TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA function on Monday, the 24th of November, 2014 at 15:00 UTC.
	On the call today, on the English channel, we have Gordon Chillcott, Yasuichi Kitamura, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Loris Taylor, and Seun Ojedeji.
	On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto.
	We have apologies from Tom Lowenhaupt, Jimmy Schultz, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Mohamed El Bashir.
	From staff, we have myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreter today is Veronica.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your 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 anyone during the roll call? It appears not, so we now have to adopt the agenda. Today, we're going to have just a quick reminder of the next ICG call, and then we will be looking at the work that has taken place in the other operational communities. A very short amount of time is spent on that. The bulk of

our call today with deal with the IANA Community Working Group face-to-face meeting that took place in Frankfurt last week.

We will be looking – first, I think I should be asking the different people that participated and that were there on the ground about their impressions. I guess going through the current draft that we now have, that we shared very soon, I think there's a public comment period that will start soon. Then looking at the main product, the main delivery of this meeting and the resulting flow charts of several groups that will be created. We'll go through those, and then of course we'll have I think in total about an hour to discuss where we are going from here, what's happening next.

Are there any additions to the agenda at this stage? Seeing no one put their hand up, let's go first to our action items from our last call. That was on the 17th of November. All action items are complete. They're all here. We've got the link to the Regional Internet Registry and also the link to the CRISP process, which is the inter-registrar discussions. We'll probably have a quick roundup of this in a moment, and the rest of it is all about Terri having to advise recording – the working group when the recording and transcripts are available, etc. I'd like to thank Terri for all of the work that she has done in preparing us for this face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt. We had all the required documentation at hand. That was very helpful indeed.

So now we have the next part of our agenda, and that's a review of the ICG, the IANA Coordination Group activities with Jean-Jacques Subrent and Mohamed El Bashir not on the call today. At least I haven't heard

Jean-Jacques name being mentioned. I know Mohamed is unable to attend as well.

All I can let you know is there hasn't been very much going on. Looking at the calendar of calls, the two links here, there is an announcement of more IANA Coordination Group calls. There was a call that took place last week that was private, primarily with a selection of their secretariat function.

As for call number eight which is taking place in two days' time, the agenda itself for the call doesn't appear to be showing any updates so far. I wonder if anyone has an insight as to what will be discussed at that call?

And thank you, Terri, for providing us with a link to the blank IANA Community meeting nine. Sorry, that's the ICG. That was the IANA one. Okay. Of course that's our next call that we will be having, the cross-community working group. No news on the ICG call, either. Oh, I see Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. The norm has been virtually nothing is posted about these meetings until often after the fact. That's not [inaudible] satisfactory, but it's not surprising right now. We've also seen that calls are announced in a relatively short amount of time before, without even being on the Wiki. Now at least their schedule, they're showing the times on the Wiki, but they're still somewhat lax as far as I can tell. And perhaps that's something we want to ask our representatives to pass on to the ICG management.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of our representatives is management. That should be easy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this comment, Alan. Of course I guess I'm also guilty of the same problem, having only updated today's call agenda just a few hours ago and having made a blatant mistake here on that link, on that agenda item since I've been [inaudible] to the next IANA Coordination Group call page. In fact, that links it up over to our next community working group page. Apologies for this, and I'll amend this at the end of this call.

Are there any other insights as to what the ICG will be discussing? None?

I think what we might have to ask – let's take it as an action item. If we can ask our two representatives on the ICG to let us know by e-mail what the topic of the next ICG call will be, that will be very helpful. Let's assign this to me. I'll just drop them a note afterwards, carbon copying the mailing list so as to find out what they are going to be speaking about.

Let's go to the next part of our agenda, and that's number four where we look at the work of the other operational communities. As you know, the RIR is on one side and the IGF are both working, having their

part of the proposal brought forward. Are there any updates from the last time that we spoke regarding those operational communities?

I saw at some point Fatima Cambronero. I'm not sure if you've put your hand down. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Sorry, Olivier, but you know there is a delay with interpretation, so perhaps you have changed the topic. Sorry for that.

It was just a brief comment regarding the previous topic, and our representatives in the ICG. I do understand that they are overloaded when it comes to work and they have to participate in the Coordination Working Group. They were not able to participate in our last call and they were not always able to participate in our calls. So perhaps they can send us information for us to make decisions and for us to be able to [inaudible] our proposal at the time we need to present or submit a proposal. So that is my comment. A reminder that they can join the call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima, for this. I believe that they are told to join the call, but of course, as you said, they are busy as well with other things. I will let them know and I will find out also if they have reviewed the discussions that have taken place in Frankfurt.

I think it's absolutely vital that they keep close track of this, because they will not be able to defend any of the points that will have been made if they're not aware of what led to those points. Certainly I can

key some other ICG members that are using their position on the ICG as a way to push a specific agenda and we need to be aware of that. So thank you for this, Fatima.

Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Olivier. When it comes to the mailing list from [inaudible], there was no activity. I know everybody is working. The only information we have is information from AfriNIC. I have circulated that information on the list. I don't know if it is worth commenting on that. I know that most of you have already read that information. It is quite extensive.

The only comment I would like to make about that survey, the AfriNIC survey, is the following. They say that ICANN should continue as it is now with the IANA functions. Well, yes, there is 60% in favor of the positive answer and the fact of keeping the IANA function as a single operator goes down very significantly: 50% say no and 20% yes. Abstentions are 23. I would say the idea is to have one technical operator. Perhaps we need to review that survey or we need to pay attention to that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alberto. Very good point, and we will look forward to hearing further results. Maybe one of the things we need to do, now that we see the survey responses, that we need to make a link over to that survey on our own documents page, and perhaps spend

some time during the next call to have a closer look at the survey results. I must admit I haven't looked at it yet.

Let's do this as an action item then. Let's link this survey to our document sources and also spend some time on it next week, unless anybody thinks otherwise. Okay, so that's one thing. Any other updates on the other operational communities? I don't see anyone putting their hands up.

As far as the IETF is concerned, there is an Internet draft that has been published now. It's called the Draft IETF IANA Plan ICG Response [4]. I will put this in the . . . IETF for Draft. I'll put this in the chat. I think for this one as well, we will have to be looking at this and linking it over to our information sources. Again, I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to read through this. It looks as though this draft has collected a lot of positive response, so far with only minor changes being affected. That looks like the kind of response that will be received from the IETF.

And of course it's worth for our members of our own operational community on the naming issues to look at the kind of response that others are making, because there might be points that we might need to either align or take from or learn from or even be aware of prior to submitting a response.

Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to mention about the AfriNIC. It just occurred to me that I should mention this. [inaudible] in the discussion

on IANA transition, the AfriNIC community on Thursday. It may be something that some of us want to participate in remotely [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Seun. We'll note that as well. And thank you for sending the AfriNIC submission input on this also on there. So these are three links now that we need to add to our document store, please.

And really what we need to spend the most time on is going to be our own response. I suggest then that we now move to agenda item number 5 as a review of the face-to-face meeting that took place in Frankfurt that the Community Working Group on Naming Issues. You will see on the agenda links to both the overall meeting space, but also links to specific points in the agenda on the day one and day two.

Below that, there is also for reference a link to the page that is supposed to be holding the current draft, and unfortunately that page hasn't been updated since November the 20th and does not have the latest draft. I'm sorry about this, but that's outside of our hand.

What I have done, though, is to upload one of the deliverables, the resulting flowchart of the various groups that need to be either created or are already in place. It's all a little bit unknown in the way whether they will be created or not.

So what I would suggest then is that we first go through the – well, go through the agendas chronologically and start with the work that we did on the principles and on the RFP 1, 2.a, and 2.b, bearing in mind we

might not have the latest documents on that. Are there any suggestions? Are you okay with that?

Seun Ojedeji, go ahead. You have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. I think RFP 1 [inaudible] pretty informational and something we could actually at any point in time discuss. They [inaudible]. So I think in order to actually maximize the time, I will suggest to you to [inaudible] breeze through that and then go into RFP [3] which is the most important. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Seun. Any other thoughts? I see agreement from Gordon Chillcott and I gather that since no one else is speaking out, then that's absolutely fine. That's a good point, Seun.

What I suggest is as soon as we receive a final copy of the – so the principles, the RFP 1, 2a, 2b, and I believe 2c as well. 2c is the triage. It's just very contractual. It looks at the different parts of the IANA contract and it says, "Well, this has to be changed, that has to be changed, this is specific to NTIA, etc." [Three] technical things, and indeed, you're quite correct. We will just send it over to our mailing list and obtain comments on those if there are any comments.

Let's go straight into RFP 3. And RFP 3, if you recall from last week, started out with a flowchart. It's not a flowchart, sorry. A table of three different straw men proposals, which the whole group started working on and went only through I think a couple of items on the straw men,

including also adding straw men number four. The way I understood it is that it took so much time to do so, the group then under the [inaudible] of the co-chairs decided to move forward in actually building what the requirements of the function were and how they would be assumed one way or another.

What I'll do is to call upon my colleagues in Frankfurt to provide us some details of this. The first RFP slot was from 14:00 to 15:40 on the first day, on the Wednesday. And indeed we went through the straw man. Let me just ask my colleagues who were in Frankfurt what their feedback was on that and whether their understanding is similar as mine.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just a quick comment. Supposedly tomorrow a complete first draft RFP – not RFP, but response – is coming out which integrates the various parts of the RFP document. So if anyone's going to spend a substantive amount of time looking at them, they may well want to wait until tomorrow and look at the revised version instead of what's available right now, because there were changes to some of the parts as we went through them. I think that is supposed to be out tomorrow.

In terms of the process we went through, we started off looking at some of the specific items. If you look at the table, the matrix, that was generated for RFP 3, it ended up with Avri's addition, five different

versions of structures, essentially. Structures and/or mechanisms. And many, many lines.

The intent was that one could mix and match different entries from different columns to end up with the final result. We started doing that on a couple of the lines, and that took so much time that we essentially scrapped the idea of going ahead like that and just started putting together what a couple of vocal people thought was the right way to go.

I certainly was quite dissatisfied with that, because I think it eliminated some of the possible options that certainly At-Large in the survey that Olivier did just before the meeting would have preferred. And specifically to not have a physical oversight body over ICANN awarding the contract, but have mechanisms within ICANN to make sure that ICANN [adhered] to what the community wanted in IANA.

That's a somewhat different mechanism from the threat of taking it away. To be candid, I think whenever alternative suggestions were raised – and they were periodically – the meeting really didn't focus a lot on them. I won't say there wasn't any discussion, but there certainly wasn't very much. As a result, I for one am not happy with the outcome. I think the proposal satisfies a number of very vocal people, at least partially, but I think has some gotchas in it, has some problems in it which I think are going to be very difficult to resolve and potentially harmful in the long run.

I won't go into it in any detail right now. I will be posting something once the formal proposal is out hopefully tomorrow and we can carry on from there.

Thank you, Oliver. Unless you want me to go into any more detail, that's where I'll leave it right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. You started fading away a little bit. I don't know whether it was my line or yours, but you sounded a bit far away.

ALAN GREENBERG: I got a new headset in the last week or so. If I start fading away, call me on it because I may not be knowing how to use it quite properly yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Indeed, yes, I put the link to the page that we were – we, as in the five At-Large representatives that were there present in Frankfurt were working out of, and therefore it was helpful for us to be able to base our positions or the feedback that we had received. But it looks as though many of the other representatives that were there had not had any kind of feedback from their community and we're just expressing personal opinions. It's certainly exactly as you said, Alan – looked as though the speed of progress was such that, very quickly, we were pulled away from this.

I thought that there had been one point that had been made, which was that the IANA functions themselves would not be taken out of ICANN and put into an entirely independent organization.

I felt that going through one line by line and coloring the boxes red or amber or yellow actually, or green, would have favored the closing of at least a few points so that we would've been able to make progress. When I tweeted – just for the story, when I tweeted on one of the points as the box being red, and so IANA functions being totally separated from ICANN and run completely separately as being a not valid answer, I was then scolded for having put pressure on that because consensus had not been achieved, and that certainly was not my understanding.

When you start making a decision with the actual participants of the working group face-to-face, my belief is that the participants have the ability to speak on behalf of their communities, and this wasn't made clear at all.

I have a real concern that if each time participants now have to go back – sorry, not even participants. What did I say? Members of the working group have to go back to their communities before they can accept anything at all, we're going to be in a position where the clock will tick and we'll run out of time. That's my personal feeling on that.

Fatima Cambronero is next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I want to make some general comments in line with Alan's comment, and that is my personal opinion and perhaps I might be wrong with that.

From my point of view, as Alan said, we're not able to analyze all the options that we had on the charter was shared with a straw man proposal. There was a specific point during the first day regarding the IANA operator and the option of having an independent and [inaudible] was eliminated.

And then, while we were moving forward, we start debating on the option of having a contracting entity, and at the end of the day, while this was somehow contradicted and other consequences were not analyzed, for example, something that we have already said before and we had already expressed on the list that was to take into account the legal aspect and the jurisdiction and the duration of the contract was not even taking into account and was not analyzed.

I think that now the topic is being analyzed and discussed regarding the [inaudible] and the duration of the contract. But from my point of view, that is not clear. We are not able to discuss that in depth and now we have this discussion regarding the existence of consensus or the lack of consensus in certain topics that we had or we discussed in our face-to-face meeting.

So I wonder why we were talking or why we are discussing if now we have no agreement and now we're going to modify everything from scratch, taking into account what is being said on the list.

Some of the topics that came up were the following. The statements being made. We're talking about a draft. There seems to be a final draft and it seems to be that, based on that, we will have to take that to our communities to obtain feedback.

Well, I don't feel personally comfortable with that because we are not able to analyze all the consequences and [response] of the options. I will stop here, and if you want, I can go on with details. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was muted, of course. Thank you very much, Fatima. Next is Suen Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. Fatima, thank you very much for that comment. I'd also like to thank Alan also for his very [inaudible] response [inaudible] meeting. [inaudible]. Yes, when we started the straw man, there was a sense in the room that it was kind of taking some time and then we started to go [inaudible] at that point. At the [inaudible] thought it was a good idea, especially [inaudible] eliminate [inaudible]. That was one of the [inaudible] actually trying to [inaudible].

Unfortunately, that's [inaudible] and on the next day we started – the chair started off in the manner of [inaudible] a proposal. At that point, I think the At-Large members they [inaudible] perhaps met or quickly have an emergency [inaudible] going to be a talk that would start from the beginning to the end of the day. But of course, nobody will [inaudible].

I was thinking we're actually trying to use [inaudible] the second day [inaudible] categories of committees. I thought [we] were actually trying to set up an auction of a [solution] from [inaudible] previously, and now [inaudible] finish that up [inaudible] the time that it was already

[inaudible] one of the sessions at noon, [inaudible] discussing on chat with the other At-Large members. We were discussing our views.

I think at that point, we had actually [inaudible] need to stop this contacting [inaudible] consider options. This is some of the feedback I was getting, [inaudible] actually basically made a point. [inaudible] points clear and so on and so forth. I think [inaudible] and I think we fell for that and I think we should learn from that. [inaudible] outcome of that meeting was a good meeting. It was to create enough [confidence], but it has not actually created any [proposal]. [inaudible] that will just be an option.

The other ways to go around this, and one of the ways is what Alan has suggested and I think if it means that At-Large [inaudible] think around that and formalize that, then I think we should go ahead and do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Seun, for this feedback from you on those days in Frankfurt. Just to share with you also my feeling of the mood from going through the straw man to actually then working on this contracting proposal.

I must say, I think I must have been guilty of misreading this thinking that the group was going to be looking at what the attributes were of the different groups that were needed there and then decide on whether these – if it was contracted, if these could be done in any other way and where these would be located.

I felt that the requirement for having a face-to-face meeting comes down to dealing with the hardest points, and the hardest points were, one, what were these different groups going to have to do in the absence of IANA being involved in the loop. And two, how that was going to be done? In other words, what jurisdiction this was going to be under and whether these would remain in ICANN or not remain in ICANN or how they would be constituted, etc. And that was going to constitute a proposal.

I totally agree with Seun that what we now have is something that is – we've got some material, but it certainly doesn't look like a proposal and I'm particularly concerned about that.

There is the RFP 4, which is supposed to work for the next 48 hours and have some progress on this to make a proposal out of the work of RFP 1, 2, 3 and so on, and I'm not quite sure whether there is an update on this. I'm not on that working group, so I don't know what has been going on in RFP 4.

If any of you are on RFP 4, it would be good to have feedback on that. Obviously time is of the essence for this, since everything has to be given out in the next 24 hours or so.

Seun Ojedeji?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. I am a member of the RFP 4, and what I can say about that group is that it [inaudible] been able to select [inaudible] to select the repertoire and the [assistant]. The RFP 4 at the moment is on

[odds] indirectly. It's on [odds]. It's currently [inaudible]. What it needs to do is what is actually [mentioned] on the documents on RFP 3 largely. And since there is no [inaudible] at the moment for RFP 3, it becomes a difficult issue to actually work on anything on RFP 4.

However, I think there was a [inaudible] that was sent – I'm trying to [inaudible] now. There was a [inaudible] that was sent that there was going to be a call, a meeting or something of RFP 4. Maybe it's to kind of see what is going to be happening. Yeah. So it was [inaudible] indicated that was going to send [inaudible] for us to meet tomorrow. That's [inaudible] time for it. [inaudible] sent the formal information yet, but I expect that maybe for that meeting, we may have something valid to discuss about.

Again, most of our work on RFP 4 will really depend on the outcome of RFP 3, which is currently pending. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Seun. Fatima has put in the chat that the RFP 4 call will be between 13:00 and 14:30 UTC tomorrow, Tuesday, the 25th of November. You're quite correct that we haven't got the – well, I have not received the latest copies of the documents for RFP 3, so I'm not really sure where we are going.

But what I was going to suggest was we go through the flowchart that is one of the main deliverables that has come out of this meeting in Frankfurt and let our colleagues on the call ask questions or we can discuss the flowchart.

EN

One of the things we need to do obviously is to provide our feedback, and I think that whilst there was feedback that was provided on the processes themselves which were given in the flowchart, the big question is to do with the actual entities themselves. The points that were before that, characteristics of entities that they're [called].

Terri has very kindly put the link in the chat for this flowchart. Are you all okay, by the way, with going to this flowchart or are there any other points that you'd like to speak about or discuss before we go to the flowchart? I see agreement from Seun. I don't see much response from anyone else, so I gather you are all okay with this.

So let's have a look at the flowchart itself. Would it be possible to have this, share this, on the Adobe, please, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. Let me see if I can get that up, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Because then I can point to it with the green arrow. I'd like to be able to share that with everyone.

TERRI AGNEW: Currently it's a small struggle, but I am working on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If it doesn't become a major struggle, that's okay. As you'll note, there are six pages to this document. When I asked a question as to where

this was going to go, it was unsure whether this document was going to be an appendix or in the main part of the proposal or whether this is a working document in the meantime.

The first page looks at the characteristics of the entity. The second page looks at just the main function of each one of these entities. And then the pages three to six look at the operational, various – they're not even case scenarios – I guess various actions which take place.

They go into quite some detail. On the one hand, I could see the worthiness of this, the detail and so on, of [inaudible] clear up any misunderstandings and it's helpful to see those. On the other hand, I was particularly concerned. We spend so much time on this.

Thankfully, this is actually – this flowchart is a resulting work of the work that we had done by making big, long lists of what the different functions needed to be and staff worked with the chairs to build this. It's impressive. It looks good and it's certainly helpful. We'll go through that in a second. We've got the operational review. We've got the [inaudible] IANA performance review. We've got the entering into a contract transition part, and then we've got the contracting post transition. These are all drafts and are all likely to change with time.

So we first start with the characteristics of the entity, and on this what you can see is there are really four entities as such that are listed here. One is the IANA Customer Standing Committee, and that's a small committee that remains in place all the time that would be consisting only of the IANA customers. So we're dealing here with the registries and the IETF and the RIRs. That's an operational thing. It would be

responsible for operational review of the transactions and for the performance review.

So far, the way that things are done is that the IANA produces such reports I think it's on a monthly basis. It just looks at whether the response rate was fast, etc. It's very operational, very technical. And it was felt I think by our – well, certainly myself, but I'll let my colleagues speak about this – that this was not something that end users would wish to be directly involved with, a daily running of the IANA activities and the daily monitoring of IANA's functions.

Seun, you put your hand up. Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. I think there's something about a particular item that is the IANA Customer Standing Committee. I hear you mentioned operational communities. I don't think, because [once we are talking] IETF or RIR, I think that means we are referring to this IANA customer as a [inaudible] dealing with the entire IANA functions.

I had this question during the meeting, but it was not clear why we needed this IANA Customer Standing Committee, because actually the review of IANA operations is actually [getting] done by those who are interested. [inaudible] standing committee formalized in the first place, because just like you said, the reports of IANA [inaudible] reports often, logically as required or as defined in the contract and anybody can have access to it.

I think one of the most important [things] is the data should be transparently available to anybody to make use of, and this [inaudible] one of the responses that [inaudible] made was that it's going to be [inaudible]. I don't know what they mean by that. Perhaps it's any of us who [inaudible] committee means [inaudible]. My personal view was that we don't need to [inaudible].

I also observed that [inaudible] same opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Seun. I should have said all I'm doing is to provide details of each one of the committees. I'm not saying I [inaudible], obviously, but that's what's on the draft at the moment. You made some very valid points there. Are there any other comments on this actually, maybe from colleagues who were in Frankfurt or even others who were not in Frankfurt here? Any responses an IANA Customer Standing Committee?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up at the moment. My own comment on this is that it's interesting to see we're looking here at creating committees. This really was the working group of the IANA Naming Issues part of the IANA NTIA stewardship transition topic, and yet this one I'm not sure whether this would work only for the naming issues or with the customer committee for all of the different functions. Certainly from its name, it looks as though this would be for all of them. I'm not quite sure how that would fit with the others and whether others would be open to something like this, the other operational committees are open to something like this.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think we really considered that. This group, if I remember correctly, would have some influence on changing what's going on. The other groups I think are looking at doing that on an ongoing basis without having a formal committee as such. I'm guessing it could be merged into something they may be doing, but I don't think we do. I don't think we thought of it from that perspective at all. As a matter of fact, the whole proposal we're talking about is potentially so radically different from what the others are proposing that I'm not sure the ICG is going to have a particularly easy time merging them all together. But I don't think we were looking at that issue at all in our time there. I don't recall us considering that much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Any other comments? And one of the questions which we have asked is whether this Customer Standing Committee would be a separate organization. Would it be part of ICANN? Again, what jurisdiction, etc. I'm not sure I have heard any feedback on this one, specifically on the Standing Committee.

Alan or Fatima or others? Seun, are you aware by any chance of whether there is an answer to this? And Fatima, you ask who are the IANA customers. I think when they mention IANA customers, this is referred to as being the operational customers i.e., in other words, the IETF, the RIRs and ICANN.

Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: So [inaudible] referring to IANA customers, the IETF or are they just referring to the gTLD and ccTLD customers? Because that was the understanding I had when they were saying, when [we were] talking about IANA Customer Standing Committee, I thought they were referring to the gTLD and ccTLD customers.

However, I think this, like I said, there's no need to be formalized, [per se] because this is one [inaudible] that all members of the community is doing. We [inaudible] access for the information is there. There's really no [inaudible] easy to see what IANA is actually doing wrong [on other] issues. [inaudible] definitely technical aspect of [inaudible] involved in all [inaudible]. At-Large needs to ensure that it's also better [accessing], so in case we need to [inaudible] independent [inaudible] so on and so forth.

And that is what I think, and [inaudible]. So I think the IANA Customer Standing Committee, [inaudible] to my own understanding seems to be ccs and gTLDs [alone]. Otherwise I wouldn't understand the [business] by which [inaudible] just for the names. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Seun. I certainly also saw in the chat that – no, it would be customers for the naming part. Not ICANN. It would be the registries directly. You're absolutely correct, yes.

Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that was an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. My question is who these IANA customers are? Because I personally don't have clear in my mind the composition of a committee and some other comment that I said before that I am not remembering now. But the composition should be clearly defined, because we ourselves are having different opinions regarding who these customers are. And if this has to be operational, well, I imagine everybody arguing regarding the composition of the committee because everybody will feel that they have the right to be a customer of the IANA.

                            So what you said before is also important regarding – and this was not defined, in fact – if this is going to be a separate committee or if it is going to be a division or if it's going to be within ICANN and who the members will be. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Fatima. Next is Alan Greenberg, hopefully with an answer to your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't think there's really any question certainly among most of the people who were at the meeting last week that the customers from our perspective are the gTLD and ccTLD registries. They're the ones for which IANA handles re-delegations. They're the ones that IANA makes changes in the root zone for. I don't think there's any question the direct customers are the ones who initiate requests that end up on IANA's desk and that IANA has to carry out.

So how one decides which ones are going to be on this representing this committee or if it's a committee of [a whole] with 1,000 people on it – 2,000 people, I don't know – but I'm presuming a representative, not the entire body. I don't think there's any question in the minds of the people talking about it last week that we were talking about the gTLD and ccTLD registration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. There's a question from [inaudible] in the chat: "What about IETF? Would these be the operational communities?" Certainly on the definition of what the IETF – how the ICG defines the operational communities or the customers and so on, the IETF, would be, I would say one of them that's here in that respect, did you think that the IETF was going to be included in this as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking me, Olivier, I don't think we considered it. Let's play through a scenario. All of this is implementing. It's implementing roughly, from the names perspective anyway, roughly the way it was imagined by the majority of the group last week.

The gTLD and ccTLD registries are exceedingly unhappy with IANA and want to have an RFP issued and are inclined to move it away from the current IANA operation.

The IETF, for instance, or the RIRs are exceedingly happy and see no reason for a disruption. How does one go forward at that point? Do we, as we have talked about on occasion, separate the parts of IANA and say they could be executed by different organizations? That's something, to a large extent, we have said we really don't want to do. But it might be one of the results of the kind of process that we're looking at right now.

So either the user committee, the direct customers of IANA, are everyone – that includes the RIRs and IETF – and somehow we come up with a way of making sure that they make a single decision, how you wait [inaudible] I would even try to guess. Or we accept the possibility that IANA could be split into three different groups, each handing the different customer base.

Conceivably – and I don't know how that would work. Maybe you could even [inaudible] ccTLDs and gTLDs, although they're both working on a common root zone, so that's far less likely to happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The bottom line is I don't know how it would work, and as I said earlier, I think we're setting ourselves up for something which may be very [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. There was chat going on on the Adobe as to direct customers rather than just generic end users as what is meant here by the customers of IANA. Yes, indeed, that would not have any end user intervention whatsoever. It's currently described on the diagram.

I would suggest going to the next point on that page. Alan, you put your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just for clarity, I carry things a bit too far. The User Committee, the end user or whatever it's called, standing committee, is not the body that would decide to issue the RFP. That, we are talking about, is a true multi-stakeholder committee.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll be coming to that in a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know, but this committee I think was designed to be more operational and call the IANA on problems, not necessarily pull the contract. But nevertheless, there are still problems if the other operational communities are not [covered in this]. But I did go too far when I was describing [inaudible] contract. That's not their prime mandate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So the IANA Customer Standing Committee, as I understand it, will just look at the performance of IANA's response when they make requests and things that they have to wait four days to change something in the root, of course they'll raise a flag. And we will see that later on in the flowchart that's following the next pages.

Now, the next entity – and we use the name entity, rather than body, because again, [inaudible] know whether this is within ICANN, outside of ICANN, a subsidiary, a brand new body of some sort or just a committee.

The next [inaudible] is an IANA [inaudible] Review Team. That would be some multi-stakeholder team that would either be formed on an ad hoc basis or periodically. And in fact, it says here periodically, for example, every five years. That would be doing a full performance review. It would also be the path of escalation for the IANA Customer Committee.

So if the IANA Customer Standing Committee found there was something wrong, and let's say the IANA provides an update of the root zone in ten days rather than ten minutes, at that point the problem is escalated right away to the review team. That's a multi-stakeholder team, as is shown here. Are there any comments or questions on this?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up on this one.

So now the next one on this page is the Independent Appeals Panel for policy implementation. That's another group. That obviously is going to be some independent organization. It's not going to be within ICANN. And it seems to be designed as an independent. . . It's a binding policy implementation appeals mechanism – there we go – which would have

some kind of arbitration taking on and the arbitration rules would be those of international law. For example, the international Chamber of Commerce. It would be put together as selection of I think it's two people totally independent from IANA, independent from everyone, lawyers, plus a third one that will be selected by these two and that would be making decisions on whether the policy that was defined by ICANN was being followed by IANA itself.

Alan Greenberg, you might wish to add to this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. This is part of the overall proposal that I support strongly. I talked a fair amount to one of the GAC representatives who was pushing for this particularly, although she wasn't the only one. The ccTLDs also have some worry that if NTIA is no longer in the picture, there is nobody to go to essentially to try to override a decision [inaudible] re-delegation type decision.

But even with NTIA in the picture, this would be a useful type of function. And they're talking about a completely standard dispute process using something like the International Chamber of Commerce.

And the way that these kind of arbitration often work is each – there's a list of knowledgeable arbitrators that are made available. Typically each of the parties elects one, and then the [ICC] selects a third one. The case proceeds from there.

So it's a completely standard process that's used all over the world in other venues, and with a group like the [ICC], it's respected in an

international venue. I think this is one of the good ideas that's come out of this whole process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. I have a question to you on this, because I couldn't quite understand how this selection process would work. You mentioned – and I said it also – each of the parties would be selecting an arbitrator and they presumably [inaudible] the [ICC], then the [ICC] would be selecting a third arbitrator.

But what are we seeing as being each of the parties? When the function of this panel is to look as to whether IANA is following agreed policies relating to – IANA's action is consistent with agreed policy relating to IANA. Does this mean that ICANN would be selecting one of the arbitrators and IANA would be selecting another one? I'm not clear on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm presuming that if .CA is redelegated and the old .CA feels that this was done inappropriately, not following ICANN policy, then the old .CA would open a dispute and defending it would be, I'm guessing, IANA. IANA essentially is the group that does the due diligence on a re-delegation. They do it according to policies that ICANN [tests] and ICANN acts as the postman, as it were, presenting the case to IANA but IANA's the one that is supposed to satisfy itself that the re-delegation process has been duly followed.

So I'm presuming the two sides in the party would be the ccTLD that was unhappy – or gTLD – and IANA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And IANA [inaudible]. Yes. Thanks for this [inaudible]. Next we have Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I have a question regarding this topic we are discussing. In the last part of the chart, it reads that this appeals mechanism has to ensure independence and avoid conflicts of interest and there is a link to the Accountability Working Group.

So my question is who has legitimacy to make the appeal? Perhaps we are devoting too much time to this, but we need to take into account the relationship with the Accountability Working Group. We see that this has been discussed on the list. That is to say their relationship, how we should work. Perhaps we have to leave the topic open in our working group to be discussed by the Accountability Working Group. Or perhaps we should give priority to certain topics in our working group.

So my question would be who has the legitimacy to make the appeal in this case? And this has to do with your question, Olivier.

Now, when it comes to Alan's comments, well, we need to be clear or we need to have clear in our minds who will be the person or who will be able to submit an appeal. This was not clear. This is not clear on the document. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Fatima. In fact, in square brackets you can see binding appeals process available to parties that are affected or impacted. I think that's, at the moment, undecided. So who has standing to appeal is undecided so far. At least that's my understanding from the square brackets.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, please go ahead. I'm trying to go back to the wider screen. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think what we have done in this case is we've identified a need. We have not tried to flesh it out. It is an accountability issue and it needs to be fleshed out more by that group, but we're essentially saying we believe that this is a mandatory part of a final process.

Now, who has standing, I'm assuming, without trying to define it very carefully – in general, who has standing to appeal? Someone who's not happy with the outcome. It's hard to imagine who that might be or specify right now. It could be the ccTLD, the operational entity, that has lost it in a re-delegation. It could be the local Internet community who feels they were not consulted in a process. There's a lot of parties. It

could be the government who feels that they believe that so-and-so should be running the ccTLD and that is not what IANA ended up.

So I'm presuming, rather, it's not our job – the IANA stewardship transition – to write the detailed rules, but I am presuming that it will be anyone who in a re-delegation or other IANA action feels that it has not been done properly.

Conceivably, maybe this process would also be used if the IETF feels that an RFP is not being honored properly by IANA. I don't know. I'd like to think those would be handled on a more operational level, but should they not be able to agree, maybe this process could be used there as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So, looking at this, would you say that end users could be seen as being parties that are affected or impacted?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, end users are certainly part of the Internet community in a country and the Internet community in a country is a very significant part of a re-delegation process. Cheryl I'm sure could speak to that far better than I can, and her hand is up. Yes, from a certain aspect, I would certainly believe Internet users are a part of the thing. They're not necessarily the whole of the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Seun Ojedeji. I think that Seun mentioned he's lost connection. Are you still on?

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm back on now, Olivier, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: So I kind of missed some part on the discussion, but I just came back on now. I think I agree with Alan. However, I want to be clear. I must ask, because I'm [inaudible] involved with ICANN, so I'd like to get [inaudible] aspect.

Of course there must have been [inaudible] in the past, and they [inaudible] now. What is the process by which they actually do that at the moment? Is there a process at the moment? And will it be the first time we have this kind of appeal process coming into formation? Is there something like this in the past? [inaudible] address at the moment. That is my question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. I know I can answer that, but I might even let Cheryl answer this question because she was part of the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team and she'll be able to let us know what

the appeals mechanism was in ICANN, and in addition to her intervention on the other points she wanted to make.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I've been involved, putting up my hand for the earlier intervention. There is [inaudible], but I'll answer the second part first.

The appeals mechanism for any number of matters, including delegation re-delegation of gTLD and ccTLD is an area that I believe is enough to be the second Accountability Review Team still wanting to be improved. [inaudible] at the moment, there are three – if not, arguably, four – layers of the appeals mechanism. They all lie within ICANN entity and there has been a number of calls over the years, and I think it's something that can is intending to address that there was an appeals mechanism at the top of the [tree] which is outside ourselves or accountable to beyond ICANN internally.

Olivier, did you want to intervene on that a little bit more before I go back to what I wanted to say in the first place?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Cheryl. Indeed, as you mentioned, the main appeals mechanism for board decisions in ICANN is one where there is reconsideration of the board decision, but only on the basis of whether the board has followed the bylaws in making its decision.

So the decision itself is not reconsidered, and therefore many don't call this an appeals mechanism as such, and I think the majority – if not all – of the reconsideration requests that have been asked, the appeals that have been made have failed due to that.

Alan I note has put his hand up just specifically for this. Alan?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go to Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Am I on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you are on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay, sorry. I didn't realize you had asked me. The reconsideration process is also for staff, not only board. And I would presume – although I don't know 100% - that IANA would be considered staff. They are technically employees of ICANN at this point.

So I would think that reconsideration could be used in this particular case, because in general what we're looking at in this appeals process is a mechanism by which someone can claim IANA did not follow policy. I mean, that's grounds on which one could argue. It's not a matter of not liking the policy, it's a matter of not following the policy.

So the board reconsideration might well be a vehicle which could be used, but the people who are pushing for this – and it's particularly governments and ccTLDs – I think feel strongly that there should be a [inaudible] outside of ICANN process for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [External].

ALAN GREENBERG: So this may well be in addition to the board reconsideration, but very much they will [inaudible] something outside of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. That's something that has been desired, flagged and looked for, certainly for the last ten years of discussions on not just delegation, re-delegation, and [inaudible] but on a number of, the hypothetical of what happens when people are not satisfied with an outcome.

Now, to the point I was raising my hand about, Seun. What we're talking about when we're talking about Internet community and the engagement of an Internet community and the affected parties, specifically with IANA and specifically with the matters of delegation, and we're no longer going to be using the term "re-delegation" in a future world. It's all a matter of delegation and [there are] things that

happen which allow – the primary source of how these things are to be done goes to RFC [1591].

RFC [1591] is the mechanism by which delegations and re-delegations as they are currently labeled in RFC [1591], so that's your macro [inaudible] predates ICANN and indeed predates IANA. So that's your gold standard, for want of a better word or [inaudible] document, which is probably a better description of how these things are to be done.

In addition to RFC [1591], there is uniquely to ICANN, and whilst ICANN has managed the IANA functions, [inaudible] GAC advice on some concerns, particular requirements and embellishments that is also used by IANA to establish a set of policy guidelines that is followed for matters of [inaudible] and re-delegation.

In addition to that [five years] or so of many of our lives has been spent looking at what's called Framework of Interpretation, and the Framework of Interpretation looks at those two documents – primarily RFC [1591] – and amongst a whole lot of other stuff to do with the policy of how this all works.

What's in RFC [1591] called local Internet community and the parties has now been [inaudible] redefined and qualified as significantly interested parties, and amongst quite an established list of exactly what those significantly interested parties in any community – sorry, any space [inaudible], be it specifically in a ccTLD world, but equally in a gTLD world. We do have the local Internet community that goes far beyond that. So, at this point, I would suggest that looking at those community [brought] and well-debated points of exactly what RFC

[1591] and the GAC advice [inaudible] and how it can be interpreted should be plugged into [inaudible]. And I'll stop because I could go on for hours. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. Thank you for this explanation. Your personal point of view is that we should be pushing for end users to be able – well, the significantly impacted community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, significantly interested parties have to be. It is a critical part. It's a major point that we argued for and [inaudible] onto the details over the last five years of the community [inaudible] within the Framework of Interpretation, and I think any [inaudible] that doesn't have that will fail to be effective by government and by what we – I think that's the term, the affected parties. Or in our case, significantly interested parties [inaudible] includes everything from businesses to service providers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. That would definitely be helpful. I know I've said that in the past, but it would definitely be helpful to have a link to the Framework of Interpretation latest document. As a follow-up, we could – sorry, I didn't keep track of it. Has it finally been published now or is it not published yet?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It has left the ccTLD community and it has gone towards the board. It has not come back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Cheryl. It would be definitely helpful to have a copy of that for us to read, if we are in a position to be able to have a copy of it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's public, so you certainly are. [inaudible] in the morning and [inaudible] in bed. I just might have it in front of me. I would be sending you a link to just the section on significantly interested parties. [inaudible] a document that is essential as is RFC [1591] and the GAC advice to be woven into all of the discussion at this point. Thank you. I should [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks [inaudible]. One more thing that's also important for this particular item, and of course [inaudible] may not necessarily be within our CWG limits [inaudible] accountability side is to define what does [inaudible] mean, when does it become something that can then go through the [inaudible] process. At what point does the [inaudible] initiated process and so on and so forth. [inaudible] consider.

One of the things I was [inaudible] face-to-face meeting [inaudible] decision-making [inaudible] recommendation. So if it's going to be a decision-making set up, then it needs to be very [inaudible] indicated on the document. [inaudible] requests needs to be very, very clear because it depends – we don't want to [inaudible] as much as possible avoid any misinterpretation from these panels.

Having said that, like I said, I lost connectivity and I'm actually surprised that we are quite fast moving in moving from IANA to [the next one]. it seems like, because at the moment, it looks like [inaudible] is going to be a very strong deciding factor in this particular draft. I would really, really suggest that we kind of discuss that in detail, especially [inaudible] multi-stakeholder [inaudible]. It would be good to know if there is any practicality of [inaudible] don't see how this would be effectively carried out. It's going to [inaudible] within ICANN. From my understanding, it looks like [inaudible] within ICANN was going to be the conversation [inaudible]. It was just a response from a question from Milton. Milton was asking about [who] renews [inaudible] depends on the agent, and we will just reply that that's a decision of the [inaudible] team. That means that that [inaudible] very strong team and it means that [inaudible] matter of fact is going to be [inaudible].

So we kind of need to discuss more on that and know whether it is actually something [inaudible] may need to have issues [inaudible] in near future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. I realize we are reaching the end of this call, so I'll ask for another five minutes to just clear the queue. Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I have quick question for Cheryl to clarify in my mind if I'm understanding this correctly. My question is if we accept these appeals independent panel for the implementation [inaudible] as part of a final proposal being submitted to the Coordination Group, would this imply that we need to revise any amendment to the ICANN bylaws or does this affect ICANN bylaws or not? Can we accept this panel and continue with our [bylaws] as it is?

And since we're going to finish with the call, I would like to add two comments. I think that we need another call to debate and discuss the remaining topics, because there are many topics pending that we need to discuss among ourselves, particularly to read to an ALAC position. And I am a bit concerned because we have many gaps and we have certain points that, from my point of view, should be very clear and drafted in a very clear so that no doubt may come up because this is something very important as you all know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Fatima. I equally am concerned about how little time we have, and we are at the end of this call already. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of answers, to the best of my knowledge anyway. I think Seun is correct that we didn't talk about the review

team sufficiently, because that's going to be a rather crucial body. That should be on an agenda for a future meeting.

With regards to whether the arbitration or whoever, whatever, the entity is makes recommendations or decisions, normally the process going into a process like that, normally the rules going into a process like that are that both parties agreed to abide by the outcome. Sometimes there's an opportunity for taking it to court in a national venue, but in this kind of venue, I would think that the bodies would have to agree to abide by the outcome.

To address Fatima's comment, whether that means bylaws changes, I don't know. Because if IANA is run by ICANN, then maybe ICANN needs to change its bylaws saying it's willing to abide by these outcomes, or maybe that's just a board decision. I really don't know, and I'm not sure we need to worry at that level. But essentially, you do have to agree going into it that you're going to abide by the outcome. That's the basis on which these kind of processes work at all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Fatima reminds me of course that she asked a question to Cheryl. I thought I'd give Cheryl some time. Cheryl, are you going to answer Fatima's question on [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am. It saved me frantically typing, which is what I was doing before you [inaudible] the call and I can speak faster than I can type. I was going to answer in chat, Fatima.

The answer is actually yes and no to that, whether or not it's required for bylaw changes endorses what Alan was alluding to as well. I believe it could possibly be [inaudible] if the answer was yes and the bylaw change was an outcome, because if the IANA operations are maintained as a sub-unit or [inaudible], whatever the model is is not so important. But within ICANN, for an appeals mechanism, that is desired by the beyond ICANN community and has been demonstrated as required or desired by the beyond ICANN community, [inaudible] in some cases significant parts of the ICANN community is to have the trust associated with it. It would need the higher level of "authority" that I suspect a bylaw change would require.

And that is not a problem. There is a process. It isn't particularly fast. It takes somewhere between five to sometimes twelve months, but it can be done. And there could be interim guarantees and documentation whilst it is being done, which would engender the trust that is required. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. Finally we have Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. So one of my major comments, because the time is almost [inaudible] now, I think we have [inaudible] been able to adequately provide feedback to those who were not part of Frankfurt.

However, I'm concerned that we will not actually be able to arrive at [inaudible] positions that is important for our discussions on the CWG

[inaudible]. I think it's important that [inaudible]. We need to [inaudible] the outcome of [inaudible] that we had [inaudible] of some of our views and our standpoints in all this. I think it's important, just like Fatima has also mentioned to actually have a collective position so that we actually will be sticking not just as an individual [inaudible].

So I would really suggest that we do that as possible. The time is already gone. We really have not achieved some level of clear direction on what we are going to do next, so I would really suggest that we arrive at that as soon as possible, because the other communities who are [inaudible] moving at a pace that's [inaudible] moving. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much or this, Seun. I absolutely agree. I have equal concerns with you. Certainly for our next call, I suggest that we would focus primarily on two things. We'd be focusing on the IANA Periodic Review Team. As you mentioned, Seun, and as others have said, this is going to have a considerable power if it's going to be making the recommendations for the renewal of the contract. That was one.

Then, also, we should focus on the IANA contracting entity, which we haven't had a chance to discuss today, but which has brought significant concerns, certainly for me, perhaps from others because it's not known at all as to where that will be, what its jurisdiction would be and how does one build a contracting entity that cannot be captured or destroyed knowing that it will hold all the contracts?

We'll have to do that in our next call. The question is now, when do we need our next call to be? The next call of the Community Working

Group will be next Wednesday and we don't know what will be discussed there.

Alan mentioned that a final draft, I guess, will be sent out imminently. Should we have another call this week or should we have not a call next week? [I'll look for it to see in the chat]. This is all about timing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan. Sorry, I can't put my hand up.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: You said final draft. I think this is the first draft. It's the first time we've seen a document all in one piece. The co-chairs made it very clear that this is a draft going out for community comment. It is not final in any sense of the word, so I think we have to be careful of that, and yes I suggest we do have a meeting soon. And I'm afraid I have to drop off right now. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Alan. I note this week is better for everyone. Let's try and find some time Thursday [inaudible] Monday. Let's try a Doodle, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday – a quick Doodle for this at the usual times, whatever times we have that are available knowing that our schedule is already pretty busy.

Fatima Cambronero, is that an old hand?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Yes, Olivier. Just a brief, quick suggestion. Until we decide when our call will be, I suggest that perhaps we might divide this document, this flowchart, in the different [inaudible] for our group so as to be able to independently deal with them, so that we can express our concerns or point of views with a proposal, so as to make our next call much easier so that we can make progress on our work. That is my suggestion and I would like to know your opinion about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Fatima. Yes, we will forward this flowchart to everyone. I hoped that they will be able to listen to this call to hear some of the discussions that we've had. My concern is at the moment we haven't even gone through the flowchart itself. We just have the description of the four entities.

I'm also told that it's Thanksgiving on Thursday, so we probably will have to get Thursday out, since our staff is primarily based in the U.S. and it would be nice to give them at least one day off. So Thursday is out. Wednesday or Friday. Let's do the Doodle for Wednesday or Friday.

And I think we need to discuss this a lot further, Fatima. In the meantime, we'll forward this flowchart if it hasn't already been forwarded to our IANA Issues group. We'll also forward the first draft. I stand corrected – first draft to the mailing list when it comes out. And of course we'll add it to our overall pages that we have.

And with this, I have to end the call. It's gone very, very fast today. I don't know why. It might be because the topic is such a very hot topic to deal with and it's so expanding at the moment.

Thanks for all of you for having come to the call. Let's follow up on e-mail.

Thanks to the interpreters for having added another 10-15 minutes to the call. Thanks very much, Veronica.

This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of the day and thank you very much for joining.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]