
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 IANA function on Tuesday the 23rd of December, 2014 at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today, on the English channel, we have Gordon Chillcott, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Seun Ojedeji, Sivasubramanian, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Roberto Gaetano, Loris Taylor, Alan Greenberg, Christopher Wilkinson, Glenn McKnight, and Le-Marie Thompson.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroneró.

We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa and Eduardo Diaz.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Terri. It's Olivier speaking. And have we missed anybody in the roll call?

Hearing no one shout their name out, I believe we have the roll call. So welcome everybody to this call. We now have the usual agenda, starting with a review of the other operation community program. There has been a bit of movement on this. And then we'll be following

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.

up on the face to face meeting of Frankfurt, by now is already a month ago. There has been a lot going on.

Obviously the 21 day public consultation that has just closed yesterday, there has been some progress on RFP3 work, which is the bulk of the work for the proposal. Certainly also some progress, a little bit of progress in RFP4, and we will be looking at that. And then RFP5 work, we'll just be having a fast update from Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

And finally, I've also left five minutes for any comments or progress report on the cross-community working group on accountability. Does anybody wish to add something to the agenda, or amend the agenda in any way?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted. And let's go to the review of our action items from our last call, on the 16th of December. There was one action item and that was for Gisella to send a Doodle for this week, and that has been done.

So we can swiftly move on to agenda item number three, and that's the work in the other operational communities with the regional Internet registries on the one hand, and the Internet Engineering taskforce on the other hand. You will notice that on the agenda is a link to the consolidated RIR IANA stewardship proposal team webpage that shows all of the different, well the details of where the CRISP is, and the composition of the CRISP team.

CRISP being Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal. And the details of the different calls, which are all open to everyone, for everyone to listen to, and give us actually got web X audio archive files

of the prior calls that took place and a listing of future calls. The next one is on the 29th of December, and then there is one on the 2nd of January, one on the 5th of January, etc. etc.

Does anyone have an update on the RIR, the work in the CRISP? I must admit, I haven't had a chance to follow the discussions in the CRISP. I wonder if anybody could enlighten us.

I don't see anyone. Seun you were typing. I'm not sure whether that was, you were following the movements on the CRISP by any chance?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, this is Seun. Thank you Olivier. I think [inaudible], I think you have said it all. The URL you posted is the one that has all of the necessary information in regards to the RIR development process. Yeah, so they list the [fourth version], and they just many things that have been suggested on the mailing list.

Things that [inaudible]... Some of them relates to the IANA dot org, the domain name dot org, and the name IANA, whether it should be transferred, because currently it is registered to ICANN. So it is being debated whether it should be transferred to, dispatched to IETF, for instance so that ICANN will not have the IP out [inaudible]. So that is one of the major things that has been discussed at the...

General discussions are in relation to the review committee that the CRISP team is proposing. Members of the community are thinking that would not be required, and that the NRO NC, which is the ASO and

ICANN, can [inaudible] requires a task of monitoring operations of the names, the numbers related for the function.

I think [inaudible] summary. [Inaudible] is on the web, on the URL that Olivier shared. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Seun. Very helpful indeed. And I've got Alan Greenberg in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I briefly reviewed the first draft proposal. It's not particularly surprising. They're looking for... They say things are working well, they're looking for as little change as possible. You know, they reserve the option to change IANA suppliers from their perspective at some time in the future if things go really bad. But they are looking at, I won't say identical [inaudible] as the ITF, but something comparable, essentially saying the ICANN should stay as the provider.

And a monitoring mechanism and a review to make sure that everything keeps working well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this additional input Alan. So we've got good feedback on the CRISP. Now with regards to the IETF, Internet Engineering Taskforce, has anyone been following the latest developments? Just as a reminder to you all, the proposal went into a final comment period, then there is a final call. And I know that there were some amendments

that were asked, but I'm not quite sure to what extent, and unfortunately have not been able to check on this.

But I see Seun Ojedeji has his hand up. So Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the record. I also say that I have not been strictly following the IETF. I want to note that the summary of... I mean, after the proposal last fall, there was a summary that was prepared by the [inaudible], and there were concerns... I mean, some of the summary related to some of the working group, the IANA working group members, felt the manner with which consensus was arrived at on the draft proposal was not acceptable to them.

And then the summary of the, of what really happened on the mailing list in terms of the discussions were not well captured. So some of the people, some of the responses that do say concerns was that the summary was not actually justify the consensus, and that the consensus was followed was in line with what IETF, what has been the tradition of IETF.

So, generally, just to give a summary of, just to give an idea of how the proposal was [inaudible] that were not [inaudible], and we don't know whether there is going to be any reconsideration in that regard. But I think IETF [inaudible]... Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much for this Seun. And I understand that there is... I think you're very well explained it. And in fact, there is a new

version that I know. You can actually see the version, it's real interesting. They have some kind of operating system in the IETF, and this is the version of the response by IETF. There we go.

There is a link here that I put in the chat that effectively sends you to the living document that is updated. The last document was version six. We now appear to be on version eight. And that must have been in response to the response that was given. And it's interesting to see the document, the [inaudible] record, the IETF write ups and the history on this operating system, or data tracker, which actually opens doors as an aside to the kind of stuff that we might be interested in At-Large to be able to track our work.

Thanks very much for this update. Let's move on. I think we've looked at how things are progressing elsewhere. We have an enormous amount of work, and enormous number of things that have taken place locally with that 21 day public consultation that was open, and that closed yesterday. As far as I understand, initially the ALAC was the only community that was singing out of tune with the cross-community working group, or appeared to be singing out of tune with the cross-community working group.

And there have been a lot more responses, especially in the last two days of the consultation, which appear to point at the fact that the interest for a contract co and the different proposals which were laid there is actually not gaining that much support, as was originally thought. Alan, I'm not sure whether you want to add anything to this.

I somehow feel that repeating what's been going on, on the call here, to such an extent, to such details, is probably futile because I know that most of us are following this very closely indeed now. Is there anything else to add Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, just a couple of things. The responses are well worth reading, number one. There is a lot of reading to do. There are a couple of completely innovative proposals, [inaudible] is one of them, that raise organizational structures and solutions that literally have not seen the light of day in this discussion before, and may well have a lot of merit. And you know, conceivably you can go with something completely new to offset what is, what has been warring factions at this point.

A couple of proposals, the registry is one of them, which I haven't read completely yet, or I've tried to but I haven't succeeded. And my first impression was different from my second impression as to what they were asking for. So, they're going to require some careful reading and careful analysis, and the people who are supposed to be summarizing them and trying to find common threads, and perhaps a common way forward, or going to have a real challenge, as is the working group in addressing some of the issues.

Very often, when one summarizes comments, when one reviews comments in a working group, look at certain ones and say, "Yes, we discussed that. We're convinced that we know the answer." And that's going to be more difficult because some of the people who, for some to

be part of the answer originally have now voiced different views in the actual comment. So it's going to be a real challenge.

I have no way to predict how this is going to go forward, but it's going to be interesting to watch. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Are there any other comments on the recent process? And of course, I note that the ALAC did send a comment in there with its proposal, and that went through our usual processes. So the vote of the ALAC was included in this. So well done to Alan for being able to shepherd this fast enough, and we put this just in time, with the support of the At-Large advisory committee.

The question is, where do we go now? I note from the chat, Evan mentioning that there is also a proposal to put the US Federal Trade Commission in charge of the IANA, [laughter] in Washington, D.C. I wonder if we could have the Russian [inaudible] in charge of that as well. That would really help, maybe. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just one more thought that I think warrants a little bit of discussion here. Clearly, from a names perspective, the gTLD registries and the ccTLD registries are the main customers, are the ones who interact with IANA. And in most cases related to the current process, not projecting how IANA's processes might change some day in the future, if ICANN puts policy work in that direction, but right now, the registries are the main interaction.

And the registries are the ones who would likely suffer if IANA doesn't fulfill its contract. Registries, and of course, all the users of the registries, the several billion users around the world. Their proposals put registries very much in a front seat in any future discussions, to some extent at the downplaying of multistakeholders in general. And I think, as things go forward, there is a moderate chance that since the registries are the largest, are the customers, and certainly have the largest to gain or lose from a good IANA, or a bad IANA, their positions are going to have a fair amount of import, I would think.

And we are going to have to look carefully at that, and not say, "Oh no, we can't have registries having a dominant position, or a different position, because it must be equal multistakeholder." But we're going to have to inject more of a multistakeholder view to this while still recognizing that the registries play a very large part in the interactions with IANA.

I think it's going to be a real challenge, and I think we're going to have to look at that carefully, and not do knee-jerk reactions of saying it's not equal, we're not playing. Because I suspect, we're going to have to balance the two views which right now are very, very different. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, thank you. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I suspect you are speaking of the makeup of the MRT. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I'm not. Because both the registry and the... The ccTLD and the gTLD registries are suggesting something other than the contract co and MRT. To a large extent, they're saying the registries should be the ones to boot IANA out, or to do all of the complaining. They meld that a little bit with some multistakeholder involvement if and when a new supplier has to be found, but they're saying to a large extent, operationally, registries are the players in the game.

Our belief is that it should be much more balanced, and you know, assuming their proposals get a fair amount of support, we're going to have to look at melding them, but I don't think we're going to change them radically, if indeed their proposals get support. So there is a whole bunch of ifs in that statement. But neither of them are talking about the MRT or contract co as such.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Or the CSE, because... It's Olivier speaking. The CSE is really the thing that, you know, day to day matters, running matters and so on, that would have the majority of registries, and then the MRT is the multistakeholder component that oversees the whole operation. I just don't see a purely registry influence [inaudible] slide forward, due to the wording of the NTIA's own request, which [CROSSTALK] ...to the multistakeholder community.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I may comment. The NTIA has asked multistakeholder to come up with a solution. It doesn't say the multistakeholders must have the dominant control position in what comes out of them. So that's a

difference there. To a large extent, although I don't believe any of the ccTLD or gTLD proposals use the term CSE, they have, to a large extent, given that none of them are supporting contract co as such, I believe.

The gTLD registry, and I do have to read, they are essentially inflating the responsibility of what we are calling the CSE, not necessarily under that name, and invoking the MRT, either never or at a very different time, only if there is a need to transfer to a different operator. So the models have changed, and clearly since they were written by registries, the registries are asking that they be in control. Not very surprising.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Christopher Wilkinson is next. Christopher, you have the floor.

And you might be muted Christopher.

Terri, is Christopher on the phone or is he on the Adobe Connect?

TERRI AGNEW: He is only on the Adobe Connect at this time. I see he's chatting right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not muted, but it doesn't seem to work at the moment. So I don't know, let's go for Seun Ojedeji. In the meantime Christopher, keep on trying, find out the problem with your microphone or something. There appears to be some kind of problem there. Otherwise, if you can't

resolve this, then we'll try to work out a deal out for you. Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the transcript record. I realize that we are on agenda 4A, and I think we should maximize the time to discuss with the ALAC proposal itself. What we have right now, I think we are clear on what ALAC [inaudible] considers four principles. Perhaps we should discuss that if we are not in agreement with any of them, we then need to refine those principles, because that is what it is actually, the timing of our proposal is going to look like.

So I'm going to request that perhaps we discuss, move forward with our own proposal so that we know which direction we are facing. The way I see it, I see it through [inaudible], both of which are internal in terms of operation. The first one which has to do with SO/AC sessions, and the other one which is actually is relying more on MOC, [inaudible] contractual, and try to convert the contractual rules into...

Are trying to reflect the contractual rules to the bylaws. So I think we should try to discuss that, and let's [inaudible] kind of understanding if it is certain working group, and if it not, if it is, what is the route that we should take? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you for this Seun. I think it's a good way forward, but we've got on the agenda, these are very flexible times. We've got 30 minutes for this 21 day public consultation discussion, which should indeed be

discussing what our own next steps are, this is what we're in right now. Afterwards, there were a couple of questions which I wanted to submit to the group, the structural arrangements of the MRT and the seat allocation of MRT. We didn't manage to get any discussion on this last call, because none of us really have much of a point of view on it.

I wonder if we do have, on this occasion now. And then also, after that, we have to work together to build that proposed timeline that I have shared on the mailing list, and Eduardo has very kindly built, because we, today there was a call about RPF4 for, asked to be able to submit a timeline for our proposal. And we've got links to the various timelines. The one which is based on the CWG proposal, and also the two versions of the timeline for the ALAC proposal.

Then finally, I was going to ask Cheryl for a quick update on the RFP5 activities. If we're, I believe we're okay with it, no one put their hand up earlier, then let's go back to 4A and discuss our strategy now, and the future movements that we're going to have. I see that Christopher is on, is now on dial out. So before we start with this, let's go with Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good evening everybody. Thank you very much for your patience Olivier, thank you Terri. Just to follow up on what Alan was saying about the registry document, which I got just a few minutes before the call. So I haven't read it thoroughly either. Of course, the registries are the principle customers of IANA.

What concerns me from a global perspective is, on the one hand, that the push is coming from the gTLD registries. And we have to bear in mind, in fact, I think we should treat this as a priority from a global perspective, that the ccTLD registries have an equal interest in the positions as customers of IANA.

If you look at their documents of the list of signatures, it's very instructive. We now seem to have [inaudible] machines and doughnuts, among others, as declaring themselves as registries in this context, which of course is not the case. What we've got here is registrars acting as quasi registries, but also in some cases, quite large numbers of new gTLDs. And as I said in the comments on the list, I think it's most important to ensure that throughout this process, within the registry community, there is balance between the gTLDs and the ccTLDs on the one hand, and that there is no risk of block voting by registrars on behalf of portfolios of registries.

That would be my main point at this stage. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Christopher. Very interesting points you made here. Let's go to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to Christopher's comment, I'm not quite sure what he's referring to, but doughnuts and minds of machines are registries at this point. They do have signed contracts as registries. So what other roles they may be playing, I won't comment on. I don't

think either of them are registrars in their right at this point, but regardless, if they are registries.

The thing I raised my hand on is that to point out, number one, there are at least two ccTLDs that have put in counter-proposals, both of them without contract co. So it's not just gTLD registries that are looking at that. With regard to Seun's comment, I strongly support that we either ratify or disagree with the statement in the preamble to our public comment submission on the four principles.

I would suggest that refining our detailed proposals at this point, is not something worth putting effort into. To be quite candid, if a non-contract co proposal goes forward, the ones submitted by registries, the ccTLD or gTLD, probably have more import. We put a lot in our proposal that made it more, might have made it more acceptable to the CWG contract co people, but not necessarily because we believe they were the optimal way to do things.

And I think until, just settle a little bit on the public comment, and we see how those are received, we're finding our proposal at this point, not necessarily the best way to put our effort. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Olivier speaking. I see Christopher has his hand up, or was that an old hand?

Could have been a previous hand. Christopher Wilkinson?

Okay, I'll assume it's a previous hand. Yeah, he put his hand down. Thank you. So, Alan, let's see, which way are we moving forward with

this then? Because we've got the... So we have our statement. And there are, I would say, really two avenues which we have been contemplating. And Seun very clearly said it actually, we've got the one which has got the IANA, the INSO and the INRO, the IANA name supporting organization and the IANA resource supporting organization proposal, which you saw the different diagrams for.

And at the same time, we also have another stream which reduces the emphasis on the INRO and IANA, but actually puts more emphasis on having bylaw changes and accountability that would allow ICANN to be able to perform the function of the IANA operators, but also oversee it. Are you saying that we should currently keep our mind open and keep those two proposals on the table with some measure of, let's see.

Well, some lack of focus specifically in order to be able to enter into discussions with other proposals at the moment? What's the next step forward for this process, do you think?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I think the main thrust of all of our efforts, and going back to the very first posts, have been we think contract co is an old [inaudible] way to go. We believe ICANN should be awarded the contract, as it has evolved with some sort of an escape hatch. And that we put enough accountability in to make sure that the community can override the Board if we believe the Board is doing something dumb with regard to IANA.

And I think that's the core of what we want. There is probably an infinite number of ways that this could be implemented that would be

acceptable to us. Some more so, some less so, perhaps. And some ways that would be totally unacceptable if the multistakeholder community were completely excluded from the process. And in fact, that is the starting point on at least one of the ccTLD proposals, but it's clearly a starting point. We don't expect them to show their hand completely on the first round.

But I think, as Carlton said in the chat, we need to set what our endpoint is, and I think that endpoint is pretty simple. The details need to be fleshed out. And, you know, if the CWG ends up ignoring all of that and recommending the contract co, then I think we're going to have a real question on our hands, as Cheryl has pointed out, of do we issue a dissenting report, and say that they do not have consensus because one of the chartering organizations completely disagrees.

But we don't know it's going to come out that way at this point, and I don't think the details, many of the details of our proposal are something we want to go to the wall to send. But the principles, I believe, are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking. Do you think we shouldn't spend any more time refining our proposal, or adding to our proposal, as it is today?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what I'm saying. The introduction to the proposal has four principles, I'll paste them to the chat if it works. I don't know if they will come out very well or not right now.

And I believe if we agree on those, I think that's the way forward to make sure that those are the issues that we want to see coming out in proposal. The details can be debated later. And, you know, if any details are, look like they're gaining consensus that we strongly disagree with, we all have to say it.

But I suspect our proposal will not be the one of which the others coalesce. I think we're going to have to make sure we get some of our ideas we like into the other proposals, if those end up being pushed by the CWG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Next is Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Thank you Olivier. Thank you Alan. This is Seun for the record. So, if I get Alan's comments correctly, it is saying that, it's simply saying that we should stop here, and then wait for the discussions within the CWG. If that is what Alan is saying, maybe we go [inaudible] that out, however, I would like us to note that one of the things that perhaps made some people in the first [inaudible] feel that the contract co was the route, was because we [inaudible] details in our proposal.

And if we, it would be good, for instance, the RFP4 meeting we were in today, we were specifically asked for a timeline. That means that we recognize, indirectly, I'm not saying that we must push our proposal, [inaudible] was there, proposal that finally makes it. But what I'm saying is that we should be ready. We need to be ready whenever there

is a need for us to push in something. And [inaudible] force to be ready, we need to have a clear idea of the routes that we think is [inaudible].

We can have options, but let's have an idea of the routes that maybe preferred, and then let's, we'll need to flesh out the entire details, but [inaudible] idea. The four principles are fine, we should agree on that, but let's have a proposal idea that actually meets the requirements of these principles. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Sean. Alan Greenberg, you're next. And I note in the chat that there has been a request, or several requests to repeat those principles, and I can read them here. The IANA responsibility awarded to ICANN, new Board accountability to ensure that multistakeholder community can [inaudible] action if dissatisfied with IANA performance. And independent appeal process to address perceived errors, and a doomsday capability to reassign responsibility [inaudible]. These are the principles.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps someone on staff can post those, because they show up as four different lines in one of the other [inaudible].

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Olivier, the reason I put up my hand is because I have no problem if we go ahead. I'll note that the request vis a vis RFP4 was made before all of those other proposals were made. And I think this is a different world. I'll be candid. I need a break for a few days, so I'm not going to work on a timeline right now, but if others want to, I'm happy to have that done.

But I think the overall terrain is different than it was three days ago when it was suggested that we actively participate in RFP4 and come up with timelines and things like that. But I'm not unhappy if someone wants to take that on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Alan. So yes, just the update on RFP4. Effectively it met today a few hours ago. And one of the things that it's taking is some work that was initially going to be allocated to RFP3, because RFP3 is just overloaded with so many points that it needs to be looking at. So RFP4 is going to be dig into the details of some of the proposal, or some of the details of the proposal.

And it's really a testimony to the chair of RFP4 to say, "Well look, we should also be considering, in all fairness, we should also be considering the ALAC proposal as it was already mentioned in Frankfurt to start with."

And so, there is, we do have some ability to flesh out some of the details of our proposal there. Specifically, we are looking at the timelines at the moment, and as you will note, there are timelines further down in our RFP4, in our agenda. But I think that we do need to

flesh some of the points out. I also do have a concern though that if we spend so much time on this, and then things change radically, we would have wasted a large amount of time to flesh things out that are going to come into something completely different.

So we are in this situation at the moment where the comments have just come in, and there is going to be a real pressure for the cross-community working group to make some serious amendments to its proposal, and yet, I personally do not know how much of a push back there is going to be from within the CWG to change the proposal significantly, and then what type of discussions will then take place following up.

And so it would certainly help if we had some clarity over what our proposal is. We've got those four main points, which are on the screen now. Is there anything else that you think we should flesh out, and that we should bring more detail to? And Seun, as you are the first person who asked for this, what details do you think we need to add to that? Bearing in mind, we've already got the timetable that is currently being built. We've got... We're going to be discussing the composition of a MRT, and there will be a team of some sort that will be built out, I think, in all of the proposals, except the registry proposal, but in most of the other proposals, there are teams or committees that will be setup, would be worth gaining some idea of what we would be satisfied or what we would be okay with.

So what else? What else do you think needs to be added? Do we need to work on and be more precise about? Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the record. So we're looking at these four principles. I think the main thing which perhaps we need to have a readymade answer for is the doomsday. It's the doomsday capability. It's... [Inaudible] the other aspects, the other three aspects, I think it's something we can [inaudible] defend, even if we realize that we have to come up with the proposal tomorrow.

I think while, you know, we're going to make sure we will be able to convince in a way that gets people to understand that either it's not going to happen or something, because people want to see the replacements because the contract co is the main component of contention. People need to, people want to see, be sure, a replacement in, for that contract co, for the role of that contract co, and we have proposed the bylaw as an option. So I would like us to think of possibility of whether the bylaws can actually do this, because I've read some comments saying that irrespective of what is in the bylaws, I consider [inaudible]...

Some of the [inaudible] they were saying that a bylaw can protect, bylaw protection can also [inaudible]... All these things are points that the ALAC goes [inaudible]. So if we can bring out those points, that supports these principles, we need to it a test scenario. Not something that is elaborate. [Inaudible] to three outreach group, function legally, and others to function practically within the ICANN ecosystem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Seun. And perhaps hopefully with an answer, doomsday capability, Alan, how?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Alan speaking. First of all, in retrospect, I should have not used the expression doomsday. One doesn't necessarily take this action when things are disastrous but when you believe things need to be fixed, and ICANN is not capable of fixing them. That might not be quite a doomsday, but a number of other people have already said we need to act before doomsday.

So, that sounded right at three in the morning when I wrote it, but it probably wasn't right. In any case, Seun is right. We need to have clarity as to whether it is possible within the current ICANN structure that is not for profit, non-membership organization, can the Board take, commit to honoring specific actions. We know it signs binding arbitration clauses in contracts.

I am assuming that binding really is binding, and there isn't a lot of wiggle room to say now, "We don't really like it so we won't do it." I think that would draw a court case. And one that they would likely lose. John Levine, in a post to the IANA issues mailing list, our mailing list, I believe, cited a number of specific California corporate rules that come closer to answering the question we've been asking for years and years, and no one else has ever done that research. I thank John for that.

He indicates that yes it is possible to setup binding rules. It may require that we identify specific people that the Board, and invites specific people, as opposed to groups. We need to understand that a little bit

more and see how much flexibility there is in that thing. It looks like there is something close to the capability that we've been talking about.

Whether it's close enough or not, I'm not going to pretend that I'm a corporate law expert, and certainly not a California corporate law expert, and I have no idea of the jurisprudence around those kind of clauses. But it looks like there may well be something within current California statutes, which allow us to do the kind of thing we're talking about.

It's almost surely possible to do it based on contracts, or things like that, and external arbitration bodies. So I think we're pretty close to what we need, whether we're close enough, I'm certainly not a legal expert who can tell you that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. So where do we go from here? How can we have some text that we can, you know, send out at a moment's notice once we will be in front of this question? And I note in the chat also, that Carlton Samuels is suggesting that this working group here also prepares some documentation for our colleagues on the accountability working group because they're the ones who are going to have to carry this forward within the accountability process. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, well some of us, some of them is us, to start with. Cheryl and I are both formal members, and there is a whole bunch of other people on this group who are participants with equal speaking rights. So at this

point, we're not sure of people who can carry that message forward, should it need to be carried forward. The CWG has voluntarily said we will find a legal expert to answer some of these questions, and indeed, some of the questions we're posing here have been asked of the CWG.

The accountability CCWG is obliged to find legal expertise to advise us on this, and that's been reiterated several times in every meeting we've held. Unfortunately there are still lacking a legal expert, but if we need to go out and buy that legal help, then we need to do that. And I'm certainly going to say that, out of frustration, if we don't have some closure by the next CCWG meeting.

So both of the working groups understand that this continually talking about the vagaries of California law and not understanding what it really means, is a totally unproductive way of going forward. We have to fix that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. I wonder, I know Carlton has been writing on the chat a few times, quite a few times actually. I wonder if he is able to speak and share with us his point of view as to the way forward on this. Carlton Samuels, are you able to speak?

He might just be on Adobe, sorry, yeah on the Adobe, so no can't speak unfortunately. Okay, no problem. Right, so what I would suggest then for the way forward here is to look really specifically at what is inaptly called the doomsday capability and to perhaps have a short paragraph on this. And this is something which we will need to be able to have

ready for this process, but also I would say that we can send to our accountability working group colleagues.

And we've just mentioned that, you've just reminded us that we've got at least two that are direct members of this working group, so that would be good. Action item for the group, for the working group to, so working group members to send the details to the mailing list about the doomsday capability. And maybe we shouldn't call it doomsday capability. What's another word?

The severability of ICANN, I can't remember, severability of ICANN, yeah. Someone help me out on this. Alan? You...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. To assure severability in [CROSSTALK]... I'll come up some words. This is, this day has been far too long and I'm not thinking as clearly as I should. But it shouldn't be hard to come up with the words.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, okay, fine. But I mean, the details of the severability of ICANN sent to the mailing list. I think we all know what we're speaking about. It's the case of being able to take the IANA function out of ICANN's hands basically, and based on our proposal that runs primarily on the bylaw system, Armageddon would probably not work. Doomsday is equally as bad.

[Inaudible] different mechanisms of ICANN to the mailing list. That doesn't make any sense. Action item, working group members to send the details of severability...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. We will see in the chat that that is what Alan suggested, the different mechanisms.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I hit enter too soon and my messages were separated. What I said is, our doomsday proposal is a requirement that ICANN divests itself of IANA. The other non-contract co proposals use different words and somewhat different mechanisms to effect the same end.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So working group members to send details for ICANN to divest itself of IANA, would be easiest. And these are like, if you can think of a way, then please do so, and of course, we're going to need some legal advice at some point, if that's possible, but if we can share this on the mailing list, it might well be that we have lawyers on the mailing list that would be able to share their knowledge on this.

Seun Ojedeji you have the floor, then we'll move on.

And unfortunately we can't hear you Seun. You might be muted.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me now?

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

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Great. This is Seun. Thank you Olivier. I just want to, I just mention this [inaudible], perhaps one of the [inaudible], one of the doomsday have a recovery feature. If there is a capability to actually, if IANA, if the Board makes IANA to [inaudible]... if there is a capability that actually [inaudible] the Board and brings in a new set of people, is that, that is, isn't that a doomsday recovery capability? I just want to have that question because, yeah.

So I also want to ask if that is possible because actually that would mean that we are indirectly [inaudible] organization indirectly because [inaudible]... perhaps a new, a fix in the bylaw that to ensure the new people are also accountable, and effective, and efficient. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Seun. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, removing the entire Board was suggested a number of years ago, regularly by some people. It was said a number of years ago by a group called the President Advisory, not President. President Strategy Committee, if I remember correctly, and that in fact had the title, "The Nuclear Option," removing the whole Board. That's really problematic because who do you replace the Board with in the interim until you formally select the new Board? The organization has to keep running, therefore you need an interim Board.

How do you make sure they aren't captured by somebody? There is a whole bunch of complications. I'll note the outer proposal does include that option, however, of removing the entire Board, should that prove necessary. So it certainly is a mechanism by which you can change things. It's a pretty slow one to get it actually back in place, and have some risks in its own right of making sure that the organization is not captured in the interim time.

You almost need caretakers who are, you know, trusted and can't do anything naughty. You know, it's certainly done when organizations go bankrupt, but it has its own set of problems.

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun for the record. Yeah, Alan, so I definitely agree with that view. And I'm also thinking, if we need to move ICANN today, there is really no organization that is willing to accept it, right? [Inaudible]... I mean, sorry, IANA I mean, by the way, there is no organization that is ready and willing to accept it.

It may also seem like a similar situation to wiping out the Board, that would be the experience [inaudible], unless we are going to assign it to [inaudible] who is experienced, for instance the IETF, for instance, or a registry that is experienced during all of this.

So what I'm trying to say is that it seems like it's going to be a similar [inaudible] in the process of assigning it to an IANA organization. But I definitely understand what it's saying, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...by the way, it's easier to find organizations that would be willing to take on IANA. I'm not sure it's easy to find ones that we would trust to take on IANA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alan. Now, I've worked with staff to change the action item. It's Olivier speaking. Change the action item into working group members to send details of how ICANN could be forced to divest itself of the IANA functions if needed. And that's open enough action item, effectively if you could just email how you see the doomsday capability taking place.

How could it work? Let's see if these scenarios actually would fly. Seun, are there any other points that you thought needed to be fleshed out further, apart from this?

Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Seun for the record. I think the bone of contention is the doomsday, however, I think the other parts of [inaudible], it's actually the other communities. Whether indeed we are considering how this proposal, three proposals from these communities

is going to fit in together. I'm looking at a more, I mean same whether there could be an option to actually have the oversight on the entire function itself.

I'm not on the different communities because actually what we have right now was on the entire function, if you have, if you want to really say what [inaudible]... It was on the entire function. So perhaps we could also add to the fact of our mind, how, what are other options [inaudible]... the possibility of having the oversight on the entire function.

Once the entire function is there, the function will be able to be named, which happens to be the unfortunate and the unfunded. One of the three communities may now ask [inaudible] to rest and rely on organizations external that can form and support whenever there is a need to fight, or that we shared with the ICANN on its very nature. I see there, disagreement with the community. Those are thoughts that I think we may consider. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's Alan speaking. One of the SSAC principles that they proposed is severability, and that is specifically if any of the three communities could decide to go their own way and split the IANA function, and that's something that they consider mandatory. And

currently, although staff allocations may make that slightly difficult, currently that is a possibility.

And certainly I don't think if the IETF for instance, felt that their part of the work was being handled poorly and wanted to switch, I don't think they would believe that they should stay where they are, just because the names community is happy, or vice versa. So the severability is where that comes in, and I don't think we're going to convince the other organizations, or they us, that we all have to act in unison. Thank you.

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Olivier, thank you. Thank you Alan. I get your point. What I was trying to say is the scenario, something similar to saying, okay, ICANN signing the document saying they agree to abide by the requirements proposed by the three different communities. I'm just talking about a way of enforcing this from outside. So the policies from the proposals for the names, for instance, proposals from the agreement from the IETF and the agreement from the [inaudible], all of those will be signed by ICANN.

However, there would then be an umbrella agreement, just ICANN signs, to say that they would agree to abide the processes defined by the respective communities. That I think does not mean that they will not, each community would not be able to [inaudible] required. However, I think if we give the possibility to have an external

organization, which is already established, I'm thinking of, for instance, who is independent from, who is independent from something from ICANN.

Because that's one of the problem of contractual. Contractual relies on, or represents on, the contract, on ICANN, which is very, very wrong. So that is one of the things that I'm thinking. Of course, it may not be. So if, I think ICANN, ICANN has been signing with MOUs with SOs and ACs within its structure before. So we just need to perhaps to threaten the MOU that will get signed.

So if IETF signs MOU with ICANN, [inaudible] also MOUs with ICANN, just as somebody, some group, or whatever [inaudible] would come up with, maybe the IETF or the [inaudible] of each SOs and ACs to also find the MOU for names. I would then get, ask the umbrella agreement that backs up all these other three. Now what that will do is that it will make it, because [inaudible] a backup plan to move IANA in the future.

And then we can concentrate on improving ICANN accountability. That is just my thoughts. Yeah, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for sharing this Seun. We are running out of time on this specific topic, so we'll have to move on to the next topic, but if I could please ask you to submit a summary of what you just told us, in writing, on the mailing list, that would be helpful. I do have one concern as immediate feedback for you, which is the moment this cross-community working group speaks about the members and the IP addresses, anyone saying, speaking about this is immediately told it has nothing to do with

the mandate of this cross-community working group, and this is probably discussions that would have to take place at the ICG level.

But I do realize you do have an idea of this whole umbrella thing. And if you could put this on the mailing list, maybe then we can work together into seeing at what level we can address this. I fear that if we bring this forward in the current cross-community working group on naming issues, we're just going to be told to go away.

But there is one question though in that, we will have that proposal sent at the end of January, then it goes to the ICG, then there is going to be some feedback, and certainly there is going to be some heavy discussions in the ICG to get these three proposals to work together. If there are some vast differences between them, it may well be that these proposals get sent back to the communities that have built them and will be asked to amend them, so as for them to fit better with the other proposals.

There is also another hurdle that I have been told by Larry Strickland at the NTIA was that if the NTIA doesn't believe that the three proposals coming through are holding together or go in line with the kind of ideal, and the kind of views that they had expressed as to how they wanted those proposals to be built, they will not be shy of sending them back to the communities that have built them. So we have a significant amount of work in front of us.

I would like to move on to the next part of our agenda, and I realize we've only got 15 minutes for about 25 minutes of work here. It might go very quickly. First, for the RFP3 work, the seat allocation of MRT

should we, and I've heard Alan's thoughts earlier saying, well the registries are pushing for an all registry solution, or all contracted party solution. What should we be pushing for on our side? Should we be pushing for a MRT that would be having the same sort of seating arrangement as the ICG?

Or same sort of seating arrangement as the CWG? Let's have a look. Alan Greenberg, you're first.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. It's Alan speaking. I think we need to be really careful about not using titles like MRT in conjunction with another proposal that doesn't use that term, because they have reallocated the functions slightly differently, and we only confuse the issue by using one term in place of someone else's proposal.

I was going to start a discussion on the mailing list after this meeting, but I'll introduce it here. I think we need to have a substantive discussion on what we believe our responsibilities are. Our being At-Large, but also looking at the non, you said contracted parties, careful. That's a different issue. That's registrars and registries. Here we're looking at registries, gTLD registries and ccTLD registries, some of which are not even part of the ccNSO.

So we're very much looking at registries of all kinds there. And so I think we need to look at what's both At-Large's part in this game, and what are the other non-registries groups of ICANN, so the other parts of the GNSO and the GAC, what is their part in relation to this? The registries

make a strong argument that they are obviously acting in a self-serving way, but on behalf of their own customers.

The only thing IANA does for them is it updates the information on who the contact is, for instance. Who is the prime contact for a certain registry? Well, if that changes, we would want that database to be updated quickly, just like the registry does. And it says if the registry physically moves, the root zone needs to point to where the registry is. It's hard to argue with a lot of those types of things.

So, the question is, where do we have a view that might be different from registries in making decisions as we go forward? And I think it's, I think we really need to come up with some stuff, some answers for that, because in the absence of us being able to identify what those differences are, the registries have a pretty compelling argument.

So, on the assumption that we can identify some differences, I think we need to put those in writing and be prepared to discuss them and defend them, and I say us, certainly in At-Large, but it's probably a wider picture than At-Large, and I think that's where a substantive matter of our future workings to be over the next couple of weeks because that's the issue were going to be fighting in the MRT, if the CWG proposal goes forward. That's the same issue we're talking about in the CSC, and it will be using other buzzwords in any of the other proposals.

So I think that's one of the things we need to focus. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. I'm sorry, reiterating the question, what's our preferred seat allocation for MRC? Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun. Thank you Olivier. I think one of the things that I think is important, perhaps should have been to actually understand the goal, the responsibility of MRT. Is it community dependent? [Inaudible] positions, these are the things that we actually [inaudible], whether it's more power subject, or whether it's more community difference. Because I think MRT should be community driven, and if it is community driven, then it would mean that then there would be equal footing within the membership of MRT.

So for me, I would say, it should not be too crowded. The membership should be as few as possible, in the interests of sharing continuity, I would say choose two, it would be an ideal number, going to five would ready... ALAC would most likely need to ask for five, which is a region, and which will actually go this beyond proportion.

The other question we also need to answer is, who are the members? What part of the At-Large community is actually going to be on this [inaudible]? Sense proposals that, we should also bring in people from outside. On what basis are we doing that? These are the things that I think we need to clarify. For me, I think a number of, or anybody representing the [inaudible] of. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. It's Olivier speaking. And I must say, you're asking more questions to a question that I have asked. And that's not particularly helpful. We've got more and more questions now. We need to focus. The question is, what is the MRT composition that we want? We've got, at the moment, one, we've got 10 straw men at the moment on the table, which is linked to the agenda. Ten straw men, we've got one from Milton Mueller, one from the registries, one derived from the GAC, one derived from the CSG.

We've got, including one which was apparently derived from one of my messages, which I don't see, well, I think it might have been misattributed, because I certainly don't remember making this suggestion, but we can change that obviously. And I don't see an ALAC one in there, and we need to have one ALAC one in there, because at the moment, we're just not there. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Okay, so part of my [inaudible] questions, answer questions. Anyway...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...questions Seun. This is Olivier. No more questions. But we're all asking ourselves these questions. What we need is answers.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. All right. Particularly a direct take on this, this is my comment, I think I'll go from there. I think we should have a look at some of them, it's not good to have one representation. That's why [inaudible] it's

going to be [inaudible] for me. I think we should propose on the ones that [inaudible], and then look at whether there are some SOs that would not be necessary, which we would need to filter out, or some we need to [inaudible].

For instance, we need to look at NCSG for instance [inaudible]. I don't know, anyway. If you look at NCSG, we will look at GNSO, RSG. I think we have given too much [inaudible] all together maybe too much number, which we have given to the names, full names, PDP side. But again, I think we may have the, I think it may be fine, but anyhow, in any case. I suggest that I will focus, I will look at [inaudible] to maintain, because it looks small enough to fly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Seun. It's Olivier speaking. And I would say a second action item, and that's for working group members to look at the Google spreadsheet of seat allocation of MRT, and indicate their preference of seating allocation.

Let's go into RC, and that's one where we have a quick timeline to have a look at. I think we're reaching the end of our call in 10 minutes, so we can spend five minutes on this, five, six minutes on that. But if we can please have the RFP4 draft timeline. So there are two timelines in there. There was a timeline that was provided by the CWG, and it probably is faster, I guess, if I was to...

I don't know if you can see that. Yeah, maybe I'll share my screen. Let me just share my screen. That will be faster. So the initial timeline which was... Can you all see this?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Not yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not yet. Okay, how does that work? Here we go.

Can you see this now?

TERRI AGNEW: Not at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It would be downloading at the moment.

TERRI AGNEW: And it's on screen now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Terri. So there were two timelines which are only just one which works with the January to September timeline, and the other one which works for month one to month nine. These are the timelines of the cross-community working group at the moment. And so the ALAC has been asked to provide another timeline in, for this basically.

And so the other timeline which was done by Eduardo, and thank you very much Eduardo for this, is this one, where essentially the big

difference is here. The forming of the IANA supporting organization, the forming of the IANA independent supporting organization. One and two. If you look at the other timeline, it's a forming of a contract company, and forming of the multistakeholder review team, and the customer standing committee, and the independent review panel.

So that really is between month one and month three, where there is a difference in timeline. Of course here, later on, you'll notice that there is also the signing of contracts, and conduct transition. That, of course, if we don't have a contract company in our system, does not sign the contract, it just says move IANA management to ICANN at that point. So, that's the current detail. And I open the floor for feedback on that.

And of course, I do understand that we have a proposal that would not be forming in IANA supporting organization, or IANA independent supporting organization. So it cannot, it complicates matters a little bit. The floor is open.

And I see Seun has put his hand up. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you Olivier. This is Seun for the transcript record. So, yes, we have [inaudible] to the timeline now. I think the only thing that [inaudible] which we are kind of [inaudible]... which is the [inaudible] contract. That's what we are [inaudible] for, [inaudible] not really [inaudible].

I think we have [inaudible] if we need to [inaudible] do a timeline, we consider a timeline, and then we just [inaudible]... unless we are willing

to replace the contract, particularly [inaudible]... in the timeline. I think [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Suen, you're breaking up. I don't know whether... I'm sorry I can't understand the last words you just said. You're breaking up at the moment.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'm not sure I understood that too well. Let me stop sharing and see the main screen, because I can't see anybody else on the screen. Seun, your audio has gone a little bit down. If you can't just share this with us by email that would be helpful. Any other comments on the timeline at the moment?

There is no feedback on the timeline. Alan Greenberg, what did you think on the timeline? Or is there not much that can be added to this? I mean one of things that could be done would be to remove the first two, or put them in another color, to say that these could be, or could not be, in the proposal. And just have a timeline as such, as it is here, which shows a minimum amount of changes. If you look here between...

So there is no need to form contract co. All of the others remain there, and then the draft, of course, draft of bylaw and of AOC, of course, then

we would be looking at reformulating the ICANN bylaws between one two and one three, the public comment would start a little bit later rather than starting in the middle of month three. Implement IANA automation would remain the same.

Complete documentation and organization setup, there would be less of that of course. You just have review comments and adjust as necessary. And then we'd look at implement CCWG accountability as being the really strong thread that needs to be implemented when we proceed forward.

I don't see anyone put their hand up at the moment, so I think we'll have to leave this as it is for the time being, because I don't see much inspiration at this time. Oh, there are...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, no, no. I'm not with anything substantive. I have a hard time seeing it in the window. And I think if you want answers that are thought out, send out a copy of an email and ask for comment. You won't get many, but you may get some that have more substance than what you're going to get from me right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Alan. There are all linked to the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then just point to it in email. Sorry, I'm losing thoughts, I admit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know, and I think that everyone is losing focus. It has been 90 minutes since we've started, so it's a bit hard. So the agenda is right here. Let's continue this discussion in our next call, and let's continue it in the, on the mailing lists.

Finally, an update from Cheryl on RFP5 work. Is there much to update us on Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the transcript record. Not really, no. What we said last week, because we met just before the last call, but we haven't had a call between the last one. And I know that there was some concern, that I understand, that the aggregation of materials from, for example, surveys that have been done in terms of satisfaction and feedback on the [inaudible] criteria of service, from, for example, the ccTLD community.

This has been done in one of the action items from our last meeting was to start aggregating some of these baseline materials for us to look at in terms of [inaudible] and referencing on the wiki page, and through the

night, when I refresh that wiki page, I notice it hasn't been updated, but I do hope that I'm seeing that stuff, like the rest of us [inaudible] for anything. And hopefully get done before our meeting on the 30th [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Cheryl. It's good to see, a bit of a concern to see that there is not very much going on yet. [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...not too much going on, [inaudible] four, five's work is contingent on tread four. And five is just a mechanism of [inaudible]... to the visibility of the process [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. I mean, the concern I have is that five has to wait now, and the work in three and four is far from having reached a stage where things can continue. I just wonder as far as timing is concerned, how things will play in January. It will be interesting to see.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The same compression [inaudible]... which is why we're starting to do our drafting as such. That's all [inaudible] come to root.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Now, last part of our agenda, are there any comments on the accountability process? Cross-community working group on accountability?

I see Seun Ojedeji. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, thank you Olivier. On the cross-community on the accountability, I just have a question. We have [inaudible] from ALAC, I think five, right? Is it five? If it's not five, please correct me. What is their point... Are they supposed to be part of this current IANA [inaudible] working groups? Are they supposed to be part of this? I think the groups will have to [inaudible] and then we can [inaudible] with them, just like we have [inaudible] on the CWG, [inaudible] actually here right now. So I think [inaudible] to join, you cannot already in this group, to give us updates.

The other, that was the question. The other comment I have is in relation to, how do we actually ensure that some of the timelines of, right now the CWG timelines seem to be getting offbeat, off the initial timeline of [inaudible]... accountability of the timeline of the CWG. So how do we discuss and negotiate and [inaudible] the IANA [inaudible]... before this timeline [inaudible]...

So perhaps we can think of possibility of helping out [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Since I sit on both groups, one way or another, perhaps I'm being biased at this point, but what the CWG is asking the CCWG is equivalent to asking the CWG to, you know, yes, we know you haven't done any of your work, but tell us what the final answer is before the Frankfurt meeting starts, or perhaps well before, a month before that. There is no way the CCWG could come up with some pronouncement at this point. It's unfortunate, but the world is going to have to adapt to that slower timeline, and I think the CWG and the ICG are going to have to change to adapt to that somewhat.

The US government timeline has been slowed considerably, and I think there needs to be a revision of the CWG and ICG timelines, accordingly. And that might give the CCWG a bit of time to get their act together. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Who is it to ask this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't have a clue. I'm willing to say it, but it needs other people saying it as well. It's just impractical to ask for CCWG answers at this point, or promises where the issues have not even been investigated, and as we've said here many times, we don't even know what's allowed, what's possible. So, you know, it's unfortunate we didn't do all of this accountability years ago, but we didn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. And with this, I move to any other business. Anything that we haven't touched on today that anybody wishes to touch on? Seun? And please make this short Seun, because we are at the end of the call. So Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

We can't hear you at the moment. Could you please...? You might be muted.

SUEN OJEDEJI: How about now? [Inaudible]... ICANN 52, ICANN 52 [inaudible] this CWG, [inaudible] going to be attending the ICANN 52, yeah, that was what I mentioned, because there appears to be a meeting of substance. Is there a meeting being planned for this, for the CWG? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Seun. I have no idea, and you probably are going to have to ask [inaudible], and the chairs of the CCWG because I thought there was going to be a face to face, but it looks like it's not a [inaudible] face to face, and it might just be one that takes place there.

And at the moment, the schedule of future meetings, of future calls, doesn't seem to be extending all the way to the end of February. I would suggest to ask Grace [inaudible] about this. Any other questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I would suggest the chairs of the CWG, not Grace, or all three.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, all three. So Grace [inaudible] and the co-chairs, so the chairs of the CWG, which is [inaudible]... And with this, I would like to thank you all for being on the call. We are 10 minutes late into the end of the call, but we did start about five to six minutes late too.

Thanks to the interpreters for having extending their time a little bit. It has been a helpful call today. Please follow-up on the mailing list. Action items are very important. One last question, should we have a call during the ICANN break between Christmas and the New Year? And I would like to see a cross, a red cross for no and a green tick for a yes.

I see a majority of red crosses. So it's good to see, Heidi you can see that we really care, and we don't want some of you to have to work between Christmas and New Year, which is the ICANN break. So that's fine. So we won't have...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, perhaps we want is all of us not to die of exhaustion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, that's fine. There is plenty of you. This plenty of you, but there is only a limited amount of At-Large staff, and a limited number of interpreters as well, so that's why we care for them. There is 3.6 billion of them, we can get rid of a few at a time.

Ladies and gentlemen, thanks very much for this. Let's have the Doodle for the call starting next year. I'm a little concerned, I think that staff... We've got a full set of staff coming back on the 7th of the month, but

that might be a bit too late. So I was going to suggest that we have a call during the... Yeah, Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Olivier. No, we come back on Monday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Monday the fifth.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. In which case, could we have a Doodle for that week then? The week starting Monday the 5th? And that...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here. Just to make sure... Cheryl here. Just to make sure that the staff looks like all, and rapidly expanding, number of calls that are [inaudible]... too many [inaudible] 24 hours, constantly in either in ordinary work or ICANN work. [Inaudible]. Yeah, because [inaudible] night shift with everything is a little bit much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It does sound like it Cheryl. So thanks for this. Make sure that we look at it and maybe don't overcrowd the days too much. So Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday on that week. That will be ahead of the

intensive work weekend of the CWG that will take place on the 10th and 11th. So with this, I thank you all and this call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]