LOS ANGELES – ALAC and ccNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, October 16, 2014 – 07:30 to 08:15
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …Thursday the 16th of October, 2014. It's the ALAC and ccNSO Council meeting. Welcome to our ccNSO visitors, should I say, or guests. Katrina Sataki.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning. Unfortunately, our Chair, Byron Holland, could not make it this morning, but I hope that we will… We will wave the flag without him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Welcome. We also have Lesley Cowley, who is… And Demi Getschko, hiding behind the camera, but we might turn to you later on.

So, we have a welcome by the outgoing Chair of ALAC, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, an introduction of incoming Chair, Alan Greenberg. Okay, so I'm discovering the agenda, of course, as we are. Which was, the agenda, of course, was prepared by Maureen Hilyard and Ron Sherwood. And the working group that we have to prepare those agendas.

So as you know, yes, this is my last ALAC meeting. So the next meeting, last ICANN meeting as a Chair. The next Chair of the ALAC, well barring any last minute changes, is Alan Greenberg. I'm not sure, Alan, did you

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.

wish to say a couple of words? Or should we just move straight to the agenda?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's proceed with the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So over to you Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, well thank you Olivier. And I must say that on behalf of ccNSO community, we thank you for the work you put into ALAC to strengthening ties between ALAC and ccNSO. I think that, well, it's really been great working with you, and I hope that you'll still be around and will help us to move our relationship even further, because it's really important that our communities now come together and start discussing issues.

There are many issues to discuss. And of course, I would like to welcome Alan as the new Chair. And I must say that we at the ccNSO have a lot of experience with Canadians, especially Canadian chairs. So dear ALAC members, if you have any questions, please… Exactly. Not actually. There are many, many Canadians now in top positions.

And our Canadians hope that at some point, ICANN will sponsor a Canadian hockey team. Yes, it has been a very busy time for us as the ccNSO. I think just as for the whole ICANN community, we've been pretty occupied by IANA transition. It's a very important issue for the

stakeholders who are directly involved, and ccTLD community. It's definitely one which is very much impacted by all these issues.

And finally, got [inaudible] off on the CWG, and we have to thank Olivier for the work you've done there. He has been very actively engaged in this process from the very beginning. Accountability also has been quite a challenge, from the process perspective. We can, well definitely exchange views a bit later. So Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And our next agenda item is the ATLAS 2 declaration issues. And we have a few minutes just to take you through a few of the points of the ATLAS 2 declaration. This, as a reminder, was a document that was ratified by the ALAC and drafted by the 150 At-Large structures, at that time, yes, that came to London, to the At-Large summit, otherwise known as the ATLAS.

If we can have a copy of the page on the screen, that would be great. So the reason why we thought about having this, and sharing these with you, is that there are a handful of these topics that are actually aimed with recipients aimed at SO and AC Chairs, and of course, that includes the Chair of the ccNSO.

So we have 43 recommendations that were drafted, of which 22, I believe, were aimed at the Board, and the rest were aimed at either the At-Large community, other SOs and ACs, or the ALAC itself. We setup an ATLAS implementation taskforce, a follow up implementation taskforce, that looked at the recommendations and started to flesh them out, perhaps expand on some of them, since they were just one

EN

liner. So there were might have been some ambiguity or perhaps it was just a seed to start of future work.

So I just wanted to go through a handful of them. I hope that we have, we have the text, we have an ending to the post ATLAS 2 activities workspace, which I shall put into the chat. There we are. So for people, you can click on this and that's a wiki page, which takes us through all of the recommendations, and doing a search, recommendation four, for example, says, "ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of liaisons between its different advisory committees and supporting organizations, to do away with the silo culture."

That certainly appears to be mandate for both Ron Sherwood and Maureen Hilyard to strengthen their activities. How could they do better? Yes, it's… Maureen, did you want to comment quickly on this? Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're working on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're working on it. Okay, great. Well the very fact we're having this agenda and we're moving forward seems to be… I think we've got good interaction with the ccNSO. Maureen files a report monthly, that she has the chance to also explain on our ALAC calls. I'm not sure how this works in the ccNSO. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.   Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.   One thing I thought might be interesting for the ccNSO to know, and as I believe, because the ccNSO and ALAC relationship between liaisons, and of course, the relationship between the GNSO and ALAC in terms of liaisons, are long-standing and well-established.

But of course, what we have done internally is that our liaisons, that's to the GNSO, the ccNSO, and to the SSAC, ex facto on the leadership team. So there is a continued ability, and yes, sadly, many more meetings in a month, that the liaisons, that our liaisons have to report in and bring things up to speed.

And I'm just putting that out there because I know there is great variability where we have liaisons in other places, how they operate. Of course, GNSO tricks the liaison as council members, but I'm unsure whether that, other than the ALAC, that who we send out kept that close to the leadership team. Just thought it was worth noting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Looking back at the page, I also… It's Olivier speaking. I also realize that some recommendations are aimed at the wider ICANN community. I'm not sure we have the time to go through these. There are handful of these. Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you Chair. Katrina Sataki for the record. Yes, maybe we should not go through all of the recommendations, but there is one

observation, as opposed to a recommendation, which really triggered interest in our community, for obvious reasons, because it's mentioned ccTLDs, and so let me quote, "Obtain openness and transparency from each country's ccTLD, or country code operator."

And we would really appreciate some clarification, and could you please elaborate more on this observation?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Katrina. I feel a tingling feeling down the back of my neck at the moment. So just to first explain observations, and then I'll hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg who will be most qualified to answer this question. The recommendations, of course, are really what we have aimed at the Board, at the ALAC and so on, for action.

The observations are not recommendations, as their name implies, and the reason for this is that when reviewing all the recommendations. Some of them were neither aimed, were either not aimed at any particular ICANN communities, so it's very difficult to provide recommendations to communities that are outside of ICANN, and of course, we are aware that with regards to ccTLDs, the policy work, and the definition of the ccTLD's operations are not done at ccNSO level, and not within ICANN, but of course is the responsibility of the individual TLDs.

So this came, this became an observation. It's not something that we can ask to be actionable, but I would guess you can say this as a hope for best practice. I'm not quite sure how to exactly interpret this. Alan, then we have Maureen, and then Evan. Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think all of these statements need to be prefaced with a little bit of background. We have these summits periodically. This is the second one we had, the last one was five years ago. We have had huge growth since then. One of the main reasons for the summit is to expose the people from periphery of the At-Large organization to what ICANN is, comprehending it all by reading websites and email lists, is a bit daunting.

On the first day they're here, we ask them to sit down and start drafting recommendations. That may or may not be the wisest way to operate, therefore they may not be worded in the most diplomatic sense, form, and they may not be fully cognoscente and aware of what's actually going on. We tried to do a lot of training ahead of time, some people attend, some people don't.

So with some forgiveness, take everything with a grain of salt.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And hence, it's Olivier speaking. And hence, that became an observation, rather than a recommendation. Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Also just raising the fact that within the regional organizations, we've been trying to sort of like develop relationships between ccTLDs and the ALSs. And we've actually, because we found that a lot of the ALSs actually aren't aware of what the operations are, within their ccTLDs, which is why we started to build up the database, which we're still

working on. And yeah, again, it's just really [inaudible] create some better understanding between the two organizations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Maureen. Next is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier, this is Evan. I think part of the call that you see here, I think also reflects a general end user unawareness of the distinction between generics and cc's. And as well as a complete lack of understanding that ICANN has basically no policy authority over cc's. You know that, we know that, folks out there don't know that. And so, I was wondering, and maybe transparency isn't the right term for this, but for instance, does there exist anything on the ICANN website that says, "The following TLDs are not governed by ICANN, and here is pointers to the websites where they are."

Even something like that, I think would go a long way towards providing end user and consumer information that would be very helpful. It would demonstrate the components of the TLD world that are not governed by ICANN, and I think would go a long way to providing some very useful information that helps show the differences, while at the same time, if somebody has a problem with a TLD, saying don't go to ICANN, go here. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki for the record. Thank you for the question and observation. Yes, I would say that on the ICANN website you can clearly find a distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs. Not that they are on separate lists, there is one list, but regarding policy, if you read carefully, you can definitely see that.

But I agree that people do not read. Not carefully, they do not read, period. Regarding the pointers to website, on the IANA database, whenever you open detailed information about any ccTLDs, or gTLD, you can see pointed to their website, so it's there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan Leibovitch for a response, and then…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just a small comment. The issue that it exists somewhere buried in the IANA pages, the problem is that it is not accessible to end users that don't know where to look. That's the big issues, and this ends up, I guess, where it is a transparency issue, that it's not something that is buried within the lingo of ICANN somewhere in the website, but becomes very clear somebody has a problem with the website where they find the TLD.

I'm just trying to make the issue as a matter of transparency as a matter of clarity to end users to being able to put this in accessible language, in

a way that's easy to find without saying, "You have to go here, then here, then here, and then you may find it."

We understand conscientious users that understand the culture here, can understand where to find that, but I'm thinking of, you know, my family back home, if they have a complaint with a domain, where do they look? What exists right now is totally impenetrable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Lesley Cowley.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Lesley Cowley from ccNSO. I accept Alan's health warning, and Evan, your comments are really helpful, because it struck me, actually from what you said, plus the issue is more around communication and information, as opposed to transparency. So it's really helpful to add some such as comments, as part of this dialogue that gives ccTLD operators something to take back and think about.

Because I can absolutely agree with you that some operators are maybe not as clear, as not as straightforward when you're going to the website. And if it's as simple as that, that's actually relatively easy, one would hope, to remedy, because that's for the good of everybody. So I guess a bit more color on what we might do, and what would be considered as best practice, would be really helpful for us to work on together perhaps.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Lesley. I have Alan Greenberg in the queue next.

ALAN GREENBERG: As we were talking, I went to the ICANN website, and you can easily find, going from the very first menu, a list of all TLDs. Now assuming you know what the acronym TLD is, but we'll ignore that. Sadly, however, it is an ASCII list of the TLDs, not a pointer, not an indication of what kind of TLD it is, it is an ASCII list of words.

We have a little bit of work to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Holly Raiche and then the queue is closed. We need to move on to the next item. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just 20 seconds to say, I have the same problem with most of the website, that if you don't know what you're looking for, there is no way you'll find it. And indeed, if you do know what you're looking for, you can't find it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly, Olivier speaking. So, the rest of the recommendations, this is an observation. I guess we can probably have a follow up item on this, let's have an action item please. And the action item is for the ALAC to follow up with observation number eight in the ATLAS 2 declaration. We were not planning on following up on any of the observations specifically.

Our real priority at the moment is to follow up on the recommendations themselves. And in fact, looking at the list of recommendations that might effect, or that would be of interest to the ccNSO, that's the way to say it, these haven't yet been fleshed out. So we will probably follow-up with you, in Marrakesh, if we manage to find time to have a joint meeting at that point.

And in the meantime, we will be coming back to you with the request that you've just made, that perhaps we could provide more details about our best practices that we would like to, that we would be interested in seeing. So let's go to the next agenda item and time is tight. So the next one is number three, no number four, and that's the shared IANA and accountability issues.

Now, of course, these are huge, huge topics. We have about 20 minutes to discuss these, just under 20 minutes. I'm not going to ask for a full interaction from our leaders in the topic, but what we do have is a working group that feeds the IANA issues on the one hand, feeds our two ICG members on the one side, and also feeds the members of the cross-community working group on IANA naming issues, I think I've shortened it enough.

And on this other side, we are creating an ad-hoc accountability working group to feed on the accountability process, and that's of course, the coordination on the one hand, and the cross-community group on the other hand. So these are the two tracks that we have on our side. Cheryl, did you wish to…? Or are you just rearranging your name? No, you wish to have the floor. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. You're using a term that we are familiar with, how we feed into appointed people, and I'm sure whether or not the record for ccNSO, they're thinking we're having dinner or what's going on. We have regular, weekly meetings, with an ad-hoc working group, that runs usually 60 or 90 minutes, I can't remember, they run midnight at 3 AM for me, so it's… 90 minutes.

So every week, the two people we having sitting on the RCG with our wider community, have a full, frank, and fearless discussion going two ways. So that's feed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this explanation Cheryl. So we have an enormous amount of work in front of us, and of course the whole week has been really busy with several meetings. We had a meeting, it sounds like a few years ago, but it was actually couple of days ago, with the ICG. We met with the ASO as well, and really the purpose of our meeting here is just to find out what kind of issues your community were interested in or were going to focus on in the proposal, and I believe, from the naming community since they're ccs.

And I'm saying here ccs, not only ccNSO, I did say ccs, including non-ccNSO members are interested in the names. I wouldn't imagine there would be so much involvement in numbers, or in protocol parameters. Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki. Yes, very to the point. Exactly. That has been our concern, to reach out to those who are not ccNSO members, and even further, to those who are not involved in regional [inaudible], in any other organization. Those ccTLDs who have not been active so far. What we have done, we have established a world TLD email list, where any, any ccTLD operator can sign up and receive latest news.

What we do care about, for us the most important point is to ensure business continuity. To ensure that those servers keep resolving, and that is the main point we're really focusing on, apart from the political issues. Technically, we must provide the service.

What we would like really to know from you, could you give us the sense that at this point, what your community is actually looking for on the IANA function transition. So what's the essence here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Katrina. I open the floor if anyone wishes to start with this. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a couple of things. I think we conceptually have thought about the whole IANA issues, in terms of probably two streams. One is that the more technical issues which are about resolving servers, root, etc. And what we have thought as an ALAC contribution is to have that kind of overlay question about are there performance metrics? Are they monitored? Are they reported publically? What happens if they're not met?

Those sorts of issues. So what are the accountability issues? And we are not digging down into the more technical stuff. I understand where you're coming from, in which where the ccs are coming from, which is, we wanted to keep working and what happens if it doesn't? And I think that's a concern we share. Then the other part of what we're looking at is accountability in the short-terms, which is more a how robust is the ICANN Board, its structures.

And really go back to a comment that Larry Strickland made when he addressed the meeting, which was what happens with a hostile takeover the ICANN Board? Which I must admit, I haven't conceptualized. But, you know, that kind of level of, the security of the openness and the accountability of ICANN itself, quite apart from the technical. So that's the way we've been approaching it.

From what I hear, you're saying, part of your concern is that technical, so that the ccs that are not part of the IANA family, nevertheless would be complying with say, the ITEF requirements, or the MOU with IAB, so it's that technically you're asking? Are you asking anything else? Because clearly, some ccs have no involvement whatsoever with ICANN, other than that kind of technical level. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. Any other points? Alan, you wanted to speak next. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one thought related to what Holly was talking about. The hostile takeover of the ICANN Board example. Those of you who are not old

enough, do not remember a president's committee… Sorry? President's strategy committee that existed several years ago, and looked at a number of things, including what to do if the ICANN Board, I think, goes rogue or the community decides, and they looked at a number of options, including what I believe they call the nuclear option, that is we recall the entire ICANN Board and start from scratch.

There were a number… It's worth reading because it sounds simple, until you say, "Fine, who runs ICANN while we are selecting the new Board? Who selects the new Board? Why do we trust them more than we trust the outgoing Board that we just ditched." As we look at options related to that, the president's strategy committee did not really end up going anywhere, but they did a lot of work. And it may be worth reading some of it, just so we don't have to repeat all of the same work.

We may come to the same conclusions they did, we may not. But it's history that shouldn't be ignored completely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Don Hollander.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you. Don Hollander from APTLD. So, what I think I've just heard is a big focus from ALAC on the accountability issues, and I'm just not sure what I'm hearing from ALAC on the IANA transition issues. Is this something that you're saying, "Oh it's really not about us and we're more interested in the accountability?"

Which is a perfectly fine response. I'm just trying to get a sense of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Don. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So the ALAC had, just as a follow up, they had a meeting with the ICG on Tuesday afternoon. And then had a brainstorming session. And I wanted to share with you the result of the brainstorming, so bear in mind this is very rough, at the moment, but these are just the issues which the ALAC, or the working group members, not even the ALAC, but all of the working group members that were present, raised and that we will be looking at in the forthcoming weeks.

With the view of probably forming our own input into the ICG. There was a concern at the beginning that the three operational communities were the only ones allowed to bring proposals to the ICG, and the other communities would just be bringing input that would be considered at a different level than the proposals. And the response that we have had from the ICG is that all of the proposals and input would be considered on a par level, provided, of course, that there reasonable.

And so we've worked along that line. Of course, we have some of our members that are, some member At-Large structures that are involved directly in the operational communities, that would be creating the proposals, but they won't be acting as At-Large representatives. For example, we have some people who are members who are active in the IETF. And as we know, the IETF, the way the IETF works, people participate in their personal capacity. But there will be some kind of coordination, if you want, as in those members, or those member ALSs

reporting back to the working group and saying what they've been up to in these operational communities.

Now, yeah. Don Hollander?

DON HOLLANDER: I'm just really excited to hear about the brainstorming results.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Don. I'll try to make it even more exciting by building it up. [Laughter] Okay. Let's… I think staff can put it on one of the screens, but, oh. First, Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Two things to follow up on what Alan said. I was a member of the president's strategy committee, and one of the chief drafters of the recommendations, which was called, the whole thing was called improving institutional confidence. So there was the word confidence. Nowadays, we tend to talk more about accountability. But what's interesting is that in both cases, a linguist would point something even above that, which is trust.

I think this is the real question. I agree with Alan that it would be useful for those interested to go back to the conclusions, and especially the recommendations of the work that we did then. The other thing I want to bring up is for our colleagues for the ccNSO, I think there are two things which are interesting in what we do.

The first is the methodology, right from the start, when it was understood that the ALAC could contribute two or whatever number of participants, in the ICG itself, that immediately a group was formed in order to vet all of the subjects which could come up, and which would be of interest to the general Internet user. And that's how Mohamed El Bashir and myself, the two ALAC representatives at the ICG, are quote/unquote fed with information and perhaps instructions. This is extremely useful.

In fact, I think this is the chief difference between us and some other groups who are taking part in the ICG. So, what I said to my colleagues on the ALAC the other day for the input of the ALAC is, first of all, we want something which is not encyclopedic. We have to choose our subjects. We can't cover everything, because many communities will be contributing all sorts of stuff on all sorts of subjects, which will make the task of the ICG extremely complex, but never mind.

The main thing is that there is no point in us spending time on subjects which will probably be better treated or more completely by some other community. So we have to choose our subjects, drill down on them, and respect the timetable, because there was also some talk about, oh, well, the timetable may be flexible, etc. I advise that that is not the case. We have to keep to that, and give our input through Mohamed and myself before the 15th of January. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. We have a queue with Lesley Cowley first.

LESLEY COWLEY:	Thank you. I was pleased to see risk on your lists there, because it strikes me that the issues you're talking around, and that I would suggest would be particularly helpful, from the ALAC is non-technical risks and how they might be mitigated, or addresses. And I guess in cc experience, risks that need nuclear options are fairly infrequent, if ever. What is more of an issue is often a gradual drift, for example.

Particularly when it comes to issues of trust and accountability. And I guess there is lots of us that are going to be focusing on technical risks and mitigation of that, and operational risks, be particularly because of the effects it might have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Lesley. Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you. Completely agree with what Lesley just said. Plus I would also like to say that for us, at ccNSO, it's really interesting to hear what you, as a community, see. And perhaps you can raise some issue that we, as IANA's direct customers, do not notice. And maybe it's not an issue for us, but that's an issue for you, and it would be really important for us to know what those issues are, and maybe we can address them together.

And another thing about the, this tight schedule, timeline that we are forced to operate in. For us, the deadline of October 2015 is more like a hard stop then a notional deadline, so we really committed to do everything that we can. At the same time, for us, it's more important to

ICANN LOS ANGELES

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

have real substantial proposal than just something thrown on the table. Thank you.

Thank you very much for this Katrina. Olivier speaking. And for the benefit of those people following us remotely, and there are quite a few, the list reads as follows, just reading through it quickly and perhaps with a few words about it. So this is the list of just the brainstorming topics, issues that came out.

Post transition safeguards. I think a lot actually going into the continuity that you mentioned as well. There is a real concern in our community that some might wish to shake the whole process, and shake the whole arrangement. And I don't think that this was the feeling of our community, certainly in the input that we received on this.

So post transition safeguards, performance metrics accomplished regularly. That was something that, I think, was quite strong. The response strategies, risk management metrics. How do we recognize satisfaction? Customer satisfaction? End user satisfaction as to how things…? What is a satisfactory state of operations? And so on.

The confidence in the root zone, continuity of allocation of IP addresses in fairness. There was concern that some of the current policies of IP allocation, which appears to be working well, might be changed in the future to the detriment of Internet end users. So continuity of allocation of IP addresses and fairness.

No changes of current IP policies, as you see key processes, do not change them. That sounds very much like continuity. And finally,

creation of another oversight body, was something that was touched on because we wanted to see whether there would be any advantage of creating another oversight body, but I do understand, and I think I'm not overstepping my mark, that our community fully understands that creating a second ICANN would just create us double the headache, then we currently have.

So, it's… Of course, this is still open, but it looks like there might be, or might not be… It's just an avenue that we have to explore. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. Just a minor point of vocabulary. The creation of an oversight body is something which we have heard on and off over the past few years, it's the thought, the idea, the notion of the creation of a sort of senate, which would be linked, loosely linked to ICANN, but which would be above ICANN. That's simply an idea.

We're not working on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Jean-Jacques. So you will not wake up to a new senate. Okay. So are there any questions or comments? Don Hollander.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much. Don Hollander from APTLD. Not terribly relevant to APTLD, but my colleagues at APNIC have a community driven approach to setting policies, and what this rough mind map, or brainstorming dump, suggests is that you want those frozen, and I don't

think that's really… I certainly hope that's not what you want. That you would want the continued community developed policies for IP address allocation to continue. Is that correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Don. I believe that is the intent, of course, is to keep processes that work, keep them running basically. So if the current policy development process within APNIC, and within the different RIRs work, then why change them? I think that was pretty much the intent. Sort of keep things that work. Not to say freeze things.

So of course, yeah, I ask for your indulgence on the wording of these. Of course, as I said, these are just verbatim from the notice board that we had, and we should have prepared for this, unfortunately, but we didn't have the time until now to translate them into English, or something that makes sense.

Okay. I think that we've reached the end of this meeting, certainly the time allocated to it. I'm not sure whether you have any more questions or comments regarding the IANA stewardship transition, or because we're all here.

Don Hollander.

DON HOLLANDER: So, just a, given that nobody else has questions. Can we subscribe as lurkers to your discussion list?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Don. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And indeed, our lists are all open. At the moment is that there are lists, is you have to subscribe to it, we allow anybody to subscribe to it. However, what we do not allow, is for the archives to be publically viewable at the moment. You have to be a list member to view the archive. The reason for it being that Google has the intention of lurking through those quite a lot.

And for anyone who does not join, and does not know some of the background to the discussions that we have, they might suddenly put something in the ALAC's mouth, which of course, might be just discussion points at the time itself. So we do have a concern about uninformed people coming in and drawing conclusions from the discussions.

That was, it's a small concern, but of course, we would accept, I think, everyone who wishes to come in. But Tijani Ben Jemma and Holly Raiche, no Holly. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I know that the cross-community working group just started, and any submission or any proposal will come from there, but as a naming structure, I am sure you are not waiting for this working group to start your work. So, what are you

now, in preparing the contribution of the ccNSO for the transition of the naming function of IANA?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Over to you Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's Katrina Sataki. Of course you're right, waiting the [inaudible]… Of course, we work, and the work being done not only in the group, also in regional organizations. For example, one of the first steps was to identify all of those ccTLDs we haven't reached so far. And regional organizations now working on survey to try to gather as much information as possible from our fellow ccTLDs, to get some statistical information, to get their view of what their expectations.

That's a quick answer, but yes, of course we've already started work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Katrina. Tijani Ben Jemaa with a follow-up, but we have to be quick because we are over time. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Did you already coordinate with the GNSO? We don't have any idea about what could be the proposal?

KATRINA SATAKI: We had a meeting with the GNSO this week, and of course we have liaisons with GNSO as well. Currently we're working in parallel. Of

course, we must take into account the ccTLDs have slightly different focus, and different interests than gTLDs. So, I mean that's a quick answer. But yes, are aware of the work done by the GNSO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Katrina. So going back to the action item, let's make it that members of the ccNSO, if they wish, should be added to the ALAC IANA issues working group, which is our working group, our backend working group if you wish. I don't whether after this, you might just give your details to the At-Large staff, or for those people that are following remotely, send an email to staff at At-Large dot ICANN dot org, and they'll add you over to the mailing list.

And of course, we welcome your input on this. It's good to have people who are experts in the field. So with this, I think that we've reached the end of our meeting. Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much for this interesting discussion, and I'm looking forward to keeping, all of these issues, keeping in touch and hope for a very productive exchange of ideas and views in the future as well. See you all in Marrakesh. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Katrina. Bye-bye.

And now we have to go to the main hall, I believe, for the sessions. Los Angeles, maybe Gisella, you can provide us with an announcement of what's happening next please, including the time for lunch.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, the next meeting, which is a general meeting, is enhancing ICANN accountability, which is now in Los Angeles. With regards to all ALAC and RALO leaders, please if we could reconvene here…

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]