
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function on Tuesday, the 9th of December 2014 at 14:30 UTC.

On the call today, we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Tomohiro Fujisaki, Suen Ojedeji, Mohamed El Bashir, Glenn McKnight, Eduardo Diaz, Allan MacGillivray, Alan Greenberg, Yasuichi Kitamura, and [inaudible].

On the Spanish channel, we have Aida Noblia, Alberto Soto, and Fatima Cambronerero.

I show no apologies for today's conference.

From staff, we have myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter is Sabrina.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anybody on the role call? I'm not seeing anyone put their hand up or shout their name out. Welcome, everyone. We've got a very interesting call today, which is packed again with a lot of things to cover.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Just a quick review of other operational community progress, and then the majority of the discussion today will be on our 21-day consultation period and the ALAC response. We need to build a response together and we need to have at least some segment, some parts, of this response ready for tomorrow's webinar that we will be presenting as a group and we'll be discussing this also, and seeing how we structure this webinar.

Let's start with adoption of the agenda. Does anybody wish to add anything to the agenda as it is currently on the screen? I would say if you have loaded the agenda, please reload it again. I've added a couple more – just two more – links to it. So the agenda is adopted, and let's go directly to the review of the action items from our last call, which took place on the 2nd of December. And the two action items that were listed there are completed. Any comments or questions on these?

Seeing no one put their hand up, let's move to the next part of our agenda, number 3, a quick update on the activity in the other operational communities. We have the Regional Internet Registries with the recent meeting that took place both at RIPE, but also the AfriNIC meeting. It's not in the agenda, but we've already mentioned some of this in the last call. And also the progress on the IETF proposal. Does anybody wish to add news about progress in the past week?

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Oliver. Just to say that the CRISP, which is the coordinating body created by the RIRs is already constituted and started its meetings.

They have a mailing list which is open, so anyone can access and can follow the discussion.

I frankly didn't do that because I am overloaded those days, but I invite everyone who wants to know more about the proposal of the numbering function body to go and to follow the list on the CRISP. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Tijani. Any other updates or comments? Seun Ojedeji?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you, Olivier. Just to add to Tijani's comment, there was a soft meeting today by the CRISP where they actually elected the chair and vice chair. There was also some discussion about whether CRISP would be having some separate platform to discuss internally before they now post their contributions [inaudible] documents to the public IANA discussion list for the [inaudible] discussion list [inaudible].

So it's [likely] that there's going to be two [platforms] of communication. One is going to be for the members alone, the 15 members, and the other one is going to be for the 15 members and the entire public. And that one is the [inaudible] list.

There was also – in the group, during the call today, there was also a consensus that whenever there's a need for a vote, they will only do that at the end of the proposal that is [inaudible] drafted [inaudible] general final consensus. That is really perhaps [inaudible].

I think that's what I [inaudible] calls that will be happening on the CRISP [inaudible] are going to be on WebX and [inaudible] invited to join, but anybody can join the meeting to actually be [inaudible] make a comment or perhaps on the mailing list. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun, for this update. Are there any questions or comments on this? Just quickly, Seun, on the CRISP first call, was there any progress on the actual substance or was it most just procedural this time? And how often would they have their calls?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. So I think [inaudible] to get some working [inaudible] the agenda, but what it [inaudible] was just to kind of get an understanding of how the [working] is going to happen between [inaudible] consensus [inaudible].

So this other meeting is going to happen online. [inaudible] going to be – how often it's going to happen, that was not [inaudible]. I think I should also note that at the [inaudible] I left the room, so I don't know what [inaudible] mentioned [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Seun. Any other comments? Now, I note that – actually, I haven't put anything in the agenda with regards to the ICG. I'm not sure. I don't think that very much has happened on the ICG this week. I guess I could ask Jean-Jacques to find out if there's been any

items of significance that need to be pointed out. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, hello, Olivier. Thank you. To my knowledge, there has been no substantive discussion. We've just tidied up a document planning a way in which the proposal of the ICG will be transmitted, or should be transmitted, to NTIA via ICANN board and there were some questions about wording, so that's being cleared up. To the best of my knowledge, there is no other matter of substance.

We're all very eagerly [inaudible] whatever is available from the communities. That has not been sent to us officially, of course, but there are various websites – for instance, the IETF proposal, etc. – which is open to public comment now.

So the date, as I had announced a few weeks ago, is maintained. That is to say that all communities are expected to respond or to send in their proposal by the 15th of January 2015. That's all I have to report at this stage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I was watching also if there were any other hands on updates. I think we need to plough forward then with the work that we have, which is to look at the follow-up of the face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt, and of course the 21-day public consultation period that is now before us.

There are a lot of links on the page at the moment. What I was going to do was to first tell you about – of course there are three links that we have there. We've got an At-Large cross-community working group on naming relating functions draft transition proposal workspace. That's where we are going to be building our statement.

The aim, as I mentioned earlier, is to try and have a first draft as early as within the next 24 hours in time for the webinar that will happen tomorrow on Wednesday at I believe – is it 21:00 UTC or so? Yeah, it's 21:00 UTC, capacity building IANA naming function stewardship transition. So we need that.

Then of course there will be – well, there have been some webinars of the cross-community working group itself. I have seen many of you on those webinars, so in effect we saw the presentation of them. Finally, we've got links on our agenda [inaudible] to the common At-Large [positions].

And in there, the first thing I wanted to take you to – now, I've spoken to Alan. Alan's message on Saturday, the 29th of October was the first one that – was it October? Yeah, 29 of November – sorry. That's an interesting one. The 29th of November was a first set of concerns provided to the cross-community working group mailing list.

This is currently somehow obsolete, or at least has been superseded by some more recent discussions. The first thing I wanted to do perhaps was share with you – I would say share my screen and take you to the mind map which we have here under Olivier's message regarding RFP 4. It's got a link to the mind map and IANA entities threats and mitigation.

The concerns – the mind map effectively gives you a list of the concerns that we have with regards to the different entities that are up on the table to be set up. There has been no response from anyone on RFP 4 about this, probably because most of the discussions are [taking] on the overall cross-community working group mailing list. My goodness is there an enormous amount of traffic on that.

So if I share my screen I'll be able to point to things. Of course, if that thing works – there we go. If you'll just bear with me, it's taking a little time to do so. Great. Technical stuff. I can talk to you in the meantime.

On the agenda, you will see the link to that mind map. If you click on there, you will find the IANA Customer Standing Committee, Multi-stakeholder Review Team, Independent Appeals Panel for Policy Implementation, IANA Contracting Entity, and finally IANA Operator. These are the five different organizations as such that the committee decided to propose.

First, the IANA operator. I think that there has been a consensus that nobody at the moment wants that IANA operator to be separated. As you know it's ICANN that currently operates this. But certainly what they're wishing to do is to make this have a degree of separability, which effectively means if the operator did not fulfill their job properly then there would be no hurdle to being able to appoint another operator instead of this operator.

I don't know what's going on with my thing at the moment, my screen at the moment. Alan Greenberg, you put your hand up, so you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, just a clarification. Some people are making much stronger statements than if things don't work, we need to be able to separate. Some people are advocating every N year, where N might be as small as three or four, depending on who you talk to. They would want to see a formal RFP being issued to essentially go back to square one and see if there's anyone else who's interested in the business and has a better proposal.

So it's not only in case of failure, essentially but potentially on a very regular basis go back out for contract. Thank you. Or [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this, Alan. And yes, indeed, you're correct. The current contract with NTIA, I have asked [inaudible] from IANA in saying, well, does the current contract say that there should be a new RFP every time and basically provide the opportunity every time the contract is to be renewed for a brand new operator to step in?

And the response was that so far it's been a case of, well, in the majority of cases we don't need to have a contract reallocation. The contract is just renewed automatically. Only in recent times has there then been an RFP, which effectively was just to keep ICANN on its toes in some way. She didn't tell me it was to keep ICANN on its toes, but I think it's well understood that this is one way to keep ICANN on its toes as the current operator.

I'm faced with a real problem at the moment, ladies and gentlemen, with being able to share my screen, which is not a good thing.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. At this point I'd like to introduce, as I do occasionally, an element of geo-politics. Of course, the IANA function has been well-assured and the current arrangements are operational. [There's a lot] about that. But I would certainly not want to give the impression that I have any issue with that.

But I think especially as representatives of the interests of the end users, we have to keep an open mind about the geo-politics of it. IANA, because of its link to ICANN, is in fact a sort of a U.S. company, or at least part of a U.S. company under California law.

And I think what we can notice over the past two decades is that there have been a growing number, a growing intensity, of calls for [inaudible] [internationalization].

Now, bringing this up does not say that I'm anti-U.S. or anti established practices. It's simply that, especially on behalf of the global Internet users, I think we have to keep that in mind, in the same way that when you were talking about the [allocation] of [TLDs], the pure fact today is that, what, 90% of all gTLDs are actually managed by vendors who are 90% of them in North America, Great Britain, Western Europe and a few other places.

I think it's our duty really to facilitate the awareness of the need to become international in all aspects, and that should include I think keeping a road open to other participants from other parts of the world who may be interested in and who would be able to provide the same quality of service that the IANA plus ICANN combination has provided so far.

So once again, this is not against anyone. I think it's simply our basic duty on behalf of the global – underline global – Internet user to look into [inaudible] to keep those options open.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I will have to add a note of caution to that statement. I can't argue with the overall intent, but I think we need to be very careful that we don't build an exceedingly complex, costly, and potentially vulnerable structure to ensure it.

The first part of our responsibility is security and stability of the Internet. There is a potential in trying to keep it open and available so that anyone can become IANA in building a structure that is simply not up to the standards that we currently expect for security and stability. Thank you. That's not a reflection of who may be operating it, but the infrastructure necessary to allow that to happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you for this, Alan. Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. My comment has to do with Alan's comments and the other comments, the prior comments, regarding the contractual terms and whether they will be automatically renewed or whether that is going to be reviewed every three or five years, for example.

So my question is where are the root maintenance servers? Where are the time zone maintenance servers? Why? Because we could say that every three or five years, we change that, but these functions have to continue being fully stable. They have to remain fully stable. It is very easy to draft a new contract, but it is very hard to physically transfer all these functions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alberto. One thing. I think that the location of the root servers and the actual running of the root servers and things is completely outside the scope of this exercise. What we're dealing with here is the NTIA's position that moves. The servers, the maintaining of the database and so on doesn't actually move. Alan Greenberg, you might wish to add to this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to say two things. First of all, regarding the root servers, you're correct. That's completely out of this equation at the moment. Obviously we want stability there, but it's not something that is handled under contract to the NTIA or in question right now.

Maintenance of things like the various parameters associated with time zones, and that's one of the things IANA happens to do, a critical thing at this point is are they accessible? And they're currently accessible through the IANA.org website or the IANA.org domain name, and there was a substantive discussion on the IETF list about what happens if things change. If IANA becomes a different entity, who has access to that?

Clearly, in my mind, that's something that would have to be built into any contracts to make sure that if IANA were to change in the future that access to the appropriate and critical operational URLs would be maintained. So that's something which would have to be factored in, but is not really associated with where they're running, but how it's accessible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Now let's go back and see if I can finally do this, if I can share my screen. Does this work? Hopefully, you're going to be able to see this. If I go into not this, but let's go onto this. Thank you. There were are.

Okay, are you all able to see that?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, I'm able to see that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent, thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: It's very small.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is small. If you're able to maximize your screen, because I can't really go any larger on this. I mean, I can try and go a little bit larger on that. Here we go.

So we've got the five entities in there. We start at the bottom of the screen with the IANA functions operator. Of course we'd have a variety of threats also faced by the MRT and the ICE. So the MRT is the Multi-stakeholder Review Team. The IAP is the Independent Appeals Panel for policy implementation. The ICE is the IANA Contracting Entity and the IANA operator is ICANN and the [inaudible]. That's how it works.

Now, the IANA contracting entity is that [inaudible] contract company not-for-profit that is currently on the table, and as you can see, possibly one of the more complex of entities – well, one of the entities that generates the most concerns.

The Customer Standing Committee seems to be generating some concern, but not that much. The Multi-stakeholder Review Team we will discuss at length today. And finally, the Independent Appeals Panel for Policy Implementation seems to be something that is widely accepted by most people. The whole idea that you need an independent appeals panel, the concept itself seems to be fine; hence we don't see any weaknesses or [mitigation] options.

Let's start at the top of the page with the IANA Customer Standing Committee. The main concerns really are – now, just as a quick recap, the Standing Committee is going to deal with day-to-day concerns, day-to-day running, keeping the trains running on time, keeping things in time and making sure that the service level agreement that the IANA operator are sustained and are followed. That Standing Committee would be primarily registries and registrars – in the case of names, of course, naming functions – because they are the direct customers of the IANA operator on this.

There are concerns – and I put two of them here – of not flagging non-compliance because of course there is a shared . . . There could be a shared responsibility with regards to complying to service level agreements, so if there was a shared default, there could be not flagging for this. Or there could be also complacency over the way that the IANA functions run, how IANA naming function is run and therefore not flagging on some of the issues. Flagging of the processes, etc.

I can't see my screen at the same time. I don't know whether we've got any hands up in the meantime.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll monitor them, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Alan. So that's the Customer Standing Committee. I'm not sure whether we want to go into any depth in a statement to point out our concerns on this, but the way that it's

currently drawn is that there appears to be some elements of multi-stakeholder input in there. In fact, there are some who are saying that the multi-stakeholder model could be in use in that Customer Standing Committee with observers for other stakeholders and registrars and registries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, we have two hands. Eduardo and me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Then let's start with Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Olivier. It's just in a point of clarification. This mind map that you made is the actual proposal that's out there, or this is what we are thinking of working on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. This is not what's currently out there. This is just looking at the four plus one bodies that are on the table, and this is dealing with the concern that we have identified in these different bodies.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Eduardo. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. What was proposed initially for the [CSC], ignoring the people who said it must only be registries, other people have said that there should be liaisons. I pointed out that in ICANN terminology, a liaison is not voting and has no formal voice. It might be tolerated, but has no ability to take any action. And the answer to that is maybe we shouldn't be calling them liaisons.

The real problem is even if there were multi-stakeholder components to this, but they can be essentially shouted down, out-voted by the registries. It doesn't have the same effect. It has to be a substantive participation such that it can take action and cannot be completely overruled if the multi-stakeholders have a concern.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Alan. A very thorough point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo, is your hand still up?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I'm going to take it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. So next we can look at is The Multi-stakeholder Review Team (the MRT). It's still at this state very unclear whether this Multi-stakeholder Review Team would be a legal entity, like a not-for-profit organization that would be created on which the Multi-stakeholder Review Team would be sitting or whether this could be a committee that would be part of ICANN or whether this could be an independent committee that is somewhere in the ether out there, but with no idea on how that would be funded, how that would operate and how the selection of people on this Multi-stakeholder Review Team would be made.

There is a concern of course with – and here are the concerns I listed. Litigation, the threat of litigation. Since the Multi-stakeholder Review Team apparently is the committee or the organization or the entity that would hold all of the cards that would be instructing the IANA contracting entity on who to contract, it would be also – the Multi-stakeholder Review Team would be the organization to whom . . .

Sorry, the committee or entity. Let's use the word entity. The entity to whom any escalation of problems arising or identified by the IANA Customer Standing Committee would be escalated to the Multi-stakeholder Review Team.

In addition to this, any RFP would be [inaudible] by the Multi-stakeholder Review Team and would be sent out by the Multi-stakeholder Review Team, and I guess decided on by the Multi-stakeholder Review Team if reallocation would be seen as being a way forward.

So concerns over litigation. If the Multi-stakeholder Review Team is just a committee without any kind of legal protection or anything, obviously process could be blocked. Contraction reallocation could be blocked as well. And then there's also concern about the lack of multi-stakeholder entity in itself, capture, that really, as you know, depends on how to constitute this Multi-stakeholder Review Team and the balance of multi-stakeholder interests.

There's also a concern about the slow response of the Multi-stakeholder Review Team. As you might remember, originally this was called the Periodic Review Team that was meeting once a year and reviewing the reports from the IANA operator to the IANA Customer Standing Committee, etc. Now it's more of a standing committee in that it would have to meet more often. Obviously it would have to meet by teleconferences. That then means of course having of course staff support, and that might mean also for it needing to be funded.

Alan, you put your hand up, so you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Excuse me, a couple of things. You said one of the options is it is a body of ICANN. I think that's absolutely ruled out from the current model, because if they want to be able to separate the IANA function from ICANN. They're certainly not going to take direction on how to do this from a body of ICANN. That just can't work.

The fact that it cannot be organized by ICANN is indeed the largest single problem in this whole model, in my mind. Some other entity must do it. There has been no discussion whatsoever of setting up a

corporate entity, so this is just an ad hoc group like the CCWG or the ICG, but it cannot be a body of ICANN.

So who constitutes it, who selects what the balance is, who selects the working methods becomes critical, because capture is not just capture taken over by someone, but you can have a more subtle form of capture if you do not include certain stakeholders in it because you don't deem them to be real stakeholders, then they are excluded from the discussion.

If the body doing that is not subject to significant public scrutiny, we have a real problem. And it's not obvious there are a lot of entities who could be given this.

In terms of liability, the current answer – because that was certainly one of the issues I raised originally – the statement says the current IANA operator will have to provide liability. That may or may not give people a level of comfort.

So there's an awful lot of questions relating – since this is the body that will be advising the contracting entity on exactly what to put in the RFP, it would be evaluating the RFP. The RFP would be issued by the formal contracting company, but its content would be decided by this volunteer group. It would be evaluated by this volunteer group. Any surveys of the public to understand how the contract should change would be done by this group.

It essentially is the operational arm of contract [inaudible], and we know almost nothing about how one would be creating it. This leaves a huge unknown in the process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, for this. You mentioned one thing, which was to do with the fact that it couldn't remain within ICANN. If one looks at ICANN the organization and ICANN the community, some are seeing a definite separation between those two. The community is not necessarily the organization itself. Could that be a middle ground possible in saying the MRT would come from the multi-stakeholder community of ICANN?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is without a doubt going to be a huge overlap between the multi-stakeholder [inaudible] in ICANN. If nothing else, ICANN is the home of the gTLD registries and a significant number of the ccTLD registries, so there has to be very significant overlap. There's no question about that.

The question is what body officially convenes it? And if you give that responsibility to ICANN, then you're giving ICANN the ability to, in subtle ways, do just the kind of things I was talking about. Make sure that the composition is a group such that it will be friendly to ICANN, which would violate the independence that the MRT needs to allow Contract Co to, on its advice, move the contract away.

So you can't give ICANN control over the composition of Contract Co, of the MRT if at the same time you want Contract Co to be able to take independent advice from it to move everything away from ICANN. That's not likely to happen.

So somewhere, it has to be convened in some other jurisdiction. Seun has his hand up. I mean jurisdiction. I didn't mean where its incorporated under some else's [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just as a follow-up to you, you mentioned that you cannot have this within ICANN if it was going to be independent in some way, but what about its funding? Wouldn't its funding come from ICANN itself today, as ICANN being the IANA operator? And in the future, what happens if it's another operator?

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed, the only answer we've had so far is there would be a contractual term that the IANA operator would have to fund this group even though it did not create it or manage it, but it would have funded its protection against litigation and things like that. This has not been described in any great detail.

Seun has his hand up, but he's disappeared off Adobe Connect. He may still be on the bridge. Tijani has his hand up also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. For some reason now, it's appearing on the corner of my screen. I'm starting to see hands. Seun Ojedeji first.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Olivier. Actually, on the CWG list, I've been having some back and forth discussion with [Keuk] on this [constructive] thing. I know he sent something just yesterday or so. I note because of my [inaudible], I've not had the time to actually compose something and write back.

My concern about this whole thing is that we have proposed [inaudible] the community something that is not even close to complete. The [inaudible] is complete, because [inaudible] people on the mailing list already [inaudible] for instance, the mailing list says they have a 10-page document and other things, and making it look like what we have is already proofed, it's already good to go, and it brings me a lot of concern because just [inaudible] things.

I share some of the concerns that Alan has mentioned. [inaudible] figure out [inaudible] connection between the MRT and the ICANN community. We're saying that ICANN is going to be the current operator of the IANA function, so if we actually are transferring [inaudible] multi-stakeholder community, what is the ICANN community? Isn't that a multi-stakeholder community? [inaudible] transfer it to MRT, what does MRT [inaudible] going to exclude the multi-stakeholder community within ICANN.

The [inaudible] indication of [inaudible], the more we realize that this can only be [inaudible] global multi-stakeholder community. That is just [inaudible]. What is global multi-stakeholder community? Very soon [inaudible], the more we bring in complications, the more we see someone or a group of people independent that they are not part of the [inaudible].

The ICANN multi-stakeholder community [inaudible] allows anybody to participate, so the more we [inaudible] ICANN community, the more people will understand what [inaudible] dealt with the details. And when I say details, details is the [inaudible] going to begin something more than just [inaudible], and we are not actually [inaudible] position should be very clear. We need to get [inaudible] before we actually make any [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Seun. In fact, some of the side discussions by e-mail and so on seems to be that it could be a composition such like the ICG's composition, for example. That could be a Multi-stakeholder Review Team. We could align the composition of the MRT on the composition of ICANN, of the CWG for example. On this case, we would have quite a balanced way.

There is currently some understanding that this could be the thing. One has to remember, though, that the multi-stakeholder community is not the same thing as the ICANN multi-stakeholder community, because some will say that ICANN is closed, even though it is open.

Let me just go through the list. Oh, Tijani has disappeared.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani still has his hand up on my screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It doesn't show on mine. I see Fatima. I don't see Tijani. So Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am here. Okay, thank you, Olivier. Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I may be completely out because I am not following very closely the discussions inside the CWG, so [inaudible] if I am out. But Olivier, you said something that really bothered me. You said what about the operation is done by [inaudible] body of ICANN?

Are we discussing the operation or the oversight? This is something [inaudible], because the operation is very well done by ICANN. Why change it? The problem is [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. One of the strong – well, what appears to have been very vocal in the group by a handful of people, and I still don't know to this day whether this is the majority or not the majority, but it's purported to be the majority that there should be a separability with regards to the IANA operator.

Today it's run by ICANN and they want to have things engrained in the current system that it would make it easy to take it away from ICANN

and allocate it to someone else. And that, of course, would then – I don't know what the consequences would be. One of the consequences of course is that the IANA operator would have to be funding the Multi-stakeholder Review Team, so funding its own oversight and that would be in a contract, I guess. I don't even know how they would have that. Or a memorandum of understanding of something.

The new operator would have to agree to funding the Multi-stakeholder Review Team if it was not ICANN. But the composition of the Multi-stakeholder Review Team could be based on the ICANN CWG model that we currently have. That was the potential solution on the composition of the Multi-stakeholder Review Team itself.

Any follow-up, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, it's okay. I really don't support this option of taking the operation out of ICANN, because ICANN is doing it very well. There is no problem so far, so why do we want to change it? The problem is the other side. If we want it to be comfortable, well done, etc., if the NTIA is not here anymore, we need something replacing it. So that's why we need the oversight. Otherwise, I don't know why we want to change the operation from ICANN. What is the reason?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. Alan, is that in response? Is your hand up in response to Tijani's point?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So you have the floor, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. The reason, Tijani, is people are afraid that someday in the future something may go wrong which might make them want to move away from IANA – a rogue board who doesn't support true multi-stakeholderism, a rogue board that decides that it's suddenly controlled by some part of the world that wants to set up an alternate root. It's the fear of the unknown that something might happen where IANA suddenly becomes – or rather ICANN suddenly becomes the devil and we need to move IANA away, so the stability of IANA is maintained. It's the fear of what might happen in the future, not because people are necessarily unhappy at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If people think about the possibility that the other body will not operate it as well as ICANN is doing, people think about the same fear for the new body. [inaudible] for ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, you're describing exactly what we need to put in our comment. We're not presenting this proposal as something that we're advocating. The whole problem is we have problems with it, and they're just the problems that you're describing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

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

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to agree with something said by Seun regarding that we do not have a proposal, a complete proposal, that we can present to the community. We haven't covered all the aspects in our proposal and it is my impression that we have been walking in circles for the last week instead of moving forward, and we keep posing questions to one another that we cannot reply, because the proposal doesn't have that level of detail.

So instead of asking questions that have no answer, why don't we draft a proposal or a document saying what the At-Large community wants that is the MRT with a level of detail that we really want so as to post this for public comment, because for the last hour or so we have been speaking and speaking about questions that have no answers. So why don't we move forward and work on something more concrete? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Fatima. Let me just make a proposal on the Multi-stakeholder Review Team that this would be composed of – that we would agree for its composition to be equivalent to the CWG composition. I think that probably is a proposal that the ALAC could make on this, so that we define what the composition or we propose what the composition of the Multi-stakeholder Review Team would be.

Seun, your hand is still up. I don't know whether that's an old hand, but I see that Jean-Jacques Subrenat has just put his hand up, so let me give the floor to Jean-Jaques.

SEUN OJEDEJI: That was [inaudible], Olivier.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Sorry?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. If we do that, and I agree that this could be a useful way forward – and thank you, Fatima – I suggest that we use some words about the fact that the crux of the problem will be to have a [inaudible] process for nomination of people to the MRT. As for the composition of the ICG and all sort of other exercises over the past ten years, it is the

power of nomination of designating people to be members of this or that review or group that is crucial, so we should not just talk about principles, but also the process of nominating. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Jean-Jacques. Seun, did you say that was a new hand?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Please go ahead, and then I'll have Alan Greenberg afterwards.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Olivier, you are saying we should actually be done proposing the composition of MRT. [inaudible] comments should actually be proposing what the composition of MRT will look like?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I believe that's what Fatima has suggested and I think that's something I would certainly and I doubt whether there's any opposition for us to do that.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I think I don't know whether we should – I don't know what proposing the composition of MRT [inaudible] already agreed on its

current proposal. That is the way it's looking like. So if we are proposing the composition of MRT, it means that we have actually agreed that, okay, there is going to be an MRT. It's either going to be outside of ICANN or somewhere, and we are also [inaudible] that whoever would propose or whoever [inaudible] propose now actually be subject to [inaudible].

I think the first thing we should actually do determine as whether we actually agree with the concept of this current proposal. If we have a consensus that we agree with this current proposal as the concept of it, then maybe it's [inaudible] trying to see that the composition, it's more inclusive or more [inaudible] as much as possible.

I think we should first agree on the concepts, because in the previous meetings, we've said we're going to actually draft something. We mentioned we were going to draft our own proposal, which is going to be more of an [inaudible].

So if we're actually [leaving] that agenda right now, I'm going to the agenda of agreeing with the current proposal. I'm trying to [inaudible] information. I think we should agree on that before move forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. Do you have an alternative proposal? Seun, do you have an alternative proposal to the Multi-stakeholder Review Team? Are you saying an internal committee of ICANN should be the Multi-stakeholder Review Team or should take that position?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, exactly. My own understanding is I think an internal group can actually do that. Yes, that's my view.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. If you could flesh this out in writing to the mailing list, then we could discuss that in greater detail. I think that we're in a stage where we really need to provide convincing arguments for not having a Multi-stakeholder Review Team, and making sure that angles are covered so not to be faced with a wall of opposition from other members in the CWG.

Next is Alan Greenberg. Yeah, go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I think there will be – there was the option provided by Alan and there was also one which actually [inaudible] on the [inaudible]. I think that is already something we can actually start [inaudible]. What I'm basically saying is that [inaudible] function of MRT. We should agree on this basic principle that we [are going forward] with the MRT with the understanding that we're going to be [inaudible] to ICANN or with the understanding that [inaudible] ICANN. As well, we [inaudible]. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think we're going to have to move ahead. We're well into the last half hour of this call and we need to come up with a way forward that is generally accepted. I do have a proposal to make that's in the last bullet. I can comment now on some of the things that have been said, but I prefer to wait and do it as part of that if we're going to get to it and allow sufficient time. I can certainly comment on what we should specify in terms of the MRT, and I don't think we want to be in the position of actually naming the people or the constituencies. We need to identify the process by which it will be convened.

And I'll simply note that an internal committee of ICANN would not be acceptable, because the unaffiliated ccTLDs are not part of that, and that simply would not be something that could be sold. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Olivier. I'm with the same [inaudible] as Seun. I like the idea of the Multi-stakeholder Review Team within the ICANN remit, but then I hear Alan saying that is not possible because of the ccTLDs. I know the ccTLD group had some issues about this transition [inaudible]. I'm not sure how the ccTLD – why if we say that this group should be inside ICANN, why the ccTLD will not support something like that versus having it outside. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Eduardo. Some ccTLD operators are not part of the ccNSO, and therefore they're not part of ICANN. So having that Multi-stakeholder Review Team within ICANN is going to not be supported by a significant number of ccTLD operators that are not part of the ccNSO.

I'd like to move quickly onto the IANA contracting entity on the potential problems on this. We've got a couple more diagrams I wanted to whisk through quickly before we go to Alan's drafting proposal.

The IANA contracting entity is . . .

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, Olivier, I want to reply to what you said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Quickly, yes. Go ahead, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, very quickly. When we say multi-stakeholder, we don't have [inaudible] within ICANN boards. It can be open to anyone that wants to participate in that. It doesn't have to be – you don't have to be part of ICANN to participate in that group. If we're saying that that group has some kind of independence of the ICANN board, somehow by the bylaws, I don't know. That's another [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. I think Alan will probably be touching on these concerns and might have a proposal on this. Let's go to the IANA contracting entity. The big threats, of course, litigation, rogue board, rogue employees, that this contracting entity which we were told originally was going to be an empty shell with no employees and no board is now seen as needing a board and all sorts of bells and whistles with it. How would it be funded, etc.?

And the threat of course from litigation is significant. Since this is the organization that will hold all the contracts, if it gets sued, is taken down by litigation – in other words, very high costs, etc. – then you end up with all of these contracts in the air because of that entity disappearing from view.

One could ask for it to be located in a jurisdiction which would provide it with immunity from prosecution, and that would then have an alternate effect where there would be no recourse for a rogue board, which is, as you can see in the diagram, directly related to the mitigation for a rogue board.

So we seem to be in a lose-lose scenario on this one with regards to litigation from the different threats that we have. We've got rogue board, rogue employees, and we also have, although that organization will have bylaws that will say they need to follow the policy or the instructions from the Multi-stakeholder Review Team, they could just say, "Look, we're not going to do such a thing unilaterally." And then what happens? Would it then get sued by the Multi-stakeholder Review Team? It's just very murky and there's very little that's currently being said on this.

Let me move to the next diagrams that I wanted to take you through quickly. This diagram is one which was taken from the proposal of the CWG at the moment and shows how the multi-stakeholder community selects members with their Periodic Review Team, and now multi-stakeholder Review Team.

The Multi-stakeholder Review Team gives instructions to the contract company and also the IANA functions operator gets given instructions by the Periodic Review Team, and of course by the contract company that has contract related elements.

The IANA functions operator has to provide reports to the Customer Standing Committee, and then when there is a real problem, that gets escalated back to the Periodic Review Team.

And finally, if there is a big problem that is raised by the multi-stakeholder community, that goes to an independent appeals panel that then instructs the IANA functions operator to do things.

All in all, the diagram looks well-built, but then one has concerns about first the makeup of the multi-stakeholder community, and then of course the points that we just raised beforehand.

I would then be pointing you to the following things. Possible proposals. Instead of having a contract company that you see here in the middle of the screen – and I hope you can read this. Is that readable? I don't hear anyone saying no.

This one is one which provides the Contract Co, which in fact is just an entity, that would follow the same sort of thing as the Address

Supporting Organization. If you got ICANN funds the Address Supporting Organization (the ASO) that has an MoU that builds the NRO from the different regional Internet registries.

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri from staff. Would you like to mute the line?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, it's fine. It's my other phone that was ringing here. I'm sorry.

So the NRO functions with a number of MoUs and is structurally independent from ICANN, so we could have a similar system again where the Contract Co or Contract Org could be an independent entity that would then be appointed by several different bodies, effectively would be having an MoU to build this and would therefore be able to defend it against any kind of attack or anything like that. The advantage of the Contract Co would not actually be an independent organization that would have bylaws and a board and could be litigated against.

The second proposal is just a slightly cleaner way of looking at it. All of the other points, by the way, are pretty much the same as the points that we've said. Here I've ordered the scope outside the names on one side and I've kept the ones which are within the names community on the other side.

The third way of doing it of course is to take the Contract Co away altogether and to have all of the different organizations – IETF, NRO, and independent IANA supporting organization. So that would be created and the IANA Supporting Organization would be created, all of

that being part of ICANN. And these all having an MoU directly with the IANA functions operator.

So if the IETF wanted to take its business elsewhere, then it would just cut the MoU and it would be out of this. And of course it would then be able to take away their appointment onto the Periodic Review Team. You can see each one of the component organizations that could appoint people to the Periodic Review Team.

I note Alan Greenberg has put his hand up, so you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Can you go back to the previous slide for a moment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This one or the first one?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's the one. I want to congratulate you. You've taken a complex process and made it more complex.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure. I know it's not a good thing, but you deserve some credit for managing to do that. A couple of comments, though – real comments – on it.

You are showing IETF and RIRs going through Contract Co. To date, as far as we know, they have shown no interest in being involved in this overall process. They seem to be able to cut the MoU, as you indicated in the next one, on their own. They are in a position to have set the policies and to judge whether they're being implemented properly. So I don't think they need all this infrastructure.

I personally doubt whether you're going to sell all that infrastructure to them, which implies among other things that there may be costs associated with it, and complexity where things become out of their control. Because right now they are in complete control themselves, why would they want to turn control over to Contract Co with the hope that Contract Co does what they want?

I think that's not something we're likely to be selling, and I'm not sure we even need to introduce that level of complexity thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Would you say, though, that since the IETF and the NRO are more on a model like this where they have direct contact with the IANA functions operator, the model that we could support would be one more like this as well with a direct link with an MoU to the IANA functions operator?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes and no. The problem is that the comparable body to the RIRs or the IETF for setting policy are integral SOs/bodies within ICANN. So we have a problematic issue of a body within ICANN signing an MoU with ICANN.

That's not unheard of. Our own RALOs have MoUs with ICANN. I'm not clear what legal power they have, but they do have such things.

So, yes, maybe we could have that, but the real issue is I think we still need something equivalent to the MRT – call it what you want – because that's a wider community than is formally represented within ICANN. And that's one of the critical things that I'm going to be talking about if and when we get to how to go forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The MRT is in that document, by the way. It's at the bottom of the document here. That would give instructions to the IANA functions operator. So the MoU would be signed directly with the IANA functions operator, but the instructions would actually go via the MRT?

ALAN GREENBERG: Something. There's a lot of variations, and I don't think we're in a position to dictate them all, but the concept I think is there has to be something equivalent to the MRT which provides guidance, and that has to have a fair amount of power behind it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Something with the current accountability, the ICANN SOs do not have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Seun, is that an old hand or a new hand? I can't hear from Seun Ojedeji. Alan, since time is ticking, over to you then. I'll stop the sharing of the page, and then we can go back and you can take us through the proposal that you have brought forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. And I asked Terri to upload the attachment. Let me tell you some of the problems we've had. As you know, I presented a very long dialogue – not dialogue, but a very long comment – on what was what I saw wrong with the CWG proposal, essentially as assembled in Frankfurt.

That was responded to by Greg. There was a lot of hand-waving and criticism of parts of it by a number of people, but Greg eventually answered it point by point, and I thank him.

I then answered his comments and he has since answered my comments. The thrust of his last comments were we do not have a proposal. We are saying we do not like what the CWG has presented, but we have not come up with a fully fleshed-out proposal, even fleshed out to the extent that theirs is to counter it, and therefore essentially we have nothing on the table.

Now, I would tend to disagree with that, but it has been said and it's been said by more than one person. I believe the way forward is to take a somewhat different [tact], and that is to not say we have a completely different proposal, but say there are aspects of the CWG proposal we support and aspects we don't. That means we do not have to specify in detail all of the parts we support. They're already there. All we have to

do is identify the parts we're unhappy with and say what we would want to see as an alternative.

That's much smaller. It's still a large task, but it's a much smaller task and I think it's doable. Moreover, I believe when we have made comments recently on the CWG mailing list, it is very easy for one or two individuals to essentially trash them for good reasons or bad reasons, but make it very difficult.

Once someone has made a couple of negative comments, the culture seems to have been evolving on the list that no one else says anything about it. It's closed. So I believe we need to come up with a viable alternative to the parts we do not like, we need to get it posted onto the public comment and get it posted early enough so other people, if they choose, can support it. That's the way I'd like to go forward.

Terri seems to be having trouble uploading the document. It's only one page. It's linked in the chat and on the agenda page. If people can pull it up one way or another, I would appreciate. I'll talk a little bit about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Terri, if you're having problems, I have the proposal here I could probably try and upload it myself.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know why we're having such problems with Adobe Connect today.

TERRI AGNEW: Apologies Alan and Olivier. Correct. It's stuck on converting for me. It got all the way uploaded and then stuck at converting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, maybe you can put it on your screen and share your screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: At the moment, I don't have control. If Terri cancels her upload . . . Here we go; I can share my screen. Let's go for it. Can you see it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tell me when to scroll.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is just an outline. I started drafting something which I think is more substantive, but I just couldn't get to the stage where I had enough to present today, so I backed out and tried to put together an overview. I think the first key is to essentially say we support a lot of aspects of the model. So we're not trashing it. We're saying we're working as part of the CWG, but we believe there are certain aspects.

The independent appeals process is something I think everyone supports. It's not something that is clear is needed a lot, but it should be there in case there are issues where someone needs to appeal, where

someone can no longer complain to the NTIA that IANA is not following policy, so there's another process in place.

The CSC, as we've said, we need someone who's, on a routine basis, going to make sure that IANA is issuing reports and they're meeting service levels. Now, that could, in theory, be done if it's within ICANN as a staff responsibility, but I think it's reasonable to say that people who are using the service should be able to readily comment on it, even if staff doesn't see a problem.

And, as we've said, because of the issue of adhering to policy which the registries may not actually support, there needs to be a multi-stakeholder component. The MRT is a marvelous concept, if one can flesh out how it is convened, who convenes it, who sets the rules.

If, for instance, it is convened by a group that doesn't believe users should have any input into the process and excludes us from the multi-stakeholder model, as for instance the GNSO does, we are not part of the GNSO formally. We cannot make motions, we cannot participate in the decision process. Then we have a problem.

So who convenes it and who sets the rules is really problematic. And right now, in the current proposal that is left completely unfed, it is implied it cannot be ICANN because of the separability issue, but it's not clear who it is instead. So we need to identify that.

And then onto Contract Co, not only do we have problems with it, but we believe it's not necessary because it's a significant cost. All for the perhaps small chance that someday we may need to move away from ICANN. The essence of our proposal is that we don't need that. What we

do need is to put in place accountability [methods] within ICANN, so that the advice of the MRT can essentially cannot be blatantly ignored.

I think if we go forward like that, we are not trashing the whole model, we're not being asked to specify all of the details which we do not have the resources to do. We don't have several staff people helping in drafting, and that's a big resource.

So I think this is something we can do moderately quickly, which might have some traction. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Can you take us through the lower parts of this [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I did, actually, and forgot to tell you to scroll.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah!

ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was wondering.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, as the document gets written over the next couple of days, the structure might change because we may find the flow is not very good. I think we want to start off at the beginning by saying we support a large part of the model, there are some problems. There are no problems with the IAP. There are problems with the CSC and MRT and a very major problem with Contract Co. And then go into more detail of what we believe the problems are and what the alternatives are.

That frees us from having to flesh out the whole model because large parts we're supporting. It's the Contract Co part, and how MRT is convened and funded that is the real problematic part.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I'll speak a bit louder because I think some people have some problems hearing me earlier on.

So, about Alan's draft paper, first of all, I think it's a good draft to work on. Essentially, we are faced with two lines or two possibilities. One is the Contract Co path and the other one is MRT. I'm over-simplifying, of course, but never mind.

So what I would suggest, Alan, is that we keep your draft and include one or two things to make it stronger. I mentioned in the chat today that I think one crucial element we have to aim for is to be part of the nominating process, because we know we've seen various examples

over the past year at least that the power of nomination is often crucial in the configuration or the complexion of any group which has any part of decision-making.

So we should not only signal that as a theoretical element, but actually demand it. I think that your paper would gain in strength if it was written in more prescriptive terms than analytical terms. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: All I can say is as a draft emerges, please comment quickly if we don't meet your target. We have to be careful not to sound self-serving and say ALAC and At-Large must be included. I think we have to [coach] it in very generic terms. But I don't disagree that the key to the success is going to be a model which adheres to what we believe today is the multi-stakeholder model and is flexible enough as that changes over the coming decades to adapt to it in ways that we may not understand complete [inaudible].

It's quite clear that seven, eight years ago, users were not a significant part of the multi-stakeholder model. They were talked about in the ICANN bylaws, but they were not actually part of it.

That may evolve with other entities that right now are not considered a significant player to become a significant player. So I think it needs to be adaptable, but it needs to be something that is decided in a collegial

way, and I don't pretend I know exactly how to do that. But that I think has to be the target.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Any other comments or concerns on this? Feedback on this proposal?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't see anybody at the moment. We are reaching the end of this call. And unfortunately, because I'm sharing my screen, I can't swap over to the chat and so on. Could we have another 15 minutes of interpretation time, please?

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. I'll double check for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Terri. What we need to think of immediately is the webinar that we have tomorrow for the ALAC and for the At-Large community. I was going to make a suggestion that the four members of the cross-community working group plus Alan – in other words, the people that traveled to Frankfurt that are closest to the issue at the moment – would be able to share the load of giving a quick presentation on the At-Large community, obviously based on what we manage to draft until the webinar tomorrow.

I was going to for myself go through the four things. I was going to go through this diagram. I think that because it is a webinar, it's better to

have diagrams to get people to understand things. So this diagram is being the proposals from the CWG. I was going to go through perhaps these two diagrams. So the one which has got a Contract Co still within the model, bearing in mind that what's in blue is completely outside of our remit and outside what we can do.

Then go through this showing how the current NRO and IETF are looking at their way of doing this. They seem to be terribly happy to have [inaudible] IANA functions operator. And then perhaps quickly saying, well, this could be one answer that we could have.

I might have to amend this. If you have any feedback on this, please get back to me immediately after this call and we can amend that to something else.

Then, passing the hand on over to colleagues. We haven't spoken about this yet. I know that Seun has put his hand up, so maybe I can ask Seun as to how he wishes to contribute on this. Certainly, we will have Alan who will take us through his proposed text. And then getting feedback from our community is going to be important, so we should have at least 20 minutes of discussion and feedback with our community. The webinar length is I believe – is it 90 minutes tomorrow? I don't even know.

While staff checks that, Alan Greenberg, you have the floor. Sorry, no. I saw Seun Ojedeji. Seun, you had your hand up.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to make a comment on the thing that [we] plan to present tomorrow. I was [inaudible] if you are presenting these diagrams and then [inaudible], I would suggest that we kind of remove the other communities from it, so it doesn't [cause] any confusion or any [inaudible] assuming what other communities are actually going to do.

So I will suggest that we just remove those. The proposal [inaudible] present our whole proposal [inaudible] only and remove the [inaudible] other community [inaudible] from the slides.

One of the things I would like to also say, perhaps we should try to achieve tomorrow is to try to see if we could present the understanding that is the current structure of how the current proposal looks like to the community, to our own community, so that they can understand what the current proposal looks like. [inaudible] understand the details of the current proposal [inaudible] provide a more useful [constitution] and so on and so forth. I believe we should start with [inaudible] hear their feedback on the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. Did you say extend the amount of time? Maybe half-an-hour, 30 minutes, for the feedback?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I don't know how to [inaudible]. I think that would be too long. If we have [inaudible] already is to make it [inaudible]. So if we can

[inaudible] one hour and maybe 30 minutes for feedback, that would be good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Seun. I note what you said. Remove the other operational communities. So remove this and remove this from this diagram. That would be a good thing.

Or perhaps what I was going to suggest then is perhaps move them over to the side and have them over onto one corner, so instead of having – of course, we'll work out the lines and so on – but that would effectively say, look, these two . . . Maybe put something in red around them. These two are outside our scope, but their current proposal is providing this.

One big concern I have at the moment is that there has been real opposition within the CWG to even look at what the IETF and the NRO are doing, and some have basically said leave the putting together of proposals to the ICG. From what I understood initially with the ICG, they were just supposed to be just cutting and pasting the reports together and bridging them a little bit. Doing some heavy-lifting work to align proposals with each other was not something that I felt was going to be done by the ICG, and I have a real concern for this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor. Then I'll give the floor back to Alan afterwards. So, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to tell you that the webinar for tomorrow is for one hour and a half. So, 90 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 90 minutes, okay. So if we do one hour presentation and 30 minutes of discussion, I think it will probably take an hour. Since it is a webinar and it is capacity building, we really need to spell out and explain what the current proposal is to the At-Large community. We have to put it at the level where some people might have not even looked at the report yet and might have not looked at the CWG proposal yet. So we need to put it at the level that people will understand. I'm well aware that you mentioned that last time, Tijani.

Okay, Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I didn't have my hand up, but I assume you're asking me to summarize. Presuming that's the case, I will be starting to draft something in any free time I have today. I'll be sending out copies or pointers. And anyone who wants to be actively involved – and I'm presuming that includes Olivier, Fatima, Seun. I'm not sure who else wants to participate, but if you do, let me know quickly and I'll make sure you see what's happening as we go along. Wish us all good luck.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Yes. Can anyone who is interested in being in the core drafting team just drop an e-mail to Alan? And then he'll be able to share it with you. Hopefully, within the next 24 hours, we've got something that we can propose to the At-Large community.

At this point in time, I would like to ask if there is any other business. I don't know whether – Seun, have you raised your hand again? My Adobe is really all over the place at the moment. [inaudible] stop sharing now. No, I don't see any hands up.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Seun. And quickly because we are reaching the end of our 15 minutes extra time. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. [inaudible] just to say that it's good to know what [inaudible] as it relates to our comments to the current proposal. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. The way forward is for Alan to develop that statement based on the discussions we've had just now, and to work with a core team of drafters and any drafters, people interested in taking part in the

drafting can drop an e-mail to Alan Greenberg and we can build that within the next 24 hours. Whatever tools is used and so on, e-mail or whatever else, will be down to Alan. So we can have something by tomorrow.

Okay, thanks very much. Seeing no other hands up at the moment, I would like to thank all of you for being on this call, and thanks to the interpreters for the extra time that we've had. Hopefully we can have a good first draft by tomorrow.

The aim, by the way, is to try and send that statement out as soon as we can so as to be able to, one, find out if there is any support from other parts of ICANN or other parts of the communities out there. Maybe other communities might be supportive of this. So far, there's been very little input in the public comment about this. I gather others are also building their statement. But there has been continued mentions in the working group, in the cross-community working group, that our proposals – well, one, are not really proposals; and two, don't carry any weight anywhere.

I would certainly be interested to find it if it does carry weight, and I would hope that it does and that people who are of the same view or organizations of the same view as we are discussing here are going to be vocal about their support for what we call the alternative method to what's currently being proposed in the CWG.

So, thanks to all of you, and this call is now adjourned. Goodbye!

TERRI AGNEW:

Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]