up with the ICG. Well, we have Mohamed El Bashir on the call. I don't know whether Mohamed, who we muted a bit earlier, could hear us. Do we know when the next ICG meeting is?

No. I take that is no. Mohamed is probably on his other call as well, or maybe he is muted?

TERRI AGNEW: We are double checking his mute. One moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Right. In any case, it's Olivier speaking. I think ultimately, you know, there will be definitely, I'm sure, another call of the ICG, or at least a subset of the ICG with regards to the secretarial RFPs, and that's a process which you will find results very soon. I don't think it does affect us directly, as far as we're concerned, we just now have to be involved in the sub working groups of the CWG.

And of course, [CROSSTALK] …other working groups on the protocol fight, and on the IP addressing side. I hear background noise. Is Mohamed back on?

TERRI AGNEW: Mohamed, your line is unmuted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is Mohamed listening? Mohamed El Bashir, no. Going once, going twice. I note we are beyond the end of this call. So be it. No Mohamed. And let's go over to Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you Olivier. I'll just point out, it does affect us if we don't know meetings are being held and we can't attend them. Last time, we got 24 hours' notice, which was not really enough.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. I think we mentioned this last time. We have mentioned that to the ICG, that it was not good enough to have very last minute calls being advertised.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would ask staff to follow up with Alice, because we don't know when the next meeting is, and the ICANN website. I put the URL in the chat,

which is supposed to point what they're doing, has not been updated even to reflect the last meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. [CROSSTALK] …action item, to follow up with Alice for the next ICG call. Mohamed El Bashir, welcome back. What is going on Mohamed, with regards to these calls, ICG calls?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Yes, regarding the calls. I think the note that has been sent earlier by you Olivier, has been, let's say, taken into consideration by Patrik in terms of early announcement. The expected teleconference is going to be one about the secretariat. So it might be a closed one due to the confidentiality of the information of the evaluation.

So it might not be publically announced, and that we're open for participation. So that is the one that is expected to happen. Besides that, there is currently [inaudible] for a teleconference yet, according to, just looking at the mailing list. I hope that answers…

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …I gather we'll all be waiting for future news on this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Just a quick note, that even if it is a confidential closed call, it should be documented that it is happening. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Hello, it's Mohamed here. Yes, there will be a report out of that, and hopefully there will be a conclusion of the evaluation process. [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I just note that I can't find any record of the meeting in Los Angeles either. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. And yes, indeed, we're well aware. So we'll get staff to follow up with Alice on this, first for the next ICG call, but also to make sure, and reiterate the fact that we are noting there is currently not clear schedule of ICG calls, or certainly no… Well, there doesn't seem to be a landing page that lists all of the ICG calls, or face to face meetings, etc.

And that's, I think, something that is definitely needed, as it has been pointed out by Alan. And any other, other business?

So we've got six action items here.   Terri to cross-check Google spreadsheet in working groups. [Inaudible] will send email to get staff, to get, I don't know what that is OCL, RFP 1, 2A, 2B. Eduardo Diaz will, it's probably status, will check status on the RFP 2C and RFP 3.

OCL to follow up with people that haven't signed up with RFPs. Next call to take place on Tuesday, the 3rd of November. And with this, I thank you all…

[CROSSTALK]

…and then Heidi after Eduardo. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Just we don't have to, because it's today, but there was a question on the mailing list, and we can do it on the mailing list, if we keep our meetings open or closed, or public, things like that. And I think there is a face to face meeting that is happening for the CWG in November 18 and 19, and I think there is something going on about [inaudible]… But we can do that offline, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Eduardo. Olivier speaking. So far the feedback I've had from everyone, you might not know but so far, our mailing list is specifically for At-Large members or people that are involved in At-Large structures. The mailing list archives are closed at the moment, and the idea originally was so as to avoid having Google pick things up on any of our deliberations, and maybe draft document and taking this as a final document, leaking it out there, and say, "Well, this is what the ALAC wants to do," something totally outrageous or different.

I think that the way things are progressing, and the fact that we are asking for transparency, everyone has come back so far and says, "Well, look at what we can certainly make…." Keep the list open only to At-

Large members, but we can certainly make the records and the archives of the list open to anyone.

So if I don't receive a note to the contrary, I think that the consensus is to open the archives up and certainly, we've had a request from one person who has asked why the archives are closed and certainly you can say, "Sorry, we'll open them up." I don't think there is anything particularly sensitive on our mailing list, and as you know, we're all used to work very transparently.

So, I think the archives will just be opened. If you disagree, please email me within the next 24 hours. If I don't hear from anyone asking for the archives to be kept closed, I'll ask staff to open up the archives, and we can have that as an action item on number six, and number seven. And with this, I thank you all for this call. I think it has been very helpful, and certainly instructive. And so I say thank you to our interpreters in Spanish. And goodbye everyone, this call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]