
LOS ANGELES – ALAC Meeting with the NCSG
Monday, October 13, 2014 – 07:15 to 08:15
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: French testing, 1, 2, French test.

French testing, 1, 2.

Spanish testing, 1, 2, Spanish testing. Testing Spanish, 1, 2. Spanish test, Spanish test. Taco test, 1, 2.

English feed, testing 1, 2. Testing hamburgers and hot dogs. English feed 1, 2, 1, 2. Hamburgers and hot dogs, check, check.

Check, check, check, hey, hey.

Hey, hey, hey.

Checking, checking, checking.

Test, test.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can we have the recording on please?

Good morning everybody. Today is Monday, the 12th of October, and the time is 7:15, 7:24 in the morning. It's early, but we have a meeting, an one hour meeting with the NCSG. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and I have Rafik Dammak sitting next to me, and we have an agenda today with IANA stewardship transition, IANA accountability processes.

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.

Two hot topics that are currently, that we're going to hear about the whole week at ICANN. Two topics which both the NCSG and the ALAC have a great interest in. We also have an IANA stewardship transition small ad-hoc common group, with just a Skype chat and an interaction between our two communities.

So if you are interested in joining this, then please just past the details along to either Rafik or I. And that's, I guess, today is just a very open discussion on the two topics. We can probably touch on our concerns, on our reflections of how things are progressing. We have Jean-Jacques Subrenat who is with us, who is on the ICG, the IANA coordinating group. Do you have...? I don't see Milton.

We have Avri, that's right. Avri from the cross-community working group with us as well. So without any further ado, I'll hand you over to Rafik for his opening words, if you have anything to add, and then we can start the discussion.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Olivier. It's nice to start this morning with you. So, yeah. I mean, I think it's also good that we... Because before we always had the meeting at the end of the ICANN meeting, and so we, maybe it was not always easy to kind of follow up, but starting from the beginning, we can have much, maybe from next time, we can work on some statement, I mean, depending to the context.

So, as you said, we have that group. We have that chat captured, but I think in the time when we discussed in Singapore, we envision maybe more in ad-hoc group, maybe with a mailing list, and having it a kind of

shorter, but some clear mission on what we can do, between the two groups to work on this, the IANA transition.

I guess we can include now also the accountability. I do think that we can find some common ground principles. We may diverge on some others, but it's not a problem that the diversity of the ICANN community. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Rafik. So let's start then with the first topic, the IANA stewardship transition. Yesterday, the ALAC had an update from several people who came in. We also spoke to the SSAC who provided us their views on IANA stewardship transition, and told us about SAC advice. So SAC 06, was it 6 7, 6 8 and 6 9, which is forthcoming and that's likely to be published during this meeting.

And I guess I can just give the floor to Jean-Jacques to frame the issues that we're concerned about, and then probably take it from there. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat, if you could say a few words, framing what our initial concerns were. I know that that we were somehow rowing against some of the flow in the ICG, or accused of rowing against the flow in the ICG, but the points we were raising were pretty important for the acceptability for the whole process, not within the group, but within the wider world.

There is a world out there, so... There certainly is. This is the world, okay. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning. This is Jean-Jacques. Thank you Olivier. Yesterday, having lunch on the terrace here, there was an American friend of ours. I asked him, “Do you know how many members of Congress in the Senate in the US actually have a passport?” He knew, but most people in this country don’t. So I think that’s part of the problem.

There is a sense of justification and legitimacy, which I can completely understand, but it does not always reflect the reality of the rest of the world, that maybe part of the problem, that we should understand the US point of view on that as well. Now, the kind of problems I noticed since the inception of the ICG, or of two or three orders.

The first is representivity [sic] or representation. If I had not, at the initial meeting in London, if I had not put up the question, oh by the way, when introducing yourself, since this is the English session, please state your nationality and your affiliation to a company or a group, and that was done very graciously, but then there is resistance on the part of several of those people in having it published.

They didn’t want it to be in written form anywhere. So this again, is a reflection, I think, or an example of the kind of unstated problems, which we come across sometimes. And because of that request I had formulated, we found out that out of the group of now 30 members, 11 were of the same nationality, which was not [inaudible].

So, we are living in the continuation of that overall geo-strategic reality, which was that we are dealing with people of good faith, very, very able, but because of the initial choice of people, whoever nominated them to be part of the ICG, now we have to deal with that. We will not change the membership of the ICG at this stage, nor until it delivers its

transition strategy or plan, but I must point out that this is not completely satisfactory, when for instance, I notice that out of a membership of 30, actually there are 8, maybe 10 people who constantly provide information and react to the emails on all of the subjects, or most of them, which means that the majority of the members do not take part in the email discussions, except for some pet subject that they may have, quite legitimately of course.

So, I thought I'd give you this background, which is nothing to do with the official agenda of the ICG, but I think that gives you some sense of the reality we're working under. A second point I'd like to point out is the importance of having, as soon as possible now, the independent secretariat to help us, as volunteers, operate in the ICG.

Most members made it very clear that they wanted, and quote, independent secretariat, unquote. Independent from ICANN, but of course, this is not entirely true because the funding for the independent secretariat will be taken entirely from the ICANN budget. So, we are in the process of selecting the candidates to make a short list.

And the short list should allow us to have with the two, perhaps three, remaining candidates, and have something up and running, I hope, in November. For the rest, I have personal views on a couple of things, but never mind. I'm at your disposal to have this discussion with you. I'd like to know what are your preoccupations, and this will help me in my work as the representative of the ALAC in the ICG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I wondered whether we could have, since you named Avri specifically as someone who was in the cross-community working group, whether Avri could provide a little bit of background as to what the concerns are within the NCSG on the whole process as such. Avri Doria, would you be able to...? I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but it was Rafik who mentioned you. Blame Rafik.

AVRI DORIA: Hi. Avri speaking. First of all, the cross-community working group hasn't really met yet, so it's difficult to say anything about it, other than it's going to meet. I think it's meeting later today. So, that's about... In terms of NCSG, while I do not believe that we have actually formed any specific opinions on it, there certainly has been a very strong concern within NCSG for separation and the difference between the people that make policy and the people that do implementation.

And also there has been a concern expressed at times that, you know, the ability to give and take the contract should not necessarily disappear, and such, but it's all fairly nebulous at the moment, except for the fact that, I haven't been thinking yet this morning, except for the fact that, you know, we cannot go to a situation where ICANN has been granted the IANA function in perpetuity without any notion of appeal, without any notion of redress, without any notion of moving the contract, or moving the function elsewhere.

That somehow while what the solution can or should be for those things, is certainly not at all understood yet, there needs to be some sort of situations. And, you know, coming out of the IGF meeting, we did, there is an understanding of sort of the infinite regress of oversight,

for any oversight you put, where does it get its accountability?
Etcetera.

And we end up with the same accountability problem at every layer, so therefore people like me are looking at solutions that have more to do with redress, and appeals mechanisms, and binding arbitration mechanisms. Now the other concern that I have, that I don't know how much it is shared in the NCSG, is the fact of having different situations for the different three pillars.

And of course, we know that this notion of their being just three operational communities, and that's all you need to solve the thing, is very much an ICG imposition. It's very interesting, the ICG says, "We are not imposing solutions, however, we are imposing the solution that says, there are three pillars and that's how you must do it, and anything else is not allowed."

So, you know, I sort of take with a grain of salt the notion that ICG isn't imposing solutions because I believe they are. You know? And if you look at the SSAC paper and such, far more that needs to be considered than what comes into the three operational communities. When you look at what's being done in the IETF, you start to see that things touch, that they touch in various places, and that the divisions aren't as clear cut.

When you look at numbers, and you see that there is an ASO, well is there really an ASO? Is it just a shadow of the NRO, you know? What are the implications of those connections? And so, by having divided it into three, the way that ICG has done, I believe they've made the

problem much more difficult... In the hope of making it simpler, I actually believe they've made the problem more difficult, but we'll see.

And sorry for very impromptu, I had not expected to be speaking at all this morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you...

AVRI DORIA: I have one. I just spilled have of it, but I have...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Avri. Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: Hi. Just a point of information. I was wondering, did anybody attend the GAC meeting on transition of US stewardship and accountability yesterday? Because I understood, at least from watching the Twitter feed, that there were some interesting proposals being made by some of the governments to the effect that there had to be additional sorts of principles layered on to make the US proposal operational.

And I, unfortunately, didn't participate in that, and I just wondered if anybody is clued in, because that would seem to be relevant to note the government's...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Bill. There is [inaudible], who is in the audience, Holly, as well, did you...? So let's start with Holly Raiche, and then we'll go in the audience.

HOLLY RAICHE: Bill, to follow up with the question, I know that we'll be meeting with the GAC, what you're saying is it would probably make a lot of sense to say, what have you said about the transition, and what were your principles? I mean, that's an action item for us, is it not? When we meet with the GAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you wish to respond? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just that these are not statements of the GAC at this point, their statements of individual countries, and you're not likely to get one GAC member try to re-paraphrase what another one said. So I'm not quite sure how effective that is, to find out what happened.

BILL DRAKE: ...had attended and heard for themselves, or looked at a transcript...

ALAN GREENBERG: Bill, I was agreeing completely with what you said, I just don't think that may be as a viable way of doing it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Mr. [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. [Inaudible] good morning to all of you. Just one small point. My name?

Okay. My name is [inaudible], GAC member and ICG member as well. With respect to what Jean-Jacques said, I fully agree with him. I was in the very beginning, raising the same question that he raised, but unfortunately, we were not supported by a few others.

With respect to the activity of the ICG, I also fully agree with him. I sent 50% of the entire email to the ICG, one person. There are other people that send many others, but there are many that did not send anything or few things. So that is a confirmation of what Jean-Jacques said.

Now, coming to what Avri said, whether ICG by dividing the process into three make it difficult, I think people criticizing, they should propose solutions. What else ICG could have done? Because the whole process of names, numbers, and protocol parameters, that are the three. What else could it do? How it could divide it differently? And why there was any comment at all, when this was raised at the very beginning before 15th of August.

So good to raise the question, but good also to propose solutions. Now, coming to GAC issue and accountability, Chairman the issue of accountability is totally vague for GAC members. Accountability has two track. The first track, accountability in relation with the IANA transition [inaudible] stewardship, that is one.

And the other is overall accountability of ICANN. The process has been changed three times. At the beginning, we would, we were told that we had a working group on ICANN accountability. A representative from the 13 communities, similar, I said similar, to ICG, we were happy with that, but it was changed to another each area, and saying that, “No, we don’t want to have representatives as such. We want to have representative from this.” But other people like consultant, like member of the Board, [inaudible].

But now they have changed it again two or three days ago, there was another release and saying that the two group of accountability, one dealing with the IANA function, and the other dealing with the ICANN overall accountability, now they have been put into one single group. And unfortunately, the first issue is, they select an acronym for that with entirely similar, not similar, identical to another group for the cross-community working group dealing with naming under the IANA transition.

So it should not be the same because that is confusing. It has confused 80% of the GAC member, and I was the only one raising the issue three times and asking the ICANN, “Please don’t use this new acronym. Have another acronym.” And now, we don’t understand this talk about the charter, who draft the charter?

They said that chartering organization. Who is the chartering organization? They said that there would be a representative from each of these communities. What is the quota? Is it the same quota as the ICG? Then, they said they would have members of the Board. Why? They would have the staff of the ICANN in the group. Why?

They would have consultant. Why? And then finally, they said that everything goes to ICANN and ICANN would edit the whole thing, so the one to whom the accountability is related, would draft the accountability itself. This is not a separation of power. The one who develop the policy, and the one who implement the policy, should be entirely different and separated. So, this is something that in GAC we were talking to have some, they called, high level principle.

I don't know to what level it will be high, and so on and so forth. People in the GAC, some of them, they confuse the whole process of today or these days with the governance. I told them, "Gentlemen, ladies, please do not mix up the governance of the Internet, with the action that we are doing." They are two entirely, two separate things.

Let us concentrate what we are doing and what we can do. Chairman, in simple fashion, the accountability issue is totally unclear and vague for GAC. And I thank you very much. Sorry I was too long, but I had to explain that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much [inaudible]. We certainly have now a full picture of the discussions in the GAC, and it felt like we were there. So that's really good.

So several issues being raised here. Another issue I wanted to ask about actually, was whether there were any orphan issues that the idea of separating this into three operational communities, are there orphan issues that will fall between the cracks that are not likely to be

addressed if the only people that are allowed to formulate proposals are the operating communities? Is there any point?

I know that Tijani, you are in the queue, so I'll give you the floor now, and I'd like to see if there are any reactions to this, to the orphan issues or potential orphan issues problem after you. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I fully agree with Avri with the fact that the ICG is more or less influencing the output, not by dividing the operating parties into three parties, there are three and nobody can complain about that. But because there, but they wanted the proposal to be, to come only from those three parties. And this is, I think this is the problem.

At the end, I think that we managed to have the possibility to have input from everyone. They said every input is welcome, but what does mean, the input? Is it only comment on the proposal of the three parties? This is the question. If it is this, I think it is big problem. We have to know everyone in the ICG, to give input, even if it is not a comment on the proposal from the three parties. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Tijani. And I'd like to actually, and yes indeed, that question is very important. Have you had any discussions about this in the NCSG?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I don't think we have really explored this issue in detail within the NCSG. But, I think one other issue, I mean other side, maybe, about the problems is, more about the accountability, is how to include those outside ICANN community, and how to liaise with them, that I think that's more about accountability track. So yeah, but for the IANA, I don't think, maybe Avri can remind me, I don't think we have really explored this point within NCSG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rafik. And the orphan issues? Any thinking about this? Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: Just as a simple point. I don't remember what, in the text, we did a statement on about the IANA stuff, right? But it was a while ago. I don't think that we addressed this specifically, but I think we have a shared perspective on it, as both representing user communities, and we think that this will be the kind of thing that will be ripe for a joint intervention, no? I mean, if we do feel strongly about it, and there might be, in fact, possibilities to bring in other parties as well, from the business user end and so on.

Because it is rather restrictive, quite obviously. Our priority designation of who is relevant in a process like this, particularly one that is supposed to establish framework that is of interest not just to the ICANN community, but to the larger world, it's obviously problematic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Bill. And for those that are wondering what orphan issues are. One, for example, is the funding of IANA, bearing in mind the functions are provided on a no cost basis at the moment. We'll just continue with the, how would this need to be changed? Or would this not be changed? That's one of the questions, I can't remember the other ones, just off the top of my head, but there are several.

I think that John [inaudible], say a few words, and then Alan Greenberg. John.

JOHN: Thank you Olivier. John [inaudible] for the record. I'm wondering, has there been any discussion about what we do as an organization if the we fail to come up with a plan for the IANA transition? Where do we go from here? That seems like sound contingency planning. What do we do if this doesn't work? There is a lot of discussion about how to make this work, but what happens when, or what happens if it doesn't actually come to pass?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you John. For this, thanks for making such an optimistic remark early on in the morning. [Laughter] Feels great. Alan Greenberg. It's a very valid point, it is valid and certainly, so far, I'm not sure there is any contingency in the ICG on this. What happens if this goes south? But, perhaps, let's have Alan Greenberg first, and then come back to Jean-Jacques and to Avri as well. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Going south could be for a variety of reasons. We have no proposal, the proposal is not acceptable, the whole deal goes off the table because of whatever politics are going on in the US. I think all of those map to the current status quo continues, and they go out to renew the contract. So I don't see how there is any other alternative to that.

That's largely out of our control. If the NTIA does not exit by turning this over to someone else, something else, then it stays with the NTIA. So I think that's the plan B. That alone, you would think, would make some parties want to make this work, but it's not 100% clear that that's in effect. In terms of orphanage issues, the only two that I came up with, and they might not be orphan issues, if all of the various contracted parties, or interested parties, included their proposals, then they're not orphan anymore.

If none of them mention it, then I think the relevant cost is certainly one of them, currently everything is provided free. That's not the only way the world works, as we obviously know. Language is another one. We're transitioning to a world where we want to say that it is not US-centric anymore, that may imply that it's not English-centric anymore. Can they provide services to parts of the world in their own language, instead of forcing English?

There is probably a few other ones like that. They are only orphan if no one mentions them. We don't know what they're going to mention at this point, so we don't know if they're orphan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Wait, okay, fine. So Avri Doria, and then I've also got Eduardo Diaz in the queue at the moment. So okay, let's start with Avri. Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. Avri Doria speaking. So, I think Alan covered it fairly well, and I raised my hand before he spoke. If we can't solve the problem, the status quo persists, and that's really the simplest solution. You know, not that is what people want, but that's what I believe will happen. And that's why, you know, I got criticized for not having offered different solutions to the ICG, but there was no notion that the ICG would ever accept any different solutions other than their own.

Most groups don't accept different solutions than their own. So, you know, you just sort of accept that, and they said, "We are divided in three, all the world is divided into three." Fine, all the world is divided into three and we live with it. You know, the ICG has said, "If solutions come up from other people, we'll just send them back to the operational communities and they'll deal with them."

Fine. You know? So, I really do not see, you talked about there being very little hope, I really do not see great hope at the moment at resolving this. You know, perhaps my early morning pessimism will be disproved, but the way I watch this going, the way I watched two communities saying, "Everything is fine and we don't need anything from nobody else." You know, that's cool.

And that's...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's not what's being said though, is it?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. If I listen to the IETF, that's certainly what's being said. If I listen to the numbers community, that seems to be what's said, is we got what we got, we want to keep what we got, and you know, give you a proposal, the IETF proposal, you know. And I very dearly love the IETF, but no changes, let's just define what we've got. Let's tell them, send it off to them, and that's the end of the story.

Which is fine, from an IETF perspective, I would agree with that too. But if you look at the larger picture of it, that may not be the right picture. I don't know. So at the moment, I just look at all of this, I look at, you know, the accountability part, and the way we have truly gone off the rails, and we've sort of said, "Oh, okay, we don't want anything that anyone else has offered us in terms of how to structure this accountability thing. We're going to do it all of our own selves."

You know? "And we're going to spend the next four months figuring out how we do it, and then hopefully we can get something done in time." I think people are right, the accountability thing has to be solved before there is any solution to give to NTIA.

Well, so four months to build a group and then we're going to come to agreement? And what? Another three months? And we're going to get approval and everything in that amount of time? I'd love to see it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Avri. You touched on the accountability track there. Are there any views found in the NCSG regarding having this two track accountability process in ICANN now with the fast track related directly to IANA issues? And a slower track, which looks at the bigger picture?

AVRI DORIA: That's, first of all, not what I understood Theresa to be saying. I understood her to be saying, there are two tracks. They're not saying they need to be parallel. They said, you know, "You want to start them together. You want to start them sequential, how you do them." I never heard anyone use the word fast track. Yes, one is, you know, the word fast never appeared in anybody's discussions.

One is, so the first thing I assume that group will do is figure out which things need to be solved for IANA, which things don't. And then go on from there. I listen to the conversations though, and we really are all over the place, where we have some people that say, "Everything has to be solved before IANA."

And we have some people that say, "There is nothing really to solve for IANA." You know, we're fine. So, you know, we have quite a distance to bridge at the moment, but there are two tracks. Whether they're sequential, whether they're parallel, whether they're start together and then forked into separate paths, which I think is probably the most reasonable, is totally up to that group when it gets formed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Avri. So, Jean-Jacques, you're sitting... Okay. So Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair, this is Eduardo Diaz. I want to go back to a conversation before, that was said, what would happen if this doesn't go through? My question is, what happens if you go through and it doesn't work? What happen next? Which is something that you mention this morning, you're looking at, you know, for some reason it doesn't work.

Is that going to be addressed by these groups, the proposal, or what?
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Eduardo. Olivier speaking. It sounds like Monday morning blues. It does not bring a lot of optimism in this, I don't know if it's the topic or the time, or the day.

Yeah, we need to do something about it. Alan Greenberg, you're still ceding your place? Yeah, okay, Alan Greenberg then next.

ALAN GREENBERG: No real answers, but I will point out that this session is a bit premature, given that I believe Larry Strickland is supposed to be talking at the CWG, and he has said there are accountability issues, and he may well be going into it in some detail. And we have his boss, or his boss's boss speaking at the open session, which also may have some interesting comments.

No?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just his boss. I don't think it's his boss's boss. I think it's just the boss.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't debating one of those, and there may be some interesting tidbits included in that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. So, I'll take the three following points. First, the thing about Monday morning blues, no. This is too serious to go by rude optimism/pessimism. This is about major world interests, for one country but for many others as well. So I have three remarks.

One is, what do we take away from our meeting today? I have a very concrete suggestion. Is that each in her or his community, when the opportunity arises, are speaking collectively to the ICG, to individuals from the ICG, should make clear what are the requirements of the communities we represent. I think that one point which came up yesterday during the discussion in the ALAC, in my presence, was that...

And Tijani brought up the question, is there a different status, almost a different level of credibility or legitimacy in the contributions which I expected from different parts of the community? On the one hand, there are three operational communities, and on the other hand, all the rest. I don't have a quick reply to that, but I engage you very strongly,

to bring this up and to require, before the end of ICANN 51, a clearer response than the one we have had until now.

My second point is about status quo, here again, you should not go according to optimism or pessimism, it's all about interests, and the stakes are very, very high. So, we must place in the context of, especially domestic US policy. There will be elections in not very long, and if you look at the two timetables, the ICG timetable or the IANA transition planned timetable, and the domestic policy timetable with the elections looming, then if you look at it from a very analytical and geo-strategic point of view, I think that the present situation does present the NTIA and the political leadership in the US, with the advantage of two possibilities.

The first is towards the liberal community in the US, and worldwide, to say, "Well, you see, we really have tried." Since our April statement, the NTIA made known its willingness to transition the stewardship, but you see, it's not working that well. So for the sake of continuity of the root system, the whole domain name system, unfortunately we may have to continue.

And then that sense, of course, the result, the plan, the ICG will or will not deliver, will be of prime importance. The other thing is that, the alternative for the representatives of the US, is to say, "Well, it's going to work, but if it doesn't work, well, sorry. We have not alternative, we just have to continue as is, and leave the arrangements currently operating between IANA and ICANN, under the stewardship of the NTIA."

So I think we have to take this in a very cool-headed, very hard-headed way, and understand that from the point of view of Washington, who whom I don't represent of course, but I can understand their point of view, all of this is very logical. It has nothing to do with emotions, and I think we should be prepared to face either of these alternatives.

And that depends partly on you, on us. My third point is, there is a new phase looming now for us in the ICG, and that is the 15th of January 2015. That is the date by which, at the latest, we have to receive, we expect to receive all contributions from all communities. It's not the complexity of the proposals which will win the day.

I'm looking at all of us in the ALAC especially. We don't want to build a machine which is 50 stories high, and unwieldy, we want to concentrate on some major dynamic points, which are usable, almost directly in the ICG framework. So I think that, speaking as an ALAC representative, we really have to get cracking now to have a presentable option of our contribution before the 15th of January. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. And you touched on the timing, of course, 15th of January being the first, a first deadline for the working groups that are going to prepare those proposals, and of course, in ICANN, the cross-community working group on the naming part of the issues.

There is only one ICANN meeting where this can take place face to face, which is this meeting, and it looks as though the working group will meet for the first time, and then after that, there is just going to be

conference calls, and no further face to face meeting, in order to come up to a solution. Do you see this as workable? Or in fact, this is sort of a general question with everyone around, or is there a real concern that a face to face would be needed?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'm going to reply to this. This is Jean-Jacques. Olivier, I think the question is not can we. If the challenge is placed that high, we must, full stop, do what is necessary to get that cracking. It will take conference calls, fine, let's do them and do them as well as we can. What is important is the result, it's not the means to get there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Right now in the queue I have Alan Greenberg, then Holly Raiche, and Milton has just come in, I don't know whether you wish to add any points, you're catching this halfway, but let's start with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't help but note that, for the second time in this little discussion, we've identified a real problem which we forced on ourselves. Jean-Jacques earlier talked about the unbalance in the participation of the coordination group. You will recall, the original proposal was that there be some selectors that the various groups make proposals and a group of selectors pick the people, which is one of the mechanisms one can use to try to balance participation.

We outright rejected it and said, “We need to pick our own people, and they go, no questions asked, and therefore the group has whoever we put on it.” And if we can’t get together and say, “Let’s make sure we balance gender, or country, or region, or whatever, they get what we give them.” Here too, we basically have said, several times, “We want a group that we form. Our rules say there is unlimited participation.”

Asking ICANN to fund a group of unlimited participation and ferry them around the world is probably a really difficult thing to do. We tried to have participants and observers, or members and observers, where if they had those titles, we can say, “Well, maybe just the members get sent around the world.” But we said, “No, everyone has to be able to participate equally.”

So, you know, we set up conditions which we think we want, but then they have implications, and we can’t absolve ourselves completely of the responsibility.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the record. First of all, I guess I don’t necessarily share the conviction that all else fails, everything is going to be status quo. I think if you read, AC068, you realize how complex it is and you realize that we’re not talking about one contract, we’re actually talking about relationship with IAB, relationship with IETF.

And we're sort of in there, but we're not the only ones in there. And we're not talking about one contract, we're talking about a range for arrangements. I didn't mean to say that. And so if we don't get it right, there is actually a lot of other parties. And we haven't thought about that in the context of, this is just, we're just one party here in about three, the others may be very happy, and it may just, they may just go on their merry way.

So, let's not actually be quite [inaudible]. I would say to the imperative that Jean-Jacques has said, is we must actually come up with something by January 15th. Maybe we should actually start?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. Next is Milton Mueller. With a full mouth.

MILTON MUELLER: First of all, let me apologize for being late. The appointment was in my Outlook calendar, in my laptop, which runs Outlook, doesn't automatically change the time zone, whereas my Google calendar on my phone adjusts for the time zone, so I thought this meeting was at 10:15.

So, I like what Holly said in her last statement, was that sort of we should get started with proposals and debating the merits and the substance rather than the process, which is pretty much in place. And I would just call to mind that we, the Internet Governance Project submitted a paper on how to do the IANA transition back in March, and then we got a lot of feedback and criticism, and so we modified it.

Brendon Curtis and I did this paper for the TPRC conference, in which we set out a specific proposal, which was pretty well received in Washington. And I'm not saying that we should all just rally behind this proposal, but at least it's better to start with a proposal, and say what you like or don't like about it, or what you would want to modify about it.

I think the dialogue would advance much more quickly if we talked about that, rather than the process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Milton. So, I'll ask Rafik as to what... Really, we've heard a lot of concerns about various points, including the process, but also the actual real issues. So Rafik, how do we move forward on this? Do we come up with a joint statement? Do we enhance the collaboration between our two parts of the same organization when you think of it?

Do we have, do we strengthen the ad-hoc working group that we have? And of course, the floor is very welcome to add any suggestions as to where to go now. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. It's Rafik speaking. Okay, I think, the idea of statement is good, but Alan raised the point that maybe, we need to know what, I mean, what we would hear today of the different session that can change our mind, or whatever we would like to say, but I guess that's one first step.

Also, we need quite to react the ad-hoc group we discussed, but after Singapore as a follow up, I think it didn't fly so much as expected. I guess with the time constraints, that would make it quite active, because we know that we have to deliver something in specific time. It's not going for one year or more. So I guess that's one of the action item, how we can have as a follow up, is to activate that ad-hoc group, maybe to expand, I mean, for the participation from the two different structure, and then we agree what we want to achieve.

So, it's just maybe coordination, just kind of liaising, sharing ideas, and so on, or trying maybe to work on some common position and so on. So yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Rafik. So, ad-hoc group, mailing list that we still don't have a mailing list ready for it, let's have an action item to create the mailing list. I think that's probably the easiest way. A lot more robust than just having a Skype chat, which is just very informal.

So the mailing list, open to all really, and with of course, a call in each one of our communities to join that mailing list. Can this be done during this meeting? Okay, perfect. So we can have that. Certainly, I was looking at one thing which was whether we are aligned on some of these issues, and whether, I gather this afternoon, the cross-community working group will have its first face to face meeting, whether we could actually say, well if one party raises a certain concern, then we can certainly support this, and align our views.

If there is a need to push an issue, if there is any pushback from other communities. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

About the cross-community working group in IANA, maybe we if we can help them to resolve the issue of the chairs and co-chairs. I mean, I don't think it was a really good start, and the first call, when we still have that discussion about the chair. I mean, co-chairs, and then vice-chairs, I mean we spent a lot of time about this in the first goal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

It's Olivier speaking. Is there any, do you have, have you discussed this within the NCSG, and is there any direction that you would like to be in? I think we're quite, we're not really, as far as the ALAC is concerned, and I'd like to get some feedback from my colleagues, because I don't think we've actually spent really any time on this, whether we have any particular view about chairs and co-chairs of a cross-community working group.

I felt there was less of a political thing then the international coordination group, which was something much more outward facing.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I meant, it's really to, that this cross-community working group will need to fix all of these issues so that it can start working. We need to [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. I think there is certainly concern, and this whole process about chairs and co-chairs, doesn't appear to be something that we want to be stuck on, on this in particular. I don't see anyone... Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I think that the leadership of the cross-community working group, is more or less, decided on. I think that we don't have to fight a lot to have something that is more balance or something like this, but for the community, cross-community and for the community coordination group, yes, we have to, and we have to get the users at the leadership.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. So that's another thread of course. We didn't touch too much on that. But it's the IANA one that's meeting this afternoon, I believe. So I think that, if we can just agree that none of the ALAC will be trying to insist on resolving the chair issue, and I think, as face to face, this chair thing can be resolved on conference calls or whatever, but when we're meeting face to face, let's get down to the issue right away. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you started off a minute ago, saying if we have any positions, we should present them and see if anyone else agrees or whatever. That was presuming we actually get down to substance today. I don't think there is a chance in anything that that's going to happen. We may well

not be debating chairs, but I'm sure there is a thousand other things that we will have to debate, sadly.

I'm willing to basically do away with almost all of the process questions, and start, at least in parallel, if not, if we can't resolve everything process, let's do it in parallel, and start the substantive discussion and that's certainly what I would be pushing for, as we go forward.

To waste a face to face meeting purely on process, I think is going to be close to a crime, but I think it's probably going to happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. This is Jean-Jacques. I would like to support what Alan has just said. In fact, I would suggest that you, at least the chairs, the co-chairs, get together to determine a short list of what you consider, Olivier and Rafik, as the most important issues. You don't want to be encyclopedic, you want to identify, three, four, five major questions, on which you will be working together, or we'll all be working together.

Any other approach is doomed. If you want to be complete, total encyclopedic, it won't get anywhere, it would take too much time. So identify the real issues where we really have a possibility of adding value with regard to the positions or the interests of the global Internet user.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. So that's really for our joint group, to proceed with. Any other points regarding this afternoon's meeting. I can certainly say that the position that Alan has expressed, there is certainly my personal position. So unfortunately, we haven't had the chance to devise a position of all of the ALAC members on this, but I haven't seen anyone raise their hand to say anything to the contrary.

And certainly, as a member of the cross-community working group, I shall certainly, if we start discussing process again and again and again, I shall certainly be expressing my concerns, and saying, "Let's just get down to the darn work and not waste this opportunity." And so I think that if enough of us say that, we can focus on things, and I hope that there is no one there to start to derail the process or whatever, that's another possibility.

Fatima Cambroner.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Olivier. I'm siding with Alan and with you. Even also, I raise the issue of the interpretation in the teleconference of the cross-community working group. I think that topic could be a result, or keep discussing through the mailing list, but not in this present meeting. The issue of the interpretation of the teleconference or the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Fatimata. That's a very good point as well. Of course, we've launched this. Again, it wasn't a case of saying, "Well, let's discuss this for three weeks." It's a yes or a no, and this is again,

procedural. So very good that you mentioned that, let's also agree that we're not going to raise this during the meeting this afternoon.

I just want to get down to the work. Any other points? Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Oh, I would raise it. I want to debate it. ICANN comes back, says yes, no. Make sure their tasked with responding to that, and of course, I dare them to say no, but nevertheless, you know. I don't think we want to debate it. If it's a yes, why would anyone fight it? If it's a no, we can discuss when the answer comes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. And I was just reminded, it's Olivier speaking. I was just reminded by Rafik that with regards to creation of the mailing list, can we have it done ASAP please? Rather than wait for the end of the week, and send the call for members on both NCSG, I'll guess we'll send it to you and then we can forward it to the NCSG, and the ALAC on the other. So we can already start using that mailing list whilst we're here in Los Angeles. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

So yeah, you talked about the time concerns, so let's start the work and the coordination. Sorry. I think the, we, Olivier? I think we should look at the time because we need to go the opening session, the opening ceremony. So, basically, we heard a lot of comments, points, and there is a lot of discussion about what should be done for the two tracks about the community and the IANA.

There is, we have deadlines, so I think both, I mean, ALAC and NCSG, we have to work on that to support [inaudible] outside of ICANN community, it's important to bring those who don't really participate in the process and to bring their voices.

So I'm happy, I'm really glad that we had this session. So let's do work, and let's follow up, that's the main point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. And thanks to all of you for coming in so early. And this meeting is now adjourned. And we've got the opening ceremony in a few minutes. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]