EN

LONDON – ATLAS II Plenary - Session 4
Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 17:00 to 18:30
ICANN – London, England

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	This is ATLAS II Plenary Session 4, from 5:00 to 6:50 p.m. local time in Viscount.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Ladies and gentleman, the session will start within the next few minutes. Not quite yet. Thank you.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Hello, everyone. We're going to start in about five minutes. I'm going to chair this meeting until our real ALAC chair is here. He is busy being interviewed by one of these news companies. I think it's Reuters.
	Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for being here after a long day. I think everybody is excited about working in these thematic groups. Basically I am chairing this today because Olivier is busy doing some interview, but he will back in a few minutes. I don't know how long this is going to take.
	Before we do that, Heidi, I'm going to ask you if you can tell us what is going to happen next after the plenary, and then we can—
HEIDI ULLRICH:	In terms of the process or in terms of the day?

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.

EDUARDO DIAZ: In terms of the day. Okay. Or Gisella. Maybe you can do that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I can do that. This is Heidi. So what's going to happen, this session goes from now until 6:30, 18:30, and then we go directly into the Board Cocktail, and that's in Balmoral. And Gisella will lead all to that, and that goes for one hour.

EDUARDO DIAZ: And where is that located? In the East Wing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't know.

EDUARDO DIAZ: You don't know. Okay. We'll follow Gisella there. In any case, what we want to do today is what we did yesterday. If we can have a representative from one of the thematic groups to give us a summary of what happened during the day and what is going to happen next. So we can start with Thematic Group 1. And maybe Leon or – no, no, no. I'm chairing this. Or Evan? If you want to give us an [overview] of what – yes, please. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Why me?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Because you're right there in the front.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. This is Evan speaking. Thematic Group 1 about the future of multi-stakeholderism that we will be renaming because we're taking the "ism" out of multi-stakeholderism. It was noted that that sort of implies an article of faith that we don't want to bring into this.

The future of the multi-stakeholder model has been very actively debated over the last couple of days, and as of right now, we have a drafting team, we have a frame of reference, and we have some overarching themes that we are now going to be working on to turn the discussions of the last two days into a statement to be presented as part of the ATLAS document. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Evan. Does anyone have a question about this or comments about what Evan said? If not, do we have a representative from the Thematic Group 2? Reiss please?

SETH REISS: Hi. This is Seth Reiss for the record. Our group worked very hard today. We were talking about globalization of ICANN and we started by clarifying that it was globalization and not internationalization because internationalization implies agreements between member states. And

what we wanted to emphasize is this a community of stakeholders, so it's an agreement between stakeholders and Internet users.

We talked about inclusion and diversity and whether that's being met on a global scale. We talked about the obstacles, the lack of participation in the PDP and working groups on the part of some communities in parts of the world, issues with volunteerism, visa problems, getting to meetings, and some of the political obstacles of inclusion.

We talked about accountability mechanisms and whether they are functioning globally and equally in different parts of the world. Some of the accountability mechanisms that are in place now, like the AOC and the IANA Contract are not global in their nature. We also talked about the obstacles that arise from ICANN being located in the United States and being a California nonprofit corporation.

And finally, we talked about operational matters and the need to expand ICANN's footprint to other parts of the world. We weren't able to define what shape that would take and how expensive that might be, but we did talk about having more offices and whether remaining incorporated in the United States or having only one point of incorporation was the right model going forward.

I'd like to thank my team for their hard work and we will be preparing a report or a statement that will go out with the other statements. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thanks to you. Are the other people wants to comment on that Thematic Group 2? If not, who can report on the Thematic Group 3? Hi. Do we know…I'm not sure who – Jean-Jacques? Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Gisella. Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me? Interpretation? Hello? Interpretation? Good. I was not meant to speak at this restitution session because that was the privilege of the moderators, Gunela and Wolf, but I was asked maybe because I'm by far the oldest member of that little group. I couldn't say no, so here I am.

I'll be just a bit longer than my two predecessors reporting on their groups because I was specifically asked to bring a bit more to you about this. It's less detailed; it's less technical; perhaps it's more about principles.

First, a word about the title of our thematic group: "The global Internet: The User Perspective." So just a reminder, initially we had been looking around in the ALAC for an overarching theme, and that was my proposal as an overarching theme. And finally, it ended up as one theme for one of the thematic groups, and I was of course very glad about that.

In our group we had roughly 50 participants, plus remote. And interpretation was provided in Español, in Français, and in English. The moderators were Wolf and Gunela. The subject matter experts, although I do not feel I am fit for the word "expert", subject matter. You can call me subject matter, if you want. So those were Fatima and myself. And the reporters, that's very important, Glen and—

[audio break]

That's not enough. In fact, some were willing to criticize the NETmundial document. And it was suggested by me, among others, that we should go beyond and to make an analysis and perhaps to go beyond NETmundial.

It also about voicing more strongly and more accurately our expectations as users, as user communities. And the conclusion here was that it rests up on each of us as user community leaders or members to influence, to impact upon our elected representatives at a local, at a regional, at a national level on the importance of the Internet today, and therefore to try to influence legislation and the implementation of that legislation.

Finally, under the user rights, I would underline the necessary coherence between regions. In other words, we must rely for the time being on best practices and on existing models, such as the draft Council of Europe guidelines for user rights. There are many other models, of course, but that's just one of them which was mentioned.

So the way ahead is also about infrastructure, about access and accessibility, and there it was underlined that physical access was one thing, but really it's much more about also making good use of it. That means providing and insisting on the necessity to provide, to make content locally.

And finally, one word about how does all this fit At-Large or in At-Large? Of course, like all the other thematic groups, we will be submitting a

written report with some recommendations to you and to Olivier and we'll see what comes out of that.

But my own feelings – and excuse this old man for taking such a long time to utter simple three sentences – is that there is really a conscience of the need for more involvement, not only in this way, towards ICANN, but the other way around. I think that is really up to you, up to us, to impact, to influence our elected leaders so that that understand gradually the importance of the Internet and all that it will take in terms of investment but also of human investment for our children and grandchildren. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I have a comment about the NETmondial. Part of the NETmondial had an effect in everything that we have discussed because we spend quite a time in our thematic group trying to learn lessons from that process and how it was put together on our theme of future of multi-stakeholders. So thank you so much. If anybody wants to add or comment on what [inaudible] said? Yes, please? You can state your name and talk.

DIEGO ACOSTA BASTIDAS: I am Diego Acosta Bastidas. Free culture, free software from Ecuador. I just want to compliment something to the good summary made my Jean-Jacques. I'd like to say that we submitted a motion for free software and open standards. We have a universe, a world of users, but this blue sphere where we live will not be understood as one thing if we don't take into account that whole community which makes a big thing

of freedom and the space of the society of knowledge. We believe that this must be mentioned. It should be acknowledged, even if we Google, if we look for something in Google, most of the people don't know that beyond this we have the yeast of open code, open source.

We have talked about conversions and gaps. Well, precisely the legacy we should leave to the next generations is a legacy related to the sovereignty of knowledge, having the opportunity of using human capital and human elements present in our countries and our peoples so that we can create that autonomy which is expressed in economic terms, which is not just a declaration, it's not something fancy or coming from the academic field or coming from close circles. There are many communities of developers working with free software or open source software that need to be reorganized or acknowledged, that need to be identified in this big universe made up of Internet users.

So in short, I would like you to consider this motion that was submitted at our group, which talks about the vision of an Internet from the point of view of users. For the sovereignty of knowledge, for the social economics of knowledge, I would like to submit this to the plenary meeting. Thank you very much.

EDUARDO DIAZ:
Thank you very much. You're suggesting that this plenary takes this as a motion? Is that you're suggesting?

DIEGO ACOSTA BASTIDAS: Yes. I suggest the plenary should take up this motion. I'd like the plenary session to consider this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, chair. I'm afraid that so long as everyone in this hall and our remote participants, colleagues, have not had time to examine not only just to have a cursory look at it but to actually examine any text, this one or another one, I'm afraid we cannot submit it to any sort of general vote. It'll be at a later stage. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I think that this session is for the restitution of the work of the groups and not for adoption of any motions. We have a session on Thursday for that. Thursday we will agree on the full document and if there is any change in the document, we have to do it Thursday. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Tijani. That's what I was going to say. This plenary is mostly for getting back reports from the thematic groups so everybody understands what happened during the day. So you will have a chance Thursday morning to bring this up. Okay? Thank you so much.

Anything else on the Thematic Group 3? If not, can we have somebody from the Thematic Group 4 and give us a report please? Thank you.

CHESTER SOONG: Hello? Hello? Yes. I'm Chester Soong, reporting for Thematic Group 4. We are on accountability and transparency.

In making recommendations in context of global [inaudible] we recognized there are two – first we recognized there are two constituencies that we need to identify here: the ICANN community and the larger global community of Internet users. And we further went on to define the two words, the two key words, accountability and transparency.

For accountability, the responsibility to answer for whether you have achieved what you have committed to do. And for transparency, the openness and accessibility of decision-making processes and outcomes. All stakeholders, including users and governments, must be able to trace back how a particular decision has been reached. The default mode of operating within ICANN must be complete transparency.

And then we came up with four high level recommendations. First, we went accessibility. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language.

The second recommendation is public complaints. The rules and jurisdiction of the ombudsman should be expanded. The website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.

Third, identification of public issues. Both the areas of the ombudsman and compliance should report regularly on complaints received by category of complaints, issues being complained, and their outcomes. Issues that are not resolved should report on how they will be addressed.

Last, we recommended a Board oversight. There should be a mechanism to hold the Board itself responsible for actions or inaction. We came up with sort of a name here: cross-community standing oversight body. That has three key components.

First, it must have access to all the relevant information. Second, it should have power to compel the Board to take remedial action. And last, its membership, the membership of the standing oversight body, must be independent of the Board. That's all from TG4. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much. Any comments on what the gentleman said? If not, can we have somebody from the Thematic Group 5 to give us an update? He's all the way at the end.

FOUAD BAJWA: Thank you, Eduardo. This is Fouad Bajwa from APRALO. I'm reporting on behalf of the Thematic Group 5. I'm trying to help out the moderator. He's been really busy all day. We've had a very detailed series of

discussions over a number of issues and we do have a long list of topics against which we have a number of problem statements and recommendations.

We've been looking at really critical issues within the context of ALAC and ICANN engagement. And we have also looked at the issues really affected volunteerism within At-Large and how such issues when they move up the bottom, the bottom-top policy development processes, possibilities of the risks associated with volunteer burnout and how to prevent them.

We've been looking at preventing the risks leading to volunteer burnouts. We have been looking at issues of how we can improve the engagement of ALSs and RALOs within the ALAC policy comment processes, and we've been having discussions surrounding identifying subject matter experts amongst the At-Large community and exploring whether such community members may be able to come forward, traveling separately from the traditional travel allocation and helping out ALAC complete its public comment processes.

We've been looking at improving the ALAC policy advisory processes and how ICANN can help within that. We've been looking at capacity building and awareness within the terms of defining and improving the effectiveness of capacity for newcomers and existing members within the At-Large community.

We've been looking at improving the policy management process within ICANN and there have been some innovative suggestions within this, which actually affect all the ACs and [OCs] across the ICANN community.

And once such important recommendation may be that we believe that it may be time to introduce policy management systems – a policy management system – across ICANN so that all this knowledge management and document versioning can actually be more organized in such a manner that a parent document is opened up across the whole community, instead of versions of the same document circulating across the community and then the problems associated with within the [SCs, OCs] and in particular in At-Large in completing the comment process.

There's an important discussion which has emerged and this really affects At-Large deeply and ICANN's own engagement with the global audience, which is the public interest. And we've had a good discussion on the issue of public interest. How does ICANN actually define public interest? And when decisions are being taken in the case of public interest, how do we link the user interest?

And issues such as consumer interest, user interests, have also come up. And there was a very important suggestion that maybe in the course of the upcoming ICANN meetings, we might explore a public interest meeting, forum, or summit which happens either during the ICANN meeting or it happens maybe a day or two before where all of the [SCs and OCs] can come and sit together and explore this critical issues because it [defines]. It's also an important part of the globalization of ICANN.

And then we've had critical discussion about the use of the word "customer" within ICANN's process development processes. And how can we differentiate between the consumer versus the user? We've been looking at the improving the advisory roles of advisory committees

in the context of how At-Large community can improve its relations with the other [ACs and OCs].

We've been deeply going across looking at how we can really improve the engagement of ALSs within the At-Large policy commenting process.

And finally, we've actually stepped into looking at whether the present technologies that we're using and the technology or the community Wiki being used across ICANN, what are the challenges we're still facing with that? And have the improvements been added on an ongoing basis, have those problems intelligence been mapped? Have they been adequately answered? Or are we just cluttered up these Wikis and they're becoming more harder for the community to use.

And we've also been looking at how we can improve the relationship between ALAC and the Board. And from here, I would like to pass on the mic to anyone who wants to add to this? Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Fouad, for the summary. I think we'll all be looking regarding the public interest, we will looking at a lot of the recommendations that came from the [inaudible] people, from the Future Challenges Working Group. I think a lot of the recommendations will probably go be repeated there as part of the final report. And indeed, the volunteer burnout, we are also looking at possible ideas in terms of, say, mentoring persons who are observers, trying to get them more to lead them into how policy is properly developed.

Also in terms of capacity building webinars, it was considered that the ATLAS II capacity building webinars were very useful and I think perhaps this should be a standing – one of the recommendations will be that this will be a standing feature to have a capacity building webinar on a particular policy issue. I think that's it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Dev. Any other comments? Okay. So I want to get a feeling from the rest of the group in terms of how you – what are your thoughts about the thematic groups, participating in the thematic groups? Things that you probably like, don't like, didn't like? Or if it was useful that this – the fact that you participated in these thematic groups? Anyone who wants to comment on that? Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you. Thank you, Dev. Thank you, Eduardo. First of all, I believe this has been a major progress that is having the possibility to discuss topics of interest with a direct impact upon our respective countries. We are discussing global issues that have a direct impact upon our countries or regions.

Also, and here there is some room for improvement or something to be reviewed and taking into account for future meetings, we have to make sure that the five, three, four or two topics that we are discussing will have interpretation. I mean, that we will have interpretation services provided in all the thematic groups because in some groups, we had people that were non-English speakers and they were not able to make

their contributions. SoI would this to be on record for future opportunities. Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Anybody wants to Chair? Jean-Jacques and [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Eduardo, who's first? Over here?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. I don't know who is there. So if you can state your name, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry. I thought you were waiting for – I was the moderator for Group 4 and I actually found that, although we didn't seem to come to a lot of conclusions, we had an awful lot of really useful discussion about what we mean in terms of accountability, in terms of transparency, in terms of our own mission.

So although what seems to be not a very big outcome, at least to me, doesn't reflect the involvement, the engagement of everybody in actually thinking through what we mean. So I just found it a really valuable discussion. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Holly. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Thank you, Eduardo. A few comments – three comments actually. One is that the whole concept, the way you have planned this whole event is I think very great. Many people in our thematic group came up to me to say, well, it was interesting. They have something to take back home which is worthwhile.

So from the organizational point of view, I think full marks. The availability of interpretation all the time was great and very efficient.

My second remark is about themes. Perhaps, Eduardo, we were ambitious. We would have been disappointed – we would have disappointed our public if we had not been ambitious. But there was a quite a bit of overlap between some of the five groups, right? Everyone was wanting to take up maybe the IANA function or accountability or things like that.

In our group we managed to keep away from those big things which were being treated elsewhere, but still, there is some overlap. So for next time, maybe we should be more demanding about the interface between the various themes.

And the final thing is that it is about methodology. In our group at least, the methodology would have gained in efficiency if it had been stated, set out more clearly earlier on. As we went along, we discovered that I think corrective measures were spontaneously brought by of course the moderators and by others. So that was a very good thing. But for another time, maybe the ground rules of how this operates should be stipulated.

And on that chapter, just one recommendation. I think that we have to in a group try to know early on, perhaps from the organizers, if on the last day for the last session we all suddenly go wild into drafting mode, which was practically the case in some thematic groups. Or if that is not really our duty, it should be taken by someone else, at least party. I'm not saying that the result we arrived at is not good. I'm simply saying that it created a degree of stress which perhaps should not be imposed upon volunteers. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I have Johnny Laureano next. And then I have Alejandro.

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Regarding the topics we had to address, that is the global Internet and the users' perspective, well, I believe that it is true that we are like a little bit behind the schedule in order to build the future. In that regard, the NETmundial meeting gave us or was an opportunity to define this. In NETmundial, it was clearly stated that there is something that was or that has existed since the Tunisia agenda, so government, the civil society, and stakeholders as well. In NETmundial I have seen many colleagues from ALSs there.

Well, from the Internet users' point of view, we achieved something that shed some light upon us. Engagement and participation will surely be diverse and I hope that we can all focus and make an effort so that in this meeting we can see how we can implement that in civil society. That is, do what the technical community and the academia and the civil society and the Internet users do, the end users.

If we made an effort to differentiate capabilities or capacities within the civil society, because we are all civil society members, but to distinguish or classify these capabilities or capacities on the basis of different themes or topics, we will notice there are discrepancies.

So if we are to reach a result, I hope we will make an effort in order to gear our efforts towards these new groups or classifications.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty from Mexico. I was in the sessions with working group one originally called "The Future of Multi-stakeholderism." I guess the report has already been read. I arrived a bit late. I was mentioning that we were removing the "ism" because, as it has already been discussing, this is not a faith but it's a method and an approach.

I would like to bring in one point that we arrived at close to the end of the sessions, which I think is missing from the discussion here. Our discussions are very much about objectives. Inclusive, open, participative. They are very little about action and about results. The parameter we introduced for the things that are important in multi-stakeholder processes like those executing by ICANN is effectiveness. ICANN actually has to do something, has to keep the IANA operation running. It has to make changes in the root zone according to a previously developed policy development process, which is rigorous. And it has to make them in a technically sound way so that DNS won't break down by some arbitrary introduction of unsound policy.

I think that when we begin get into – at the end of this round of thinking, what is important for Internet users around the world, which

we're supposed to be caring about. The first thing that has to happen is that Internet continues to work well and improve. And from the ICANN purview, the area on which ICANN works, that the DNS, the IP location, IP address allocations and the IETF parameter registries keep working well, keep being accessible, keep changing in a rigorous, fast but again technically cautious way

And that's the first interest of the users. What does that mean from a user point of view? If a user says, okay, I paid my ISP and my ISP is paying some cents – or the newspaper and the store are paying a few cents of a dollar – for their domain names, and this becomes to $100 million or $200 million including the gTLD Program, and then they spend this money in a meeting for 200% of the users, the meeting, the ATLAS meeting must be costing about $2 million if you think tickets, if you think staff time. The whole cost must be around $2 million.

Are we spending those $2 million in a way that benefits the users? Are we making ICANN more effective? By demanding transparency in an unwise way, by demanding accountability in an ever more complicated way, making it less effective? Making it distract more staff or hire more staff just to fill forms that make sure that there's trace and transparency and accountability? But it actually takes more time to do things, which actually have to be done. Then we are not helping the users.

So I think that's once you're in the top team, the managing team, the coordinating team for the summit do your final drafting, I think that one thought will be whatever we recommend has to be worth $2 million of users' money.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Alejandro. Okay, next I have [inaudible]. Please state your name so I pronounce it correctly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good afternoon. My name is [inaudible] Lee from South Korea. I have prepared some video now Internet Asia. Let's go 100 years [inaudible] telephone age. At that time, you can see the picture of the Internet. Okay. I will try the video.

VIDEO: "Lauded throughout history for their genius and charm, the inventors of the telecom network created what is revered as the largest and most reliable machine ever built. These are the extraordinary tales of network pioneers.

                           In 1888, one unlikely telecom here emerged. Almon Strowger was an undertaker. He was also a bit of a tinkerer and a talented part-time inventor. Strowger began to notice in business at his funeral home was starting to decline. It wasn't because the death rate had dropped. His business was just getting fewer calls.

                           At that time, all calls had to go through the town's operator. So when a call for a funeral home came in, she would say, "I'm so sorry. Let me connect you to the undertaker." But where she connected the call was completely up to her. As it turned out, the town's operator was married to Strowger's competitor. And when a call came in for the undertaker, she connected the person to her husband and not to Strowger.

Well, Strowger looked at that and said, "That's not fair." So he set out to create a device that would take control out of the hands of the operator. Ingenious and simple, the automatic telephone exchange was the first mechanical device that allowed a customer to dial a number directly, prying control from the operator, allowing the customer to have choice, and catapulting Strowger to the top of the undertaker industry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. And then how about now? How about now? Okay, yeah. I have prepared something. Okay. Again, my name is [inaudible] Lee from South Korea. We hear a lot nowadays even advanced countries are suffering from global economic crisis. What happened to these organized countries with high speed Internet? Gathered here today are experts on the Internet and it's my honor to introduce these questions. Where is the cyberspace? Where is the cyberspace? And two, what is the written constitution over the cyberspace? Three, who the customer who is type your brand and company name in the Internet address bar? Please take a note, not in the search bar.

[inaudible] oil, gas and all of the natural resources are driving forces of the economy in [inaudible] Asia. [inaudible] allocation also played a big part in helping the economy as well. What do you think is it though that [inaudible] that we should exploit in the [inaudible]?

The question calls for everyone's attention because these are issues that impact the current status of the economy and [inaudible] most of us are not well aware of this. To all of you who are here today in the

[inaudible] ICANN meeting, I am but here to think about how you can solve the global economic crisis in relation to the questions that I [inaudible]. Thank you. Have a good day.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Olivier, please comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you much, Eduardo, and apologies for arriving late. There were quite a few things happening at ICANN. Just picking up on this point, I think I've picked up most of what was said and I think there's been some support in the audience. Would it be possible for you to submit your text in writing as well and share it maybe on the At-Large participants list? Because I think it would be helpful for many people, especially many of us who are non-native English speakers and it would be good to have it on record as well.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, well, I think this is the point where I want to thank you for having [steady] reports. And what I'm going to do now, I'm going to allow – I'm going to have Olivier take over the rest of the meeting. So please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Eduardo. And thanks for telling me now. Are you ready to take over? I understand now we're reaching the next steps part of the meeting. Obviously we've had our nine hours of face-to-face discussions. I'm sorry I don't know what the overall results are but I

gather that there's been heated debates and discussions, and that recommendations are on their way to being drafted.

Certainly in the group that I was part of, we haven't finished polishing the recommendations. In fact, we've got a draft. I think that might be the case in some other groups as well. The path from now on is Monday and Tuesday, we're going back to the regular ICANN circus, which starts tomorrow morning with a big opening ceremony. So of course you will all be inclined and interested in joining all of the discussions that are taking place out there.

The moderators, subject matter experts, and drafters (so, reporters) will be meeting, I think it's on Wednesday afternoon to basically put all of the statements together into one large report that will then be passed on to the Board. Of course, you will have a view of that large report and a presentation of that large report on Thursday morning.

And hopefully by then we'll have a report that then can be voted on by the ALAC at lunch time on Thursday. And then on Thursday afternoon, the Board meets after the public meeting and the report will be handed over in a short ceremony to the Board.

Until Wednesday evening or Wednesday late afternoon until the drafters and moderators and subject matter experts meet together, I gather that there will be a lot more work that will take place. In our working group we have asked that we continue the work on two media, that we'll be using the mailing list to speak to each other and polish up on some of the ambiguities of some of the recommendations we might have at the moment on paper, and basically clean them up. But we will

also be using a well-known company's online document system, which I think you can all guess, where many people can draft at the same time and the document take further shape. So that's added work, I guess, for our reporters.

I ask in your groups to help your reporters out. It's not just them who have to draft that. I think and I hope that you're all ready to give a hand to the final draft and make sure that it really reflects the discussions that have been put there.

The recommendations in our working group, so that was working group five, are going to consist of recommendations into improving At-Large itself. So internal recommendations. They will all be given to the Board, but of course we'll be advising them of internal recommendations for improvement of our own processes, but also recommendations to the ICANN Board for improving ICANN as a whole or ICANN processes as a whole. As I said, I gather this is what's going to happen with all of the reports.

Are there any questions or comments with regards to the process moving forward from here? Well, seeing the amount of – the number of people who are about to fall off their chairs, it's obvious you've been working pretty hard. I wish we had a few – Glenn, I think you might need to take a couple of pictures of people about to fall off their chairs and say, after nine hours, that's what you get with people.

I said earlier, the At-Large Summit was an experiment within the At-Large experiment within the ICANN experiment. And it looks as though we've managed to at least produce one result, which is to put you to

sleep tonight very well, and for some of you, having to wake you up and then put you to sleep later.

But maybe a few people would like to comment on the process by which we achieved this and whether there are any improvements? You've already touched on the improvements part? Okay. But Jean-Jacques, I think you wanted to say a few words? And I don't know if we have a microphone somewhere.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No, it's just to say that it was discussed at the request of Eduardo, so I won't repeat it. It's about methodology but also the choice of subjects because we noticed that with five groups actually there was maybe a bit too much overlap among – between certain parts of certain subjects. So that's one thing. The methodology, it has to be specified in advance how you work. Is it a drafting session, or is it what? But I won't go into detail. Eduardo will tell you about all that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I've been told I'm telling the world we're sleeping. We're not sleeping. We're tired. We're exhausted of all the work and that's a great thing to see. There's been a lot of energy put into this, so that's a really good thing. And I really thank all of your for all of the efforts that you've put here. You're not paid to do this. You've given up your time. This is a weekend. You've got another week ahead of you and it's really great to see all of you here and still ready to continue this punishing schedule that we have for the rest of the week. So that's – I think you deserve a round of applause for that.

Perhaps one thing I should mention is the big issues that we're going to face this week. There are two strong topics that are going to be discussed both in this week and in the forthcoming months.

The first one is the transition of stewardship of the NTIA contract. That's the contract that ICANN holds with the U.S. Department of Commerce with regards to running the root and also running – well, all of the functions that IANA basically has. So the protocol parameters, numbers and addresses. That's going to be a long discussion and the target for the end of this discussion and for the community – and when I'm saying the community, not only the ICANN community but also the Internet community because other communities outside of ICANN have been invited to take part in those discussions. That process has a target date of September 2015 for a total report to be given or proposal to be given to the U.S. Department of Commerce to show what kind of a structure, organization or whatever entity – or we don't really know what it is – that is going to be put in that proposal, will replace the stewardship of the U.S. government.

You will see that there are several sessions this week that will be dealing with those matters. I invite you to go to these sessions. Listen, maybe inform yourselves on these and maybe also comment on these as well.

The At-Large community is on record that in previous public comments that there needs to be a very strong user involvement on two levels. The first level is the actual stewardship itself because the whole stewardship has two facets to it. One is the accountability. The second part is the enforcement of the accountability. And there's a belief from our previous statements that both the accountability process itself but

also the enforcement of that accountability need to have a very strong user component inside it.

Why the two parts? Because you cannot hold something accountable if there's not an enforcement of it. You can't have a rule if nobody is going to enforce that rule. And this is one of the complexities of it all.

So there is a Cross-community Coordination Group that is going to be created in ICANN. We have announced on one of the last ALAC calls that we have two seats on that coordination group. It's a high level coordination group that will obviously need people of high skills and much knowledge in the issues itself. So we have another group that we have created to make a selection. You're all invited to volunteer for both the group that will make the selections and the group – and for those two positions as well. Of course, you can't be on both the selection committee and apply for the positions.

We are looking at dealing with this in the next couple of weeks because the work will start in early July. So it's important to be aware of this. It's an open process and we will try and get the best people in those two seats that we have as compared to all of the other seats that are out there.

There's also a proposal from the GNSO and the CCNSO, so the Generic Name Supporting Organization and the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, to form a cross-community working group on the issue of NTIA stewardship transition.

It might appear bizarre that you have two separate processes but part of the reasons for this second process to take place is that the first

process was initiated by ICANN staff and the ICANN organization. The second process was initiated by the community itself. You might have heard there are sometimes some political components to that as to who decides what and so the second process will also take place.

And I understand that GNSO has been discussing this today and has also discussed this with the Country Code Name Supporting Organization on that. I haven't got the latest update on this. I don't know if – Alan, do you have any update on this? Or none? None. Okay. So that's in progress and we will know more later on this week.

The second, another working group is being created and that's a cross-community working group on ICANN accountability and transparency. That's going to be follow-up to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team's report.

Again, we don't really know that much about it so far. What we do know and what I've heard, what I've read in my mailbox just a few minutes ago was that it looks as though maybe four or five people from each of the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees are going to be asked to sit on that committee or on that working group, with an unlimited number of observers that could sit on that. So it would be good to have a good show.

The only thing I would say is if you do decide to volunteer for that working group, make sure you can actually make the calls because if we have four seats and only one of them is actually occupied during the discussions, not only do we lose our voice and we lose the voice of all of the Internet users, end users that really put their faith in us, but at the

same time, it looks pretty bad. We fight very much to be on these committees and then to only occupying a small subset of these seats doesn't reflect well on this involvement. So there's going to be another call also for volunteers for this.

And as I told you just a moment ago, this is all work in progress so there might be changes by the end of the week. Obviously the discussions that will take place over the week will provide you with more information and obviously the Board meeting at the end of the week is going to be putting more focus on what's going on.

Is there anything else that I need to cover perhaps, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just really quickly. That item is going to be discussed during tomorrow's ALAC session at the end. Just a few minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Yes. So tomorrow's ALAC session is in the afternoon. It's taking place in the Windsor room, which is the room in the East Wing. And you're of course all invited to attend. You know it is a small room so it's a little bit hard. I think that's pretty much all the things I need to say with regards to what's coming up this week. Go out there.

I know there's also some discussions going on tomorrow. The GAC high level meeting – the Government Advisory Committee high level meeting – is taking place. That is going to take place in the largest room here I

think upstairs. And it is a very significant meeting because there are several ministers coming to the meeting itself.

Some of the feedback I've had from the open GAC discussions that took place over today and yesterday, because they've also worked whilst we were working, is that the issue of dot-wine and dot-[inaudible] is still on the table after three or four ICANN meetings. There is a sense of frustration from the different parties. I'll come to you in a second, Pastor Peters. Thank you.

So that is something that we will probably hear about openly tomorrow in the meeting. I don't know if all of the GAC high level meeting sessions are open, but I think the majority of are. There is also a GAC public session that will take place where you will be invited to speak. So I invite you all to go to that public session and provide your point of view. Remember, though, that without a consensus in our community and without a drafted statement and so on, we can't say that we are acting on behalf of the ALAC or on behalf of At-Large. But what we can say is we are from the At-Large community and this is our personal comment. I think that's something which sometimes needs to be reminded.

That's pretty much everything. You've got the full summary on what's going on the whole week. You've got your schedule. Have a really great week. It's your time to experience as I said, the circus. Some people call it the magic, some people call it other words but I'll pass that. But it's an experience. And I also that we will be able to repeat this in the future. This is not our last meeting, of course, but we'll reflect back when we've got those statements ready. Eduardo, anything else?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to let you know that right after this meeting we have a cocktail with the Board, and I encourage everyone to try to meet our Board, starting with Rinalia, which is the new member and Sébastien and all the members of the Board. So they get to – you get to know them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So this is – the Board meeting – Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella is going to be leading all of us to Balmoral, or at least telling us how to get there. When you're finished.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Heidi. So Gisella will lead us there. Pastor Peters? Do we have a microphone?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I've got a mic here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's one in the front.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: In the course of your remarks, opening remarks yesterday, you did mention in passing that if the ATLAS training or meeting should be two yearly, four yearly, or three yearly but we never actually discussed that, so I think it would be appropriate if we resolve to the Board if [inaudible] agrees to the frequency of this training. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Pastor Peters. I'm glad you bring the topic along. When Fadi Chehadé gave his opening words with our community – was it yesterday? It feels like a week ago but it was yesterday. Fadi Chehadé did say that we had waited five years between the last At-Large Summit and the one now and said, "I hope this will happen more often." I think that was his words. I'm not sure whether he meant two year, every three years, or every year. I think every year is probably a bit onerous on all of us to do. I'm not sure. But at a shorter interval – definitely a shorter interval – than every five years.

Part of the component into the ICANN Board making a decision on whether we should have more regular At-Large Summits is part of the return on investment. This is a costly affair. Flying 150 people around the world into a hotel, etc., it's not easy. It takes a lot of logistics on the part of ICANN. And of course we're very thankful for this to have taken place.

Of course, we're going to continue to grow as a community, so the next summit is likely to have more people, yet more people than what we have at the moment, and thus the costs are likely to rise. The thing that we had to go through to be able to have that summit was to propose a

set of deliverables and to also convince the Board Finance Committee that this was money well invested.

I think that one of the real deliverables will be of course the reports that we're going to give to the Board. That will be evaluated. I hope that they will be pleased by what they read and I'm sure they will because I've seen the amount of work that has gone into this.

And I think that with Fadi Chehadé having told us five years is too long to wait, there definitely seems to be some point of view from at least him. Hopefully maybe tonight we can ask Steve Crocker as well or the Chair of the Board and see how the Board feels about this. And maybe you could relay your experiences to Board members in an hour's time, or is it in half an hour's time? That might be part of thing in getting an At-Large Summit happening earlier rather than later.

Your meeting with the Board tonight is going to be a case of them meeting you, seeing how diverse a community we are, but also being able to see how excited it's been for us to come here to London and meet with others, and how it's enabling us to be more prepared to contribute to the At-Large process and to the ICANN process by At-Large being part of ICANN.

So it's important that we convey this. It's all a matter of people. Board members are people. If we convince enough Board members and if the faith of the Board in At-Large is strengthened through our actions, it's likely that we will see a next At-Large Summit earlier rather than later.

With regards to a date, that's not in our hands. I feel that it's not in our hands. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Olivier, you left out the largest payback from this. It's fine to have a deliverable out of this. The real payback is going to be seeing over the next couple of years how many of you, now that you've seen an ICANN, now that you've participated, continue to participate remotely.

We need people in ALSes to participate in the various processes within ICANN: the policy processes, the discussions about ICANN itself. There are lots of things you can do without being at a meeting every year. And the real payback is going to be how much increased participation we get that we can demonstrate that because we brought you all to London, we're getting more active participation from the regions, and therefore better quality input that we feed into ICANN on a regular basis. That's the real payback, to get people who are really committed to the process to go home and get other people committed. It's hard work but that's the real benefits. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Allan. And yes, true. You're right. Absolutely. So we have Alejandro Pisanty, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, and then Roberto Gaetano. Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: [inaudible] meeting. Before the meeting takes place, already it's giving the wrong – it's sending a very clear signal that these meetings are about meetings. That our process, that the At-Large process concern is about process.

Put out a statement focused on results that's worth whatever the – I've been questioned [online] about my estimated cost for the meeting. I mentioned a number of $2 million. There is 200 participants approximately. Average round $1,000 for air travel, $2,000 hotel value approximately. Not at the standard rate. Add meals, opportunity costs, there's 20 staff dedicated to this. Ten staff? Ten staff dedicated to this who could be doing registries, who could be doing IANA, who could be doing – so it adds up to a lot of money. Put out a declaration that's worth what the summit costs. You'll get a new summit but [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Alejandro.

I have to cut the discussion because the meeting with the Board –the cocktail with the Board – is starting up and we are eating into our time with them.

Just a quick follow-up to what Roberto was saying earlier. The recommendations are going to the Board regarding [inaudible] the ICANN corridor. See you at cocktail, and go out there and speak to the Board members.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]