TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large ad-hoc working group on the transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function on Tuesday the 4th of November, 2014 at 17:00 UTC.

On the English channel we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Seun Ojedeji, Yasuichi Kitamura, Eduardo Diaz, Loris Taylor, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Jimmy Schultz, and Leon Sanchez.

On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Thomas Lowenhaupt.

From staff, Heidi Ullrich will be joining us shortly, and myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today will be Veronica.

I would like to remind all participants to please state their name not only for transcription purposes, but also for Spanish interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Terri. Have we missed anyone on the roll call? Doesn't look like it so… It does look like it, because Leon Sanchez has put his hand up, but Leon you are already accounted for. Leon?

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.

And I see thanks in the chat. Okay, let's get going then. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this one and a half hour call. We've got a lot of things to discuss. There has been a lot going on this past week. And so, we'll look at the charter quickly, the accountability working group, and having a quick look at any movement on the IANA coordination group.

A review of the cross-community working group work, together with an IANA stewardship proposal. As you know, there was a call just shortly, just a couple of hours ago, and then we'll be looking at a little bit more deeply into the work of the RFP sub working group, that cross-community working group, and going into looking at building our own At-Large additions. That's the plan for the call today. Are there any amendments or editions to the agenda?

I don't see anyone put their hand up or shout out, so the agenda is approved, and we can go immediately to the review of the action items of our last conference call, that was on the 28th of October. There are all done, except one, which is not marked as being done. That's for Eduardo Diaz to check the status of RP2 CNR FP 3. I know that Eduardo is on the call, but maybe we can leave this update until afterwards, when we reach that part during our call agenda.

Apart from this, all the other action items have been completed.

TERRI AGNEW: Olivier, this is Terri.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Pardon the interruption. I do have a quick update on action item six. Alice did get back to us with some information.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Please go ahead then.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. She let us know about the next three upcoming ICG calls, which will be on Wednesday the 12th of November, the 26th of November, which is a Wednesday, and also Wednesday the 10th of December. All at different times. And she also provided us with a landing page for the ICG, and I'll put that all in a chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Terri. Question, would it be possible to actually put these on one of our own wiki pages? I think that probably would be helpful.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And we could track things around [inaudible]… Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair, this is Eduardo. I missed something. Do you want me to talk about this action now or later?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Eduardo. No, I suggest that we discuss this later when we reach the relevant section during our agenda. We have a section discussing RFP 2C, RFP 3, and all of the different RFPs. So that would probably easier.

Any other comments on any of the action items that we have here before our very eyes? I see no one with their hands up, so let's move to the next part of our agenda. And the next part is the review, a quick update, sorry, on the charter of the accountability working group. Both Tijani Ben Jemaa and Dion Sanchez were representatives on this.

And so I'm not sure if I see Tijani on the call, but I certainly see Leon Sanchez. So Leon, would you be able to take us through this please?

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri from staff. We're dialing out to Leon as you are requesting him to speak. If you could just give us a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

We'll ask that…

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, hello everyone. Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …listed… Just to let everyone know, as we see your name listed along with any of the parts later on in the RFPs, for example, please be sure that you're dialed in at the correct time. Over to you Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. Thank you Olivier. So, we have so far, four meetings, five meetings of discussing charter things. And Tijani just sent yesterday I believe, the final version and the redline version of the proposed charter. The main aspects of this charter that I can highlight, is that there are two [inaudible] themes dealing with those things that needs to be solved before the IANA functions transition takes place.

And the other one focusing in those subjects, or those areas, with which [awards?] doesn't need to be finalized before having this transition. So, there will be also [inaudible] suggested [inaudible] members to the working group, the cross-community working group. And there is a minimum of two representatives for the chartering ACs or SOs, and a maximum of five.

So this would take us to somewhere like the previous cross-community working group, that has already been filled by members of the At-Large community. And well, I don't know if you have any questions on the subject, or on the scope of the charter. There are some questions posted in this charter that are the main focus of the working group, but they are not exhaustive.

There are just initiatives, and they are not supposed to constrain the working group's work, to those [inaudible] …to further develop the work of the working group. So, I know you need… Olivier, do you have any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Leon. And the floor is indeed open for questions now, and Alan Greenberg has his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Leon, is there anything in the charter that you have any reservations about that we should make an objection to? Or attempt to do an amendment at this point? Or are you happy to… You and Tijani believe that this is a good document for the ALAC to approve.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I believe it's a good document. I'm happy with it. I'm not sure, I think, as far as I understand, Tijani is also happy with this document. I don't see any point in which we should make any reservation, or objection. And of course, this needs to be circulated to the community, and if everyone raises hand and wants to raise any concerns, of course, we will be happy to take it to the drafting charting team.

ALAN GREENBERG: And perhaps not get it, adopted by the other groups as happened last time. No, I was just making sure that there was nothing that either of

you had raised on the chartering group that was, you know, essentially vetoed that you were unhappy with. So I'm glad that that's not the case. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, not so far Alan. We raised some concerns. Tijani made some [inaudible] on the draft charter, and they were considered and closed. So as far as I understand, everything is good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Leon. And next we have Fatima Cambronero. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. This is Fatima for the record. I have a question regarding this draft. I read, and there is something which is not clear to me, there are two paragraphs referred to the expert group. That might be point beside, in addition to the members of the working group.

My question is, who will define the concept of expert, and what are the requirements to be an expert? And who will be in charging of appointing those expert groups? This is in addition to the members of the group. This is not clear to me when I read the draft, so could you please summarize this? Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Fatima. This is Leon Sanchez again. Well, the expert advisors are considered the draft charter as an aid to the cross-community working group, and there is no clear mechanism of just [inaudible] state, as to what is the definition of expert, and who is going to designate this advisors.

I understand that this advisors would be assigned by the same working group, and in that sense, they would be called for a [inaudible] working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Leon. Olivier speaking. Are there any other questions or comments on this? So seeing no one put their hands up, I think they… Certainly, with regards to the feedback, it's neither you or Leon, nor Tijani, have found anything absolutely wrong with this charter. I guess the next thing that we will be looking to receive is to have the charter sent to the ALAC, and then the ALAC has to approve it. Is that the way forward?

LEON SANCHEZ: That is correct Olivier. As we did with other draft charters before, the next step would be to send it to the AC and SO chairs, and have it approved, or of course, [inaudible] which I don't see why it would be a problem for the ALAC to, just for this charter. I think Evan addressed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Olivier speaking. Just to make sure again, this draft that you have sent us, or that Tijani has sent us, is really the final draft.

So we could send this to the ALAC now for ALAC members to start reading, and to start looking through it. Is that correct?

LEON SANCHEZ: It is the last version. We have in hand, I don't have any knowledge as to if there is going to be changes. But this is supposed to be the final version.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Leon. Olivier speaking. Alan Greenberg, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just a comment. Listening to Bart on the last call, on the CWG call, he was given the dates when the other groups are going to be meeting to approve the charter. And it sounds like it's probably going to be a good two to three weeks into November before the charter gets approved by most of the groups.

We then have the inevitable couple of weeks of administrative process discussions. There is the issue of appointing the experts, as has already been discussed. That sounds like we're not going to start meeting until close to Christmas, when things stop for a while. And by the time we come off the Christmas break, it's almost time for us to deliver something to the ICG, or getting awful close to it.

Is there any real possibility that we're going to be able to get this done? I'm asking Leon. Was this discussed at all in the chartering process?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alan. This is Leon Sanchez. Yes [inaudible], and our aim is to have it finished [inaudible]… I don't see much space for error here. We must meet the deadlines, and we must have this finished [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope you have a magic wand to help in that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much everyone. It's Olivier speaking. So I don't know whether it is the remit of this working group to have an action item to ask Tijani and Leon to send this to the ALAC, but as we have the chair of the ALAC on the call, I would make a suggestion that this charter gets sent to the ALAC since it appears to be the final version, as soon as possible, and then perhaps during the next ALAC call, or even prior to the next ALAC call, a vote of the ALAC to take place to ratify the charter.

                          So these people will have time to read it, rather than just be given 48 hours, then asking to read it quickly. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Chair of the ALAC was waiting to ask that question about rather the drafting committee members were happy with this before forwarding it to the ALAC. And that would be done almost immediately. And I plan to take an online vote, since our meeting is not going to be held until the end of the month.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier or Alan, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. Just a really quick question. Should that draft be put on a wiki page so it can be sent to the ALAC and any comments can be made?

ALAN GREENBERG: If that can be done quickly, I'll include the link in my message.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, it can be done quickly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And that was, for the transcript, that was Alan who spoke earlier with Heidi. So that's fine. Thanks very much for this, and let's go on then to agenda item number three, the review of the ICG, the IANA coordinating group. Has there been any movement since the last time that we spoke last week?

And there was a call of the ICG, and [inaudible] remember if there was one. But for this, I think we can have an update, a quick update. We've

got 10 minutes. That means that Jean-Jacques Subrenat is with us, and Mohamed El Bashir hasn't made it yet here, if I can see the list of attendees. But Jean-Jacques, would you be at least able to provide us with an update on the ICG activities?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Jean-Jacques trying out the microphone. Can you hear me Olivier and colleagues?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very clearly indeed Jean-Jacques. Please proceed forward.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good. Because I have new earphones with the microphone. Good. So unfortunately, I don't have anything to report, because the members of the ICG have been occupied over the past week simply clearing up some little matters and margins, so I have nothing to report. The, if you remember the last ICG meeting was brief, and was given entirely to questions related to the selection of the independent secretariat.

So that is continuing. I will not mention any names, of course, but to simply to let you know that there had been a code for some further information about possible or potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and that has been worked on. So we should be very close to submitting the name, or two names, to the whole ICG for a final choice.

On the other developments, I'm afraid there is nothing to report except that of course, like everyone else, we were following the information

from ICANN about the change of location for ICANN 52 from Marrakesh in Morocco to Singapore. And as far as I know, the ICG will be, therefore transporting itself to Singapore as well. There will be a formal vote on this by the ICG, that has not occurred yet.

Now in terms of purposes, I can say that we will be following the calendar. At that, Olivier, is all I have to report, that [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. Are there any questions on your report and on the activities of the ICG? Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the transcript record. Thank you Jean-Jacques for the report. I just [inaudible]… You said the process for the independent secretariat is still ongoing. I don't understand, is it [inaudible] reports that come into ICG, that when the secretariat actually [inaudible] looks like they're almost in the middle of the process, and secretariat is not ready by now.

So is that not a concern for the ICG in anyway? My second question is in relation to the conflict of interest. Has there been any recent issues that perhaps could [inaudible] or further description of further declaration of people's interest on the ICG? Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Two points. First one is about the current, yes, I think that this has taken a bit longer than it was expected

or [inaudible] for, and we should be coming to a decision within a few days. Your second question was, how come, what was the reason for this talk about conflicts of interest. There was no very specific, it was a matter of principle.

That had not been brought up at the beginning with sufficient clarity, and which one of the members of the selection subcommittee and myself, who thought that for the sake of clarity and to be completely transparent and accountable especially, that we have to make a further check about conflicts of interest. Now, please note that when I say conflicts of interest, it is not necessarily a proven conflict of interest. It is a potential, a true, or even simply a perceived conflict of interest.

That's what we were working on. But you will understand that at this stage, I cannot give you further details because that would, you need to give names and therefore to deal with candidates [inaudible] that is, that will not be proper of a selection process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. Any other questions on the ICG process? It doesn't look like there are. Jean-Jacques, we've got the list of the next calls, just to remind us. So the next one of them, the 12th of November, is that correct?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hang on just a moment. This is Jean-Jacques. Hang on just a moment, I can check, hang on.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …spoken to us about this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. So the next one is on fourth of November at 20:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it is in the chat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, and the one after that is Wednesday 26th of November at 02:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier speaking. Do you have any idea of the discussions that will take place on the 12th of November? In other words, are ICG members active in the different communities? Will they refer back to the work and provide updates about the work in each one of the different communities or not? Or is the ICG just waiting for the current proposals to arrive on their desks, and so then it's just going to be very slow moving?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you for the question Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. My take is that between now and the 15th of January 2015, which is the nearest

date by which we expect to receive the contribution from communities, we are in observation mode.

In other words, as individual members, we are in touch with various parts of the community to try to follow what's happening and to try to just anticipate on what we'll have to do later on, in the assembling the transition plan. But for instance, in my case, I will not be participating directly in any of the discussions, because I think I have to be able to receive instructions from the ALAC, as your representative, and I keep myself informed by following the discussions, some of the regions, but are not going to take an active part.

That's a puzzling choice, but I'm ready to change it [inaudible] it has to be some other way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. Seun Ojedeji again.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thank you Olivier. Thank you Jean-Jacques. I just want to pick on Jean-Jacques on that particular comment. So members of the ICG were actually involved with other community, in other communities who are actually making comments, and then we saw sometimes. I'm not actually in any way exciting comment, but the fact that [inaudible] there are views that they believe that should happen.

So do you have… Is there any ICG any way of surviving such extent of interrogation for the member of the ICG on the different IANA… I mean, different communities. And then anything, you mentioned that

you are not actually going to be looking at the contribution [inaudible] is kind of restricting you. Are you actually restricted by the ATLAS?

Or are you restricted because you have discussed this in the ICG not to do so? [Inaudible] because I want to know the business by which some of this members of the ICG are discussing of the [inaudible] thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun for this. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Thank you Seun. This is Jean-Jacques. That's, there is no clear-cut rule, as far as I'm aware, which asks for ICG members to intervene or not intervene in various working groups. I think the idea, the whole idea, is that we should, as a group, be as well informed as possible. Now, some members of the ICG, as you know, represent very large communities, that's the case for Mohamed and myself, and others less so.

I cannot speak for the others, not even for Mohamed who is unfortunately not on this call. So I can only speak for myself, so I'm saying that I have adopted this position as a matter of principle, because I think it's not proper. At least I would not be comfortable with taking part actively in the discussions, and perhaps even having some influence on them, [inaudible].

And then taking that away, and not having to work on it on the ICG. I may be wrong, but at least that's my personal position, and I cannot speak on [inaudible].

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And that's indeed a question I was also asking myself. Olivier speaking. And I certainly have seen some members of the ICG involved, but I haven't raised the point because I think it's even the case also in the IETF, and the RIRs, and we do have a best, a few more people at hand, active people to be able to go to all of these various committees.

But it seems like others have this similar people involved in the actual discussions and different operational communities, and also sitting on the ICG. I don't want to spend so much time on this, but Jean-Jacques, you have the last word on this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, proceed Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Yes Olivier, since you bring up this question in another form, I would like to answer very clearly. Why am I applying the… principle I just explained to concern [inaudible], it is because it is of the ALAC. For other parts of the community, this situation may be different, but you may remember that the ALAC had a very clear procedure in order to select two representatives. And this was made available to the whole

ICG membership, that we are not individuals who have been jockeying to put forward some agenda, I don't know.

But we are there really to express the views of the ALAC, to make sure that the [inaudible] of the global Internet user are properly taken into account, and that I take as my primary duty. Now of course, in addition to that, it is also my duty to be, as well as possible, and that's why it's a great help for me to this and all of this ALAC or the other At-Large working group calls, and I will attend some of your calls for the other working groups, but as I said, I do not intend to actively participate, except perhaps to avoid factual mistakes. Thank you.

Does that answer your question Olivier?

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri from staff. Olivier, we're unable to hear you at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it will probably help if I unmuted myself here. Thank you. I was wondering… I was just saying, Jean-Jacques, yes, thank you for this explanation. I did note a disapproval or a red cross from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I wasn't quite sure to what point. She was…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a minute please….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …I was disagreeing, Cheryl for the record. I was disagreeing from a personal point of view, having [inaudible] as well as representative for the [inaudible] a number of equally important forum. I think that, while I respect Jean-Jacques's perspective on this, I disagree with it. So I was indicating that I disagreed with it.

I think he's also required in the act in the best of interest of, and not just be a representative in the more purest sense of only bringing forward what one is fed. That's my view, and I'm not actually a member of the ALAC so it doesn't really matter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl. And the way you mentioned, acting in the best interest, this basically mean that you're not commanded to say X, Y, or Z, but do make also judgment calls yourself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I don't want to spend too much time on this. I see Jean-Jacques and Alan Greenberg. So we'll take the two people in the queue. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Could I defer first to Alan? Because he may have remarks to which I would advance as well also, as well as to Cheryl. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sure. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.   Alan speaking.   I think the words that Cheryl used, a judgment call, are critical, but in a wider sense than she said.   The decision on whether we need our representatives to actively participate at all, will depend on some extent on how the world unfolds. If the ICG is given definitive proposals that it can integrate into a document, and there is no real decision process, there is no need to send things back or negotiate with any of the people submitting things, then that may well be a good position.

On the other hand, we put people on that group who we think can stand their territory and take positions as necessary, and whether those traditions are personal judgment calls, or there is an opportunity to vet them and discuss them with ALAC, the latter is certainly preferable to the former.   The former might ultimately be necessary in any given time. So I prefer the individual members just not make raw judgment calls on their own, if there is an opportunity to discuss.

And if there are substantive issues that will have to be determined or decided by the ICG, then I would hope that we would have active

participation in coming to closure on those, if there are issues that matter to the ALAC, and to users, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier, and thank you both Cheryl and Alan for your remarks. Listening to it carefully, I had the impression that there may be a slight misunderstanding because the way I presented things. Of course, in the ICG, it is total commitment and complete expression of views. Whether these views have been vetted by the ALAC, before I express that, that is the best case, so much the better.

If, for matter of urgency, I do not have the possibility of consulting the ALAC, then I give an impression on my own judgment. What I was talking about was not within the ICG. I was talking about the working groups, the sub working groups as it were, which are not within the ICG, and one about transition and the other about accountability. It is in that context that fortunately the At-Large has many representatives in the various groups, and they're following that clearly. So I will try to follow that the best I can, but will not intervene in those sub groups unless that I find it's necessary perhaps for the accuracy of data to do. But I repeat, within the ICG, I take my words fully as Cheryl and Alan were suggesting, and I couldn't think of any other way of course. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. And closing, Alan Greenberg please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you very much. I certainly have no problem with that. That is not taking part in the working groups developing the plans at the same time as you're sitting on the ICG.   But within, so within the boundaries of what I was saying before. That I do not find problematic, thank you. Thank you for clarifying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this clarification, and I do realize time is ticking. And the next thing we need to do is to have a quick update on what is happening in other operational communities, first in the RIRs and also with the Internet Society, IETF.   See how they are moving forward basically.   So for an update, I see Alberto Soto who is many of the mailing lists. And so Alberto, I would be very grateful if we could have an update. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Alberto Soto for the record. The more active part was in LACNIC. There was a meeting in Chile. There were two sessions, two hour sessions, devoted to IANA transition topic. On the first session, the Brazilian government said that the transition should be carried out as it was suggested, [respecting] the multistakeholder model.

APNIC presented, or they said that's a political topic, therefore it should be taken into account. And they said that no modification, no technical

modification should be carried out, if this modification somehow effect the stability and functioning.

LACNIC also agreed with this. They believe in the bottom up model, the RIRs do not have an issue with ICANN, or whether ICANN should continue or not with this process. The oversight process that is carrying out. During the second session, LACNIC... Or let me rephrase. In the second session, there was a consultation process. In this session, there was a paper presented, and LACNIC take the APNIC proposal, and it complements the, or supplements the proposal. They propose the creation of a working group, and they said that an oversight should be exercised by an oversight member council.

And this should be composed of representatives of the civil society, the private sector, governments, and the technical communities. Then they would, they should sign with ICANN, an affirmation of commitment, replacing the charter 2007 and 2009. Accountability would be assured by, or guaranteed by, the representation of the different multistakeholders.

There was a very active participation of members and also very active remote participation. And this proposal is also being supported by many members of the RIRs, and there are some concerns regarding the composition, but they will discuss this later on. The RIRs, until the first week of December to present their proposals. These proposals should be considered by the committee, the RIR committee and that proposal would be delivered to the ICG on the proper time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alberto. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just to ask you on this. So, as far as the different RIRs are concerned, is it the idea that they would all coordinate and maybe they would all be proposing this number oversight council, or are we still far away from reaching such a discussion?

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. The proposal is that number and [inaudible] sign agreement with ICANN, and they carry out the supervision of the oversight all together. They're discussing this, and this is part of their concerns. But this is what they say should be finished before the first week of December.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well good luck to that. It's Olivier speaking. It sounds like a lot of work on their hands as well. Seun Ojedeji, you had your hand up a little bit later, I'll let you speak and then we'll move on to the other regions as well. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun for the transcript records. So I want to make first a quick comment on the reports given by Alberto. So one of the comments I want, the first thing I want to say is that, yes, something like

this proposed… It does not necessarily mean that it has received general acceptance from all of the RIRs, okay?

So there have been quite a long of comments about this particular proposal, some of which I also make within the AFRNIC mailing list, and also within the [inaudible] mailing list. So I think the good thing to do would be to look forward within us necessarily repeating what has been said, look forward to what the composition of the proposed oversight committee is going to look like. [Inaudible] what they would be doing in respect to the oversight [inaudible] versus the existing [NRO?].

Just wanted to give a quick one on AfriNIC. AfriNIC is going to be meeting, okay. I think if Tijani is on the list, I don't see Tijani, that's why I want to do this. If he's… Olivier, if you permit me to give an update on the AfriNIC, then I can go ahead, I'm not sure Tijani is on the list. [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …proceed forward, then we'll have Cheryl after you, so please go forward with this.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. For the AfriNIC region, it's going to be [inaudible] face to face, starting on the 22nd. It's going to last the 28th. I think they're going to be IANA discussion on the transition, most of which going to be the panel for that. There has been two proposals that was sent to the AfriNIC mailing list. One was sent from, sent by Richard and the other was sent by myself, and I think I also saw that actually [inaudible].

So, discussion on the mailing list has been quite not as very, very loud, but I believe at the moment, we'll try to, AfriNIC is trying to, in consultation with the [inaudible], select the first member. So each RIR was expected to select two members from the community. One for staff, to represent each region. The deadline has been set for 15th of November. So everybody is supposed prepare [inaudible] with their members, and then the [inaudible] will pick the ones that will prepare the transition proposal for members, in consultation with the community.

There is currently a set of questions that has been pushed forward to the AfriNIC community, which is currently expecting responses. So that is a summary of what's happening in the AfriNIC region. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Seun. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Olivier. Cheryl for the transcript record. Just briefly, and Seun has covered a lot of it. I've put in a couple of links that you may find useful. The APNIC list, space has a blog which is again, a good explanation on the multistakeholder oversight number council, which is the proposal from LACNIC, but it also makes sure, and will make clear to our community. So I would like to see those linked perhaps in our [inaudible] space, because it covers the desire of an acclamation of commitment style relationships, this new proposed oversight [inaudible] etc.

And of course, it will be, of course, up to the [crisp], which is what Seun was just describing, to also agree, as well as take any other modifications that may come in to the original and more primary proposal that we looked at before, and that are modified by LACNIC and [inaudible] modified by the other NICs as they go through and do some fine tuning on this. But ultimately, it will be to the [crisp] to come up with a coordinated cross to our approach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. And now we've gone through the RIRs. Do we have anyone who has an update on what is going on in the protocols community? Don't see anyone putting their hands up at the moment.

So I've been reading the IETF mailing list that deals with the IANA plan, and it looks as though the IETF has a plan moving forward. They have put together a paper, which again, there looks as though, wanting to keep stability as being the primary concern, and therefore no major changes or changes all together. The fact is, the US government has to step away from a number of contracts, so they've been looking at it really, seeing what needs to be removed from those contracts, how things need to be amended for this.

But there is definitely no idea at the moment about the breaking up of all of the different functions and breaking up of IANA. On the other hand, there has been a discussion with regards to the oversight of IANA dot org, and IANA itself. And there have been some saying that since the IANA functions pre-date ICANN all together, then the IANA functions

should be put under a trusteeship of the Internet Society or of some other organization.

And that has been a bit of a heated discussion because some disagree with it and some agree with it. So the discussion is still unclear at the moment and has reached no consensus on this point. I don't know what the default is. I would imagine that the default is that nothing changes, but certainly the discussion is on the table at the moment. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Eduardo for the record. In lieu of what you're saying about this heated discussion in ISOC, which I wasn't aware of, does that have to do with the fact…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not in ISOC, in the IETF. [CROSSTALK] …mailing list.

EDUARDO DIAZ: In the IETF. Does that have to do with another email that I read about, you know, some domain names were delegated pre-IANA by [inaudible], and they belong under the California Law? I mean, is that related? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Eduardo. Yeah, the discussion, it's Olivier speaking. The discussion has gone into such conjunctional directions, that have

come back to John [Pastel], indeed, speaking about some IP allocations, sorry, not IP allocations, supported protocol allocations that predated all of this. Some came back to 1970, which is apparently when the IANA term was first used. I don't think the discussion is going to lead anywhere, personally. My personal feeling is it's not going to get anywhere.

And of course, there are some who are trying their chance right now at saying that, of course, all of these protocols are for the Internet qualified, but you can also add different protocols that are not Internet. The usual stories of various people, various names who you might remember, or recognize, and that usually troll around all of these discussions, asking for multiple rules, etc. etc. Eduardo Diaz, back to you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. Thank you. This is Eduardo again. Just a follow up on that, just to understand some of the things that, I'm reading the emails and sometimes I get confused. Are these domains that we're talking about [inaudible]… called the supplementary ones that are like different from the ones that happened after IANA started? This is just to understand that terminology. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Eduardo. We're not speaking domains, we're speaking protocols here. So this is the IETF naming issues are under a different working group. And thankfully, we haven't reached that point yet,

although there have been discussions with regards to ccTLDs, obviously, and that's another can of worms.

No, here we are dealing with the ownership of IANA and the stewardship of IANA itself. Since it's not under the US government anymore, some are saying it should go under ISOC, since it was in ISOC in the early 1990s that the early mention of IANA was made, and others retorted by saying actually no, the discussion about IANA started even earlier than the 90s. So far, I would just say a non-event, for the time being, and we'll see how that develops through the forthcoming weeks.

Let's move on in our agenda. I note that the time is ticking. So we've had some feedback of all what's been going on outside in the other operational communities, and now we can have a look at the developments within our own operational community, and that's of course, the naming operational community. You've got two agenda items relating to this, and five and six, which are likely to, I think, be merged in effect.

I thought we'd have them both separately, but of course the call has just taken place now. If we can, the call effectively… The call linked to in five, effectively discussed the matters which are in agenda item number six. So, that's how we are. Maybe the easiest way is for us to go through agenda item number six and get feedback on the process, or on the level where we are right now.

And what I was going to suggest was to start with the principles and criteria document, which was discussed on the CWG call. And Fatima Cambronero, I understand, has done some work on this and can provide

us with a quick update please. And I hope I'm still on the call, because there is an enormous storm out there. I still, good [CROSSTALK] …deluge of water outside.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This Is Fatima Cambronero. Thank you Olivier. How much time do I have to speak about this topic?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have a couple of minutes Fatima. It's Olivier speaking.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Okay. So I will speak about the background and the context of this. In the cross-community working group forum, there was an action item which was to send this draft regarding the principles, this document would be circulated to the different lists, and then we would decide if we would continue to discuss documents or not. We had two sets of principles. One of them had to do with the working principles of the working group.

And the other set of principles have to do with the transition. Many of the members said that we shouldn't waste time in debating these principles because the principles were already enshrined or contained in the NTAA announcement that we already know. Based on the action item, what we did was to circulate two drafts to the list. There was a draft on the principles of this cross-community working group, and with the operating principles of this working group. If you want, I can speak about this.

But if not, let me tell you that there is another draft regarding the criteria where all the issues related to the IANA transition are contained. This was sent to the list for revision and for discussion today. We received only two comments, and today there were two comments as well in this call, and before discussing the document, I would like to say two things.

The GAC, the Governmental Advisory Committee, is working on a set of principles, and they will circulate this principles, they would share the principles with the group for discussion. And today, they said that they send this draft, that the group send this draft to the GAC for them to consider the document as well. In the meeting in Los Angeles, regarding the IANA transition, some of these principles, high level principles, were discussed, and we're working on that.

Now, specifically on the document that we are now seeing on the screen, the document is divided into an introduction, and then you will see five main principles, and there are sub principles within each principle. In the introduction, as you can see, this principle and criteria are intended to be the basis on which positions of the transition of the steward form.

This means that before the proposal is sent to the coordination group, this proposal will have to comply with all of this criteria and principles. These five principles contained in the document are, and I will mention them, and then I will itemize them one by one, stability, security and stability, the other side, accountability and transparency, sorry, and I will speaking about…

When I say [inaudible] in Spanish, I mean accountability, and this is for the translator, then this is point number six, every levels, policy based, diversity of IANA's customers, and that is number, letter E, diversity of IANA's customers. When it comes to principles A, security and stability, changes should not be undermined, should not undermine the operation of the IANA function. Changes should be, the minimum needed to assure accountability and stewardship of the service.

It is the draft [inaudible] made a comment suggesting to add the work of activity… I'm sorry, but I got lost. So, the word objectivity should be added in this paragraph. That is, of a comment received by Mary. Now, when it comes to principle B, regarding oversight accountability and transparency, this principle is divided into six other principles: transparency, independence of oversight, independence of policy from IANA, protection against capture, performance against service level commitments, and against the agreed policy based, and six appeals.

Now, let's analyze them in detail. When it comes to number one, transparency, the document reads, "Transparency is a prerequisite of accountability, where there might be commercial confidentiality concerns, or concerns over operational continuity. There is any process of delegation or re-delegation of TLD." The decision under regional for that decision should be made public, or at least, be subject to an independent [inaudible] as part of the [inaudible] assessment of service performance.

When it comes to this first principle, no comments were received, and I personally believe there is nothing to change here. When it comes to item number two regarding independence of oversight, it reads, and we

have several questions and comments. The document, the draft document reads as follows, "Oversight should be independent of the IANA function operators, and should assure the accountability of the operator to the global multistakeholder community." That is what is in that draft document.

Now there are some comments. Comments that is the independence of oversight is contained within the principles that we are discussing right now, if this is an open issue. And why do they say that? Because in the announcement they made by the NTIA, well they speak about this oversight and the independence. And some people believe that we are repeating the concept.

Some other comment that was received had to do with adding the word inclusive after operator and global, so the document should read, "Oversight should be independent of the IANA functions operators." And the addition of this word, inclusive, is correct from my point of view. And there is also a redundancy, or another comment, a redundancy in the concept.

Well, from my point of view, this will not be a problem because we are somehow reinforcing the principle, and there is no issue with that. Now, when it comes to third item in terms of independence of policy from IANA, the draft document reads that that IANA operator should be independent of the policy processes. Its role is to implement changes in accordance with the policy agreed through the relevant, bottom up policy process. This principle has a note reading that this does not presuppose any [inaudible] for separation of the policy and IANA roles.

The current contract already required separation. We received comments on these principles, and they said that this note contradicts somehow the concept of the principle, because in the very beginning, it speaks about separation, and then the note says that it does not pre-suppose any separation. So we need to review the note and perhaps modify the wording of the note.

Now, when it comes to protection against capture, the document reads that safeguards need to be in place to prevent capture of the service and of any oversight or stewardship function. There were no comments on this point from my opinion. Perhaps we should define the concept of safeguards, so as to avoid any misunderstanding in the future. That is my personal opinion, and of course, it's up to you to discuss it or not.

When it comes to number five, [inaudible] against service level commitments and against the agreed policy base, the document reads that this should be monitored, and there should be a mechanism to ensure the failures are corrected. We received a comment by Chuck Gomez reading that the second part of this principle is an action item, but not an assessment criteria in fact.

So he believes that the first part to be considered as a principle, but that we should change the wording so as to have a principle, and that the second part of this trusting has to do with the action and operation. Of course, this is open to clarification or to further comments. And we received another document requesting to add, at the end of this principle, the provision for a shut-down or a total failure of the service.

From my personal point of view, well this is not clear to me whether this is a principle or this has to do with the function, and of course, we can review it. When it comes to item number six, this is appeals. The document reads, in cases of any significant and irreversible decision, for example, in case of re-delegations, there should be an appeals process open to the key parties, and this should be open to public criticism.

We received a comment asking for, or asking to add the word unfair in case of any significant or irreversible decision, and there is another comment asking for the addition of another type of wording. I do agree with these comments, when it comes to the active process, well we are ready to speak about this. When it comes to item number six, service levels, we received new or relevant comments. I will mention them very briefly.

The performance of the IANA functions must be carried out in a reliable, timely, and efficient manner. It is a vital service, and any proposal should ensure continuity of service of the transition and beyond ,
meeting a recognized and agreed quality of service, and in line with service level commitment. We have three items, number one, service level commitment should be adaptable to the relevant needs and suggested continued improvement.

Number two, the process should be automated for all routine functions, and point number three reads, service quality should be audited ex-post review against agreed commitments. There were no comments on this point, and I personally believe there is no issue with it. When it comes to [CROSSTALK]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 30 seconds please, because you have taken a bit of time taking us through this document, and we have to discuss, or have an update on a few other things. It's Olivier speaking.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima. Olivier, I will finish very briefly. This is Fatima for the record. So, when it comes to this last topic, policy based service levels and diversity of IANA customers, well we had no relevant comments. When it comes to item E, regarding diversity of IANA customers, there is a paragraph referred to ccTLDs, so in this case the context of this paragraph was the ccTLD regional organization from Europe.

So this should be taken into account. When it comes to next step, well we have today's period to receive comments for this document. This document was drafted by [inaudible], so he will be in charge of consolidating all of this comment that will be received in this call and in the next two days, and then there would be a document drafted to discuss in the face to face meeting.

And to sum up and finish, I want to say two things. I don't see this document, anything referred to Internet users, and of course, I volunteer, if you want, I volunteer to compile all of the comments, and to send that information to the list to be included in the next draft. I'm sorry for being, for taking too much time for this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Fatima. It's Olivier speaking. And you mentioned not seeing anything about Internet end users on this. So here is a question, quickly, to our working group. Should there be a mention of end users in those principles and criteria? Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl for the record. It's a slightly more complicated question than might be thought. In the principles, I could argue either way. And the reason that I could argue either way is that we really, I believe, should be supporting a clear focus primarily on the security, etc. etc. of the Internet, and of course, the IANA relationship with its customers, which is [inaudible] I don't like, but never mind, that's what [inaudible].

Where the end users, for example, come into some or greater need for being enshrined into this sort of documentation, is often at the level, for example, where it's looking at the interpretation for 15 91, and you're looking at delegation and re-delegation. Then we look at what needs to be called Internet community, [inaudible] community is now referred to as significantly interested in part of [inaudible] elsewhere.

And I'm fairly comfortable that that far more granular and detailed inclusion of Internet end users, and indeed, other stakeholders, even though they might not actually be Internet end users, is pretty robust. So I just want to put that clear stake in the ground, but I could argue either way, and [inaudible] I think are pretty well cared for providing the interpretation for 15 91 are enshrined in that [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. So I think in terms of what you said, yes, we should have…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But I think it actually is, I'm not sure it needs to be specifically [CROSSTALK]… Sorry, that was Cheryl not being clear, but I had been talking to people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Cheryl. Olivier speaking. I note from Jimmy [inaudible] who put in the hat, that yes, there should be an inclusion of Internet end users. We've got a queue with Alan Greenberg and then Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. It's Alan speaking. Two comments. I'm really not in favor of what I would call gratuitous references to users. That is, construing something just to make sure the word users is included. I don't think that enhances our creditability or makes the document any better.

The second thing is, we bring two things to the table, and you know, we have essentially demanded that we are part of this process. Part of what we bring to the table is a user perspective, the other part that we bring of the table is not being part of the domain industry, and the overall group that runs the, quote, runs the Internet. So we bring a sense of independence to the process and we look at things which may

not concern end users directly, but we may look at that and say, "That's not healthy."

And that part, I think, at the level of these principles, and in fact, at a lot of the IANA transition issues, is our main role. Not so much pursing the end user as such as, as much as rather, pursing an independent view of what's going on, and is this reasonable? Or is it adversely or other unreasonably favoring some party or other that is part of the former process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I like Alan's transition of what he calls gratuitous references. Indeed, I think we can't indulge in the pleasure of putting end user everywhere. I also take Cheryl's point. However, under the principles which we have on the screen, under D, policy based, I wonder whether we couldn't touch up a small [inaudible] again, picking up non-discriminatory, and putting something like, the needs, or the requirements of the global Internet user, etc. etc. Or, to simply [inaudible] comma, especially require from the point of view of the global Internet user. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Jean-Jacques, so just adding a point on there. I'll let Fatima Cambronero come back to you on this. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. I just wanted to clarify that it was part of my duty to comment that this phrase, end users, was not included so as we as a group can consider that and debate that. I would say that I agree with Alan's comment. It's not clear to me whether this document will be part of the proposal or not, because depending on that, I believe we should push to include this phrase end users, or global end users.

I did not find any information about this. I don't know if this would be included in the proposal or how this document will be used. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Fatima. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I actually like what Jean-Jacques said. It would be nice, but probably naïve to presume, that the term bottom-up multistakeholder includes users. I note that we still don't have a seat at the table in the GNSO. So, pushing through some level of user involvement in the policy base, may well be something that we want to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alan. I do realize we've got six minutes until the end of this call.   We haven't even touched on the TWG subgroups, RFP. Let's put this on the side, and try and see if we can add an end user element. The concern I have, at the moment, is when we

were in part D, where it says policy based, decisions should be based on policy agreed through the recognized bottom-up multistakeholder processes, I interpret this as being, and this is of course, in the naming side of things.

I interpret this as being the ICANN way of doing things with the SOs and ACs, etc. So that obviously includes end users, includes governments, includes everyone on there. So I'm not quite sure that it is that much of an important thing to add end users listed in that overall scheme of things, otherwise we might start wanting to include registrars, registries, intellectual property, rights holders, non-commercial stakeholders, governments, and start listing the whole lot.

And that probably would be more detrimental than just keeping it at that. Let's continue that discussion on the mailing list. I don't want to finish the call without touching on a quick update on the RFP subgroups. As you know, work is taking place on those subgroups with the RFP 1, 2A, 2B, 2C, and then 3, which is going to be the bulk of the work, and the bulk of the battle, I believe.

That's where some of the issues that are quite controversial will be discussed. And so let's start with RFP 1, quickly. I see that Claire is uploading it. Hopefully, we can have it on the screen in a matter of sections. And RFP 1 is effectively the, so there was a group, 1 and 2A and 2B that started out. And RFP 1 is just a description of the community's use of the IANA function.

It's a detailed description of how the, what the IANA functions does, etc. So it's a description of the function, and the customers of the

function, and what registries are involved, etc. etc. And number two is a detailed review of the pre-transition arrangement, and pointing out all of the different policy sources for the country codes, the top level domains, for the generic top level domains, etc.

And RFP 2B, provides details of the existing pre-transition arrangements on the oversight, and with regards to oversight and accountability. So that's the current thing, the current three pieces of work that are being worked on. RFP 1 is pretty much finished and has been presented to the cross-community working group, and 2A has also been presented and some feedback has now to be collected.

2B I think is on its way. 2C will probably sent out by tomorrow some time. And I wondered whether there were any questions or comments on these? I can't see any of them being uploaded at the moment. Terri, are you faced with problems?

TERRI AGNEW: Number one was uploaded, and then when I heard you say, number two, I started uploading number two.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You just jumped between one and the other, okay.

TERRI AGNEW: Just let me know which one you want up and I'll put it back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We haven't got, well let's just go through one quickly, if we can. I just want to show you the document, we don't have the time to read through it obviously. And it would be doing double duty. Chuck Gomez has very well gone through the paper during the cross-community working group call just a few hours ago, and as soon as the recording up, perhaps we could publicize it on our mailing list, we can listen to his explanation of how this all came together.

But this one is, so that the first track here, is just a few paragraphs on the community use of the IANA functions, and how this works all together, and with details of the different functions, list of IANA functions used by the naming community. There is a good, important table that is there, and then it goes into the actual functions themselves, deeper into the actual function.

So I would say much of this is actually based on SAC 67 and SAC 68, which are the SSAC papers. Part of the terminology is taken from there, part of it was taken from the original IANA paperwork, and the way that things are discussed in the GNSO. So, I think that statement doesn't really need much change or anything. Are there any questions or comments on RFP section one?

No questions or comments. Okay. Let's go through RFP section 2A then please. So there we are, with 2A. This one looks at the overall proposals, the relevant sources of the different policy. A pretty incredibly document. For this, there are several people that worked on

that very well indeed. [Inaudible] …and also [inaudible] spent an enormous time on that, looking at the different sources and so on.

I don't think there is anything significant that we need to change on that, or that we need to ask to change on this. These are just what the sources of policy are, how processes work, and it's pretty detailed as far as the different arrangements that might be, or different actions that might be asked for from IANA. Delegation, re-delegation, changes to the root zone, etc. And as you've got the table here, which was in detail as to who does what, ICANN staff, ICANN Board, GNSO, registry operator, NTIA, and IANA.

These are the different points, I would highly encourage that you read through this paper, so that we can form an idea of whenever the US government is going away somewhere, do we need to put something in replacement of this. That's of course, RFP number three that will be discussing this.

Any other, any questions on RFP section 2A subgroup? I don't see anyone having put their hand up. Okay. So that's the second one. I would again encourage that you read through it, and then 2B, I believe is, due in by the end of the week. I note that Seun has mentioned in the chat. So 2B will be at the end of the week, and just as a reminder, 2B will be the existing pre-transition arrangements as far as oversight and accountability is concerned. That's going to be perfectly [inaudible].

And then 2C will be the triage, and that's a complicated one. IANA functions, contract triage, that work hasn't even started yet, as far as I know. So [inaudible] to be speaking about it. Eduardo, you might know

a little bit as to these things. You are on that group. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. I just put a link to the set of documents that have to do with [inaudible] triage, and the [inaudible] and latest one was from October 28th. And basically, it's a list of all of these contract items of the IANA contract, and they're identifying, is it an operation side? Or is it an accountability side? If that item can be enhanced or not. Basically that first word is there, and my belief is that [inaudible] to see how we can solve this, so it can be more fine-tuned.

But it's a very long document. It's complicated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Eduardo. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. Then of course, we've got RFP 4, 5, and 6, and these haven't even started yet. So, in essence, I just wanted to open the floor to ask whether there were any questions or comments on any of this work. I know that we have people in all of the subgroups now, so what I will probably ask is in the future, just an update on the work.

Obviously, I think that all of us should be in RFP 3, because that will be the post transition oversight and accountability arrangement is going to be the big discussion here, and this is due to take place within the next 15 days, if I understand correctly. Any comments or questions on this process?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here. [CROSSTALK] …with the importance of [inaudible], whether or not I should [inaudible] the first meeting of the subgroup, which will be coming up later this week, on the Thursday [inaudible]. Just [inaudible] I can look it up. Do you want everyone potentially involved and engaged there? Or do you want to keep [inaudible], or how do you want to do it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. So indeed, there will be a first call of RFP 3, at 14 to 15:30 UTC on Thursday the 6th of November, two days' time. 14:00 to 15:00 UTC first call. I'm not going to mandate that we all go on this, but if you do have the time for it, that would be good.

Because it will certainly save us from having to repeat ourselves on this part. And at the moment, it looks like it's going to be slightly messier than RFP 1 and 2, so it would be good to have a good showing on there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And maybe we can have an action item. Staff to forward the invitation for the first RFP 3 call to our IANA issues mailing list. Terri, I'm not even sure whether you have that invitation.

TERRI AGNEW: For the RFP 3?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, I believe we do have access to the information. Is this, it's by membership only. You can join the call, correct? So if only you're a member can you join.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Yeah, Olivier speaking. As you can hear from my voice, I don't know. I think it's probably open. I would imagine it's open, I don't think it's by membership. There is always a big question. But I think that ultimately, let's just have it…   I'll tell you what, [CROSSTALK] …staff for it. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At least participants, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As long as one is a participant or a member of the cross-community working group, I don't see why there should be blocking of participants. If you can please… Let's ask staff, so if Terri could please check with

staff running the call, I believe Grace, then… But I think it will be an open call.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly, I can do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Okay. So that's the… Thank you for this suggestion Cheryl. That's a very good point. And I realize we are eight minutes beyond the end of this call. And unfortunately, I also have a hard stop, but we have gone through the work items. As you know, RFP 4, 5, and 6 are currently not having moved very much yet. And then building our At-Large positions, we would probably know more after the RFP 3 call.

So what I would suggest is to have a call next week, that will focus specifically on a couple of things. If our call is on the first part of the week, then the CWG, sorry, then the ICG call, the IANA Coordination Group call, is on the 12th, which is on Wednesday, so it will happen afterwards, in which we would just concentrate on the RFP 3.

Or if it happens at the second part of the week, then we will be both discussing the ICG update, and also RFP 3. Are there any preferences?

Let's go for a call in the second part of the week. Let's aim for either Wednesday or Thursday for a call, if you all are okay with this.

Eduardo Diaz.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just to be aware that Thursday, there is the CWG call, every Thursday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As well, okay, that's right. So maybe, okay. Let's do our next call in the early part of the week, and so we'll be able to spend more time on RFP 3, and then we'll have a call on the week after, discussing the CWG and discussing the ICG.

I see people are asking for Wednesdays and so on. Staff will send out a Doodle and we'll work something out. Probably the easy way out of this. Okay, any other business or questions?

So, Olivier speaking. Just to remind you all, we've got some RFP to read. There is quite interesting, and I have found it to be very helpful in understanding the issues, and certainly building up on SAC 67 and SAC 68. I have asked our SSAC liaison on how SAC 69 will be coming across our doorstep, and I have been told that it's quite unlikely for it to be ready any time soon.

So we're on 58 and 67 for the time being. And with this, I thank you all for having been on this call. I note a lot of people have to go to the next call, as I've said, I have got a hard stop. So thanks for this. We've got several action items that are there. Staff will follow up with the action items and forward them to the mailing list as well, and adding everything on the wiki page.

And with this, this call is now adjourned. Thanks to Veronica for the interpretation that she has done today all by herself, well done.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]