OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Today is Tuesday, 13 May 2014, at 15:00 UTC. We have a webinar today about the transition of the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (otherwise known as NTIA) stewardship of the IANA functions to the global multi-stakeholder community. A second part to the webinar is about enhancing ICANN accountability.

Joining us today, we have Theresa Swineheart, she is Senior Advisor to the President on Strategy, and Sebastien Bachollet, ICANN Board Director, selected by At-Large.

Welcome, everybody. This call is run in English, Spanish, and in French, so interpreters require your names as you start. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

I think we'll start with the webinar, and then afterwards we'll have some time for questions in a question and answer session.

Thanks for everyone who is participating, and I hand the floor over to Sebastien Bachollet. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you for joining us today for this presentation. It's not really included, but I think it's an important part of the preparation of the At-Large Summit in London. It's very important to have that organized as soon as possible. You will hear from Theresa about the details of the two topics in front of us, the one about the NTIA

and the stewardship transition and the other about enhancing ICANN accountability.

We already, for the one who had a conference call yesterday, not for me and I don't know, but a few hours ago, already about the first topic, the NTIA one. I think that for the sake of having everybody at the same level, Theresa will go through again.

I hope that we will spend more time in the second topic because it's a new one. It's important that it's done in [inaudible] with the first one. It's not the same. It's not putting all the question in just one basket, but it's important that it is taken into account at the same level of complexity and the same level of importance and trying to have the same type of schedule. We will be able to give you some idea about the schedule if you want to know more about that. For the moment, we need to have you with the knowledge about what is happening, what is the subject.

It's, from my point of view, the second topic, the ICANN accountability announcement is even more important for At-Large than the first one. But as we start with the NTIA stewardship transition first, it's why you learn first and more about this one.

Please don't hesitate to ask questions both to Theresa, who will make the presentation in detail, and myself during the call and after if you need. I think it's enough for my introduction. I will give the floor to Theresa for the presentation. Thank you. Theresa, [inaudible]

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. Thank you, Sebastien. Can everybody hear me okay? Take it off of speaker and sorry for the sirens. it's Washington, so, there you go. We tend to have quite a few sirens on the street, so I'll try to keep it on mute when those occur.

First of all, thank you very, very much for having me here and for Sebastien introducing and joining for this. I will say Sebastien and I had a conversation a few weeks ago, now, wasn't it? I think? We were discussing both the posting of the enhancing ICANN accountability and then also the NTIA stewardship of the IANA functions processes. Sebastien had suggested that this might be a great opportunity to do a specific briefing to ALAC. Thank you very much for that, Sebastien, and thanks for the opportunity.

What I'll do is I'll go through the slide deck quickly. I'm happy to either stop in the middle for questions or, Olivier, I defer actually to how you want to handle this – if I should just go through it and then we leave the questions towards the end. Is that perhaps a better way to go?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Theresa. I would suggest having the questions at the end in order to make sure we cover all of the angles. But I know that it's in two different parts, the presentations in the two different parts. Let's first go through the first part, see how quickly we go through that. Then we can decide. If we're a little bit late, then we can have all the questions at the end.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. Okay, I defer to you. I think as everybody is aware, on 14 March, the U.S. announced that it intended to transition its stewardship of the IANA functions to the global multi-stakeholder community. They asked ICANN to convene the stakeholders together, first, to establish a process and then, second, to with that help facilitate what would be the development of a proposal that would fulfill the criteria that NTIA had set out.

In light of that and just moving forward so we don't spend too much time, I think, on an area that most may already be aware of, some questions have come up in the context of why was this done now? The response to that is really that the USG had always envisaged its role as a transitional one. Transitioning is an important part of the privatization of the DNS, as was outlined by the USG in 1997 already. The decision for this supports and really reiterates the multi-stakeholder model for Internet policy making and governance overall.

In the context of the transition and the guiding principles, when NTIA communicated to ICANN its intention, it also reiterated that a proposal that comes forward for this transition – so a proposal that enables this transition to occur of NTIA stewardship role in the IANA functions – needs to support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model.

It needs to maintain the security and stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS. It needs to meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services. It needs to maintain the openness of the Internet.

EN

These are very, very important principles that we'll need to be keeping an eye on as a broader community in these discussions and in the process that ICANN is facilitating in order to ensure that the proposal actually fulfills those areas.

NTIA was also very specific that it wouldn't accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or an inter-governmental organization solution, so really reiterating the first principle around support and enhancing the multi-stakeholder model.

I think most are aware of the IANA functions, so I won't spend too much time on this slide, here. But I'm happy to go back and answer any questions if there are on that. Here is also a visual about the IANA functions at a glance. This is also available on the website because I realize that this visual is a little bit hard to read.

The developments since the announcement have occurred: we launched a dialogue at the ICANN meeting in Singapore in order to get the community views around what kinds of mechanisms and principles might be part of a process for having this dialogue with the community and moving this forward with the proposal. Comments on that were received.

I'm sorry; let me take a step back. The dialogue in Singapore allowed for input into this. Comments that were received from the dialogue in Singapore and then shortly afterwards were then pulled together into a proposed framework on what a draft process could look like. That was posted together with a scoping document on 8 April.

The draft proposal included a set of principles and mechanisms that the community had identified in the discussions, both at the ICANN meeting in Singapore and in subsequent comments. Feedback had really focused on the creation of some sort of working group or steering group to help shepherd the process and identified some elements that would be necessary for the process to develop a proposal and opportunities for participation and engagement.

That scoping document itself identified what was going to be within scope for the discussion and what is also out of scope. Some areas that came up in the context of what is out of scope included that, for example, the IETF and the Regional Internet Registries, of course, develop their own policies in relation to the IANA functions. That's not within the scope of this. What's really within the scope of this is looking at what is replacing the NTIA stewardship function in the context of the IANA functions overall.

The scope itself is visualized here. As everybody can see, you have the IANA policy specifications and development, which are handled by the respective organizations listed to the left. You have the IANA implementation, the operational side, listed in the column in the middle. Then you have the accountability area, what the current relationships are.

For example, within the context of protocol parameters, it would be the IAB and USG, or in the context of IP addressing, the Regional Internet Registries and the USG.

EN

What is looked at for the future is what mechanism would be put into place and what proposal encapsulating all of the proposed mechanisms in relation to what the USG role is there. That's really what the conversation is about with regards to the NTIA stewardship transition.

The principles and mechanisms that the community had identified in the dialogues are captured on this slide, as you'll see. Inclusiveness and transparency, obviously, are very key. Then, also, mechanisms that ensure the opportunity for full engagement, multilingual and global in scope, conducting of stress tests and leveraging existing information and processes, so it's not fully reinventing the wheel, necessarily.

The draft proposal came out with what was suggested as a steering group. Feedback since then, when the deadline closed last week, has suggested that this may be called something else from different groups had raised that.

But this is what the draft proposal had put forward, the proposed process, one that ensures that there is work by the respective communities in relation to the IANA function. But then also a compilation of what the proposed mechanisms are into what would be a proposal and then circulated to the community on a regular basis for continued input until a conclusion is reached.

Then also really reiterating that there's a lot of dialogues happening. Not just within the respective organizations that are direct customers of the IANA function but also clearly even within the ICANN or national and regional Internet governance forums and other respective dialogues

that are happening. Those are multiple areas of opportunities for participation, engagement, and discussion on this topic.

What happens next? There was a 30-day process for input from the community on the proposed draft framework process. We received some really wide range of input and suggestions and areas of improvement and agreement or disagreement. That was invaluable.

Thank you, also, for the submission I received from the At-Large Advisory Committee, very much appreciated that. What we're doing right now is looking at that and integrating all the input in order to refine the process that was proposed and make all the adjustments based on the community feedback.

That's where we are right now. That will be compiled, and then it'll be put into place and published. We're hoping for about a two-week timeframe but, obviously, that depends upon how one can incorporate all the input and make sure that what is the next phase in the process is agreeable. The hope is, then, that with that, there's also a dedicated website supporting the process, that could be finalized and prepared for by the ICANN 50 meeting in London in June.

That's where we are with regards to that specific process. There's some additional information here on the links to the website. All the comments that were received can be found in the public archives there. As one comes out with the reiteration of the revised proposed process based on the community input, obviously, one can go back to, obviously, the public archives and see how those areas were captured.

I don't know, Olivier, do you want me to take questions on that right now, or should I move on into the enhancing ICANN accountability process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Theresa. I think that since we are at 22 minutes past the top of the hour, we're making good progress. We can take about five/ten minutes of questions on this and go back to ICANN accountability. Then we'll have another ten/fifteen minutes of questions at the end of the call.

THERESA SWINEHART: That sounds great. However you'd like to do it, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The floor is open for questions. In order to ask a question, you could type it in the chat or you can put your hand up and I'll take the questions in the order that they arrive.

THERESA SWINEHART: Sebastien, also, feel free to respond to any. If you have any for Sebastien, as well, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you very much. People are thinking because that's been a little bit difficult. I have a question for you in the meantime, Theresa. If one goes back, I think it's a couple of pages back, looking at what there

is today and then the different actors that are currently directly affected by the contract itself, so having defined the contract. Shall I? I can do that.

THERESA SWINEHART: Oh, I see. Okay, there you go. I see. It's whizzing in front of me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can pull this back.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, there you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So here we go. The accountability. Current accountability, IAB, U.S. government; RIR, U.S. government, etc. When one looks at this, I have already heard some of those actors saying that, well, they just got rid of the U.S. government, and they should be solely in charge for their own accountability. Is this something that can fly, or is the mechanism going to be multi-stakeholder [inaudible]?

Someone has gone off mute but has not asked a question.

THERESA SWINEHART: That's okay. Olivier, do you mind just repeating? I couldn't get the last part, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We see here the current accountability mechanism has the U.S. government involved in all four cases: protocol parameters, general purpose IP addresses, generic domain names, and country code domain names.

Some of the actors that are currently involved on that table are saying, "Well, once we don't have the U.S. government in there, we can have our own internal accountability mechanisms and we'll just run things by ourselves."

Is what the U.S. government has said with regards to the transfer of stewardship a case where they give a chance to the stakeholder themselves to be their own judge, or does it actually explicitly ask for a multi-stakeholder model of some sort to transfer this stewardship to?

THERESA SWINEHART: Well, I can't presuppose anything. Obviously, none of us can. I think what's important, though, is two elements. One is that within the respective areas of the customers of the IANA functions – so the IETF, for example, or the Regional Internet Registries – they have their own policy development processes and, in that context, also, their accountability with their respective communities and how that's been done. Those dialogues will be important.

The compilation of what will be the proposal for actually the transition of the NTIA stewardship and the area that is the global public consultation, which is really the synthesizing and pulling together of what these future mechanisms would be, the green boxes. Those have to fulfill the criteria that NTIA has set out.

EN

I think we need to see what the respective communities come up with. I think we need to then see, also, how that is pulled together in the process and how it meets the criteria. I can't answer the question specifically because I don't have the answer for it. We need to see what comes up and then if it meets those criteria that have been set out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. We had a question from Loris Taylor who is asking: "Will there be additional opportunities to make comments since the public comment period has finished on 8 May?"

THERESA SWINEHART: Right. I think that we've had a dialogue around the process and in looking at putting the process in place. At some point, the process will need to start doing the substantive work. I think we need to take a look at the input and whether there's final agreement on what the process looks like and then move forward on the actual operationalizing of the process itself.

My sense would be that it would be good to be moving and have the process in place so that ICANN is the facilitator of that, but the community itself is working on the process where they've provided input. But we need to see whether we can achieve that in [inaudible]. Right now, the intention is that we are completing the process phase and moving forward into the phase where the process itself can be operationalized based on the input that's been received.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Theresa. One last question, and I think we can then continue with the second part of the presentation. I don't see any further hands up.

The GNSO has been reading the input that was found from the different stakeholder groups, etc. The GNSO Council has, through the voice of Jonathan, been saying that they are creating a cross-community working group specifically on the IANA functions. Is this steering group, basically, will that integrate with the cross-community working group, or is this a separate process?

THERESA SWINEHART: Well, the role of the steering group – and there has also been some proposals in to change the name of that, so obviously those suggestions will be incorporated – is to pull together the overall input from the different entities that are coming in. If there's a cross-community working group, obviously, that could go into that process, as well. That would seem to be one avenue. Sorry, there's some background noise, there.

My understanding is that has been proposed. So if there's a cross-community working group that's working there, then that would be an opportunity to provide input into the overall process that has been commented on by the community.

Again, remember, one thing that is important is that this process itself and the process that the community has commented on and provided input in goes beyond the ICANN community specifically. It's a broader community. The proposed process is one that can pull together the

EN

different areas from the broader community, including the community outside the ICANN community. If there's a cross-community working group, that would come into that process itself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Theresa. There is a comment in the chat and then there's a question, as well. Okay, quickly, then.

So from Garth Graham: "If we define 'global' as a federation of locals, as does Community Informatics, then the global multi-stakeholder community and accountability takes on a different perspective."

Then a question from Oksana Prykhodko: "Will this process influence on the transparency and accountability of the GAC? Will there be any changes to the role and the status of the GAC?" Theresa?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible] the first one.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead, Sebastien, and I'll take a look at [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You ask a question about wording, it's always difficult when just try a second to be in the shoes of somebody don't speaking English and trying to understand what we meant with "global." Don't try to put too much in it.

The question was the wording of ICANN, we were talking about and still talking about the internationalization. Internationalization means inter-nation. What we, as users, are looking is to a worldwide possibility of interaction.

In English, "global," "globe," it's a world. It's why we came with this wording of "globalization" and not "internationalization" of ICANN. To be global is really to be worldwide. That was the way to go in the direction of including everybody, every organization, every country, and so on and so forth.

That was for the first question. For the second question, Oksana, it's not a discussion here for the evolution of the GAC transparency, accountability of the GAC itself. It's either the review of the GAC, but it's also within the ATRT-1, ATRT-2 (Accountability and Transparency Review Team) who came with some proposal to enhance, to [inaudible] the work of the GAC and the transparency and accountability of the GAC.

That's not included in this discussion here in IANA and nor in the one will we start to discuss about the global ICANN accountability and globalization of ICANN. If you want to add something, Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART: No, no, Sebastien. I think you covered it very well. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, Theresa, let's advance over to the end of that first part. Let's go to the next one: enhancing ICANN accountability process. Theresa, you have the floor.

THERESA SWINEHART: There we go. Excellent. Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, also, the questions on the prior process. I'm happy to take any follow-ups if they come after this session, as well, of course.

One of the areas that came up in the discussions when there was the announcement of the NTIA stewardship transition was also the question of if there's a change in ICANN's contractual relationship with the USG, does that have an impact on ICANN accountability overall?

In addition to the public dialogue on the NTIA stewardship transition in relation to the IANA functions, we've now launched a process, a separate but parallel public dialogue, the scope of which is really to look at the contractual relationship to the U.S. government in the context of the IANA contract and the perceived backstop with regard to ICANN's organizational-wide accountability in relation to that.

The purpose of this dialogue is to really examine from an organizational perspective how ICANN's broader accountability mechanisms could or should be strengthened to address the absence of its historical relationship with the U.S. This can include looking at strengthening existing accountability mechanisms, including, for example, the Affirmation of Commitments.

One area that was provided in the document that was posted last week was also an inventory of ICANN's existing accountability efforts. That's an important area to be looking at in the context of if anything needs to be strengthened or if there's any existing gaps. That you'll find on the website with some background material and some links in the proposed document. That's just been outlined very briefly on this slide here, as well.

For the public consultation, we had a dialogue at the ICANN meeting in Singapore that had looked at three question areas that were captured in the materials that were posted last week.

Those were really focused on identifying the key elements for strengthening ICANN's accountability to address the absence of its historical contractual relationship in the context of the output for this process, then looking at the prioritization of those elements for the development or the refinement. Then to set forth a timeline and mechanism for the implementation of any of the improvements that are identified.

While this is separate from the IANA stewardship transition process, this dialogue is really about enhancing ICANN's accountability. The processes will run in parallel with each other and help inform each other.

The comment period was opened last week. As this is happening within the ICANN context as opposed to the broader context which is the NTIA stewardship transition, the comment period on this will go through the comment and reply period cycle that is traditional for the ICANN

community. That will close on 18 June. Again, the output of this process should focus on these three areas outlined above. It will run in parallel and help inform the other process.

The dialogues that have occurred to-date, which are captured in the materials, again are a conversation and discussion that occurred at the ICANN meeting in Singapore that looked at some of the areas about what does it mean to the community to be assured that ICANN is meeting its accountability commitments; as ICANN grows and improves, what should be some guiding principles around the notion of accountability; then how does the Affirmation of Commitments play a role and could or need it to evolve to support global acceptance of ICANN's accountability and who should take part in this.

Outcome from the Singapore dialogue was a view that there should be the establishment of some sort of working group involving the community to look at this area; that the leadership, obviously, of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees need to have a responsibility; and that we need to have a community dialogue.

The proposed next steps on this have been to establish an ICANN Accountability Working Group; that the leadership of the ICANN SOs and ACs should be responsible for working with their communities to appoint community members to the working group; and that after the public comment and reply period, the working group could being its work and hopefully in time for the ICANN meeting in London.

On the accountability process, there were some additional questions that were posed to the community in this process. You can see these

here and we'd welcome, obviously, community input on those specific areas, as well.

I think that brings me to the end of the presentation on that. I'm more than happy to elaborate on any areas on the context of working group members and appointing community members.

There's also a proposal to look at community members with expertise in subject matter areas that are relevant and important to accountability overall. Those are listed in the document that was posted and the proposed next steps in process. Those include areas such as international organizational reviews, global accountability tools and metrics, jurisprudence and accountability mechanisms, consumer protection areas, board governance transparency. There are several subject matter areas where I know we have community members who have a lot of expertise in this.

I think that Sebastien had mentioned at the beginning of our overall dialogue in this webinar this process in particular is very important and I think where the ALAC community plays a very important role because it's the area and strong interest around the accountability processes and also, obviously, many of the members have a huge amount of expertise and knowledge in this space.

I'm more than happy to answer any questions on this and, Olivier, I want to leave enough time for answering questions and engaging with the members on this call.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Theresa. I now open the floor for questions yet again, where you may ask questions during the second part, the accountability process. Or, if you still have a question with regards to the transfer of stewardship for NTIA, you may ask questions on that. Now, looking at the screen, I can see Alan Greenberg in the queue. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Theresa, one of the accountability mechanisms that is often used to catch things that fall through the cracks from the other things you put in place is a whistleblower-type act. ICANN has a policy in place. Was there was a specific reason why this wasn't included as one of the failsafe mechanisms to ensure accountability and transparency?

THERESA SWINEHART: As far as why it wasn't listed in the listing of the inventory?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

THERESA SWINEHART: The inventory was of some of the accountability and transparency efforts. Obviously, there's many. It's not all-inclusive at that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments on this? I don't see anything yet.

Coming back to the previous topic, the IANA topic. The proposal which was made is for the steering group to be created. I didn't quite catch what the timing was with regards to the creation of the steering group, whether this proposal was going to be amended based on the feedback that was received or whether it was going to proceed forward regardless, whether its composition was going to change, and what timelines were we dealing with.

Now, the reason why I ask you is because the ALAC is, itself, designing its own process for being able to select someone – and I believe here on the diagram which you provided, it was two people – for the ALAC to be able to have two people on that committee. We are putting together a selection committee to be able to put the right people on there, basically. I wanted to find out what the timelines were.

THERESA SWINEHART: I think as everybody can see from the comments received in the archives, there was a wide range of comments. Some of them were really more focused around changing the name from a steering group to more of a coordination group, those kinds of things. Also, some suggestions about additional representation that may be needed on the group. What needs to occur now is just a full review of all the comments received, the incorporations of that into what would be, then, their revised framework for the process.

I would suggest to proceed along the lines, Olivier. The process will have a mechanism, obviously, that has a group that is pulling together the proposals. There'll need to be representation within the context of that mechanism that's being put forward and the adjustments being made based on the input that's been received.

Again, I would anticipate about a two-week period to get all the input captured and then the framework for the process refined and then put out to the community for them to identify who they want to put on based on what the outline has looked like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Thanks very much.

THERESA SWINEHART: Please, Olivier, also note that for the accountability process, there is also the suggestion for a working group and, through the SO and AC leadership, for expressions of interest to be put forward to that. You may want to – I don't know how ALAC wants to handle that, but I just that flagged that again that for the ICANN Accountability Working Group process. There's also the proposal that leaders of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have a responsibility for appointing community members to the working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so it's likely that there will, therefore, be a working group of the same type as this steering group for the other process.

THERESA SWINEHART: Correct, but it plays a very different role. For the NTIA stewardship transition, that's really about pulling together the proposal to meet the criteria of the NTIA principles with representation also outside of the ICANN community and engagement with the broader community outside of ICANN.

The ICANN Accountability Working Group is really looking to the leadership of the SOs and ACs to be working with their community members to appoint community members to a working group with skills in subject matter areas that are relevant for that specific area of work.

It's two different kinds. One is more of a coordination steering group, and the other is an Accountability Working Group looking at a very specific area of enhancing ICANN's accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Theresa. I note a question from Avri Doria in the chat: "Should community members appointed to accountability groups be people who have served on previous ALC mechanisms, or should they be people who can take a fresh look at both the mechanisms and the results of previous efforts?"

THERESA SWINEHART: I think people who have experience on prior accountability groups and have experience and expertise in these areas should certainly put their names forward. It's really for the leadership, then, of the SOs and ACs to be working with the community members in order to identify the names

that should be put forward to the working group. I would encourage anybody who is interested and can participate to put their names forward through the process there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see there is a comment from Cheryl Langdon-Orr mentioning perhaps a mix of seasoned ALC people and newcomers.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I don't see any other questions for the time being. What I was going to ask with regards to the accountability process is your timeline, your overall timeline. We know that the NTIA process finishes in, well, or is supposed to have some results by October 2015. What is the timeline that the Board is looking at pursuing with regards to this accountability process?

THERESA SWINEHART: Well, I certainly can't speak on behalf of the Board but as was noted in the document, this process informs together and they'll be running in parallel.

The output of this process should really look at identifying the key elements for the strengthening of ICANN's accountability; to prioritize

EN

those elements for the development and refinement; and then set forth a time frame.

Given the timeline of both of these and the putting into place of the working group itself, the processes should be able to run in parallel and inform each other. Sebastien, I don't know if you have anything you want to add to any of this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Theresa. I just wanted to add one discussion about this group, whatever is the name, the steering groups or working groups of the two processes. Because I know that there are discussion about why and what process the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC who makes a final decision and [inaudible].

I have a very deep concern about the fact that you leave different groups deciding of the people who will be in this group. Not because they will make wrong choice but because at the end, you may end up with the same type of people for all the groups and how you ensure diversity.

I think it's something At-Large and ALAC must take that into account because we, as a organization within ICANN, we try very hard to be as much as possible [multi-something]. We are always trying to have the five region groups [inaudible]. If you have just one, you can't. If you have five, you can. But if you have five for each group within ICANN, it's too much.

EN

We have to find a process. I am not at all denying the fact that it needs to be the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC. I just want to remind you, then, when we organized the meeting for the working group, I was in charge of the as the Chair of this working group. I didn't pick and choose people. I choose at the end a subset of the ones chosen by the SO and AC to have, at the end, a group with more gender balance [inaudible], with a more different knowledge and regional balance and so on and so forth.

One things we need to find is a process to end up with that because, if not, the risk that we will come a large [inaudible] of people coming from U.S. or from North American and a large group of people who are [inaudible]. That's not good for the ICANN in general. I would like you think about which process we can set up to [inaudible] this question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I note that there was a question on the chat from Johnny Laureano. Johnny first sent the question in Spanish, and I didn't quite understand it. I used one of the automated translation tools, which gave me a very similar question to what is written on the chat here where it mentions that Mr. Byron – and I believe that's Byron Holland – and the ccNSO mentioned that the current contracts with the ccTLD, IANA, and ICANN, that transparency mechanisms were implemented in the process of delegation or re-delegation of ccTLD for this new process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who was the ALAC-ccNSO liaison at the time mentions that the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, which is a working group that has gone on for a long time and had a very serious amount of work on its plate, the Framework of Interpretation Working Group has worked on these matters relating to RFC 1591 and GAC items relating to the same matter.

Therefore, I would suggest that you have a look at RFC 1591. There have been some GAC items. Perhaps, Cheryl, if you can help Johnny Laureano in his search if he has any additional questions on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. I note that Maureen Hilyard also worked on the FoI Working Group.

I don't see any other questions at the moment. I have one question which might be challenging to answer, I'm not sure. There have been, a while ago – "while" being just a few months ago – there was a creation of a Board Globalization Panel.

This webinar was originally titled – and I didn't set the name, but I don't actually know who set the name – it was Globalization of ICANN In Its Transparency and Accountability Processes. Yet, the presentation did not have the presentation did not have the word "globalization" used even once. Where has globalization gone? Is this a separate process? Is this off the table? Or is this still on the table?

THERESA SWINEHART: I think that it's been a term that's been used in the context of enhancing ICANN accountability and also the NTIA stewardship transition. The fact

that I didn't use it in the presentation doesn't mean anything rather than it's just these are two processes relating to that very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. So globalization is still on the [inaudible] then?

THERESA SWINEHART: Right. We use that as a term, overall, about how do you better globalize ICANN, the globalization of ICANN? There's been many elements that relate to that in community dialogues, including the dialogue around the NTIA stewardship transition for the IANA functions areas and enhancing ICANN accountability to the global community overall. Sorry to create any confusion with the title of the webinar versus the slide deck. That was not intended in any way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: I'm sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, just to make sure. Because, of course, there have been calls at NETmundial for globalization of things and multi-stakeholder and all of those things. There comes a question, sometimes, when looking at these presentations. If it doesn't use the term itself whether ICANN has

been changing its direction or whether there's still much discussion regarding whether this should proceed or not.

THERESA SWINEHART: Absolutely. I think, Olivier, the way I also look at it is just it's more of an umbrella term for many of these things. Clearly, these two process are very important ones relating to ICANN's globalization overall.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thank you very much for this, Theresa. Before we end this call, as you said, there is currently a public comment period which has started, consultation and enhancing ICANN accountability. I just put a link onto the chat, which Ariel mentioned earlier, as well. She put a link on the chat.

As ever, we are looking for a penholder for this. Now that you've all been on this – and I see quite a few people have been on this webinar – you're all qualified to hold the pen. I'm not going to ask for someone to put their hand up right now and say, "I want to hold the pen," although I could. But I'm not going to do that because I'd like someone to think over this and say, "Well, I'd like to hold the pen and be the penholder for this." Or maybe several people could work together and draft the At-Large feedback on the accountability process and what is on the table.

The closing date for this is, we've got initial comment closing date on 27 May. But as you know, the ALAC, with all its processes of needing to go all the way to edges and all the way back up to the ALAC itself does sometime take more time. We'll probably be looking at submitting a

comment between 28 May and 18 June, which is the reply date. Theresa, we will be advising your services if we do require the additional amount of time and if we're not able to submit in the initial comment period.

But with that many people on this call, I would really hope that we get someone – maybe someone else, someone new – to draft their first statement. Of course, you will get all the help from everyone else on the ALAC in order to be able to draft this.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Sebastien. Yeah, I would very much support your call to the community for providing input on this and responses. Also, just to flag again that the document also looks at the establishing of the working group and already looking to expressions of interest to be put forward through the leadership of the SOs and ACs, as well. But I think the ALAC community has a very important role in this and would certainly support your calling pen to paper on that. Look forward to seeing that.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Theresa. Sebastien, any additional things that you need to add?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that as Theresa, yes, we, ICANN, need your input definitely. But you are part of ICANN, and I am sure that you will give your inputs on that subject. It's a very important one and it's, for me, one of the more important in the next few months we will have to deal with.

If you need my help, and I am sure that [Siranush doesn't talk], Rinalia can also help on that. We are ready to help At-Large to [inaudible] on the subject and give you information input with pleasure.

Then thank you very much for participating to this webinar. It was a short time to be call on, but you were very numerous participating and that's very good. Thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien and thanks to you, Theresa Swineheart, and thanks to all of you who have come on the call. Thanks to the interpreters, of course. Thanks to all staff who have been very diligently putting this whole thing together at very short notice.

I just wait and look forward to receiving plenty of e-mails of volunteers to draft their first draft of this statement. With one minute to spare, I think – or no, we're just on the top of the hour. Then we can just end this call. This call is now adjourned. Good-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please disconnect all remaining audio lines at this time. Thank you very much for joining.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]