TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad-Hoc working group on the Transition of US government Stewardship on the IANA function, on Monday the 17th of November, 2014 at 17:00 UTC.
	On the English channel, we have Gordon Chillcott, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Christopher Wilkinson, Glenn McKnight, and Mohammed El Basher.
	On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.
	We have apologies from Fatima Cambronero, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Judith Hellerstein, and Alan Greenberg.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Sabrina and Veronica.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state their name, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Terri. And welcome everyone to this call, the At-Large working group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA function. And have we missed anyone on the roll call by any chance?

I didn't hear anyone shout their name out. So, today we have the bulk of the call that will be taken in discussing the preparations for the cross-community working group meeting that will take place in Frankfurt, in just over 48 hours from now, or just less than 48 hours from now. And the bulk of the work will actually be discussing the different proposed post-transition oversight and accountability arrangements that are currently discussed in the cross-community working group RFP 3.

So we'll take about 60 minutes on that, and we will be looking at the results of the straw man matrix poll that we have sent, both to the members of this working group and also to the ALAC mailing list. Before that, we'll just be quickly going through the charter of the, well an update on the charter of the accountability working group and also, we'll be looking at the work that is currently taking place in the other operational communities of ICANN.

Are there any changes, any amendments, that anybody wishes to add to this agenda? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted, and we'll first go through our usual action items from our last meeting, and the three action items we had were all complete. Any questions or comments on the action items? Don't see anyone putting their hand up, I see you're all ready to go for the next agenda item, and that's a quick update on the chartering of the accountability working group, update on the voting, etc. And for this, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa who is with us.

Tijani, I don't know whether you've been following this up. I would have usually asked, called upon Alan Greenberg, the chair of the ALAC

to provide us with an update, but with Alan not being here, do you have any update for us regarding the chartering of this final version? Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. The charter is put for voting, and for your information, we have received, a little bit late, demand for amendment from LACRALO, and it was a little bit late so it wasn't possible to attach it. So we will not manage to make any big changes because it is already adopted by the GNSO.   The demand for amendment should be done much earlier, but unfortunately it was done late.

And also, the kind of amendment they are asking for, was that they wanted the CCWG to consider all the recommendations, the [inaudible], and the cost.   And that here is something that we don't have a consensus about, in fact, At-Large [inaudible] ALAC [inaudible], and we didn't discuss it in fact, because as I said, it was late but the few people who spoke about, we don't have an agreement on this kind of amendment, but we propose that we make a recommendation for our participants in this CWG to consider efficient, the cost, we are not all in agreement, because I think that, I am one of those that think that it is not our duty, is to make ICANN accountable.

The cost of that is not our concern. There are members from the staff and members from the Board, on the CCWG, who may think about that. It is not, we have to find the best way to make ICANN accountable. And

we don't have to sacrifice the accountability because of the cost was a discussion that took place between two people. In any case, it cannot be an amendment to the charter, and I think we are reaching an agreement to make it as a guideline for our representatives on the CCWG to always consider the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this update Tijani, very helpful indeed. And I can also provide you with an update on the work of the selection committee that will be selecting members for this cross-community working group. Of course, now that it's being charted by the GNSO and the voting is taking place in the ALAC regarding this committee, there are increased pressures for us to be selecting members for this working group. So a call for members, for candidates, for expressions of interest, has been sent over the weekend.

And I thank staff for working over the weekend to have sent this just in time. We have 10 days for any candidates who wish to send their expression of interest. And the selection committee is basically ready to make its selection at the end of those 10 days. The selection committee is the same as the one that selected, in fact, the previous people for the… I think the previous process was for one person to be on the coordination group, so the selection committee made a selection on that, and also a prior process as well.

So we've got an internal process that is well oiled up as one can call it, and we are ready to be making the selection, hoping that we will be

able to have a balance selection that will represent the five regions, the five RALOs. The aim is to have enough candidates to be able to, enough good candidates to be able to represent the five regions.

So that's where we are today. Are there any questions on the update that Tijani has provided or that I have provided?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So once again, I would really like to thank the work of our members in the drafting team for this charter. As you know, there is a cross-community working group on cross-community working groups, and the complexity of the task of drafting charters, etc., is such that the cross-community working group on cross-community working groups hasn't really advanced well enough so as to be able to have a product that can be used when creating cross-community working groups.

So it's all to the credit of our representatives who were Tijani Ben Jemaa and also Leon Sanchez, worked very hard, working really as a matter of negotiation to build those charters. And that's really great to be able to have a team dealing with it. Let's move to the next part of our agenda, and that's the review of the other operational community progress. As you know, the primary amount of work we're now doing is within the names community, but there are also two other operational communities out there.

And there are the regional Internet Registries and of course, the Internet Engineering Taskforce. At the bottom of our front page for our working group, we have linked to the different mailing lists of the

EN

regional Internet registries, but also to the Internet Engineering Taskforce, etc. And I therefore ask, in no specific order, if anyone has an update first on the regional Internet registry work.

I know it's only in a few days, [CROSSTALK]… changed since the last time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I heard a no from Chery Langdon-Orr, okay. I see Alberto Soto has put his hand up. So Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Olivier. There is a document from a meeting held not long ago, I think the meeting ended on the 7th, but I have just received that document. I didn't have the chance to read the document, however there is a significant when you read the document because it mentioned the proposal by LACNIC, which up to that date, it was just a group of stakeholders in charge of providing guarantee.

Because it was a multistakeholder group and it was granting accountability. Unfortunately, I didn't have the time to read the document, but according to the table of contents, I can see interesting

topic. That is all I have to say right now. I was not able to see any movement or any exchange in the other mailing list. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alberto. I was not aware of this document, reading the document here. This appears to be a document that is drafted, an official document, drafted by CENTRE, the Council of European National Top-level domain Registry. And that's based on what happened last week at the RIPE 69 meeting, RIPE being the European Regional Internet Registry, that took place in London.

And shame on me, I wasn't in London at the time, so I was not able to make my way to that meeting. But I too have not read through that document, but it looks as though it does have some, certainly some interest for us, and I suggest that we perhaps read this and discuss this at our next call.

If there is, actually, anything that will fall out of line with the work that is taking place elsewhere. I note a lot of other people in the queue. I see Tijani Ben Jemma and Gordon Chillcott. So let's continue with Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. Now, the we're appointing the representatives on the CRISP, and at least three of the [inaudible] have already appointed their representatives. I think there is missing LACNIC and I'm not sure, but at least three have already appointed their

representatives. I have to remind you that CRISP is a committee, if you want, that is in charge of preparing the common proposal of the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Tijani. That's also a very helpful update. Indeed, before the Regional Internet Registries will be able to send their document over to the IANA coordination group, they obviously need to have a coordinated document, a good step forward on this for them. Next is Gordon Chillcott.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thank you Olivier. Gordon Chillcott for the record. On that coordinated output from each of the registries, an interesting email turned up for the ARIN registry last Thursday, which basically seems to lay out a set of deadlines for ARIN. Let me quote from there, if we want the ARIN community output by 1st of December, so Chris can have 45 days to assemble a single document, and that email goes on from.

And that email is from Jason [Schiller] by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Gordon. It's Olivier speaking. So it looks as though the RIRs are in line to be able to move forward and proceed forward with Chris. It looks like also everyone is feeling the pressure of time to be able to come up with a solution. And I do have concerns obviously about the different proposals that will come out,

because it looks as though, for the time being, each operational community is working in a silo, and it will certainly be interesting to see how this will all come together when the ICG receives this on their desk.

Let's just have one action item, I think, from this section regarding the RIRs. I think, is it Terri who updates our pages? If we can have that link to the CENTRE document updated on our list of documents, that would be very helpful. And I don't know whether there is a page that also points to the CRISP by any chance, because I believe it would be interesting to also have a link to the CRISP, to be able to find out, once the CRISP is created, whether the CRISP, well what it's operating as and how updates and so on, on its call.

I'm not sure whether the calls will be public or not, or how that will operate. [Inaudible] pointing to the page so as to be able to track what's going on here. Are there any other comments or questions? Now we've gone through the RIRs so that's a good thing. Now let's have a look at the Internet Engineering Taskforce, the IETF. Has there been much progress within the IETF? Has anyone been tracking this?

The last I heard, was that there was a document that was drafted, that typical IETF fashion, went through the usual process of formalizing documents and it's just as though it was all just looking at the script minimum amount of changes, but I didn't keep track, unfortunately, any further than this. No update here. Okay, well let's put this to the side and assume not that much has happened since the last time that we spoke, which was a few days ago.

EN

And let's go to agenda item number five, which is going to the meat of our call today. We have at least, in fact, we have more than 60 minutes on this list. Obviously, if we had gone through the whole list before that, then we have no, we don't need to take the full hour. And so what I would suggest first is to have a look at the results of the poll that we sent out.

As you know, I think you've all filled it in, we have this poll that was asking about the three different, these three different straw man proposals. And in fact, one of the problems that has to do with time, is that since we started with three straw man proposals at a time when the survey is created, proposal number four appeared as well, and then proposal number 1A also appeared, which is a bit of a concern because the more time passes by, the more proposals start springing out and people in Frankfurt are going to end up with not one, two, three, or four, but maybe even more than four proposals, thankfully having a number of mix and match arrangements.

One of the ideas of sending a poll out to you all, the members of the working group but also to the ALAC, was to give some kind of rough guidance to our members who will be face to face in Frankfurt, to be able to respond and to make a choice of what our community, what we feel would be the best way forward, and be able to defend points knowing that these are not just personal choices, but choices of our, a number of us.

I can't say the whole community, but certainly a number of us. And so the call, which was sent out, only gives us a few days. We had some

EN

very good response on that, certainly bigger response than I originally thought, with quite a few people providing us with details, etc. I see that the agenda of the cross-community working group face to face meeting is on the page, maybe we can just start going quickly through this and asking a few questions on this as well.

I also know that Tijani has put his hand on. So Tijani, you have the floor.

And you might be muted Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. Now I am not muted anymore. Thank you. Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. I would like to say that there is much more than four or five proposals, because besides the proposal number four, and the 1A, if you look at the result of the survey, you will have a big number of proposal, if you assemble those results, you will find a lot of proposals.

So, I think that from our side at least, we have perhaps not, we are not sticking to one single proposal, we have a mixture, if you want, of elements from several proposals to make the one that we perhaps wish to see. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Tijani. And I also note that in the chat, Glenn McKnight has written that the poll is a rough consensus. Indeed the devil is in the details. And it's getting very detailed now, more and more. I must say, I have some difficulty trying to track the multiplicity of

EN

responses now in the cross-community working group with some people coming up, already expanding on some of the proposals, the straw man proposals, and making changes to them.

I understand, I think that the chair of the RFP 3 group is also facing some problems in making sense of all of what's going on, because people are using various versions of the document, etc. But I believe a lot of the discussion will take place face to face, and consensus on this. Let's have an one minute run through the proposed agenda, because I wanted to also ask whether anyone had concerns on some of the other parts.

So not just the RFP 3, but the other parts of the agenda. Indeed, day one, for the morning of day one, the basic work will be the review of RFP 1, 2A, and 2B. So here I think it's thinking about the principles and the current processes, and also a triage of the current processes, etc. in the current documents, and seeing how the current legal documents have to be amended.

Are there any concerns with any of these at the moment? Is there anything that our representatives should be bringing forward or pushing forth? I certainly know that some of our, well some of you, have been on these sub RFPs, so I don't know if there is any concerns that are still there before these get adopted.

I certainly believe that these were probably getting adopted quite fast in Frankfurt. Christopher Wilkinson you have the floor.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [Inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you do now, we can hear you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah, Olivier, just… Oh gosh, hold on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You might have to turn off the, yeah.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just two preliminary comments. First of all, avid followers of this process, it is becoming increasingly impossible to keep track of all of the documents in all of the subgroups and all the options. I think it's becoming overburdened from the point of view of private individual participants.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Christopher. I don't know whether you continued after this.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just now, no because my broadband connection has crashed.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, effectively Chris, if I understand you correctly Christopher, I mean, at the moment, with the RFP 1 and 2A, and 2B, and 2C, etc. for a single participant, it's very difficult to follow. And yes, I agree with you. It's not one of these easy things. If we have shared the burden among several people, and one of our pages, actually shows the involvement of people in the different RFPs, my personal feeling on this, I think, is, as far as 1, 2A, 2B, and 2C are concerned, the work is being done very methodically and very thoroughly.

And I'm quite pleased with the overall result. Maybe one thing that would need to be done is to read through those proposed documents and having to try and pick them somewhere along the line. I believe that just in 30 minutes time, there will be a freeze on documents. So hopefully, a final version of the document will be sent out to the cross-community working group mailing list. What I suggest is to forward these documents to our IANA issues working group list, and then those people, well, all of us to be able to then look at the RFP 1, 2A, 2B, and 2C documents, and find out if there is anything that springs to mind as to be either restrictive on what the overall solution is going to be, because sometimes that's how it is.

You move he goalposts so that you get the intended result that you want to get. So we want to make sure that these are not restricted in the sense that it would actually go against the points that we're trying to push through in RFP 3. And of course, the consensus that will be reached in our community. But at the same time, I personally don't think that it's going to be a huge amount of work to look through these because the last I looked at them, they looked okay.

Those documents for 1, 2A, and 2B looked okay. But as you said, very well, it's very hard to keep track of what that last version is.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: So Olivier, since I still seem to have the floor, may I just say very quickly the main points which I made in my response to the survey. First of all, I think it's very important indeed that the entity is charged with IANA oversight is multistakeholder. I do not agree, indeed, from the point of view of European competition policies I understand it, I think it would be almost illegal, for the entity responsible for IANA to become comprised exclusively of registries.

Particularly, as in the future, a number of commercial registrars and companies will hold portfolios of registries, so you're dealing with organizations with an effective block vote in the IANA entity. The IANA entity, whatever it is, has to be multistakeholder, including At-Large and including GAC. Second point, is I understand this philosophy of those, and Avri Doria has, for example, has been most eloquent in this, and so has Milton Mulleur, those who wish to retain the option of separating IANA from ICANN.

In the last resort, I disagree. You cannot envision a situation where the ICANN system and the IANA system are separate. It's only because of the vast cost of suitable, adequate oversight. So my bottom line is that we have to find a solution, and this goes right back to the accountability of ICANN itself. We have to find a solution where the accountability of

EN

ICANN is adequate and sufficient to justify the maintenance of IANA as a division of ICANN.

And finally, we have to be very, very sensitive to the anti-trust aspects of the proposition of the cross-community working group. I don't need to mention the word VeriSign, but it is quite extraordinary, from the competition point of view, that the main cooperation with economic and financial interests, in this field, is representing the registries. No, that's not kosher. That wouldn't fly if it was seriously disputed in law. Anyway, that's enough.

First, multistakeholder oversight. Second, it's a [shimmer] to try to disassociate IANA from ICANN. And third, competition law applies, even to the working groups of ICANN in this context. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Christopher. Very helpful indeed, and I've taken note of that. I see a green tick from Gordon Chillcott on the Adobe Connect. I see next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. Tijani speaking. I agree with Christopher about the oversight body, to be constituted by the multistakeholder community, but I want to add something. It must be led by the multistakeholder. By multistakeholder [industry]. Because, why I say that, because there is a trend in some part of the community, that they want it to be multistakeholder led by private sector.

EN

And this is what I absolutely disagree. In another version, they say led by non-governmental leadership, and even this is not sufficient. It must be multistakeholder. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. When you mean led by multistakeholder leadership, one stakeholder would have to lead, how could you lead it by multistakeholder? You would have more than one leader?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, I don't think that [inaudible] will be constituted by one person. I don't think so. The oversight cannot be led, it cannot be done by one single person, or led by one single person. So, when there is… I told you, I have heard that with instance, that they want it to be multistakeholder led by private sector, and this is something that is not acceptable at all.

It must be multistakeholder leadership. That can mean, if we were to have one chair, or one leader of something like this, it can be chosen by the multistakeholder community.   But not private sector, not non-governmental. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you….

[CROSSTALK]

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you Tijani for your support, and elaboration on this matter. My conclusion would be that the chair of this body, we may be jumping the gun a bit, but it's quite possible for a chair of such a body to be independent. And the stakes are becoming so high, and so, in some cases, so anti-social, that the idea of giving the registrars who own the registries, leadership in this field is not acceptable to user interests.

And in my interpretation and history, would not be acceptable to governments either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Christopher Wilkinson. Very good start to our discussions, and certainly reflecting some of the results that we have had in the poll. Of course, there was some discussion already on this topic, with regards to the oversight of the functions themselves that took place on the cross-community working group mailing list. And certainly looks like some work will need to be done here.

Well, we'll leave it at that for the time being. Right, so, the surveys are out. The survey results are out. And what I did to try and save the amount of jumping from one page to another, was to give the answers, the answers for just, straw man one, straw man two, and straw man three on this working group document, which doesn't look very good

EN

unfortunately. It's a little bit, very small actually here, but just prior to that, and I'm sorry for if I'm jumping from one thing to another.

The first question which was asked in our survey, was one which was not on the straw man itself, which was, "Do you support the creation of an oversight body for the naming related IANA functions?" And as far as the members of this working group are concerned, there were six yeses, and then there were six no's, which said, "I would prefer a mechanism for oversight," and four which said, "I would support a mechanism for oversight with the possibility of separation."

So, 10 saying no, we would not want to have an oversight body, and six saying that there should be an oversight body. In the non-members of this working group, the vast majority of respondents said, in fact, six, out of seven respondents said, "Yes, we would like an oversight, creation of an oversight body for the naming related IANA functions."

And one said that they would support a mechanism for oversight with a possibility of separation. So, we are in a situation when there is, in our working group, the majority of people that would like to have a mechanism for oversight, but the wider At-Large, the majority of people looking for an oversight body.

Are there any comments about this result?

So I don't see anyone [CROSSTALK]…

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm not on the web at the moment. It's Christopher again. First of all, the distinction between a body and a mechanism, is fairly subtle. I can see that the body is more visible, but it's also more expensive, and runs a serious risk of duplication. And as one or two people have pointed out, future bureaucratic expansion. So I have reservations about the body, because I think most of what I would like to see can be achieved through mechanism, provided, and this is for the sake of today's discussion, I'll shall probably volunteer to work on the ICANN accountability working group.

But provided that the accountability of ICANN itself is acceptable. And that requires serious changes to the structure of the ICANN Board, and the nominating committee, and so on and so forth. But I don't think the value added of a body, as opposed to a mechanism, justifies the cost, and particularly the cost for people like us.

At-Large and even governments, can do this oversight business once. The more thing is split up, and you have to do the oversight business once, twice, or three times, the less effective we will be. End of story.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Christopher. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. As I said before Olivier, we can notice the big difference in the result of the poll taken by the working group [inaudible] and one taken by the ALAC, not number of the

EN

[inaudible]… This [inaudible] complexity of the issue, and demonstrate that you may think something [inaudible]… follow the discussion, it will then read something. Perhaps you will not have the same point of view and the same vision.

So I don't know how it will be used if it goes to vote, but I think we have to be very careful not to meet them, because perhaps we will have around result, around orientation from our representatives, if we take both the results and [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani, it's Olivier speaking. And of course, we have said, the reason for splitting the poll was to give more weight to the replies and answers to the members of this working group here. That's well understood. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. It's Cheryl for the record. The bit I think is extraordinarily useful, and I think [inaudible] numbers of [inaudible] that might be able to [inaudible]… because of having dichotomy, use it all [inaudible] favor rather than [inaudible] look at the difference between the informed and the generally informed, because this is an example, one of [inaudible]… this type of structural discussion, where the general interest population, and notice that's not the general population, but those in the population that have a general interest in the topic, will have a set of responses, reactions, and expectations, which, lacking particularly depth, discussion, and debate are slightly different to those that are

EN

highly focused, and have looked at the nuisances and some of the greater details [inaudible].

And that's all a very useful thing when we're talking about the type of model that something that is going to be, hopefully, used by the [inaudible] numbering and [inaudible] not [inaudible] but way the difference, the structures and functions, filled with numbers, names, and protocols. Because if you take it as [inaudible] into true need, you spread it across into two [inaudible] opportunities, you're only are going to get the more [inaudible] and that's something on the negative ways, generalist but interested [inaudible] holding [inaudible], because it's far less likely that people with expertise and time and energy and influence, will be able to be engaged in all of these different bubbles, for the want of a better word.

So, keeping it together, whatever it is, I can use an argument that is strengthened by this type of result. So I think we should be able to utilize it that way, if not, you know, utilize it for the hard percentages of what a representative [inaudible] of the At-Large community think. The other thing, I think, and is likely to be the case, just looking at the [inaudible] report, and we can talk about that later if there is time, Olivier, because there are a couple of things that we should discuss at the end of the call if at all possible.

But, coming back to some of the issues that individuals, all they be influential individuals raised, such as from an At-Large [inaudible]… response to the London meeting. ICANN, even though membership organizations, so it's not accountable, members don't have to be

EN

accountable at all, if you create something as vastly important with this resource allocation issue [inaudible] important, and try to run it on a traditional, inverted commas, membership model, then you're only [inaudible] are going to be able to get the majority, generalist view out of your members.

And this data is a very good angle to say why that shouldn't be the case, why you should have a mechanism or oversight body, and if you don't like those ways, whichever, as long as it's functioning properly, and the body is multistakeholder, and multistakeholder isn't beyond the ICANN set of stakeholders. If it's that important, it needs to be globally able, open and able to multistakeholder, just [inaudible]… There is an argument as to why that should be the case.

So you would attract the greater expertise to a single table, rather them having them sectioned all over the place. [Inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I must say, I strained a little bit in being able to hear you. Your voice was a little faint, and I will be listening to the recording again [CROSSTALK]…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …I apologize, I should have mentioned that earlier. My microphone is a little off [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A little off.   But certainly I note, from what you said, that there is interest in keeping the functions together, and I think what you mentioned specifically about the fact that the, any oversight and so on, would have to be something that not only looks at oversight at the ICANN communities, but also everyone else, basically. Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that is correct. I think that's very important. And in fact coming back to, it's Cheryl again for the record, Tijani's point about private sector led, the reason that that mantra comes out, and that goes back to the original white paper, pre-dating ICANN, is that that is the opposite to governmental, of course. But if we are going to successfully play that game, if it's an important point, why private sector should be engaged and involved in any of the oversight mechanisms or bodies, is that we all want something that's closer to a multistakeholder model, it's not too difficult rather than say, private sector cannot be trusted, because of course, in many cases, particularly in the numbering community, you're going to get a great deal of support for that type of approach, because the people who run the business know what's going on.

And they certainly should have a say. But if you add, you know, the other sector, which for an economic term, is traditionally, at least [inaudible], named volunteer, and so if you just change that mantra to not to be private sector led, but a multistakeholder model, which is inclusive of private sector and volunteer sector, or private or volunteer

sector, [inaudible] can possibly make everybody feel happy, because what we are saying is, it shouldn't be purely governmental. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you for this Cheryl. I believe you agree with Tijani's point, that this should be multistakeholder led.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Always have, and one of my points is, it has to be multistakeholder beyond ICANN…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Beyond ICANN, okay. So, multistakeholder in the wider sense than just the ICANN community basically.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct. You may not get any more than are in the ICANN community, but they have to be capable of having more than in the ICANN community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Cheryl. Olivier speaking. So, rather than looking at the whole thing overall, I thought maybe we would go through each one of the questions asked. And as you'll note, we've got this straw man matrix on the, sort of working document that's currently on the

EN

page. In fact, I've just captured this about an hour ago, and looking at the original document, it has changed again.

So we'll just take this snapshot that we currently have. It shows straw man proposal four, of course, we didn't vote on straw man proposal four, because that has actually sprung up in the past 48 hours, and as we knew there was a proposal for, we didn't know what kind of proposal it was, and now it seems to be a trust model with periods, periodic contract review, and reassignments. So that doesn't have any committee, or anything like that, it appears to be some kind of model which is still an evolution.

So we'll have to look at this separately, I think, maybe later on. Once we've got a more cooked version of it, because I'm still not quite sure as to what is meant by trust model, whether one is looking at an actual, the legal definition of trust, as in an overseas trust, or something in the Cayman Islands, or some place, or whether one is looking at a mechanism, a trust mechanism. And I'm not seeing here the word mechanism being used, I'm seeing here trust model.

But coming back here to our first three straw man proposals, you will note, in a small, just underneath…. Let me just use this little green arrow, there we are. Just underneath the headers, you will notice that there are two numbers that are here. This is one that I've very quickly put together. The first number is the answer that was provided by members of this working group, and the second was the number of people outside of this working group who preferred this option.

And looking at the first question, with regards to either creation of an oversight committee, or creation of an oversight body in straw man two, and creation of an oversight body in straw man three, bearing in mind there is a different, and the type of oversight body in straw man two and straw man three, it's pretty obvious that the majority of respondents preferred the creation of an oversight committee, especially in this working group, where the committee would be an internal committee that's within ICANN.

Are there any comments or thoughts about this? Am I getting the right view of this for number one?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, Christopher here. Yes, you're guessing the right view, with the qualification that this depends on the success and renouncing of the accountability of ICANN. You can't give ICANN the internal [inaudible] of such importance. And in one of my earlier postings, I suggested that the IANA committee should be as autonomous, for example, the nominating committee. You can't give ICANN an IANA committee at the same time as leaving the present situation of ICANN accountability untouched.

So, as I've said, I think I said six months ago, the urgency is for the ICANN accountability to be adequate to justify decisions to maintain IANA, the internal organizational, internal ICANN committee. But we don't see much progress in that respect, and it's really damaging because a lot of people are using the failure of the process for ICANN

accountability as a justification for extracting IANA and privatizing it to the registries, because ICANN's accountability is not yet accepted.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I just had to come off mute. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, hopefully with a microphone so close to my mouth that I'm [inaudible] you all now. Let me know if [inaudible]. With what Christopher just said, there, that is very important, but even in the less reactive community and here, we're going to bring this later when we get back to the [inaudible] report, but out of London, but at least one of the observations in there that was discussed, was the fact that ARIN, as appears to be stating, the only RIR in this view, but nevertheless, one of them, is saying that, until all of the accountability issues are settled, that it should have a chilling effect on a transition.

And so, at least out of the London meeting, it appears that the numbering community, to see that whilst not all of the Internet registries are of this view, the North American one apparently is. So, it's not even limited to people who particularly who want to have fractioned and new to other mechanisms, so taking IANA operations elsewhere.

It's even an important issue for what is seen by the RIR consensus to date, which is working on the, don't try to fix it if it's not broken model,

but resulting on a few extra things, where most of the RIRs are relatively happy to now go on and discuss [inaudible] mechanisms and body, etc. Particularly the multistakeholder one, which is all good for the naming community's point of view. At least one RIR is apparently [inaudible] until all of the accountability issues, so nothing can really change. We need to be very aware of that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. Very important indeed. And that appears to also point to what Christopher had said, certainly the linking between the accountability mechanisms of ICANN, and the accountability of ICANN as a whole, and the acceptability of the creation of an oversight body within ICANN, seems to be absolutely critical. And I personally do not know how this would be fixed when one has a very tight timeline to provide a response to the US Department of Commerce on the issue of NTIA, whilst the overall ICANN accountability, I can't even call it review, but process is taking more and more time.

It seems to be rather late in the way that it's doing things. It's just running very slowly at the moment, and it's just only starting right now. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I hope you hear me better now. The choice that we did when we said a committee rather than an oversight body, was linked to a better accountability. And I'm sure this will happen, because now we have a cross-community working group about

EN

accountability, and if we fail to set the right mechanism for accountability, or the right process for accountability, this means that we fail. It is our duty to make it successful, and I don't think we will [inaudible], so that's why I do prefer to say that I prefer a committee, and I am sure the accountability will follow.

We will have a very good accountability. The output of the cross-community working group about accountability will be, I think, satisfactory. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. So I see rough consensus on the creation of a committee, rather than an oversight body outside of ICANN or as a subsidiary of ICANN of some sort. Let's go to the next thing down, go to number two in the document. And here, we are looking at the composition of, I know it's called composition of oversight body, but it was composition of whatever, if it was a committee, or an oversight body, or whatever.

Whoops, someone is playing with it at the moment and making it larger. It's not me. Someone is playing with it at the moment.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, this is Terri. I was trying to get it down to number two on the screen for everyone. Sorry, I'll take it back up again.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did you un-think of it or think it?

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: I think it's half the screen in the window.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't even know where we are now. Okay, where are we? Help!

TERRI AGNEW: Number two.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know, but I don't know where number two is. [CROSSTALK] Okay…

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: You click on the full screen of logo on the ICANN on the top of the screen and you get the whole document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yeah. Can we also see this? Composition of oversight body. And here, overwhelmingly, the second composition, the second straw man proposal was chosen. I think that's pretty straightforward. We've heard about this earlier on this call. The members of the, whatever it is, would be, would have to be multistakeholder, including GAC, SSAC, RSAC, ALAC, and we've heard from Cheryl Langdon-Orr a

EN

suggestion that it would not only, yeah, it would have to go beyond that.

Are we all okay with this, on this call, with going beyond? Beyond the ALAC, of course, a green tick from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and a green… You're agreeing with yourself, indeed, yes. Anyone else on the call that agrees that the multistakeholder composition should go beyond just the ICANN supporting organizations and organizing committees? Christopher Wilkerson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Yeah. First point, internally I would prefer that you would refer to At-Large rather than to ALAC. A committee which you have been a distinguished a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. If you refer to At-Large, you open the door to wider participation from the user interests. Regarding outside the ICANN community, yes, I'm in favor, but with a certain trepidation because of the risk of first of all, the difficulty of identifying who represents the participants from outside of the ICANN community, which is almost a clone of the question as to who represents the interests of the ICANN community within the ICANN community.

But there is a problem of creditability and legitimacy there, and there is a problem of duplication. But in principle, yes, provided one can identify an appropriate selection mechanism.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Christopher. And I note green ticks from everyone else on the call today as well. So it looks like we have a broad consensus on this. And with regards to your point about ALAC and At-Large, in the proposal here it mentioned the other stakeholder groups and constituencies, and of course, the ALAC is a constituency, but the [CROSSTALK]… is the entity, that's right.

The ALAC falls within the definition of the different entities, but obviously, when we mean the ALAC, we're not picky as to say just the members of the 15 member committee of…

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Correct, so fine, okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's understood. Thank you. Let's move on to the next one then. Let me just scroll down slowly, number three here, documentation to replace NTIA contract. And this one was a very involved set of details, because some of it had more documentation, some of it had more documentation, some of it had less documentation involved with it.

I don't really know whether it's that much of an issue, as far as we are concerned, with regards to how much documentation we want. I would personally say the more documentation, the better. And it looks as though the majority of people on the call, sorry on the poll, specifically people, you will notice here, the majority of people in the working group responded to straw man A or straw man two, sorry straw man

EN

one or straw man two, but the majority of people who were not members of this working group were probably quite confused and just went for a mix of this whole set of documents.

Here, the difference between straw man one and two is the, and I think I need to go to a big screen for this as well. IANA functions and oversight agreement, so it basically looks at some document that will, the straw man two, some document that will replace the elements of the current IANA contract deemed necessary or desirable as set forth in whatever appendix it is that one is looking at.

And then everything else underneath is pretty much the same sort of thing. It has got a service level agreement, and also… For straw man one, everything is just based on the service level agreement, for straw man two is based on this service level agreement and IANA functions and oversight agreement with both of these proposals having a term of three years, and that would be renewed beyond the three years, the initial three years. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you've put your hand up, so you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I think I'm unmuted. Am I loud enough for you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes indeed.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, great. Just thought now would be a good to counter-point, going into the service level agreement, and just make sure that everyone going to Frankfurt is also very aware of what's coming out of that [inaudible] at work there. And if you would indulge me, and it won't take long, but I think it's important to read into the record, just on this point, because, or at least on this point, because some people will actually form their views, or carry their views into the room at Frankfurt by listening to transcripts.

And it says, from the report, the [inaudible] from the IANA dash RIR service level contracts, [inaudible] prefers a list of criteria for the service level agreement [where favored?] to enter with the IANA operator includes, and it goes on to list some half a dozen report points. I would suggest that it's very easy here to argue where integration, the more deeply thought out aspects specifically in the numbering community, on what they want out of a service level agreement, can very easily be slotted in.

I don't [inaudible] the consequence, I think we should be able to argue these versions point, where the numbering community has talked more about service level agreement at a theoretical level, the fact that it needs to be about technical performance, etc. etc. We only need to argue slot in the numbering community's and the [inaudible] community's, get them organized, requirements on this. And get across that the numbering community will want to have a larger say.

They are not onerous, they are not difficult, and they are talking in the case of RIRs, at this stage, [inaudible] between now and the increased

EN

will be bringing up more unified approaches, working with contract or agreement mechanisms which can either be with a new MAUs between ICANN, in other words, leaving IANA in ICANN, very much in line with option one, [inaudible]. Or, those same requirements could very easily work under the oversight agreement, [inaudible] two, two three, or a trust agreement working for.

So it's one of those times in this line, I will strongly argue we just talk about bringing in the [data], more thought out specifics from the numbering community, and plugging them into the service level agreement. However, [inaudible] you need to make sure [inaudible] on the table. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you for this Cheryl. Just a quick question, it's Olivier speaking. A quick question, since you have read through those service level agreement details on the RIR side of things, are these directly applicable to the naming?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we're talking about, first of all, obligations for the IANA operator to execute global policy according to global policy development processes, and that would be outlined, in this case, the MAU between ICANN and the IANA. That's not a problem. Process and timelines for communication, this would be [inaudible] IANA operating in terms of performing number related functions, so all you would have to do is say number and naming related functions.

So tweaking that would be easy. Review mechanisms [inaudible], that's very much what the numbering community is interested in as well. Duration and condition for termination of contract by both parties, [inaudible] so that's something both numbering and naming should be able to agree on.

And dispute resolution and jurisdiction, something that the numbering community is much less focused on the details on, because they've got a bullet point on it, the extra work that the naming community is doing will be plugged in. Does that help?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much for this Cheryl. Very helpful. And I think what we will do, by having a link to that document that will be available to our members when they are in Frankfurt, I would just point them over to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I suggest you don't just link the document? It is a very small part of a 12 page report. We are talking less than 300 words in three paragraphs. I would cut and paste, just the bits of it that are on page three, which is talking about the differences in the draft proposals btw the five RIRs. There would be 75 words there. The idea is to the RIR service level agreement, as you heard, there wouldn't be more than 110 words there, and the discussion raised by the new chair of [inaudible] about the membership aspects of ICANN.

That's another 50 or 60, and a couple of other bits and pieces. I would suggest cutting and pasting the relevant bits, rather than, which would be one side of one A4 sheet for the people in Frankfurt, otherwise they're going to have nine pages which are fluff and useless.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. I was going to suggest then, that perhaps Terri could do this cut and paste, and send it over to our IANA issues mailing list. And so our people in Frankfurt will have that in their mailbox. And of course, the subject topic that will be saying, RIR service level agreement. Easy to find.

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Yeah, Olivier, first of all, staff, I've got into the full page of the straw man document, but I can't get out. So I don't know how to chat or to put my hand up. On the substance, Olivier and Cheryl, yes, what you said [inaudible] of a sense, but Olivier, in the European context, we're not there yet.

As far as I can see, there is no significant context between At-Large and Europe, and with the numbering community. And if we go in this direction, I think we need to invite, not encourage, RIPE to be a little bit more forthcoming, a little bit more open, and to join. I notice that last week, we had a consultation in Brussels, among European stakeholders, and nobody came from RIPE, and nobody came from the European Root Server.

So in Europe here, we've got some time to make up before we can buy into exactly what Cheryl is proposing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Christopher. It's Olivier speaking. I think Cheryl just suggested that these are the sort of service level agreement topics that we should have at hand for our representatives, to be able to suggest if the question of service level agreements comes up during the face to face meeting. It's just a source.

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Yes, I've learned from one experience, that while I think would be a good thing, it is one thing, and what passes as the consensus as the European stakeholders, is another thing. And even if they're the same thing, you have to, there is some work to be done between A and B.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Christopher, Olivier speaking. I think it's a fair point, in any case, I don't even know whether we will reach the detail of what type of service level agreement will need to be included there. We only have two days in transit, but we'll see. This really is to be able to play this by ear when we have to cross that bridge, and understand where we are going on this.

If there are people who are saying, "We don't have service level agreements, what is the reason?" Of course, at that point, we have this information at hand. Let's move on. I have a concern, we have 15

minutes remaining to go through the rest of this document, quickly. I wanted to really make this as useful as possible for people who will be listening to this, remotely, or listening to the recording, our colleagues who are not on the call.

So I wanted to go through these quickly, then we'll have at least a full thing, we can always continue the discussion by email afterwards. And of course, what I would suggest, is that when we have the meeting taking place in Frankfurt, there is a Skype chat, we have a Skype chat that is then used for immediate feedback on what the responses can be.

Moving to number four, the status of the IANA functions operator, that was a big question. And here, it looks as though the majority of members of the working group preferred the functions operator to remain a division of ICANN, but whilst the small majority of people outside this working group prefer the IANA functions operator to be a completely independent entity. In view of the overwhelming nature of the response here for the entity to remain within ICANN, I think that we've got rough consensus on this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl for the record. Just while you're discussing that in Frankfurt, I think that the point should be made that there is usually any different [inaudible]… there is actually great difference, but in legal sense there is a great difference, but in how it's going to look in the new world context, an effect to the community, I don't believe there is a big difference between the one, the division of ICANN, for poll two, a

EN

subsidiary of ICANN, which actually has been some legal discussion, a number of advantages that should not be underrated.

And the straw man [inaudible] poll, which talks about the trust model, in which case, the IANA functions stays within ICANN, but the contract is reviewed in different ways. There is a mix of mechanism and model there. And to be honest, I think our majority, whether there is equally informed or generally informed community, could probably live with any of those, because it's all talking about moving as part of ICANN. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this Cheryl. I draw your attention to straw man four, which mentioned the function, the IANA function remains with ICANN until such time as the trust reassigns those functions to another entity, contract [CROSSTALK]… three, four, and five years…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I read that not as a, is going to therefore transition out, but has the ability to transition out if accountability or service levels are failing. So it's the whole rationale, that is also in model two, where you've got a subsidiary, so should you need to move it out because of poor performance, or unacceptable levels of accountability, it will be the one to unravel and to [inaudible], so it's the big six, as opposed to a transition to that type of end game. But that's how I read it, unless I'm reading it wrong.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, you're absolutely right. It's Olivier speaking. I think you're quite correct, it's just a little bit awkwardly described here. And I'm sure this will change by the time we reach Frankfurt. Let's move to the next point down. And the next one down here is number five, the method of oversight. Now, in the method of oversight, we have a very balanced view here. Six, six, and six. The, whatever it is, would be, and its committees would do the following things.

And the big difference between straw man one, two, and three, there are a few differences. In straw man one, there is no review of IANA's performance against the overall policy and so on, establishment [inaudible], it's a secure, stable, and resilient Internet operating as a single operate able network.

And in straw man three, there is no point that says there should be a meeting annually with the president of ICANN to review and approve the budget for the IANA naming services, for the next X number of years, could be three years. Everything else, between the three proposal, as far as I understand it, it appears to be the same. [CROSSTALK] something we really are particularly concerned about. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's all about what you have to negotiate at the time, because if it's within ICANN, and ICANN is funding, then, you know, that part E, while you need to meet annually with the President of ICANN to review and

EN

approve, is because it gives, in the case of straw man one, greater input into the financial operational control of the IANA operator.

In straw man two, where you've got a whole subsidiary, that's just a smart way of how it should happen, that's kind of [inaudible] standard operational performance. In three, it's funded in a different way, so why would you? And of course, in four, they're not planning on having oversight as such, but just contract renewal. And that probably, this is the biggest thing, where I am discomforted said in four. This is the one part where I have [inaudible] from anything in four. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. Are there any other points on this?

Okay. So let's go further down on this. I think we could live with either, whether we want to have, I'm seeing it here, whether we want to have, well if you add straw man two and straw man three, then you would have that performance review to be looked at, and with regards to the oversight.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it's one of the, Cheryl here. It's one of the greater preferences for two, that I have over one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's how we see it. Okay. And of course, the involvement of the President of ICANN is something which I don't think is a huge issue. It will be pushed forward, and it looks here, since we have six, six, and six, that makes it 12 in favor of having this meeting with the President of ICANN. Let's move further down the list to the funding of these operations.

And this is an interesting one because we've seen here that the funding, you've got funded by registries in one, funding by ICANN in the second one, and funded by registries in the third straw. It looks, the majority is funded by ICANN. A clear majority for the members of this working group. Of course, we're looking at the same thing, at the end of the day, the money will go from the registrant, through the registrar, through the registries, through to ICANN, through to funding this process.

Just like everything else is funded basically. But certainly having a document which says it's funded by registries, is something which many of our members are probably thinking, hang on, it's not registries that are funding this, it's the process by which the money is transferred from the end user, all the way up to the top. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl for the record. Obviously, I've argued for an awful number of years, that the taxation model, of course, should be labeled as such. But that's not my point. I think the point that we might need to make, is the difference between the title funded by registries,

between one and three, because one and two are actually, in some way, funded by ICANN, well they are funded by ICANN, but specifically registry tithing via ICANN is in one, as opposed to more generally in budgets funded by ICANN in number two.

The funded by registries in three is, as in a totally another model, is one that needs a lot more thought if anyone starts to go down that pathway, because having had a little bit to do with registry operation, [inaudible] will be paying both. So it has serious effects on the flow through of funding to ICANN, if you go through three. You would rationalize that you would only need to do a fee for service with the IANA operator, thank you very much, and policy be buggard for the rest of it.

And that's a very scary thing indeed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for these details Cheryl. The devil is in the details as was mentioned earlier. And of course, funding of the trust is another slightly different way of looking at things. Lightweight administrative function of the trust, cost of all of the publications, and the cost of bringing together the ICG like group for review funded by the holder of contract. And a bit more generic the way that it's described here.

Let's go to seven, ruling of IANA functions operator. Sorry, funding of IANA functions operator. So we were looking earlier at the actual funding of the oversight body, as you know, and now it's the funding of the operator itself. And here, all three are exactly, well, pretty much

the same. Majority of course being number one, the function, the committee, rather than others.

So let's move on to the next one down, transparency of decision making. And here, there was actually mixed results for the members of this working group. There were seven for enhancing consistency, what the difference is between those two, actually I thought they were very similar to each other. Let's scroll down. I'm sorry to be looking at this, but I thought they were very similar.

Transparency, decision making. So, continue the current practice of public reporting on naming related decisions, make public all recommendations to the ICANN Board, agree to not redact any Board minutes relating to naming decisions, have the President and Board Chair sign an annual [inaudible] that it has complied with the above positions, ICANN functions staff to be provided funds to hire independent outside legal counsel to provide advice on the interpretation of the existing naming related policy.

And the difference, of course, here is that in straw man two and three, we are looking at independent organizations, or semi-independent organizations. So the name, rather than the IANA functions staff, will be IANA, INC. And IANA INC's budget would be allowing these things. So sensible slight differences on this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you. Cheryl for the record. Yeah, there are very slight differences between, as you've pointed out, but I think if you wanted to know why you probably have that [inaudible] in one, because of the way that question happens to be leading you, if you already had established a preference, as most of us had, for straw man one anyway, that is why you would continue on to use the one column, or nine and all sub points.
	It's not saying that we don't recognize the very small differences, almost identical views, across the other two. I think that's just an artifact, wouldn't be too concerned about the seven to one there, I think that's an artifact of you've already chosen one here, and assumed it was one.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you for this Cheryl. Let's move then to nine, and we have the redress and consequences of failure to perform and hear the majority of respondents both in, well in the group, went for straw man one, and others went for number two and three. The majority in this working group is going for one. I suspect again, this all has to do with the details in the, each one of the proposals here, and of course, to do in the event of a failure, what would happen and the different language that is used when you've got the functions happening within ICANN on the one hand, and the ones that are happening outside of ICANN in straw man two or three.
	Are there any comments or questions on this specifically? I note that in all of the straw mans, there is the ability to initiate a RFP for a new IANA

EN

functions operator. There is the initiating of a formal performance review on this, and then there is also a question of the breech appears to be the result of ICANN behavior. And that's an interesting through here.

The breech appears to be a result of ICANN behavior outside of the IANA group, require the IANA functions operator to move outside of ICANN, and be established as an independent entity. I wonder where there has been any thought on this one, because I just wonder needs to be a standard process? Any thoughts on this?

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: That's the big stick.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the big stick says Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Anyone else? Okay. So we're okay with that, I believe. And then let's go to number 10, and that's the final one, the policy appeal mechanism, which is pretty much the same for all three, with an independent review panel being able to settle disputes, etc. and I think that it's the same, yeah it is the same process for all three, just a matter of language between the three.

Again, here for the, I guess, related to what people chose earlier, higher up in their responses, majority went to straw man one and straw man two. It's interesting how the majority of non-working group members went for straw man four, but again, this is just, I don't think there is any

EN

difference in the way that three are actually performed. Anyway. Okay, we've gone through the whole table.

We are, we have reached the end of this call. I just wondered whether there are any overarching issues that anyone wanted to put to the record now, so as to be able to transmit to our representative in Frankfurt? Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. It's not so much an overarching issue as a note and apology. The timing of the Frankfurt meeting happened to be also be when I am travelling to meetings in Melbourne, but it is a Board retreat. So I like normally, when my night time can be [inaudible] …to the wonderful world of ICANN, a good whack of my early day, in other words, the first half of the Frankfurt meeting day, I'll be at meetings and doing other things.

So, apologies for only doing cameo appearances in the Adobe Connect room. And I've asked staff not to make me an auto dial out, which [inaudible] …in a hotel room. I will, when I escape my requirements for the Board retreat, will drop in and be only [inaudible]… If you need any input that you will value my comments on, please Skype me, because I won't be watching the AC room [inaudible] of both days. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. So that's noted. And we also have Christopher Wilkerson in the queue. Christopher, you have the floor.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Hi. Olivier, thank you very much for an excellent chairmanship over a difficult contents call. The Frankfurt meeting is not the last word. We will all review what happens in Frankfurt, when it's documented, and goes back to the constituencies. I have an interest in the At-Large constituency, in the ccTLD constituency, and indeed in ISOC. I must say, Olivier, At-Large is giving us more feedback than ISOC. I don't know what's going on, but I'm grateful to you for this kind of meeting.

Frankfurt is not the last word. We will have several opportunities, I'm sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Christopher. Next we have Ellen Strickland.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Muted Ellen?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND   You might be muted Ellen.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Hello, can you hear me?

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

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Thank you so much Olivier for the meeting. I just want to make a contribution and thank you all for the work on this survey. I think it's a really valuable contribution from At-Large. I sort of know, from my organizations perspective, we're working internally, on this sort of multistakeholder process [inaudible] around our preferences, and we don't have a position right now.

So we couldn't enter, but I really wanted to just acknowledge that it's very useful feedback, you know, and something to reflect on. My only other comment would just be that it is really noticeable those difference between the working group and [inaudible], and I think, as you pointed out, [inaudible] many of the differences were sort of grouped between one and three, I think just go back to question four around the status of the functions operator, as ICANN or independent entity.

And that's a pretty big difference. I'm noting that the people who aren't on the working group, many of them are very engaged people within the ICANN community. I think it is quite a notable divide. And I would just point out, overstating the consensus, and while there is a consensus among the working group, there was a divide there that was just covered, and I think there might be things to be learned by teasing that out.

As we said, it might be just lack of information or not being engaged. But it is quite a notable divide. So I just wanted to comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Ellen. Very good point indeed. I've actually scrolled back to this in our PDF that's on the screen. What I would suggest is, of course, for our representatives, and in fact, for everyone in the working group to not only look at the overall numbers, the results, but we have linked the results of the survey along with the comments, which were made, we've linked that to the agenda of this call, some of the comments are very interesting indeed in there as well.

So it would be good to take on board, and you mentioned, yes, question four, there is not a full consensus on keeping this, keeping the function operator within ICANN. There are some voices that are looking at, saying, "Well, let's have something that's independent." But I think the majority would be saying, "Stay within ICANN on this." As I've said, there are also comments on this topic. So as a follow-up, finally seeing no one else having put their hands up, and because we are over the end of this, over time on the end of this call, and we have interpreters that are diligently interpreting this call into Spanish, that have a time limit as well, I would just add maybe two or maybe one action item, which is to remind everyone to, sorry.

To advise everyone when the recording and the transcript of this call are ready. I think the recording is a matter of a few hours, and just let

everyone know that the recording is up, and both recordings, of course, in Spanish and recording in English, and therefore let the people who are not present on the call today, let them go and listen to the call. That's one thing. And the second thing is to make sure that the straw man document with those numbers, which is currently on our screen, is also easily reachable.

What I was going to suggest is that we link it to this call's agenda as well, so when people are listening to the call, they will have access to that document, because otherwise they won't have a clue to what we are talking about. That's it for today, I believe. Any other thoughts or…? I don't see anyone else putting their hand up. So I thank you all for this, I thank again, the At-Large community, and the members of this working group for having provided so much input to the members that will now be going at the meeting, face to face.

There is going to be a Skype chat, and obviously, there is also going to be a remote participation possible. As you know, you have members of the working group, but also participants in this working group. I do not know what the rules of engagement will be for participants during that face to face meeting, but we will find out, I guess, in 48 hours' time.

And with this, I thank you all. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night. This call is now adjourned, and thanks very much to the interpreters for that extra 15 minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]