

September 2014

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the At Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function on Thursday the 25<sup>th</sup> of September, 2014 at 1430 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Yasuichi Kitamura, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, Leon Sanchez, and Gordon Chillcott. On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto and Fatima Camronero. We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jamaa, Alan Greenberg and Roberto Geatano. From staff we have Heidi Ulrich and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Welcome everyone to this call. As you have noticed we do not appear at the moment to have Mohammad Al Bashir nor Jean-Jacques Subrenat on the call. But we will still go through our agenda and fill in on the parts that we are aware of and the points that we need to work on. And we will point our two representatives on the IANA Coordination Group to the calls recording and transcript afterwards.

Let's start first with the adoption of the agenda. We're going to deal first with action items and review of the ICG. We will get updates and statuses from the [0:01:38] communities that are going to bring

---

*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.*

September 2014

---

proposals and then we'll have an update on their cross community working group that is in creation. And then ALAC preparation for the LA Cross Community Working Group.

Finally we will have a position, yeah, ALAC IANA Transition Position drafting group that we have to discuss what we do with that and prepare of course for our LA meeting. Any amendments to the agenda or additions?

Seeing no one put their hand up, the agenda is adopted and so we can go directly to the review of the action items from our last call, the call on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September, 2014. There were a number of action items there. They were all complete. So I think we've done the whole thing. So technically we've got the agenda for Los Angeles and the followup is done on the mailing list. So nothing to add to the action items. Are there any questions or comments on the action items I've listed on the action item page?

No comments, okay. Let's go back to our agenda and go to Agenda Item Number Three. And we'll first start with updates and status of the different communities and the IANA Proposal development. As you know the operational opportunities are now tasked with preparing their proposal. And I was hoping that Jean-Jacques and Mohammad would be able to provide us with some feedback on what has been happening first on the ICG itself. Since they are currently not on the call, let's go first to the operational communities. And if you would look at the working groups. So the IANA C Working Group page which is linked from the agenda. You will see "Mailing lists currently engaged in discussions".

September 2014

---

So we've got the mailing lists for the different RALOs, and... Let me start again. We've got the mailing lists for the IETF and different other organizations like ISOC for example and also the mailing list for the different Regional Internet Registries. Let's start with the IANA Transition mailing list and the Internet [0:04:39] mailing list and the IAB which is the IETF which is the Internet Engineering Task Force and also the IANA Transfer ISOC discussion.

Is there anything to point out there? And I know we have Alberto Soto, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fatima Cambroner, Avri Doria. They are all here. So the wish is to give us a quick feedback on what's happened this week.

I can start naming names. I have received a written note from some people, but I have not forwarded it. If I don't wish to speak here, then I can just forward your note over to the mailing list. And I have Avri Doria in the queue. Avri, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. So, I only wanted to mention one thing which is in the, I guess, IANA TRAN IETF group. They are basically working on an exercise that, while they presume that the system they've got is fine, they are looking at a set of conditions without deciding whether those conditions would necessarily happen but looking at a set of conditions to see whether what they've got at the moment in terms of a plan answers all the issues that might come up in those cases.

September 2014

---

So they're taking what they've got which they say they have and have been working, and they are not looking to change. But they have accepted the sort of stress test notion of what if this happens, what if that happens. And they just seem to be in the process of finalizing a few scenarios. That's about it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Avri. Olivier speaking. When you mention their putting together a few scenarios, are they effectively looking at their proposals and saying, "Is this going to pass with the US Government?" Or are they basically looking at case scenarios whereas another organization would want for example to try and capture the IETF or capture processes in the IETF or they might be looking at their process for recall process for appeal? Is this the sort of thing they're looking at?

AVRI DORIA: Not quite. Although, those things could perhaps fall out of the discussion. They're looking at things like the scenarios. One of them is the everyday IETF IANA Protocol [0:07:53] Registry activities, post-[0:07:56]. So discussion of things like what happens if the three IANA functions are separated to different operators, what happens if the IETF creates another name or numbers like protocol parameters that might leverage existing frameworks of RIRs, but which require open bottom up policy development going forward, whether or not the functions are separated to different operators.

September 2014

---

A second category of scenario, what they call the [0:08:27] future. The IAB determines that a new contractor [0:08:35] works with the IAOC and the IASA. Now, I don't remember the exact letters of all of those but they are the administrative bodies and the administrative supervisory function. I'm sorry, I didn't think I'd be talking about it, so I didn't look up to remember what the exact letters were.

To establish criteria I once knew, but I've lost it. To establish criteria for selection of a new contractor and then ICANN so then a notice period begins. A transition then takes place and the function moves to the new contractor and is no longer ICANN.

They have scenario type called rejection. I can, while I was out of the business and providing IANA [0:09:22] registry functions. And the question is not whether these are likely or desirable or rather are there pieces missing from [0:09:34] IETF documentation to handle the different angles of these possibilities.

So that is specifically what their scenarios consist of at this point. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very interesting. Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. Very interesting way of looking at things and proceeding forward. At this point in time, anyone who is on the IETF list, is there any action or anything that you believe should be undertaken at this point in time, or we should just be aware of the discussions and not really consider contributing in any [0:10:16]. Of course I know that you are contributing

September 2014

---

in individual capacity, but is there anything that this group should be looking at and perhaps also come in with counter arguments?

[Cross talk 0:10:33] Avri Doria first and then Gordon. Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, I have no recommendations at this time. I'd say perhaps proposals of scenarios if one wanted to. But at this point I'm just watching and participating from the perspective of an IETF participant. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Avri. Next is Gordon Chillcott.

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

Thank you Olivier. Gordon Chillcott for the record. Question for Avri, are these scenarios posted anywhere where we could take a quick look at them?

AVRI DORIA:

It's in the email list and the email list is open. There is also a website for the working- I don't think they've been posted there specifically. I'll put the addresses for both the archive and the working lists and I'll take a look. I don't think that they're necessarily posted there. Their charter is, but these are really just now being discussed. The mail I just read was from 23 September. So that's where it's still being worked out. They're very list intensive and I don't think there are any internet drafts on

---

September 2014

---

anything that that's the next level of documentation other than the email list.

So if this were to want to do anything, there's participating in the list and there's always submitting an internet draft that presents an argument. That would be the way if the At Large ALAC [0:12:23] to that discussion and people have said that if you care, get involved, then producing an internet draft would be the way to submit it. Because there is a liaison between ICANN and the IAB, but that's not the path I suggest we try to follow. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Avri. Is the list you are referring to the Internet Gov Tech.?

AVRI DORIA: No, it's the IANA plan. It's a working group within the general area. Is that not the one I was supposed to be talking about?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's perfect. I just noted that it wasn't on our mailing list on our list of mailing lists. So I think we might need to add it on there, looking at them, no, we don't have it on our mailing list. So if you put it in the chat, then Terri will then add this to the front for this working group which has all of the different mailing lists that are involved. I think I am also subscribed to that mailing list, but then noticed that it wasn't on that page.

September 2014

---

Terri, are you okay with that?

TERRI AGNEW: I am, provide me the link and I'll be happy to add it. And this is Terri.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Terri. It's Olivier speaking. The link is now in the chat. So please update as necessary. Well, there's two links in there, but yeah. You can separate the two links. Thanks very much for this update, Avri.

Any other updates on any discussion that might have taken place at ISOC, on the ISOC mailing list or on the ICANN wide discussion. I have noticed for some reason people have quieted down a little bit there. I note Alberto Soto, you have your hand up, and therefore you have the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Just give me a second because I don't remind the name of the list exactly because I am participating on all the lists. But in the mailing list called ISOC, IANA ISOC, seems the last report I have sent because I was not able to participate in the last meeting. I drafted a summary, but the only information that was sent since then has been the same information that we have, and some document on the information providing details about email and meetings. But the list is not working. It has no activity right now.



September 2014

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Alberto. That's very helpful. I gather that of course ISOC not being one of the direct operational communities, they probably are in a similar situation than we are trying to work out what is happening next. And I have followed some of the ISOC discussions. I think that they are putting together a working group, an internal working group or maybe that mailing list is the working group. So you're absolutely right. There hasn't been much. Thanks for following up on this, Alberto. Next we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. My little update is not actually from either protocols or the numbering communities, but actually from the Asia Pacific specific naming community. And that's a two page report which I have passed on to you and staff to include in full QA notes today and to our resources on this matter as an outcome of the APTLD meeting, in other words, the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain, which is, for lack of a better word, the country code industry group that makes in parallel with the [0:16:58] 38 meeting in Brisbane last week. There was a two part discussion relating to IANA and all things that we're interested in here.

The two partner most importantly I think included a fairly extensive and quite reasonably interactive briefing on the work of the country code name support organization [0:17:29] framework of interpretation working group, which obviously is particularly important and of interest to the APTLD community. But also to the GLTLD community because it looks at of course matters to do with what is concurrently called

September 2014

---

delegation and relegation. That is what I'm saying currently called delegation and relegation.

One of the outcomes of the framework of interpretation work group will be a proposed change of [0:18:02] that's another story for another day. Building on that however, because what that does is [0:18:10] and indeed make a number of proposals for refinement and specific outcomes that the... I and operator should follow in the matters of delegation and future delegation which currently it's called re-delegation. And how to establish the desired level of following up the expected and commonly [0:18:20] in the future requirements for all of that was a secondary conversation and throughout the age specific representative there to do with the IANA transition that the report from the Asian Pacific community is about two pages, not too dissimilar from what Avri was describing on the IETF and [0:19:11] list where as they obviously have gone down as preparatory protocol hypothetical exercises. That's not something that the naming community has done at this stage-

TERRI AGNEW:

Excuse me, Cheryl. Pardon the interruption. This is Terri. Our interpreters are having a very hard time hearing you at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That's fine, Terri. I'll shut up. That can make it even easier. So, if you just refer then rather than me rattle on, that we look at that report. Thank you.

September 2014

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I actually can hear you. I think the interpreters might have a line that is not very good or at least a bit faint because I didn't seem to have any problems understanding you. But thanks for your report. And what I'll do, I'll have that report forwarded to the mailing list. I just had one question for you, Cheryl. Was there any discussion among the APTLD community of its relationship with the CCSO and how it was going to take part in the proposal that the naming community was going to submit? Was there any discussion on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll be brief so the interpreters have some chance of passing on what I'm saying accurately. Yes, there was because of course the APTLD community is wider than those members of the [0:21:03] operational community than currently are members of the IMCCSO. So the very fact that there is a plan and deliberate engagement and this region was one of those mechanisms to gain import and discussion with non ccNSO members was a very important point. Thank you for the question, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this. So, we have now been through the IETF update and for the update ISOC can update now not even a mailing list, but a face to face meeting that took place this week or recently in the Asia Pacific and Pacific Islands and Asia [0:21:59] Islands area. Let's

---

September 2014

---

move on to the RIR mailing list, the Regional Internet Registry. This is the number community. I wonder if anyone has any update on the discussions that have taken place on those mailing lists.

Is there anyone here who wishes to- Yeah. Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking for the record. I just wanted to tell you what happened in the Lutnick registry for the Latin American at the Caribbean. As I told you before, for these lists we have assigned three coordinators from the community under the past week, last week I believe. One of the coordinators on behalf of all the coordinators sent email to the mailing list to start the debate on this issue, because as I told you before nothing was really going on on this discussion base.

So we just reminded them of the principles that the decision [0:23:15] process should handle. This was included in the email. And they also send some questions to start the discussion asking for example, what the mechanism to replace IANA function should be or how Latin America and the Caribbean choose to be engaged in this process. And one of the participants in the list answered, it would be interesting to follow the discussions being held on the coordination group and the coordinator said that it was beginning to do this. And he provided him with the information on the new meeting of the coordination, the IPG group that will be held in LA after the ICAN meeting. That was all.

September 2014

---

And then personally I am a bit concerned that there is no interest from the Latin America, Caribbean region in this issue, which is so important. This is being handled within the NRO or I'm not really sure what's going on really there because there really isn't a discussion and the concerns of the region are not really being taken to the list. But this is what has happened lately in the list. That's all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Fatima. And let's try and find out from the other regions if there is a pattern here. I wonder if someone from the APNIC region has any update on what's been going on. I know Yasuichi Kitamura was following this in the past. I don't know if Yasuichi is able to speak.

Mic is off. Sorry. Okay, no problem. Anyone else in that region? Cheryl maybe? Should I resort back to you? Has there been any movement on the APNIC IANA meeting list?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nothing of any significance. Since the IPNIC nation I'm saying. [0:25:35] discussion but not a lot of [0:25:37] happening there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. On the ARIN mailing list. So far we were looking at the ARIN public policy mailing list, the PPML. I'm not even sure if a mailing list has not been started up by ARIN specifically for discussing the IANA

September 2014

---

Stewardship transition. Has there been any movement on this? Gordon Chillcott.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Good morning again, Olivier. I see nothing on the PPML mailing list except a number of assurances. This is going back a couple of weeks. They all get together and discuss this and next month in Baltimore. I've seen nothing. I didn't get a chance to look around to see if I could find this other mailing list and I will do so in the next day or so.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this update, Gordon. I recall from memory not even this week, but a couple of weeks ago seeing Milton Mueller ask John Curran about two things. One if there would be a mailing list of ARIN that would deal with those issues and two, if there was going to be a mailing list that would bring all of the RIRs together like an NRO mailing list. And the response was... I kind of missed the response. But I think the response was in the case of yes, we'll do that soon. But it didn't look as though this was a priority at the time. I wonder if this is also what you saw or maybe something that Alberto or Avri saw?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Sorry about that. My mute button caught me. That was my assessment as well. But I am going to look around. I'm going to have a lard hard look at the other mailing list as well when I get the chance. But on that

September 2014

---

particularly mailing list, [0:27:55] fairly quiet on that subject. They're being, as well as other internal policy matters recently.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. So we've already got an update on the Lutnick [0:28:07] site and as far as the right I know the site list is concerned there was a little bit of movement in the creation of mailing list, but there doesn't appear to be much movement either. What I have noticed from several of the RIRs is that they are saying, "Well, we soon have our face to face meeting, and so we will be discussing the issue at our face to face meeting." And there doesn't appear to have been much discussion on the mailing list prior to the face to face meeting. Unfortunately I'm not going to be able make it in London for the Reich meeting, and I think because it's at the same time as ICAN is taking place or there's a clash in schedules somewhere.

But I just have concerns and I guess we all should have concerns about the transparency of these processes since many of these meetings, and I don't know about the other meetings, but certainly as far as the Reich meeting is concerned, there is a fee for attending and it is Reich members, etc. So there is certainly less transparency than we might have wished for in those processes. But at the same time I should say it really wouldn't be much of the ALACs, in the ALAC realm to point this out. We're treading on thin ice as far as this is concerned and it's going to be very difficult to... we certainly cannot take an official position on the processes of the other organizations. However, as individuals of course we can raise these points. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

September 2014

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm less concerned on that point than you are, Olivier. And let me explain why. These operational communities, particularly the numbering lists, yes, there is a price for the face to face meetings. But these are, for want of a better word, industry organizations. Why wouldn't they be? In the mean, however, they're already working, have worked and will continue to work with CVAC that's been given over, more than a decade now, on how they'd like to see particular aspects of the IANA operator behavior and service to their community and service to the [0:30:50] have been discussed accepting all of these points.

Every time the NTIA has gone out for request or expressions of interest. They've already been engaged. This is not fresh and new. This is day to day business for them. So I guess I'm less concerned to the aspects of transparency as it is measured for the communities that these lists serve. The other thing is of course I think without exception, and I had certainly attended our meetings in the past remotely, all of these meetings and I assume Reich is another one of them, have promoted participation capabilities. Whereby the issue be no cost other than the bandwidth and human and otherwise, but we're committed for it. But I just wanted to counter your part, but absolutely agree with not really our business. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. So, we've gone and we'd done around what's been happening in the other parts of the world, of the IANA



September 2014

---

world shall we say. Are there any more comments or questions on what we've gone through here? It looks like there's no great stride forward, so we can swiftly move forward to the next part of our agenda. And I thank you all for monitoring those lists and monitoring your going to these meetings and making sure we're aware. At the moment I don't think there appears to be any action that this group needs to take at the very moment. So let's move to the updates on the cross community working group.

As you know, the At Large advisory committee has ratified or agreed to ratify the cross community working group on IANA, naming issues, I think it's called now. And yeah, the link on the agenda over to the charter work space which has the latest charter, which I think was the 14<sup>th</sup> of August. It was the one that Tijani Ben Jemaa and Leon Sanchez put forward. I think this is correct.

Leon, I know you're on the call. Maybe you might wish to have a quick look at that charter that we have on the weekly and let us know if this is the right now. It is correct. Okay, thank you.

So, this charter now has two amendments that the ALAC also sent out to the rest of the ICAN community. The first one we agreed the SSAC commitment, adding the words, "for the root zone" at the item four in the section titled Scope to Improve Clarity.

The second amendment that was the third amendment by the ALAC was the issues related to assuring the ability and effectiveness are also in scope of the CWG. Such as use could include but are not limited to

September 2014

---

charting structure or the lack thereof in language that IANA can function in. This was just an additional point in the ALAC wanted to make. Unfortunately our amendment came a little bit late and some other parts of ICAN, other supporting organizations had already agreed on the previous amendments as a little bit of a communication problem there. So now the charter as it currently stands is the one with the ASAC commitment but does not contain the ALAC commitment. That said, if we wanted to push forward for the ALAC commitment I don't think that would actually stop the working group from meeting and from starting operations and we could leave this ALAC commitment on the back burner.

But with so much going on at ICAN at the moment it might well be we have missed our window of opportunity to get our amendment accepted. So then next step, as far as this working group is concerned is for the working group to meet face to face. So there is two things.

I think that the first I have received an email from a Jonathon Robinson and Byron Holland who are the chair of the GNSO and chair of the TPSO. Now, they are the ones who started that working group. They are currently working out the plan of having maybe a conference call taking place before the meeting in Los Angeles and then a cross community working group meeting that will take place in LA itself. In fact, you can see a link to the main ICAN schedule, which already has a meeting from 1215 to 1345 on the Monday of the week. And I don't know how that's going to clash with the schedule that we already have. Obviously it will be good for our representatives and the cross community working group to attend that meeting. It's mandatory for them to attend that

September 2014

---

meeting and then if they are not in Los Angeles of course it will be important for them to attend remotely.

That said, we have just touched on the representatives in the cross community working group and as you know we have five seats on this cross community working group. I have asked the RALOs to make a choice of their representative on that group from the members of our own IANA transition working group. All RALOs have now suggested, someone suggested a candidate except NARALO that is going to come back to us shortly I hope I just had a chat with Glenn Snipe moments before this call. So hopefully we'll get an answer soon.

But with regards to the members of that cross community working group, the way that it works in At Large is there are suggestions made by us, so the suggestion of the RALO making have to go through this committee and this committee has to make the recommendations to the ALAC. And it is the ALAC that appoints people on that working group. This of course can go very quickly if we could just do this by consensus call. We don't need to vote on people.

So the selection or the proposal from AFRALO was Sean [0:37:54]. The proposal from URALO was myself, Olivier. The proposal from LACRALO was [0:38:08]. And as I and the proposal from APRALO was [0:38:12]. So, of course I don't think we have much of a discussion on these, these are the RALO proposals. So these are the people who will go on that cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition. And that's the cross community working group that will develop the proposal for the names part of the IANA contract.

---

September 2014

---

Who is NARALO [0:38:48] on the chat. There is no NARALO at the moment on there. And I have asked Glenn McKnight and Garth Bruin to supply somebody. So if you are volunteering then I would suggest that you get in touch with them and find out. I don't really know, and I have told them there seems to be confusion. I have told them that they have to choose from the NARALO reps essentially listed you all on there by the way, as taken from our page, our working group page. So in there we have John Levine, Jody Palestine, Matthew Ratannon, Bill [0:39:28] Lois Taylor, Thomas [0:39:32] and Gordon Chillcott. This is the list that we currently have.

So that's the update on this. Are there any questions on this specific point? And I note that Glenn McKnight is on the call. So that's good. Glenn can follow the discussion taking place here.

Now, there is one thing which has been asked and the ITG has now asked also to meet directly with a cross community working group on IANA issues. There's an email from Melissa Cooper which is also linked to the agenda that is sent to Byron Holland, Jonathon Robinson and me. And my response has been that since the matter is currently or was originated by the [0:40:35] GNSO, it really is down to Byron and Jonathon to provide details of whether they'd be happy to meet. The concern I have and it is not in my response in the email. I just responded, deal with Jonathon and with Byron and we'll follow through with it. But the ALAC would be very happy to meet if you were, the ICG was to meet the cross community working group.

September 2014

---

That said, there is a concern as far as we're concerned with the amount of time that we have and slots that we have in the current schedule for Los Angeles. And it looks like quite a mess basically, because we just have so much going on. We don't appear to have any free slots. So what I might suggest then at the chair level if you allow me to do so is to ask whether the ICG could meet with the cross community working group during a time that the cross community working group is meeting. This is a proposal, I'm not even sure whether this type of proposal would fly with others. It's just that it would be very hard for us to actually find additional time in addition to the cross community working group discussions that we have so far.

Any comments or questions on this? I see a no from Cheryl. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I should be clear, my no is in fact no to the likelihood of being able to find time. But I could probably put up a green tick to agree with what you were saying.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So you would be okay just to make sure you would be okay then with suggesting that the ICG meet with the CWG when the CWG itself meets in Los Angeles. Okay, green take from Cheryl, thank you. Any other thoughts on this? Just as a reminder, the CWG will meet for 90 minutes from 1215 to 1345 on Monday. And at the moment, all it says is that there is a face to face meeting of the cross community

September 2014

---

working group to develop an INIS stewardship condition proposal on naming related functions. That's all it says at the moment.

Any comments or questions on this? Anyone? No? I don't see anybody pointing in either direction. So let me ask then as a consensus here, is there anyone opposed to me suggesting to Jonathon Robinson, Byron Holland and Melissa Cooper that the ICG could meet with the CWG during the CWG's already existing session? Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA:

I don't know. I don't know if there is even a CWG list. Perhaps somebody could tell me. As I said, I believe I'm going to be the NCSG's member in that group. I wrote to the CWG drafting team list which I'm on and still on, and which I know that the chairs [0:44:46] are on and asked about that. Now, one of the arguments that came back is this will be the first that we've actually spoken to each other and how can we speak to the ICG without having spoken to each other first and with only 90 minutes? You know, how do we have time to do both

I had a slightly different perspective, but since I'm not on the CWG list I decided certainly not to argue it that of course wouldn't have a CWG position yet, but we might have some individual comments. But I do see the problem with having only 90 minute slot for a first meeting and not using it, especially when looking the schedule that the ICG has put out, there's probably almost no way we could finish in time because the next face to face ICAN meeting is after the deadline presented by ICG. And even if the group finishes its work in time, which is very possible, the

September 2014

---

notion that that work could have been reviewed, commented and approved by the individual SOs and ACs is improbable.

So we're in a real bind here at the moment and I don't know what the right answer is. I'm not weighing in on whether we should or should not send that letter in. I'm just presenting some of the difficulties that have already been expressed by people talking about it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Avri Doria. Olivier speaking. Very fair points indeed and this actually is why I'm asking the question twice, three times over, because indeed, if that is the only time that the ICC Working Group will have to meet face to face, they might wish to do something else.

As regards to a Cross Community Working Group mailing list, I don't think that one exists yet. I think it's such at early phase, the ALAC has only just voted in favor for it. I think the ccNSO and the GNSO have also done so and the [??]-SSAC also appears to have done so. So we're kind of very varied at this stage. Cheryl Landon-Orr is next.

Cheryl Langdon-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Landon-Orr for the record. Avri raised a very important point which I did hear some discussion at least in the naming community during our IP NIC and ICGO meetings last week in Brisbane and that was the fact that the timing of the 15th of January deadline from the ICG coming just shortly before there seems to be a natural

September 2014

---

opportunity at the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh. Those dates were absurdly appeared to be some thought they would be some sort of an opportunity to have had the ICG deadline immediately after the Marrakesh meeting but I have heard no proposals to formally suggest that to the ICG. Of course we do have [0:48:27] on the ICG and this community, the Ad Hoc Working Group may want to consider during our Los Angeles meeting trying to get that conversation or at least that possibility looked at. We understand the pressures of the deadline, but I think there could be argued a reasonable case that having a deadline for the ICG immediately following a natural opportunity for naming, numbering and undoubtedly by the [0:48:56] protocol communities to have a little bit more time and an opportunity to build a final consensus and agreements on things could be an advantage -- more of an observation and less of a recommendation but I just wanted to come in [0:49:11].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I agree with you and I think it would be a bit difficult for us. I think someone doesn't have their... one needs to get their mute at the moment. If you could please check with [??]-Adiego, Terri, that would be great. Yes, I think it's probably not the ALAC position to go and ask for additional amounts of time except of course if we do it through the ICG. It's a pity that our representatives, Mohammad Al Bashir and Jean-Jacques are not there.

But what we'll do is to maybe put it as an action item to have them follow up with the ICG and to take that discussion, maybe checking with



September 2014

---

other members of the Cross Community Working Group and -- sorry-- other member organizations that will take part in the Cross Community Working Group prior to taking this up directly with the ICG.

So action item, Mohammad Al Bashir and Jean-Jacques Subrenat are to coordinate getting in touch with other component organizations of the Cross Community Working Group on naming issues and find out if there is a problem with timing for the proposal. That's not a perfect sentence but I think it probably will do. Are you okay with that, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, thank you. I got that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Terri. So it's Olivier speaking. That's one point. The other one I think is to do with the Cross Community Working Group itself so I shall not send an email... Well I tell you what I'll do then. I'll send an email to Jonathan Barron and Alyssa, make a suggestion of the ICG meeting with the CCWG at the same time, at the time of the CCWG meeting knowing full well that there might be pushback on this.

The other solution of course is that there are budgets for these things and I have a feeling that if the Cross Community Working Group has to work face to face again in between ICANN meetings, then the Cross Community Working Group will have to ask for funding to meet face to face somewhere. I know it's likely to be a large group, up to 30 or 40 people. I can't remember exactly how many; I didn't make the count

September 2014

---

how many people that would be. But there is definitely some funding put aside for the IANA Stewardship Transition mechanism.

OPERATOR: This is the conference operator. May I have your conference ID and password please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I beg your pardon? I think this might be the wrong line at the moment. I'm already on a conference.

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. We're checking into that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Did I sound cross just now? So coming back to the gist of the discussion, so effectively there could be a way perhaps to have another face to face and to ask for another face to face meeting, but that's going to have to be for the co-chairs of the CWG. But anyone with a view on the budget we'll see that there is money, that there certainly are funds aside for this sort of activity. There are funds for the ICG; there are funds for the CCWGs. Okay, any other points or questions or comments on this?

All right. I note that Jean-Jacques Subrenat has arrived so welcome, Jean-Jacques, and I see you have been faced with technical difficulties. We have reached the point now Agenda item number...well we're still

September 2014

---

on number three but we have had the updates and status from the different communities on the lineup proposal development.

We are now going through the updates on the Cross Community Working Groups and we're just about to go into the ALAC preparation for the L A Cross Community Working Group in ICANN L A. I think that at this point in time we don't seem to have any specifics. I've mentioned the four out of five people that have been -- that are going to be sitting in on that Cross Community Working Group. Since Glen McKnight is on the call, the one position that is yet to be filled will be filled very soon. Glen has messaged Garth Bruin, Sheriff Merallo to get a quick vote or a quick consensus on their representative on this.

So now I guess we are on the ALAC IANA Transition Position Drafting Group and that was one suggestion for Mohammad Al Bashir who unfortunately still doesn't appear to be with us. His recommendation was that the ALAC should form a small group that should start drafting the ALAC position on the IANA issues that need to be considered in the coming proposal, and he was concerned that the time was running and therefore it's important that we start drafting a contribution as soon as possible. My response to this was that I think this is something we will start in our working group meeting at ICANN 51 in Los Angeles.

But prior to moving through this, let's first have maybe an update from you, Jean-Jacques, if are able to speak and to do so. What has been going on on the ICG this week?

September 2014

---

...I'm afraid Jean-Jacques's microphone is not active so... Terri, we still don't have Mohammad Al Bashir?

TERRI AGNEW: Correct. Adiego has been trying this entire time to reach him.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Right. Seeing that we also have a problem with Jean-Jacques's microphone, then let's continue and we'll see if something can be worked out for Jean-Jacques's participation on this call.

What I would suggest then, if we're going to be discussing our agendas and what we're going to be doing in L A and of course for those people who are not able to make it in L A we'll be doing in that session in L A and of course we'll have to take part remotely, is to go to Agenda Item Number Four, the Preparation of the Working Group Meeting at ICANN 51.

I would invite you to have a look at our Agenda of Tuesday, 14th of October, an illustrious date because -- well, first if we live through the whole day which is a very, very long day indeed -- there is a session that starts at 15:15, so 3:15, a quarter past three in the afternoon, ALAC Work Part Two. You can scroll down to that part on the weekly page.

This is probably going to be essentially discussing the IANA Stewardship Transition. Do not read the second column or third or fourth column. Just read the English column. The other columns are not updated yet. So at 3:15, a quarter past three, we first have a discussion with the Address

---

September 2014

---

Support Organization Address Council and the Address Supporting Member Resource Organization. And that's a meeting of the ALAC with the ESOACNASONRO. I expect members of this working group, our working group here, will wish to take part in this discussion and as the Chair of this Session I will really rely on members of this working group to make a point and to discuss things.

We just heard earlier of concerns that you had or that have been expressed on the RIR, the Separate Regional Internet Registry mailing lists. There does not appear to be a concerted, overall NRO-wide discussion and so maybe that will be the point, the time when we can ask questions about this. Would you say asking questions would be a wiser thing than to tell them what to do?

I would certainly point in that direction and engage a discussion on this and ask if there are any RIR-wide or NRO-wide discussions on this and it really is the plan of the NRO to push forward on this issue. That was one. So we only speak to them for half an hour, but that then opens the door to Part Two of this which is from 3:45, so a quarter to four until a quarter till five, one full hour where the ICG will be coming to the ALAC room and be meeting with the ALAC and there we will have an update from the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. We'll have the Chair, Alisa Cooper will co-chair the time with me, the session with me.

And on this, how do you think we should play this? The suggestion was to start with a small introduction. I think that most people in the room will be aware of what the IANA Stewardship Transition is all about;

September 2014

---

perhaps ask Alisa Cooper for some introductory comments and words; maybe have Jean-Jacques and Mohammad Al Bashir to also provide an update of where we are today as far as they are concerned and engage the discussion with the rest of the ICG.

Are there any questions or topics that we wish to touch on specifically with the members of the ICG? And I'm emphasizing this because this is not an opportunity that all ICANNs and ACs are going to have, only the GAC and the ALAC have asked for some face to face time with the ICG and originally there was some pushback from some ICG members for this to happen.

Thankfully, thanks to Alisa Cooper, she has managed to convince those members of the ICG that we are skeptical about meeting with independent parts or with only subcomponents of ICANN to actually meet with us and to have a deeper discussion during the public forum which will take place a few days later and of course which will take place in a much less personal manner than when we are face to face like this. Fatima Cambronerio, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

This is Fatima speaking for the record. Thank you very much, Olivier. I think this is a very important opportunity for us to be able to speak with the ICG members and I am a bit concerned because this meeting we will see at large members who are not really following this process and this mailing list or in these groups and that the discussion may not be

September 2014

---

followed as we wanted to or perhaps we're not going to ask or ask for explanations about what we really need to know.

I am very clear that these are open and free meetings, but somehow -- and this is just my personal opinion -- I would like us to channel what we want to ask or explanations that we want to get through Jean-Jacques and Mohammad so that we can prevent somebody else who has not been following this process closely, so that we do not really lose our time to ask our essential questions. This is just a personal opinion that I have and it's not a rigid point of view. I just want to know what you think about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Fatima. Olivier speaking. That's a very good point you make here. That certainly can be done. Another solution would be to say when we start that session that members of the IANA Issues Working Group will be given preference as far as the queue is concerned. It's also a possibility a little bit like when the at large leadership team meets on Friday, members of the ALT are given preference over anybody else who is in the room but others are also allowed to ask questions but just get further back in the queue. And in that way of course, if we have sustained number of questions, then I think the points will be very straightforward. I could basically in the introduction also suggest that the meeting be primarily for members of our working group to ask questions and to make points.

September 2014

---

The concern I have with channeling everything through Jean-Jacques and through Mohammad is that it then makes the interaction a lot more rigid and it makes it flow a lot less than when we are just face to face like this. At that point, channeling things through Jean-Jacques and Mohammad is more conducive to be the kind of strategy we would follow in the public forum for example or in a much larger forum where we have our two spokespeople who will be able to take part. I note agreement. Okay, thank you for this. So let's do this then. Priority speaking time for IANA issues with Working Group members.

Topics we want to raise, points we want to raise with them specifically, any suggestions right now? Now if we don't have suggestions on this call, I would like your commitment to send suggestions as to what we want to discuss with the ICG on the mailing list after this call. Jean-Jacques, you have your hand up. I know of course you haven't spoken yet and that's very welcome that you be able to direct us or to help us on this. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor...and you might be on mute at the moment or there might be a problem with your connectivity...No, still cannot hear you. Jean-Jacques Subrenat? Okay then. Ah!

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, now we can hear you. Please go ahead.



September 2014

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: My goodness. Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. So I would say first, please excuse me for this bother. Second I would like to suggest that one point we would like to get a better sense of is in the preparation of the Transition Plan. We want to make sure as people who are concerned mainly that the interests of the global Internet user, we want to make sure that there would not be too many layers of screening and over dominant let's say representation of mainly industry in the way the plan is set up.

We're still early in the process but from the [1:07:05] 2015 onward we will have to look at all the contributions and to sort them out and in a way to ourselves in the ICG evaluate the value of each contribution and then to take from that what we think is valid for the Plan itself. That is the exercise in which we really want to make sure that there will not be any unwonted filtering. Of course there will have to be criteria; there will be rules etc. But maybe someone in our group would like to put that kind of question when we meet with the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Are there any follow-ups to this point? Okay, so this is Olivier speaking again. So Jean-Jacques, how would you recommend the flow then with the ICG? Would we set up a list of questions of what we want to hear from the ICG? Would this be something that you will find helpful?

September 2014

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I cannot speak on behalf of my colleagues in ICG but as I see it, belonging to both sides as it were, that we will have about one hour. Right? So an hour is quick come and gone, so may I suggest that as Chair, you give not an overview but just a catalog with just one word per topic saying we have discussed this among ourselves and there are let's see I don't know three or four areas or three or four main topics on which we will be questioning you or making remarks and these are the following: one, two, three, four.

And then in a prearranged way you would give the floor to this or that member of our community to take up in that order Question One, Question Two, etc. so it is a fairly orderly process. And I think it is important because on the ICG side the people will be mentally prepared to answer in a more accurate fashion the questions raised. Also there is less improvisation. I think there is also a greater sense of commitment to what one answers. So it is an orderly process. It is not quite as spontaneous as a public forum for instance, but I think as far as the result is concerned it's probably more operational. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jean-Jacques. And so next question for you is do you believe the ICG will be more likely to answer procedural questions about the process that it will follow to put together those different proposals, or will it actually be ready to discuss any of the component organization proposals themselves?

September 2014

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I think it will be mainly procedural because of the time at which we will be interacting with ICG. It will only be in October, which is a few months away from the cutoff date for receiving the comments and proposals from communities. So I don't think that we in the ICG have the right to presuppose or preclude any approach as far as content of the Transition Plan is concerned. What we want to make sure of at this stage is of course process to make sure that it's fair, that the interests of the global Internet user will not be cast aside, and maybe in the process precisely we have to make sure that the way to arrive at that result is smooth and fair. Does that answer your question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. That's very helpful. It's Olivier speaking. And considering the time is ticking here and it doesn't look like we will have time to draft questions or topics and then therefore have an action item for all members of the IANA Issues Working Group to work on questions that we would be asking the ICG, making sure that the questions are based on the process of the ICG not on the content of the component organization proposals...which I think you said will not be ready by then.

I draw your attention, Jean-Jacques, to one of the action items currently in the Action Item Box which mentions that yourself and Mohammad would coordinate getting in touch with the other component

September 2014

---

organizations that make up the CCWG on naming issues. So effectively I believe you'd have to speak to the ICG members for the CCs and the GNSO and find out if there might be a problem on the timing for the proposals to be given in.

I'm not sure whether you were on the call at the time. The problem was that it looks as though the Cross Community Working Group on Lending Issues will only have the time to meet once face to face and that's going to be in Los Angeles. And beyond that there are no more face to face meetings until the time that it needs to submit its proposal to the ICG. So you might wish to raise that point and find out if there is any feedback on that point. If you don't quite understand the request I can follow up with you after this call.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, please do. Yes, because I'm sorry, these connectivity problems make it so that I've missed a whole lot of stuff. But I don't want to burden this call just now. So if you have three minutes or five minutes later that would be terrific.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Then let's go over to the next part of our Agenda I think, which is Number Four, Preparation for our Working Group meeting. So if we continue back on our schedule -- and Terri don't move what we have currently on the screen -- after the face to face meeting with the ICG, we've got Conclusion and Next Steps, 15 minutes which will probably be

September 2014

---

used to continue the discussion with the ICG and then a quick next steps.

And then from 17:00 onward, and remaining in the same room, the Working Group, our working group that we are now on, will be meeting for another hour and a half, another 90 minutes, and we will have immediate feedback from our ICG members. So from you, Jean-Jacques, and from you Mohammad Al Bashir, on the discussions that we had with the ICG in the previous session, then the majority of this 90 minutes is going to be taken on as to what our strategy is for ALAC Proposal -- identification of issues, main goals, any conflict management, end user perspective and so on. I think this is really the answer to Mohammad's concern earlier where Mohammad recommended that the ALAC should form a small group that should start drafting the ALAC position on IANA issues that need to be considered in the coming proposal.

Is there any feedback from you, Jean-Jacques on this part of the work? I gather that you will probably be leading this with Mohammad at that point. You'll probably be co-leading this working group meeting. Any feedback from you?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques. Well I won't be leading, nor will Mohammad. We will be at the disposal of the group and of yourself. What I think is important that we think about even now to prepare for that important meeting...

September 2014

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Your microphone is cutting off.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'm so sorry. [1:17:05]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, let me stop you. Your microphone—

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: [1:17:05] Still we want to keep up with this very strategic focus on long term issues [1:17:19]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques? I'm sorry, Jean-Jacques, to cut you off. Your microphone—

JEAN-JACQUES Subrenat: Can you hear?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Can you hear us?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No... Okay, can you hear me now?

---

September 2014

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's better now. Your microphone was cutting out so I'm afraid you will have to repeat what you just said. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Not quite very well. I'm certainly having trouble hearing Jean-Jacques. I think it might be a bad connection in Jean-Jacques's microphone or a bad connectivity at his end. He is using Adobe Connect? Sorry, I realize we are reaching the 90 minute mark on this call and I know that others have other conference calls. Let's try one five more minutes to see if we can have Jean-Jacques now maybe on the dial out and then if we cannot, then I suggest that we adjourn the call and we follow up by email...Terri, how are we doing?

TERRI AGNEW: I have no response from Jean-Jacques at this time if you prefer to dial out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, can you hear us? We are not able to hear you unfortunately. Your microphone is cracked up or something has gone wrong on the technology side of things, which happens when one is traveling worldwide...No. I can see that Jean-Jacques is speaking

September 2014

EN

---

because there certainly the microphone seems to be active but I just am not able to hear Jean-Jacques Subrenat on the Adobe Connect...Okay, well sometimes things don't work. So there we are. Ladies and Gentlemen, what I was going to suggest then is that we continue this discussion on the mailing list. I've made the proposal here of our agenda with the discussion on the strategy of any like proposal, identification of issues, main goals, conference management and end user perspective. If you think anything needs to be amended, please fire an email on to our mailing list. If you are fine with this Agenda, please send an email also to confirm on the mailing list.

And Jean-Jacques, I'm really sorry that it hasn't worked out just now technologically, but we will work something out. I'll come on Skype in a moment with you immediately after this call then and we can take notes and take it from there. And with this we now go into the last part of this call and that is any other business.

Seeing no one put their hand up, I thank all of you for coming on this call. I think that staff has a follow up immediately take the recording, link it to the Agenda for Mohammad to be able to listen to in his own time. I understand Mohammad also had technical issues today so it's just one of these days and it happens sometimes. And so I thank you all for being on this call and with two minutes over the top of the hour, I would say thanks and good bye.

This call is now adjourned. And oh, one last thing. We are not going to have another conference call before we meet in Los Angeles. I think next week is going to be very difficult. If we do manage to do one, then



September 2014

---

we'll do it ad hoc. The reason is because I'm traveling as well and I'm not quite sure yet. So let's try and find out -- how do we do this? Okay, instead of adjourning right now, let's first -- one more action item.

Staff to send a doodle for next week for a call next week if we're okay with a call next week or not. The week after, we are all or many of us will be traveling so that will definitely not be possible. But next week is probably still okay for some, and others may need to leave the call because I'll be in Ukraine at the time and I have no idea what the connectivity is like in that country these days. So thanks everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night to some of us. Take care. This call is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**