

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad Hoc working group call on transition of US government stewardship of the IANA functions, on Wednesday the 12<sup>th</sup> of November, 2014 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Gordon Chillcott, Seun Ojedejii, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alan Greenberg, Yasuitchi Kitamura, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

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

We have apologies from Leon Sanchez and Mohammed El Bashir.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreter today will be Veronica.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Have we missed anybody? Have we not mentioned someone who is on the call? Speak up now. Okay, no one else, so that's great. Thank you. Welcome everyone. The first thing we have to do is to adopt the agenda. As you'll note, we have a quick summary of what's happening with the accountability working group

---

*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.*

---

charter, then we'll have a review of the different proposals in the operational communities out there.

We will note there is nothing with regards to the ICG, the IANA coordination group. I believe there hasn't been very much going on there, but I will call on Jean-Jacques, perhaps, on agenda item number four to provide us a quick update as well, just in case. And we've got the review of the CWG to develop an IANA stewardship transition proposal, with the link to the latest meeting.

I think primarily the work we'll be discussing today is the work that's taken place in the RFP subgroups of that working group, that's an agenda item number six, with RFP 1A, 1, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3. And then if we have some more time on our hands, we'll be working on our At-Large positions. But I gather that six and seven will probably be mixed together, reconciling the positions that we have, or that we are developing with the positions that are being expressed elsewhere.

Are there any amendments or any additional points that any participants of this call would like to add? Seeing no one putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted, and we can start with the action items. And Terri, whilst the action items are up on the screen, with the updates in the agenda PDF, so that we've got a full agenda with a new link to today's RFP 3 call.

Okay, thank you. Right, so first thing, review of the action items from our last call, the 4<sup>th</sup> of November, as you'll see, they are all completed apart from one, which actually I think is completed as well. The draft CWG on accountability charter, which was sent by Tijani and discussed

---

in our last call, is to be sent to the ALAC. And I was going to check whether this was actually to the ALAC already? It might have been. Alan Greenberg you might be aware?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm well aware. It was sent to the ALAC. We've been open for comments. People have made a number of comments on random mailing lists, because it went to a number of different lists. No one has made a comment on the wiki to date, and our comment period officially ends in about eight hours.

I note that last time around on the CWG charter, we ended up approving an amendment, but we're the only ones that approved that amendment, so essentially it had no effect because we did that after some of the other groups, or just about in parallel with the other groups approving the charter. That's likely to happen again at this point, because we didn't act very quickly in the process.

The GNSO, I know, is looking at the charter tomorrow and may well approve it, the ccNSO in about a week. So if we have any amendments to it that we really want to get in, we have to get a lot more formal about it very, very quickly. Otherwise, even if we approve an amendment, it's going to have no real effect on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this update Alan, and one of the drafters, or one of the members representing us on the drafting team, Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I'd like to say that the comments on the charter are more about the work of than about the charter. I didn't see any remark [inaudible] charter. That's why I respond [inaudible] comment [inaudible]. What is new is the charter, that's some of the GNSO wanted to change the number of [inaudible] numbers, for each charting organization.

The GNSO feels that some of the [inaudible] of the GNSO wants [inaudible] seven rather than five. And they argued that they have seven [inaudible]. But there is an opposition inside the group, [inaudible]. And I don't think this will happen, but it will be the decision of the GNSO [inaudible]... ask for an amendment [inaudible].

I was one of the people asked a question. I said, I understand that [inaudible]... represented but why, for the CWG, [inaudible]? Why there are only five on the CWG, and there ought to be seven on the CWG. This is nothing more, [inaudible] the charter. I think we start from tomorrow, [inaudible]... And I think that the process that we are [reading] now is very good, because we [inaudible] to comment.

I will be posting it on the [inaudible] or [inaudible]... So I think, from the side of ALAC things are [inaudible]. It is not like the CWG, Alan, because the CWG works [inaudible] on the very short time, now we have been assigned and normally, [inaudible]... some things now so that people can read it. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. I must admit, your voice dropped out a few times, but I still managed to make sense of what you said. So next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I couldn't hear everything that Tijani said, I think I got the main gist. My recollection is on at least one of the emails, there was a suggestion for a change in the charter, but clearly if we were to make that suggestion, it has got to be conveyed to the other groups quickly. So, our process, our comments close today, I believe I said our vote will open 24 hours later, I don't have the schedule in front of me, but I believe the vote will open tomorrow for something like a six or seven day vote, I don't recall exactly. So that's the current plan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan, and thanks for this Tijani. Question to both of you actually, who makes the final choice if one of the constituencies wants more participants? Is it the drafting team that would have to discuss this? Or is it something to be decided amongst the SOs and ACs. How does that work? That was the first part of my question.

The second part of my question is, if the ALAC decides to ratify the charter as it is, and so proceed forward with things, does this still leave a choice for the GNSO to act, to come back ask for more people for the agenda soon. Does that mean the ALAC would have to re-ratify if that's agree? Two open questions. [CROSSTALK]. Yeah, go ahead Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, Alan Greenberg speaking. If you recall, what we did on the CWG, on the IANA CWG charter, is we approved the charter as written, and separately approved an amendment with the hopes that the other groups would adopt it also, which they didn't. I am hoping that if we do an amendment, we will do the same thing, and the same is true for any other group. If the GNSO for instance, completely rejects this charter, but adopts one with a change in the number of members, then we'll have a situation where different groups are adopting different charters, and we're back in the situation we were in with Jazz, if you remember correctly, where the GNSO and the ALAC at one point had completely different charters, and it wasn't clear how the group could proceed.

We fixed that, eventually, by the ALAC modifying its charter, so it could fit with the GNSO one. We have no formal provision, and we still haven't setup rules of adopting CWGs so that if everyone approves the base charter, then we have the base charter. If everyone approves any amendment, we have an amendment. If we go some other direction, we're in new waters.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. Isn't there a cross-community working group on cross-community working groups which should reach some position on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

They're still working. And I can tell you...

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They're working on their own charter, aren't they?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, they're still working, and I can tell you, this particular has not been addressed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Tijani was in direct response to what Alan was saying? If that's case, I'll let you jump the queue and then to Alberto Soto afterwards. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes [inaudible]... You asked a question about the procedure, how it would happen if there is a request from the GNSO to make seven other than five. If it is, as Alan said, if it is an approval of the charter, but with an amendment, and if the other organizations prove it, if it is a rejection of the charter, if it is an [inaudible], normally it has come back to the drafting team, because before, when we worked before, the charter was written by the working group itself.

So the charter was returned back to the working group to correct charter to a new charter. Now we have a drafting team, so normally [inaudible] and the charter has to be done, in the document, and then the approval has to be done by the chartering organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Next is Alberto Soto. Alberto, you have the floor.

---

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. I have posted on the chat, on the chat agenda we send today as LACRALO's opinion, and I have received an email by Leon, he is not on the call, and thinking this, and Tijani said not only that no relevant comments were made. I don't know if that comment was taking into account, or perhaps it was not seen the [inaudible] has already seen this comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alberto. Alan Greenberg and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. Alan first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. As I mentioned, in my first comment, there were comments made on various mailing lists, because different people are on different lists, not everyone saw them. I had asked that comments be made on the wiki so that Leon and Tijani could respond to them. So far that has not been done, and therefore we have this confusion over what people have said and not said. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier. I am sorry Alberto, I didn't see your comment, that's why I said we only received comments on the chat itself. But perhaps, as Alan



---

said, it is a different. If you sent it on the ALAC list, I would see it. It is better to put it on the wiki so that we have a chance to [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. And, of course, we mentioned the wiki. The wiki is on the policy development wiki. I'm putting a link to the wiki page into the chat as we speak. There we go. So Alberto, what I would suggest then, maybe you could make a copy of that comment and put it on the wiki, which is a reference there that will create the help.

I understand there are a few hours left before the response is put together. Okay, great, thank you. Well thanks to all of you on this. Particular thanks goes to Leon and to Tijani for working hard on this charter. It's the second one that you are both working on, I guess you're starting to get used to putting charters together. It's a thankless task, and at the same time, should I just use my Australian word, bloody hard mate. Cheryl might start the applause at that point. Alan Greenberg quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you, just for clarity. The GNSO Council meeting is at 11 UTC tomorrow, and therefore, if an amendment doesn't reach them by then, there is almost no chance that they would like, that they will approve it after the fact, if they approve the charter as currently written. So timing is very, very tight. It's not just at our level.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this Alan. Could I make a suggestion then? It's Olivier speaking. I know that our comment period is closing on this shortly, I gather you are looking at having a vote launched after that. Should we wait maybe 24 hours after the end of the GNSO meeting to launch the vote, in case there are some unintended consequences from the GNSO Council meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe our vote is scheduled to launch after the GNSO meeting? I need to double check. I will click on the link you just provided and double check, but I believe it is scheduled to start tomorrow evening, not now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. The voting will start at 23:59 on the 13<sup>th</sup> of November.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which is after the GNSO meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, marginally after, or did you say 11 AM or 11 PM?

ALAN GREENBERG: 11 AM.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 11 AM, okay, that's why I asked a question. That's great. Thank you very much for this. Fatima Cambroneró is next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. I apologize, but I have a question regarding the procedure that I am not understanding. In ALAC, the comment period is open. For example, this comment that Alberto has sent, will it be considered for ALAC to be added to the charter?

And secondly, is this comment being taken to the drafting report? I need some clarification on this because we need to see what will happen with the amendment, and I don't know what will happen with this amendment, but we are suggesting. So could you please shed some light on this? Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alan speaking. In response to Fatima, the only rules we have are what happened last time, and we can presume that something similar will happen this time. Last time, we voted on the base charter and the amendment separately. So we effectively approve the base charter, and then attempted to change the charter.

The amendment, because we did it so late with respect to other AC/SO approval, never got approved by the other groups. And therefore, our

---

amendment essentially never took effect. I'm assuming that we will do a similar process, that is, we will not attempt to block or veto the charter by only approving it with our amendments, especially if the GNSO has already approved a different version.

And in the past, other groups have been reluctant to take amendments that were made after the fact, and ratify them themselves. So, we don't know exactly what will happen. Chances are that any change we make, if we make it quickly and tell the other groups quickly, and it's not offensive to them, there is a good chance it will take effect. Otherwise, we don't know how it will turn out. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Alan. And reverting back to our agenda, we are still on the review of the action items, and looking at the action item page. Are there any other comments on the other action items on that page? All of which are complete.

No more comments. So that means we're finished with the action items, and we move to agenda item number three, which incidentally, is the charter of the accountability working group, and we have been discussing this and reached a conclusion, so let's move to agenda item number four. The review of the other operational community progress, and that's the time when we ask our representatives and the different operational communities, or participants in the different, there is [inaudible] representatives, participants in the other operation communities to tell us about progress there.

---

One which was not listed is the ICG, the IANA coordination group, Jean-Jacques Subrenat is on the call. And Jean-Jacques, I wonder if you have some more news for us regarding the ICG, if you can briefly provide us with any details. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

And at the moment, it looks like your Bluetooth microphone is not working Jean-Jacques, or you might be muted.

Okay, we'll come back to Jean-Jacques Subrenat shortly. I note that he is in typing something at the moment. Not muted, but there appears to be another technical problem. Whilst you're trying to work out the technical problems, let's go to the other operational communities.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay...

SEUN OJEDEJI: ...can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Seun go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEFI: [Inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Seun, I'm not sure. You sound very garbled at the moment. It's Olivier speaking. You sound very garbled. I think there might be a technical

---

problem for you to speak at the moment. So I can't quite understand what you're saying. I do believe you're trying to provide us with a quick rundown on what's been happening in the communities that you're involved in.

Maybe I can give the floor to Alberto Soto, and try and see if we can find an alternative for you to be able to speak here, and for us to be able to hear you. If that's okay, let's go to Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto for the record. Olivier, what I can say regarding the last meeting, is that there is a survey carried out by the five RIRs, but there were no substantial proposals regarding the transition. That is to say, there is a survey that is being circulated, this was created by the five RIRs. I am not sure, but I think this was created or originated in [a clinic].

And they are dealing with a topic that we're discussing right now. That is to say, if there should be a change in the operation, if the oversight mechanism should operate the policy development processes by the regional Internet registries. I mean, these are things that are being currently debated, there is nothing new, and the idea is to have the answers, and not to repeat the topics, so by now, there are no concrete answers. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alberto. It's Olivier speaking. Just following up on this, is there any actually concrete proposal on the table at this point in time?

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto speaking. No Olivier, no proposal. But as I know the RIRs are waiting for the reply. That's all, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alberto, next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is Cheryl for the transcript record. There is no concrete proposal accepting the discussion paper put and already discussed and shared with this group, I mean they do have that foundational piece of work. It has been blogged about, it has been referred to, it's very much a situation as normal, continue on. It's not broken, don't try and fix it, but make sure you've got decent SLAs [inaudible].

That has, in fact, been on the table for quite some time. In fact, has been on the table and discussed even before this stewardship issue came up. So, there is nothing new on the table, and there is no, now, refurbished and crisp approved ratification of it as yet. But there is a basic piece, but assume there is no foundation because there is a foundation.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, thank you very much for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. Just regarding that proposal, could you refresh our minds if there are any [CROSSTALK] proposal?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can suggest that you look to the wiki page, where all of it has been linked, and it has been linked for several months now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the concerns are on the wiki page as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, thanks for this Cheryl. Now, do we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat back on, can we actually hear Jean-Jacques or not? Let's do another quick test. It sounds like it's not working. It's Olivier speaker. Earlier, or just earlier on the test, I'll read to the record. From Jean-Jacques Subrenat, my report is very brief. Only one point currently under discussion is the choice of a secretariat, that's the discussion within the ICG. A decision should be announced within a few days from now.

So that's just a sideline thing. Thank you for this report Jean-Jacques. Going back to the other operational communities, we have heard from the RIRs. Are there, is there any feedback on any of these mailing lists,



---

such as the IANA transition mailing list, or the Internet Engineering Taskforce discussions, or for this on the IANA transfer ISOC discussion. The number of mailing lists there. I must say, I've followed them as well.

I haven't had very much chance to read through the points too clearly. See we have Alan Greenberg and Tijani Ben Jemaa in the queue. Let's start with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I raised my hand with regard to Jean-Jacque's comments. And just to note, there is an ICG meeting later today. I'm trying to find the agenda, I haven't found it yet. But I'll post something in the chat when I find it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. From an earlier discussion with Jean-Jacques, I understand this is a closed ICG meeting to discuss primarily just the secretariat, the choice of a secretariat, hence the announcement that should be coming soon after the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe I received an invitation to it, but I'll double check on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, oh, well, a privileged person. Now I see why your agenda is very busy. Olivier speaking. Let's have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. On the AfriNIC list, there is a lot of movement today. And the main active persons are AfriNIC people. They are asking for our people also to contribute, for example, I think [inaudible] one of those two people that participated in discussion. Now, AfriNIC is asking for more comments because they need to have, to give their, how do you say, their participation, their contribution.

Very soon, we will have the meeting in [inaudible] in 22, 22, 23 or 24 in November. And AfriNIC hopes that by [inaudible] they will be able to give their contribution. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update Tijani. Surely, the RIRs are working and pushing forward. Do we have now Seun Ojedeji back on the call on a clear line?

TERRI AGNEW: Not at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not at this time, okay. Terri, thank you. And so we can revert back to the question. Any news from anyone on the IETF, on the protocol side of the discussion? No hands up for the time being. I must say, I've only had half an eye, not even looking at the IETF work. I note Tijani has put his hand up, maybe we can have Tijani and then I'll fill in [inaudible] as to... Tijani Ben Jemaa.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I am not following the IETF mailing list, but I know, I have seen, I am sure I have seen that they are using that contribution, they have already produced something. So I don't have the details, because I'm not following that, but I think they are very well advanced. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much for this update Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed the IETF appears to have just, a document that's up for comment. I think it's actually in the last stages of commenting, before next week. Let's have a quick read and see if there is anything to point out. I do believe though that it is rather late to be pushing towards any kind of changes or amendments to the document. What I understand from having scoped through the document, if you, not even a few days.

I think it's a few weeks ago, it's one of the earlier drafts, was that primarily the idea of having something that is unstable as possible with as few changes as possible was the process that was being following. And I note that Seun has rejoined the audio. So let's do a test with Seun Ojedeji, and if you can speak, please go ahead.

Okay, it's Olivier speaking. At the moment, I seem to be hearing Seun in binary, but it would be better if he spoke in plain English. Sorry that was a very cheesy joke, but it certainly doesn't sound like him at the moment.

Nope.

---

Seun, I'm sorry, I'm not able to understand anything at all. So we'll have to move forward and try with staff to do a test again later on, and we'll come back to you when we are able to hear you. With apologies for this. Right. Any other points regarding the review of the other operational community work?

Seeing no hands up, let's move to the next agenda item, and that's the review of the, well, the last call of the cross-community working group to develop an IANA stewardship transition proposal on mailing related functions, agenda item number five. The last call was on the 4<sup>th</sup> of November last week.

The next call is tomorrow. The process was a little slow, I must say, last week with much discussion being on the, more of the process rather than actual policy or any of the work that was done. There was another rating of the principles of operation, and there was also some discussion on the proposal of how to structure the work. And there was just a status on the subgroup work, and of course, we're going to be going into the subgroup work shortly.

So we don't need to mention anything regarding that. The call tomorrow, unfortunately at the moment, let me just check the agenda because the call, so far, did not have anything on this agenda. And no, the agenda for the call tomorrow is still empty. So, I'm not sure, does anyone have any further information about tomorrow's call?

Okay. So no one has any information on tomorrow's call. Does anyone have any comment from the last call from the fourth of November.

---

I see no one putting their hand up either. Thank you Terri, for putting the links into the chat. My comments, I guess, are that tomorrow's call will be quite important on seeing the update from the different RFPs, and I would suggest that we move directly then into the discussion of RFP subgroups. And therefore we can move to agenda item number six.

Now, you'll note a number of bullet points in the agenda there, and what I was going to suggest is that you look through RFP 1, 2A, 2B. CWG RFP 2C, and the CWG RFP 3. You'll note also a link to the current draft of documents being developed. You'll note that it's a one stop shop. It's one page which is all of the current draft that the different parts of this working group are working on.

So you can see the draft list of variables, the pros and cons and questions. I must say, I am quite impressed with the organization that has now started to come together with all of the variables being there, the objectives being there, the way the work is organized. And then also, a number of points, so pros and cons of different scenarios, with regards to ICANN being a division of ICANN, a subsidiary of ICANN, or being entirely independent of ICANN.

I would really suggest that if you haven't read those documents yet, to read those, the discussion regarding ICANN being part of, sorry, IANA being part of ICANN, or a division, sorry, or a subsidiary or being independent, it will very likely come up in the discussion, cross-community working group discussion tomorrow. So it would definitely be positive for us to be well aware of the pros and cons of this.

---

With regards to the other document there, you've got the straw man matrix, and the three straw man proposals from the three. And we're going to read in a moment. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Eduardo for the record. You know, we're talking about... Can you hear me okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well Eduardo. Please proceed forward.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, I'm sorry. It's just I'm hearing an echo in my line. The call that we had today with the subgroup number three, you know, there was something that was put out there, somehow us, and when I'm saying us, ALAC, we, you know.

I don't really have a feeling for what ALAC wants to do. Like for example, in my professional opinion, I think that IANA should stay within the IANA, the way it is right now, in the IANA cooperation, I mean the ICANN cooperation. And then there is other things that they want us moving about, in a whole subsidiary, or independent subsidiary of ICANN.

And I'm not sure [inaudible], you know, because sometimes I'm afraid [inaudible] that really doesn't, you know, reflect what we are, the direction that we want to give from ALAC. So if you could enlighten me on this, I would really appreciate it. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this Eduardo. And I think part was going into depth in RFP 3. What we can do is just to expedite RFP 1, and 2A, and 2B, and maybe even 2C, just to provide you with the details that I was involved in with those groups, and effectively 2A was a description, sorry. One was a description of the community use of the IANA functions, 2 was the existing pre-transition arrangements and policy sources, 3 was the existing pre-transition arrangements as far as oversight and accountability is concerned, and 2C was the existing pre-transition arrangements as far as NCIA IANA functions contracts were concerned.

I think that most of the work of RFP 1 and 2 is dealing with facts, not with opinion, and with what we have currently. And from what I say, they work very, very well put together by a number of individuals there. I don't have any specific comments to make on this. And so before we launch into RFP 3, does anyone have any specific comments on RFP 1 and 2?

If you do, then put your, if you don't, then put your hand down please for the time being. Okay. So we have Fatima Cambroner. Fatima, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: It took a while for the translation of what you asked to get to her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Thank you. Sorry for this. I see no comments on RFP 1 and 2. Alan, are you queuing up for RFP 1 and 2?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm queuing up for three.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ever so eager [CROSSTALK]... It sounds like it... No, I just want to make sure that we're fine with it, and so we can put this issue to bed. Let's go off to RFP number three. The call took place just over an hour ago, and obviously, many questions. And Eduardo raised a question on what were own positions, what was the ALAC position.

What I was going to suggest is that we look at the matrix, which was looked at in the previous call. Terri has very kindly put the matrix up, well, has got a copy of the matrix and she'll be able to put it up on the screen. But let's go through the queue first. So we have Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, and Fatima Cambronero. Let's start with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think you should give Fatima after me, because that's where she was in the queue before you told us to put our hands down. I cannot... To answer Eduardo, I cannot say what the ALAC's position is, I can say what my personal position is. My personal position is, I would like the responsibility for the IANA function to stay with ICANN. I believe there needs to be some level of some viable oversight to replace the NCIA oversight that was there before.

The NCIA oversight does have the ability to change the contract to some other entity other than ICANN, but Larry Strickland has made it really



---

clear that there wasn't any other viable entity that they saw. So I am happy for it to stay with ICANN, with oversight making sure they are doing a good job. And I would like whatever mechanisms that we put in place, to be as minimally disruptive as possible.

So although some of the scenario call for very significant and very disruptive change to effect the transition. My inclination is to go for something as simple and clean as possible, that will address the end need. So I'm not talking specifically to the scenarios that were presented today, but just that, you know, we don't need to unnecessarily complexify [sic] this, if we can avoid it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. When you say ICANN, of course we've got the three different potential scenarios. As a division of ICANN, as a subsidiary of ICANN, or external to ICANN. Which would you prefer Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I prefer that it, we do initially as whatever as simple as possible to, but that would create the necessary oversight and community control, to make sure ICANN is doing a good job of it. I have not studied the proposals enough to do whether we could do completely, as the internal department as it is now, or we have to do that [inaudible]. My inclination is to say that it does not need to be incorporated outside of ICANN, but I certainly have not studied that in any detail.

---

So I'm not sure what the answer is, but my preference is, the simpler the better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Olivier. This is Eduardo for the record. I totally agree with Alan on this. And this, again, is my personal opinion. It should be something simple, and this oversight group, I think needs to be put in place. And this, like you said Olivier, we can pick up pieces from all of the proposals and then make one proposal out of it. But we thing that I saw, that really concerned me, was the fact that, you know, when they are, the proposal where they have your side with the ICANN, suddenly the multistakeholders are not there, just the registries, the way they are putting it together.

I know this is a proposal, but we have to be very aware of that and make whatever solutions is going to be an oversight, includes everyone that gets involved in ICANN, and that's my personal opinion. And the other thing is, you know, for the face to face meetings, if we go there with these proposals, we would never get out of that room. Somehow we should concentrate and make one that makes sense for everyone, not only for ALAC, but for anyone in the group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Eduardo. It's Olivier speaking. Of course, I'll be bringing five [inaudible] to the room, for the five day [inaudible], and of

---

course we'll be able to have some faster ways to reach the answer. So, just to come back to you in the same way I came back to Alan, division of ICANN or subsidiary of ICANN? Any preference?

EDUARDO DIAZ: A division of ICANN. The way it is right now, with our side [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. So you had said, a division of ICANN with an oversight body. So that's basically, oversight body within ICANN.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Eduardo. Next is Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Olivier. This is Fatima for the record. Perhaps my comment is not right, because we have already discussed this point. But I would like to say, that I agree with Alan and Eduardo. And for me, it is very important that this group should decide which of these proposals is better, whether we want a combination of proposals, [inaudible] proposal, or which proposal do we want, because from my point of view, we need to have an unified consensus of proposals.

---

Because during the meeting for in the calls, we can provide our point of view, but in fact, we don't really know the official position of ALAC. I may have my personal opinion, but that is not the ALAC position. So I think we need to work together in the little time that we have. We need to work on this proposal and decide whether we want one proposal with a combination of three, or what we want.

I was not able to read the proposals in that. I participated in the call today, but we need to decide whether we want an oversight body or not. That was something discussed today. So I will stop here with my comment, because we need to keep on discussing. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you for this Fatima. It's Olivier speaking. So I see the two variables, whether the IANA function remains in ICANN as a division, as a subsidiary, or external. And then, of course, do we wish to have an oversight body inside or outside? And thirdly, I think, whether this oversight, well the composition of the oversight body. We'll come to that when we go through the page, the straw man, the three straw man proposal.

From what I was going to suggest was we would, as a working group, on this call today, we still have half an hour, we will go through this straw man proposal, decide on which one of the three straw man we like, on each one of the issues that are listed there. And then propose this to the ALAC, until our next call, and I was going to suggest that our next call takes place, maybe on Monday next week.

---

I think that's before everyone starts flying to Frankfurt, and that would effectively provide us, well, some advanced notes so that when we arrive in Frankfurt, we are in an unified position. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. A couple of points. First of all, I start flying on Monday, I'm a little bit further than you are. So, I don't know. I don't think we're going to be able to come up with a definitive ALAC position. I think the ALAC people are going to have to work together at that meeting. We don't know, even if the ALAC people, or the RFP 3 people, come up with a specific single proposal, it's not clear what's going to come out of that meeting.

And we cannot tie the hands of the people who are in that meeting to only support something, what we're supporting isn't being off the table completely. There are people in the CWG that do not want to see the transition go to ICANN for instance, as a definitive thing. They want to see it be able to move somewhere else completely. So I think we're going to have to be somewhat flexible, and we need guidance but we do not necessarily need a single position that are the only ones we can support.

I think that might take us out of the conversation at the time we need to be most focused on. So, guidance is what we need at this point. And I have something else to say but honestly, I've forgotten what it is. So why don't you go on.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And from discussions I've had in the past, such as treaty negotiations that have taken in the past like [inaudible] for example, the WCIG 12, that what was generally happening was that some redlines were defined, as in what we can live with, what could we absolutely not live with, and we mentioned some flexibility.

I would be cautious of things that we need flexibility if the parties that are advocating things that we don't like, are not themselves flexible. If they are saying, "This or nothing." I would really warn the ALAC about playing the game along as being bullied, especially since I have seen that there are other communities outside of At-Large who hold the same views as we do. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree with you completely, but we need to be able to maneuver in things that we still believe in. I'm not saying adopt something adopt something that we don't believe in because of flexibility. I'm saying we shouldn't be absolutely tied. The other comment I was going to make was your question on subsidiary or, wholly owned subsidiary or divisions.

I'm in the CWG list, I've asked the questions several times about what is the functional difference between that, and specially the question that if we have a wholly own subdivision, or a wholly owned subsidiary, that is incorporated in some other jurisdiction, and that's one of the reasons that we've talked about incorporation. So we might not be subject to US law or whatever.

---

It's not 100% clear to me that that isolates the organization sufficiently, and the question I've asked is, is ICANN, as an US based organization subject to a court order to tell its subsidiary to do something. And if that's the case, then the isolation breaks down, and we need to understand those facts before making that decision. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks for this Alan. Let's go to the next person in the queue, if I can find my window. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I just wanted to bring up clarifying points from something that Eduardo said, and I see where Eduardo has picked up the concept of the straw man proposal, and that we all need to be talking about registry operators, being the ROTC body. Greg did point out, perhaps you didn't hear it during the call Eduardo, that the fact that it's a registry operator, in line 2A on page two of what is on your screen, on all of the columns, was a typographical error.

And in fact, the only column that it should appear in the first straw man proposal one, straw man proposal one is the only one that has a message to industry. All right? Straw man proposals two and three, in fact, both multistakeholder models, and so we should take part on either of those. The residual question that was raised [inaudible] meeting on that particular line item, however, which we probably do need to also remember to discuss, is whether or not that NS model is one that should be limited, as it is currently it could be interpreted to

---

only being inclusive of entities which are currently components [inaudible] ICANN model.

And I am certainly [inaudible], and perhaps there are others, that it should in fact in a multistakeholder model, which is inclusive of the ICANN component, but wider and more open than that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. You're adding another dimension to the questions that we need to ask ourselves. Next is Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. This is Seun [inaudible]... thank you for the [inaudible]... I want to report, Fatima mentioned [inaudible] I was trying to get an idea of what ALAC really wants. Can you hear me now?

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: Now, oh okay. I'm particularly, I think [inaudible] so my thanks to Olivier personally. I'm very much interested in what ALAC wants [inaudible] the way the comments and the discussions they did on the CWG, if I were to continue [inaudible] if I were to continue, within my own view, I guess I want to be sure that actually was, ALAC is also taking [inaudible] because I'm looking at [inaudible] and it don't look like it's



---

something that is going to be, going to give the At-Large [inaudible]... to be more visible in negotiating process.

[Inaudible] straw man [inaudible] which yes, [inaudible] complication. However, there are some realities we need to face, especially the fact that we [inaudible] ALAC, At-Large have potential resources to make our presence known, to make one voice, and [inaudible]... We didn't have that much. Look at ICANN for instance, we only have one person on the Board.

So I think we need to be careful on the proposal that we can finally support. We need to consider how, what the future of ALAC, the future of At-Large look like in this system. And we need to also [inaudible] have something functional, something that is [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible]... similar composition ICANN has [inaudible] SO and AC, it's like a double [inaudible], in my own view.

However, [inaudible] it's very important, even before we get to the [inaudible] that we actually [inaudible] ALAC if you have discussed in the stability [inaudible]... in which we are discussing. [Inaudible]... personal views. I'm sure [inaudible] from what ALAC [inaudible], so I want to be careful, I don't have very much experience within the ALAC, so I want to be careful [inaudible] on statements I make.

So I think it's very different [inaudible]... election they are focusing on. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Sean. It's Olivier speaking. You might have missed the little part of the call where I explained the suggestion for the process forward, which is really we are the At-Large community here, and the idea is that, we as the most informed persons in At-Large would be discussing the proposals that we have in front of us here, the straw man, come up with our common proposal to the ALAC, and then this would be passed on to the wider ALAC and At-Large community for confirmation if you want.

I don't know if the word ratification comes in there. I think there were probably a little bit too heavy handed to call it ratification. But certainly would be making our, so this working group here, the IANA issues working group, would be making its recommendations, and I would expect that the At-Large community would probably move forward and say, "Yes it is mandated to work on this, so we go along with that."

So this is what we're doing right now, at the moment, trying to find our common position. Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. About the flexibility Alan, I agree with you, flexibility is needed, but we have to go first with the common position, the At-Large position. We have to define it, our people on the CWG has the duty to find this sufficient. But we have always our challenges and temptations, especially the Skype chat.

We used, by the way, with Mohamed and John [inaudible] because of the ITG, and I think we have to do exactly the same thing. We have to defend our position, but we have to interact with the [inaudible] of the

---

CWG, and perhaps modify the position, or be flexible, according to the situation. Cheryl spoke about column, we have and just repeating the process.

Yes, you are right, but even for the columns where you have multistakeholder, I have heard [inaudible], and be consistent, and by people we know very well, saying that multistakeholder should be led by private sector, which leads to the same [inaudible] in the process. I am really concerned about that, and I do have that the At-Large community will be reassured on that.

I argue it very, very, very strongly, the charter in the drafting team about that. And I managed to change the private sector by non-governmental. Even non-governmental is not okay for me, but it's better than private sector. So now we have to work so that it's neither private sector nor non-governmental. It should be multistakeholder led by multistakeholder. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Tijani. Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto. Thank you very much Olivier. What I can see is that those who say IANA should be in attendance, well they're only taking into account this accountability or transparency or accountability in fact, but they're not taking into account the operational side. Those belonging to the operational community, for example the RIRs, two of the RIRs, I think that IANA should be kept within ICANN, as it is now, but

---

not generating policies and exercising an oversight by means of a body composed by the different stakeholders.

That group would carry out the oversight and there would be an agreement with the same provisions that we have today, from the NDI and ICANN regarding IANA. This is what we're discussing. We have multistakeholder, but the RIRs should be kept within ICANN, because there are no problems with that, there is no issue with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Fatima. And just returning a question back to you Fatima, so for you, would you prefer as a division of ICANN or as a subsidiary of ICANN? I'm sorry Alberto, I'm sorry about that. It's a lady who is doing the translation. Sorry, the division of ICANN or a subsidiary of ICANN?

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. I say it should be within ICANN. This is Alberto Soto speaking. But someone said something about the legal aspects of this. So it should be within ICANN, but it should be a department at least. A department with its own sanctions being able to execute different agreements. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alberto. In coming back to you Tijani, I didn't ask you the question. Division of ICANN, subsidiary of ICANN, or external to ICANN?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Division, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Division, okay. Thank you for this. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On two points. On the question which I'm not sure I answered, I gave a vague guideline. My preference is a division. There are substantive, real benefits for having a wholly owned subsidiary, I have no problem with that. It's obviously more significant more complex, and I would want to understand why it is justified.

In terms of whether it is external to ICANN, or can move external to ICANN, the point has been raised recently that, to a large extent, ccTLDs are in ICANN for the IANA services. If the IANA services were to move away from ICANN, there is a moderate chance, at least, so say people who associate with ccTLDs, that that community would just disappear from our environment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan, and I note Cheryl's point, division or subsidiary, in that order. So primary division, secondly a subsidiary. And Seun Ojedeji, you are also a member of that cross-community working group, I asked earlier, and you might have heard it or not heard it, whether the view here, or your view, is whether ICANN, the IANA should remain a division of ICANN, should be a subsidiary of ICANN, i.e.

---

something that is somehow separated by a subsidiary, or totally external to ICANN?

I wonder whether you had a view on that Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun for the transcript. I'll support a division of ICANN. I'm sorry, Olivier, perhaps, could you, can we differentiate the difference between the division of ICANN and subsidiary? It sounds like [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Seun, it's Olivier speaking. A division of ICANN is just a wholly owned department within ICANN. A subsidiary of ICANN might be a part of ICANN that is still under ICANN's umbrella, but that would have different personal, different IT, and support resources. Something that has like a paper wall between ICANN and the IANA itself.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. So that would mean, a subsidiary would mean [inaudible] of ICANN, of IANA. Is that correct? A division would mean [inaudible] in operating the division, [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it's just down to the links between ICANN and IANA. At the moment, I believe that the IANA [CROSSTALK]...

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: I prefer division.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You prefer division, you said? Okay.

SEUN OJEDEJI: ...division, right now, at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, correct. Okay. Let's go back [CROSSTALK]... Thank you. Let's go back to the queue. Alberto Soto still has his hand up. Is that a new hand? I think it might be an old hand, but Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto. Sorry, it was for my previous comment. Sorry for that.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that is an old hand. I will clarify on subsidiary, because I've had a fair amount of experience with them. A subsidiary is a separate legal entity. It has its own board. It could, by agreement with its owner, share its resources. And the owner has the ability to as the sole stockholder to change the Board if it doesn't like what the Board is doing, but it is a separate legal entity.

---

And that may have impact in terms of what laws it operates under, tax issues, if there are tax issues, and things like that. Which is why, very often, organizations create subsidiaries to isolate them, but that does not give you full isolation because the controlled relationship.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Next is Seun, you have your hand up again.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun. Thank you for the explanation. That was very useful. Based on that, I think I would go for the division. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Seun. Just to let you know, it's Olivier speaking. I'm currently putting together a tally of choices of division of ICANN, subsidiary of ICANN, and external to ICANN. So far no one has voiced their opinion that it should be external to ICANN. There has been mostly support for the division of ICANN.

In fact, all people who have said subsidiary of ICANN so far, have basically said that as a second choice, in case. Fatima Cambronero is next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima for the record. Thank you Olivier. I want to ask a question to see if I can understand the difference between division and subsidiary. Probably Alan may answer my question. It is not clear to me



---

the difference in terms of two questions that are important to me. Whether this is IANA, is an ICANN division, how the accountability mechanisms would work.

What is the jurisdiction would be used? Would it be the same as it was today? And if it is a subsidiary function, well again, what the accountability mechanisms would be, and what is the jurisdiction and applicable laws? Could you please clarify it and help me understand this topic? Because with that information, I would be able to make up my mind in terms of the choice that I want to make. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Fatima. Alan Greenberg. You have a suggestion?

ALAN GREENBERG: I really can't answer that question. Normally a subsidiary operates because of wherever it is incorporated. So in theory, the subsidiary we're talking about could be incorporated in Switzerland, or Malaysia or wherever, if they're advantageous.

What I do not know, and I have asked the question, but we need a legal opinion on is, does that fully isolate the subsidiary from the US jurisdiction where ICANN resides? And I don't know that. Since ICANN is the sole owner of its subsidiary, it might be required by US authorities to take action, and cause the subsidiary to do something, in which case the change of venue has lost a lot of its impact. I don't know the answer to that.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun for the transcript record. I think [inaudible] difference between division and a subsidiary, has to do also [inaudible] I mean Fatima, has, if I understand, if we kind of use the current model that we have right now. So my question is this, could we, at this moment, say that IANA is isolated from ICANN, at this moment? [Inaudible] ...contract that NCIA is doing.

And if we say it is, if it is isolated, we can get it isolated, is that it's [inaudible] narrow [inaudible]... IANA [inaudible] entities in any form. So would we say we have [inaudible] in such a scenario, or is it a subsidiary? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Seun. It's Olivier speaking. My understanding is that, at the moment, it's a division. It's a function that is operated by ICANN itself. That it's a division. Alberto Soto?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Thank you, that's fine...

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Thank you very much. Perhaps we are not seeing something clear. IANA is a function, when we say IANA we are talking about functions. When we speak about policies, policies

---

are generated within the ICANN ecosystem. That is to say, IANA will be able to generate or create policies.

Of course, we need to take into account, IANA takes into account that policies created or implemented within ICANN. So, in that sense, we have a division, and we have functions that are being fulfilled. Someone spoke about the decision making process. Many people are talking about, not here but in other groups, they are talking about accountability and transparency, the way everything is being handled or managed.

But I'm not talking about the operational functions. These are functions belonging to IANA, and IANA can operate within a division, and this control being exercised over IANA because, and everybody says that it should be external to ICANN. Well, there are people, people say that control should not be external to ICANN, but it should be exercised by multistakeholders, or many multistakeholders. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you for this Alberto. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: There seems to be a little bit of confusion between policy and, I hate to use this term, but implementation, carrying out IANA's functions. The setting of policy for what IANA does comes from a variety of places. With regard to root zone management, it comes from ICANN with regard to ccTLDs and gTLDs. With regard to the numbers, it comes from the RIRs or from IETF, for the other resources. There is no discussion at

---

all on the table of changing where the root zone management policy comes from.

It comes from the ccTLDs and gTLDs currently residing in the ccNSO and the GNSO. That's not being discussed as changing right now, although as I mentioned, if IANA function were to leave ICANN completely, it's not clear with the ccTLD policy would come from at that time. Not that there is an awful lot of it is, but there is, some specifically with regard to re-delegation of ccTLDs.

So I think we need to be very carefully separate out the fact that we are not talking about the policy of things moving from ICANN, we're talking about who carries out the day to day operations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this. It's Olivier speaking. I think we've beaten to a pulp. I realize that we are only four minutes away from the end of this call, I have asked staff if we could extend for another 15 minutes or so. I wanted to touch on some of the main points on the straw man matrix that we have on the table at the moment.

Via screen, you also have a link to it that I could give it to you right here, in the chat, that will allow you to open the straw man proposal, from the matrix. There is a fourth... Well you have three proposals that are on the table at the moment. There is a fourth one with regards to collation of an oversight body.

One of the main discussions took place during the RFP call an hour ago, was whether they should be an oversight body, and what type the

---

oversight body was formed, what the oversight body would have. And so straw man proposal one, two, and three can also be mixed and matched. What I suggest is that we go through the different segments and see if we have an overall preference.

I don't know whether we can have a polling function or something that we have here on the, using the Adobe, because going through the queue for each person is going to take another hour or so, we had discussions on each one of those straw man proposal. First question was, creation of an oversight body, yes or no. Do we wish to have an oversight body created or no oversight body created? It is the point, I think Avri Doria felt that there shouldn't be an oversight body, that mechanisms within ICANN were enough, with maybe some kind of yearly or three year review process, just like the ATRT or something.

Others felt that an oversight body was needed, obviously you can see the three straw man proposals there, show the creation of an oversight body. The first point I wanted to try and see, do we prefer an oversight body, do we prefer no oversight body? If you have a preference for an oversight body to be created, please put a green tick on the Adobe Connect.

If you think that there shouldn't be an oversight body, all together, then please put a red cross next to your name. That's a tough question, then leave it... Oh I see two things. If you don't know put, what should we put if we don't know it? Put it on the chat if you don't really know, you haven't got a preference. Or you can put a laughter, yes, you can put on a happy face.

---

Unfortunately the happy faces don't last forever, they tend to disappear. I see a number of people having said that there should be an oversight body, and a number of people don't have any preference. So it's good to note this, but we're going to have to work more on this one.  
Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: My comment was that we need a mechanism. If there is an oversight mechanism, we can invent, which the Board can't ignore, then that's sufficient. If we can't, we may need a body.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. And I note that Cheryl has given her approval for this. Eduardo Diaz next.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. This is Eduardo. I agree with Alan that we should be talking about mechanisms overseeing this, and not having a specific body to see in this. We can have a mechanism, that once a year we can do an audit on the general operation and things like that. The committee will know if IANA is functioning or not.

---

That something is going to happen and people will know, and maybe at that time, that mechanism will be activated. That somehow you're not [inaudible] later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Eduardo. Seun, Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you Olivier. So yes, with that, proposed of Alan, which is, say mechanism. A mechanism [inaudible]... I think it's just like what Eduardo has just said, it's easy to know when things are going wrong. Of course, it's not a function that does not take the [inaudible]... What has been lacking in the past and up to now, is perhaps when we're making things out [inaudible] ICANN details, what is the channel to get those things resolved?

What is the channel to make sure that these things are properly in the future? So I think those things can be [inaudible] mechanisms. The better question, when it comes to mechanism, is how does [inaudible]... So I think, [inaudible]... mechanism line. [Inaudible] ...to ensure that if in the process itself, ICANN policies, and the way that we've agreed [inaudible] on that ICANN bodies. So this was [inaudible]... I think one of the ways [inaudible]...

...it is an agreement that empowers the community to be able to follow ICANN staff, [inaudible] IANA on their [inaudible].... I would also suggest that perhaps [inaudible]... working group that kind of the [inaudible]...

---

CROPP, not necessarily outside of ICANN. [Inaudible] ...within the community, I think it should be fine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Sean. It's Olivier speaking. And in the meantime, we have started a poll that we should be seeing on your screen. And it asks, should there be an oversight body? Yes, no, or three mechanisms for oversight. I note that not everyone, we've got a few answers at the moment. Not everyone has voted yet. So, look at this. I will vote cast the results in the moment, I don't want you to feel by pressure your colleagues for voting one way or the other.

The results shouldn't be broadcast at the moment. And I also thank the interpreter Veronica, for saying yes to extending this call for another 15 minutes. It is the middle of our work here. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I want to add that I agree on the mechanisms for oversight, and also for mechanisms for the possibility to gauge that there is a reach point, a point that we reach that IANA has to be separated from ICANN for X reasons. So I will probably, after the voting, a mechanism of oversight, which will really be an option of a possibility option, I'm sorry. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. I just think the vote, there we go. Let's have one, two, three, or four. Sorry to ask you all to make your selection again.



---

We're making this vote wider and wider at the moment. Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes, this is Seun for the transcript. I just want to have a response to Eduardo. I think we should, in this [inaudible], not look forward to a mechanism [inaudible]... I think the possibility that we have right now should be maintained [inaudible] for a mechanism for that. The mechanism for oversight is what should be many important [inaudible]...

The mechanisms of oversight was continued. So the separate possibility should be evidence, even before we actually starting [inaudible] reason for oversight. Separately [inaudible] ensure that it would be what would be the mechanism function. So the possibility that we have right now should be maintained, we shouldn't have...

I suggest what are the mechanisms of possibility, or what are the mechanisms for oversight. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Seun. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we're talking here about the accountability group, which hasn't even been created yet. Ultimately, what we need here is an IANA that works, and that cannot be subverted by a rogue Board. Now, that might mean we come up with an oversight mechanism that the Board cannot

---

afford. That may not be legally possible, I don't know. In that case, we have to go then look at other possibilities.

And I don't quite know what they are. There have been suggestions that ICANN be a membership organization, and therefore the members control the Board. There have been things, other suggestions, that the IANA function is not locked into ICANN and the result is somebody, some entity, we don't know who it is, the new oversight body, takes IANA away from ICANN if the Board is rogue, and is not doing its job properly.

These are complex questions, and I don't think a simple one, two, three poll will answer them, because we don't know all of the conditions and what is possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan, it's Olivier speaking. So I think the point is just to get a temperature of the room, as one says. I know we've got quite a few answers here. I haven't voted personally, by the way. So as to keep the neutrality in this discussion and debate, although I do have my points of view of that. Did they broadcast...

Well, the results of the temperature should be broadcast to all of you. I hope that they would show now. And it looks as though the most responses have gone for mechanisms for oversight, or... If you add mechanism for oversight and the mechanism for oversight for separatability [sic] possibilities, whatever that means.

---

Whether it means separating the IANA function eventually, if it needs to be separated in the future, if the oversight function needs to be separated, that we separate into policy. Two people have preferred that there should be an oversight body. It looks to me at the moment, that well, there isn't much support for creation of an oversight body. And the oversight mechanism seems to be what is pushed for.

So, there you go. A few more have come in. So, yeah. It's more towards a mechanism than towards having an oversight body. That's one thing. I don't know how one is able to record those votes. Terri, could I ask you just to record the numbers please?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Because we need to put this to the record. So we've got three yeses, five mechanisms for oversight, and two mechanisms for oversight with seperatability [sic] possibility.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan. Could you read my comment into the chat, because I think that captures what people are saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Alan. So Alan mentioned in the chat, "I sent the answers in oversight mechanisms if we can find one that works, barring that, we

---

need to look at structural changes.” That’s correct Alan, thank you. Okay. So that was one. And yes, I have taken into account, by voting myself on behalf of the people that have texted me, privately what their view was.

So the numbers take that into account. Now, going back to the document, once we’ve thought about that, if we are faced with having a number of people asking for an oversight body to be created, we need to form a view on the operational performance review, whether... Well, the form of this oversight body, and this is... So there are three forms which are presented here.

Straw man proposal one, which talks about an operational performance review committee, that would be ensuring the continued performance of the current, new and approved IANA functions, etc. Provide oversight over the IANA functions operator, and provide a body to which the IANA functions operator is accountable. Straw man two and three are saying the same things.

The first one, just basically says, the body will be an operational performance committee. Straw man two says that this body should be a performance review oversight cooperation. And straw man number three, mentioned that this oversight, well that it goes further than straw man one and two, and it adds that this body should provide stewardship of the Internet according to the principles of multistakeholderism, a competitive market, public accountability, security, and stability.

And so that body would be called a performance review and oversight INC, which I believe is an incorporated company, if I’m correct on this

---

one, seeing INC on this. So, Terri, just for the poll before, I just received another vote by [inaudible], if you can add another number to mechanisms for oversight please, so we would have six for mechanisms for oversight.

TERRI AGNEW: Will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Terri. So now, which one of those three do we...? I have to say it's sort of another call again. Let's open the floor first for a quick discussion. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: There was a mention in the chat that maybe we would want to add three and four into one, because we have said a mechanism, it can be a mechanism with a possibility, was not a possibility, with whatever. It encompasses all. The important thing is that we should find a mechanism, not a body. So I agree with the suggestion that was put into the chat, that maybe we want to add [four into 120].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Eduardo. This poll, of course, is just for our own purposes, and to gauge which way we're going to move. Obviously, the common thing between three and four is the mechanism, and they're obviously appears to be overwhelming for mechanism rather than a

---

body itself being created. If we were to have an oversight body, what form an oversight body should have?

And I'm just basically, at the moment, creating a very quick poll. Some want straw man one, straw man two, and straw three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes I see Seun Ojedeji and then Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, Oliver. So, here is the poll of the questions [inaudible]... Is this just like a backup plan of something because I think most of the poll shows [inaudible] for [inaudible]... And actually the three proposals are talking about [inaudible]... So in a way given a view just in case [inaudible]... in the larger community for no body for oversight. So that's [all I do right now] Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Yes Seun, that's what it is. You're quite correct. Okay, we are going to push for no oversight body on this. There is an overwhelming push for an oversight body, we also need to have then our next move, moving forward. Okay, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, I'll support, in that regard, I'll support straw man two. Sorry [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK] All right, sorry. Do you want to give [inaudible] or something? Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. Cheryl Langdon-Orr next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Olivier, we're not going to get through the rest of the seven pages. So this is almost a sort of hmm exercise now. I'm not sure the polling is going to tease out everything that we need on all of these lines, and unfortunately, the first line is one of those.

I would argue, I'm not sure any single choice, just across a horizontal, is going to be taken. I definitely straw two, we can [inaudible], but that's taking the whole column of straw two, not just line 1A. So if you're going to ask me to dissect it, line by line, I'm actually fairly ambivalent across an opaque [inaudible] ...it depends on what structures introduces mechanisms and safeguards thereof.

I personally think if we have to a mechanism, I'm sorry, a body, in that probably the only that will get up and get support, is the one outlined in two. Three is lofty, laudable, but probably not treatable, and one is just not going far enough. That's not going to be answered on an one, two, three support choice. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. And I realize that you were speaking about this. My question is badly drafted, because obviously I asked for people here to choose between straw man one, straw man two, and straw man three, and as we said earlier, there would probably be have to be some mix and matching. And I also agreeing with you that going through the seven pages would be possible if we don't have another 24 hours on this call.

What would you suggest, or what would people suggest to move forward on this? I can think of two ways of doing. Either we can continue the discussion on the mailing list, regarding each one of the points in the straw man, 1A, 1B, 1C, etc. etc. or emailing what our preferences would be with A, B, and C.

So as to find out what mixed and matched products we would be happy with. The other way would be to ask for a poll to be created with a different question, 1A, 1B, 1C, and so on, for people to answer one, two, three. That obviously can be done with a Survey Monkey poll. I do realize that it's a lot of work, but we have that run for a few days, until Monday let's say, Monday or Tuesday. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Cheryl for the record again. I think a practical way forward, if we're going to get something easier to analyze, and do more effective [inaudible], is to go with your option two, the polling. But please allow for comment in every one of those one, two, three choices, because we won't be able to tease out the nuisances otherwise.



---

So having [inaudible] to go ahead, but we have to do text comment and annotations as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Cheryl. I think that probably sounds like a good idea. I note that Heidi has suggested a Survey Monkey poll, and that Terri is currently adding an action item, that a Survey Monkey poll be developed by Olivier and Ariel, and offer options for each question.

I think it's not options, also offer comments for each question. All to run from Friday, no. It can run from as soon as it's ready, and today we're Wednesday. So let's see if we can run for the poll today, until our next call should be on Monday or Tuesday next week. And I realize that not everyone will be there, but you all have emails, and rest assured we will not be making choices on the call next week.

We will be just discussing some of the points which will come out of that poll that will come out of that poll that we put up. That should really give the people travelling to Frankfurt and also the participants that will be participating remotely in the discussions, with a lot more food to work from.

And at least we will be able to say that when we are pushing for specific points, we can actually follow, some of the views that we shared here. I would also like to share the results of this poll with the wider ALAC. I have a problem with this, in that it is going to take a longer amount of time to come back to us with a point of view of this. And obviously, we had all been following this very closely.

---

We're well aware of the different issues, and it's a concern that we'll have to start with a very basic start, and not get very much from the ALAC, hoping just that the ALAC [inaudible] if you were in charge of this, you proceed forward as you think we should proceed forward.

At this point, I know we are beyond the end of this call, and Veronica must be suffering at the moment. Veronica being our interpreter. Do we have any other additional business or other suggestions? I note that several people will be flying to Frankfurt on Monday, I know that some are flying Sunday, and some Tuesday as well. So, what we can do is just to have that poll, take it from there on the email.

And people will respond something. And we'll have a call on Monday or Tuesday. A Doodle will be sent out to see if we have the most number of people on that call. And then we can just discuss some of the responses after we've done the poll. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Heidi, this is Heidi for the record. Just two questions. One, is when the poll is set to close? And secondly, there is a question from [inaudible], whether the Survey Monkey will be open to the At-Large community that's in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Thank you for this Heidi. With regards to your first question, I think Monday, 12 UTC, so that's lunchtime is probably good enough. In fact, I would even ask for Monday zero UTC, will give us the rest of the week to read through this and to answer. With regards to having all of

---

the ALAC to answer this, I'm a little concerned about the knowledge of the ALAC as far as the issues are concerned.

Alan, help me out on this one. Or anyone else on here. How would you prefer this? Would you say the ALAC should or should not?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there is enough time for the ALAC to do something on the short-term, and anyone on the ALAC who has an interest within this group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, there is a harm in opening to the ALAC, or make it more public to the At-Large, to treat the responses differently. Having a weighting that is seriously considered for those who came in informed, effective, and take into consideration the temperature of the room from the rank and file.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfectly reasonable.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well I do that sometimes Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Don't make a habit of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan and Cheryl, and please behave. Good point. Let's do that, let's make the Survey Monkey poll not anonymous, so that we know who is from the ALAC and who is in this working group. And then we can, and also, there was a question in the chat, will the poll also incorporate the two polls that we did here?

What forms they might have? Well obviously, that, what function and oversight have will indeed be included, but we can also include the first question about the question of whether we are in favor of an oversight body or an oversight mechanism? Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, my hand was just not put down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Heidi. Fatima Cambronero you have the last word for this call.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. Just a comment that has to do with a concern that I have. We do know that

---

this is a very complex topic and not everybody is following the topic. So my concern is that if we open these topics to members that are not aware of the topic, and just cast their vote because perhaps we can have [inaudible] which is not a real result, because they are not following the topic. This was my concern. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you for this Fatima. This is Olivier speaking. And in order to avoid this, we'll go along with the suggestion that was made by Alan and by Cheryl, that we can treat the responses from the ALAC differently, than responses from our members of IANA issues working group members. So effectively we'll put more weight on the IANA issues working group members, on the responses for those of us who are well aware of the issues than on the responses from the rest of the ALAC. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I should note, people on this working group will actually be active at attending calls and participating.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. And indeed, you mentioned about people attending his call, I note that we are nearly two hours into this call. I thank all of you for this, but in particular I thank Veronica, the interpreter, for having lasted the full two hours. Go and get yourself a drink or something, you must be very thirsty by now.

---

Thanks to all of you. I think this has been pretty productive. We've got a way forward. I shall be working with Ariel Liang on producing the Monkey Survey, you should expect that in your mailbox very soon. Any last any other business before we close the call?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That was Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And thank you for the point. Thanks to all of you. This call is now adjourned, goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**