
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the At-Large Briefing: Enhancing ICANN Accountability on Thursday the 5th of June, 2014 at 20 UTC.

On the call today we have Alioune Diop, Oksana Prykhodko, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Ron Sherwood, Garth Graham, Siranush Vardanyan, Michael Yakushev, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Pedro Veiga, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Leon Sanchez, Seth Reiss, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Eduardo Diaz, Pastor Peters, Jordi Iparraguirre, Sebastien Bachollet, Evan Leibovich, Allan Skuce, Michael Yakushev, Loris Taylor, Otunte Otuene, Ali AlMeshal, and Fatima Cambroner.

On the Spanish channel we have Christian Casas, and on the French channel we have Michel Tchonang. We have apologies for Mercy Moyo, Wolf Ludwig, Werner Hülsmann, and Jean-Jacques Subrenat. On Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. I'm not sure, have we missed anyone in the roll call by any chance?

MARK URBAN: I'm Mark Urban from ISOC Disabilities, special needs.

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.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello, Mark. Okay, so we'll add you to the list. Thanks for alerting us. This is a misnamed call in that it was originally named a Briefing Call on the topic of Enhancing ICANN Accountability. It actually is more of a discussion that we are going to have.

The reason for this call is effectively that we have started at the last ALAC call that took place last week. We started a discussion on effectively a public comment topic that was actually named Enhancing ICANN Accountability. After a few minutes it became clear that a lot more discussion needed to take place in the At-Large community and on the ALAC to be able to provide some kind of an answer or some kind of a statement if this community were going to provide a statement as such. It's a huge topic. It's a public comment that started on the 6th of May that is having a reply open date on the 28th of May. The reply closing date which is the time by which we have to send – we, as in the ALAC – has to send a comment to the public comment period on the 18th of June.

But in a discussion that I had earlier today with Theresa Swinehart who is in charge of that process of public comments for this topic, I was told that the reply period might probably close until after the ICANN meeting. We basically have some more time to be able to provide some input into the purpose.

Tomorrow there will be an announcement with regards to the follow-up on this creation of Enhancing ICANN Accountability working groups. There will also be an announcement made with regards to the transition

of stewardship of the IANA function. These two processes appear to be somehow linked together whilst not linked together. Linked in that ICANN needs to show that it is going through its process of enhancing its accountability before the transition of stewardship takes place. It's one of the many different things that needs to take place in the run up to next year's date. So, that's how they're somehow linked. They're somehow not linked in that of course ICANN is not IANA. It's a much larger entity [inaudible]. The IANA contract is just one thing, but ICANN is looking at some more things than that.

There's also a process of ICANN globalization which had started at some point and which is also some process that somehow links with this, so the things are not quite clear as to how, so far. Perhaps some of the people who are on the call today will be able to help us out in that respect.

This call is recorded. As you heard, we've taken a roll call. If you wish to speak, then you can first type that you need the floor on the Adobe chat but the preferable way is, of course, to put your hand up in the Adobe Connect room, and of course I'll give you the floor. When you start to speak, please say your name so as for the transcript both has your name but also for the interpreters to be able to say who is speaking. We also have a French and a Spanish channel for interpretation at the moment.

The public comment itself is linked to the agenda page. That's, as I said, Enhancing ICANN Accountability. The whole accountability process is envisioned coordinated by a natural working group that will be comprised of community members and subject matter experts. There is a list here of the whole range of subject matter experts that are being

suggested. There is a webpage that has the setup already, and an Enhancing ICANN Accountability page which will set out the details that proposed terms of reference for the process as well as setting the questions that need to be asked to provide input to the ICANN accountability working group. Some of the questions are listed on that public comment page. This is a pretty open public comment page.

The question really is: where do we start on this? I've heard some initial questions which were asked of the type. Well, there's been two Accountability and Transparency Review Teams – ATRT-1 and ATRT-2. The more recent one, the second one, having finished its work last year. How did that relate to the current, this new process? Is this because they're supposed to pick up the ball? Another big question. A lot of questions, basically, on this.

The documents that are linked to this process and that are sort of asked to be added on our agenda are, first, the document of the IANA function that was a presentation that Nigel Hickson made for the PRE-ATLAS II Capacity Building webinar on the topic of the future of Internet governance. In that Nigel Hickson provided details of what the IANA function was and it was great to take place with it. Then, we also had a webinar run by Theresa Swinehart recently speaking about Enhancing ICANN Accountability. This is exactly the good intro. What I was going to suggest was to perhaps take another three minutes of the time of this call to go quickly through the slides of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability presentation so as to remind ourselves to this.

The other two things that are in the agenda page are a link to the – well, there's two links actually. There's a link to the ATRT-2 Final Report.

Obviously, it looks as though a core part of the work of any working group that will be created on Enhancing ICANN Accountability is going to be the monitoring and the – I'm not sure whether you can say the implementation, but certainly the monitoring of the implementation of those recommendations, and of course of the ATRT-1 recommendations. It's a good starting part if you're unaware of the current work that has been done and the recommendation. It's a good starting point to read through that report.

Finally the Affirmation of Commitments. That's there, because at the moment, the whole basis for the ICANN Accountability mechanisms is actually the Affirmation of Commitments. Specifically section 9.1A to G, I think it is. I'm just getting this from memory. The 9.1 section effectively said "ensuring accountability, transparency, and the interests of global Internet users." That's a significant thing and that's a contract [inaudible] the Affirmations of Commitments, of course, is a contract which was signed by ICANN with the National Tele-Communications and Information Administration in September 2009. That's one of the instruments that is likely to change in the future once we look at the next ICANN, I guess, or the next stage. I might not be using the right words for it but that's the way it is.

I see the presentation was on the screen. That's really great. The only problem is that it doesn't display properly, I think. Is it displaying properly? No, it doesn't. That's really fantastic. That's supposed to have a typo. Could I ask staff to just make a PDF of this and then we'll use the PDF to go through that? Because we have it in [inaudible] not going to get much out of these slides.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It seems to be [inaudible] at the moment. If one goes through the presentation oneself, the titles and things are coming up. I think it's just a control [inaudible] after that page four. So it might just be a control setting. Certainly the title comes up when one pushed the fast forward button if you were looking at it in full screen mode.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, there we go. Now it's appeared, okay. Very strange. I have not done anything, Cheryl, thank you for letting us know and making the magic happen. I see it's the automatic fast forward or whatever which has made it not work.

That was the presentation that Theresa Swinehart gave us shortly, just a few weeks ago. It goes through the first slide, the U.S. Governments announcement. I think they were all aware of this. The "why now" U.S. Government having always envisioned this role as transitional. I guess opinions differ on this. You might have seen some of the input.

I don't know why this thing's moving forward by itself now. Why is this moving forward by itself? I can't speak that fast. Can someone please stop this? Yes, yes, of course, keep on fighting me. You'll lose. Sorry, I'm just talking to a stupid machine at the moment.

The U.S. Government, how will they envision this role as transitional? Opinions differ on this. Of course you will have seen some of the input that we have received from Jean-Jacques Subrenat who unfortunately was unable to attend this call where there is of course another theory

that the whole Snowden set of events got the whatever transition to be pushed forward much faster than the original idea, and certainly put this more on the front run for things that needed to be done earlier rather than later.

We're not going to be discussing this. I think it's one of the things where everyone has their own opinion and as a vast – as a large – community we probably all have our own point of view on that.

The guiding principles are something which I think we need to be very much aware of in this community. You have to remember this presentation was built, I guess, along with some of the input that was received in previous consultations. So the whole guiding principles, which of course are very much in line with the follow up to the NETMundial Guiding Principles for Internet Governance showed that we should support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model, security, stability, resiliency to the Internet DNS, meetings and expectations of the global customer's importance of the IANA servitude, and finally maintaining the openness of the Internet.

These guiding principles haven't been changed much from what the current principles are for running the NTIA function – the IANA function, sorry. What are the IANA functions? I think we've gone through these. There are several of these. There's actually a nice big, beautiful diagram of the IANA functions and what they are, etc. Remembering we are dealing with here, in a call, which doesn't deal specifically with the IANA functions [inaudible] ICANN Transparency and Accountability processes. Development since the announcement.

I'm just fast forwarding through quickly because there are a number of things. I think it's a long presentation but it basically we just have to see a few things on the scope itself – the visualization of the scope itself is important. Again, that's just to do with the IANA Stewardship Transition. Then we've got the principles and the mechanisms by which this should take place. That was the [inaudible] Steering Group which is going to be announced tomorrow with a slightly different composition. A few of the SOs having been maybe increased as far as the number of representatives [inaudible] on there are concerned. The process itself and the opportunities for [inaudible] preparation. This whole proposal, if you want, is a mix between the ICANN accountability process and the stewardship – the transmission of stewardship.

This part of the presentation deals with the accountability process itself. As you can see, it talks about the strengthening of the [inaudible] accountability mechanisms [inaudible] Affirmation of Commitments – the one that we've just spoken about a moment ago.

Again, we have this big question on examining from an organizational perspective how ICANN's broader accountability mechanisms should be strengthened if there was no contractual relationships. If Affirmation of Commitments goes, what happened then? How is ICANN accountable to its stakeholders and to the end users, etc.?

Here we have the [inaudible] of ICANN's accountability efforts at the moment. We've got the Affirmation of Commitment and its reviews, the Accountability and Transparency reviews. We've got the Security, Stability, Resiliency reviews that will be called SSR reviews. There is a redirect mechanism that is bylaw mandated organization reviews. We

are well aware that the ALAC went through a review. In fact, all of the SOs and ACs were reviewed ever since the beginning of ICANN. And now we're going into a second round, I think, of reviews for some of them. There are bylaws, documented relationships. There is of course all of the documentation pertaining to the Boards of Directors and the complex board selection process involving the making up of the board selection from the SOs, and of course the AC as far as the ALAC is concerned, but also the Nominating Committee selecting some Board members.

Of course this is all related to external laws, as well. In some of the cases here you would say, well, the major law – and I'm not a lawyer so someone might probably put their hand up and contradict me – but the law of California, the state of California, as far as ICANN is concerned is probably the most prominent to do with their own internal works. Accountability process. Here is the explanation of the public consultation. Effectively the outputs aren't such – identifying the key elements for strengthening ICANN's accountability, prioritizing those elements and then setting forth a timeline for the implementation of those improvements.

It looks as though, from my own understanding on this, is that we are looking at a super-charged ATRT-2. In other words, we're not looking at just the accountability and transparency of ICANN as it is today, but what is going to be the design for tomorrow's ICANN accountability and transparency mechanism. That's going to be a process. This is the first of several consultations I am sure. And of course, just to remind you all, there are two working groups that are going to be created on ICANN-wide working groups.

On the one hand there is a steering committee, which is going to be actually renamed the Coordination Committee for the Transition of Stewardship for the IANA Function. That's the one you just saw a few minutes ago over here, if I can come back to it slowly. Here we go. That's the one that we saw here. That's just to do with the IANA function.

Then there is a cross-community working group – or rather a community wide working group, because I don't think it's actually called “cross-community working group” as such. But it's a community wide working group that will have as many people as one wishes to have from every supporting organization an advisory committee that will deal with the ICANN accountability side of things. There's no selection as such on that. I gather that we issued a call for members at the last ALAC call and I know that there have been many people who have stepped forward to be in that working group and to officiate in that working group.

Further to this, I think we will also have our own working group in At-Large to be able to discuss the issues. That provides for several [inaudible] to be able to discuss this and to reach consensus. This call after me speaking for 25 minutes is really the starting point of our own process to discuss the accountability processes and where we want to go.

I note that Evan Leibovich is on the call. I was going to hand the floor over to him. Even if you wish to share your views on this as well since you are marked as the co-chair of the Future Challenges Working Group, and with the Future Challenges Working Group having worked on these

issues in the past as well I think it would be good to hear from you for a short while and then start the discussion on this. The discussion really being, what are we going to recommend as our first statement with regards to the process? You have to remember, this is the process that is currently being shown to us for the forthcoming few months and perhaps the forthcoming years. Over to you, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVICH:

Thanks, Olivier. I had not formally prepared anything for here so I'm going to address what you've asked for to the extent I think I can.

The Future Challenges Working Group did submit a comment to the ATRT. It was not explicitly addressing the questions but it was trying to take a higher level approach to things as indeed the Future Challenges Working Group has tried to act in almost a think-tank manner, forward looking at a very high level and try and think of a holistic way that this all works together as opposed to answering the specific questions that the ATRT had asked. Nonetheless, it seems that it was taken into account and considered by the ATRT.

My own comment at this point would be to say that the ALAC has already gone on record as supporting strongly the results of the ATRT-2 results of the report. I'm personally very, very disheartened that the board hasn't embraced this and taken it on or even explained why there are certain parts of it that shouldn't be heated. Personally before we start undertaking any new endeavors about ICANN taking new steps to enhance its accountability that it actually heeds the review team that it commissioned itself to look at this before – that before it starts taking

anything new that it examines the work of the groups that it has already asked to do this, that it is not responded to in total. And before we start undertaking something new, let's try and resolve how things worked out with the ATRT-2 which itself, I believe, was trying to figure out why not everything from the ATRT-1 was followed.

The last thing I want to do is get us into a cycle of, "Let's create a review group. Let's have it come up with some good recommendations. Let's have the board and the rest of ICANN cherry pick the ones that are easy to implement and then move on and create another group and just get into this cycle."

We're now into the second iteration of the ATRT. The board has not fully adopted the report of the ATRT-2. I would like an accounting of why that hasn't happened before we start any new cycle of starting the same thing over. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much for this, Evan. Thanks for your thoughts. Absolutely agreed that there are questions as to whether another group needs to be there. And as you know, there have been some times in the past when one working group has produced recommendations and then the board has [inaudible] the recommendations back in the arena by basically asking to have another working group shift through the first recommendation and then narrow them down somehow.

I had a feeling that with the world watching, this really is a process where the world is watching. And I note from Mark on the chat that ICANN suffers from an image problem, that it's an engineering technical

group and not an open community directed governance body. There's a lot of image problems and things that I have a feeling ICANN wants to do things right on this, and this is obviously why we have to be involved as much as possible – we as a community – and make sure that things are done right.

I see people in the queue. So, let's start with Christopher Wilkinson and then we'll have Alan Greenberg and then Mark afterwards. So, Christopher, you have the floor. You might be muted at the moment, Christopher Wilkinson. If you are not muted, then we cannot hear you at the moment, Christopher.

TERRI AGNEW:

This is Terri from Staff. Christopher, it doesn't look like your microphone is activated, so you'll need to select the telephone icon at the top toolbar and activate your microphone. Sorry for the interruption.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this help, Terri. Whilst you activate your microphone, Christopher, I'll hand the floor to Alan Greenberg and then we'll come back to you. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Those of you who know me know I'm not normally overly flattering or complimenting ICANN on accountability and transparency, but I'm curious about Evan's comment that they haven't implemented the ATRT-2. They have six months to respond and they're taking it down to the wire, but they're not responding until London. I'm just wondering

what indications you have that there's reluctance to follow the recommendations. There may well be, ultimately, but I haven't heard anything yet so I'm just curious what you're [seeing] this off of?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVICH: I guess my only quick response is why does it take six months to reply to something? At least ALAC responded to it really quickly. At least some kind of statement saying, "We endorse everything it said. We're going to figure out how to implement it all." It doesn't take six months to say that. It doesn't take the kind of delay that we've seen so far. Perhaps I'm prepared to give the benefit of the doubt, based on what you've said. Let's see what happens in London.

Anything short of a full-fledged endorsement and commitment to implement everything on the ATRT-2 indicates ICANN isn't totally serious about engaging in these community-driven transparency processes only to cherry pick the parts of it that it wants to implement. That's not how this works. If this ongoing work to enhance accountability is to be more than a charade, then ICANN has to demonstrate that when its community says, "This is what you need to do to enhance your transparency and accountability," that the board says, "Okay, we respond to the community." ICANN is supposed to represent the interest of the community.

The ATRT-2 had a widespread composition and if the board and ICANN cannot implement everything that it said and I have to call in to question its serious commitment to accountability and transparency ongoing. Let's see what happens in London. Maybe we will get the full-fledged endorsement that you think they're coming down to the wire. Frankly I think that it doesn't take six months to say, "This is a really good thing and how soon can we get about doing it?" Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Let's see if Christopher Wilkinson now is able to speak.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you now. Welcome, Christopher. Please, you have the floor. We could hear him and now we can't hear him anymore. Okay, that's one of these problems with Adobe Connect. Let's go back to you afterwards. Let's have Mark Urban, please. Mark, you have the floor.

MARK URBAN: Thank you. Just a quick note to what Evan was pointing out. I think it's valuable to see how ICANN has reacted to some of the existing requirements. Although I'd have to say, having reviewed both the ATRT documents, they're very labyrinthine. And while they're valuable in that they provide very specific recommendations, I believe that part of a

challenge for ICANN here is that it isn't just a statement of basic principles where the details will be flushed out as part of some kind of an ICANN-driven consensus process. Instead it's, "Okay, do this very specific thing."

So, the burden on an ICANN board to be able to evaluate the current recommendations is that they're not just agreeing to principles. They're agreeing to very specific, "You're going to do X. You're going to do Y." They have to think through how that impacts their organizational functioning and what impacts and what resources they need to allocate to these activities.

Just to give the credit to, again I'll fill the [inaudible] that Alan was saying, which is, they may be looking at these very detailed recommendations and saying, "Okay, can we do this? How do we do this? What's the mechanism that has to be done?"

That said, I'm wondering if we could possibly, as an activity, while we're waiting for ICANN to look at the very detailed things create a more generic document that's designed for high-level policy makers because these are the principles that the ATRT documents represent and that these principles are the principles we're expecting ICANN to follow and we'll be looking forward to working with ICANN to clarify and develop processes to actually build out these principles into specific actions and activities. That gives us something to do while we're waiting for them to act and it also provides a document that they might be able to endorse more quickly and more effectively, and then promulgate out to the community as a way to get policy makers to buy into them taking the time to do this right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for very much for this, Mark. Effectively you are responding to the second question on the Adobe Connect at the moment. What should be the guiding principles to ensure the notion of accountabilities and [inaudible]. Very valid, indeed. Okay, let's go down the list of people in the queue. Let's see, Holly Raiche is next.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. What I'd like to do is we've had a really interesting meeting [inaudible] but it had people like [Chris Disspain] and [Steve Wilson] and [inaudible] and a lot of [inaudible] who are involved in ICANN. In particular, [inaudible] spoke really well about the [NRO] position, that actually there are three parts to this.

One being, just the IANA function. That's doing very well. It's very accountable. Don't touch it. The policy function is a bit more problematic. You would have to say, "How does that work? Where is the accountability?" That's possibly where you look, and then there's [inaudible]. I like the framework [inaudible] and look at what we're actually [inaudible]. Mark, I agree. [inaudible].

The other contribution was from Bruce Tonkin who said, "Well actually one way to speak about [inaudible] is to think, first, [inaudible] and are they doing so, doing what, and what happens if they are not [inaudible]." Another really interesting framework to put this all into. I think we probably should start with framework as to what we're doing and then [sorting] to there. And where do our responses to the ATRT-1 and 2 go, as well as what other people are saying, because [positions]

are starting to come in as to other groups in ICANN and what they're doing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Holly. We next have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier I'm going to speak [inaudible], I do apologize. I wanted to come in behind some of what Mark, in particular, was saying about the need to create out of the experiences and very productive work [inaudible] in a post Affirmation of Commitment world in ICANN. I think we need to draw a bright line there. It's going to be very easy for us to bring a lot of old luggage along with us if we're not very careful in this process.

There is a bright line which is pre- and post- Affirmation of Commitments. There will be another bright line which is probably in the not too distant future that what we need to do is recognize the [inaudible] but work on the experiences and strengths. Just the change that has been observed – and I've been pretty closely observing this process having served on the ATRT-1 where it was a [inaudible] exercise with extremely important outcomes but tended to be somewhat more [inaudible] as a product than the work of ATRT-2 was by comparison.

The importance of the model, however, might be recognized and the process that is [opposed for this enhancing] ICANN accountability, and [indeed] exercise to explore the stewardship transition of the IANA function too is something other than NTIA – is based on what I [see] as a

robust and successful model that we're seeing here in both the ATRT exercises now.

That said, we will have to recognize that what gets built next should necessarily go beyond the "usual suspects" from within ICANN and I think we need to, therefore, as Mark was suggesting, identify things that are admittedly at a higher level but are in absolute keeping with the successful mechanisms and modalities, and outline the general desirability of what community – and I don't mean just our community here – the community at large [inaudible] at large [inaudible] more fully and certainly more globally based accountable and transparency structure for ICANN.

One other thing I just wanted to raise, and that is the importance of recognizing resource limitations which have been spoken about, and of course all of the minutia, what Mark is describing as labyrinthine recommendations, out of both pre-existing ATRT [ethics] are far more at the implementation. And whilst that is important, those things by necessity have to be [inaudible] by valuable resources. There have been a number of things that have sucked up those resources and may have slowed, or in some way impeded, a pathway that we'd have all preferred to have gone along faster.

I am very keen, however, to see this work and I do think that contributions from the At-Large community specifically feeding into this model, as it's been described by having our own working group activities leading into whatever is created is incredibly important. I'm going to stop now, even though as you imagine I could go on even longer. Thank you for indulging me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Of course, for those of you on the call who don't know, Cheryl was the At-Large representative on the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team. There is a history there, as well, on this. I note that Mark is still in the queue at first position. I'm not sure it was the old hand hasn't been put down yet or what. Okay, thank you. Next is, Alejandro Pisanty.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you, but your voice is very muddled at the moment.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Does this work better?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure. It's very [inaudible].

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I seem to be having some feedback.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You certainly have some feedback. We can hear you when you don't. So maybe if you turn the speakers up and speak or use headphones, that might be helpful.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Is this right? If not I will not keep you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Try and speak, Alejandro, and then we'll see. If our interpreters are able to understand you then others are able to understand you, as well. Sometimes we have a bit of a bad line. Go ahead, Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Very briefly, I think that you have to look in a much broader way at accountability. One first point is that there has to be much more reciprocal accountability within ICANN. That means all parts of what accountability [inaudible] be very transparent and tell us better what accountability and governance mechanisms are so that there is less of a chance of [inaudible] speaking or suspecting ICANN to be in the process of being [captured] by any particular interest [inaudible].

Number two, I think that the ATRT-1 and ATRT-2 reports [inaudible]. I think they engender a lot of bureaucracy. They do not largely increase accountability and transparency. And for other [inaudible] new governments to come in to look into this now in the wake of the NTIA transition. We find it too little and still not at the [inaudible]. So we have to look at the higher level, bringing some political science. [inaudible] would be useful, but get more than our more inclusive contributions

[inaudible]. We are really moving – with NTIA moving away from the IANA oversight, they're moving into a completely new territory. There are no single-government [inaudible], and every single government then can demand more accountability, more metrics against [inaudible].

On the other hand, if we create mechanisms that are too [little], that everybody checking on everybody else, the result will be [inaudible]. So [inaudible] between the risk of capture and the risk of [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alejandro. I didn't understand all of what you've said, but I will be listening to the recording later on. Your voice was a little bit loud, but I understand the need for making sure accountability is not captured by a single entity having, looking at accountability on a higher level and on several levels actually, as such. Let's try now with Christopher Wilkinson, again. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Thank you. Good evening. Just two simple points. First, I think we need to address the questions and issues that Jean-Jacques put forward in an e-mail earlier today.

Secondly, I support the gist of Evan's comments, and indeed criticisms, of the way things are going. We need much more operational results from the board and from ICANN as a whole in consequence of the,

frankly, very considerable voluntary effort that the At-Large and other user interests are putting into the ICANN process.

Thirdly, I would strongly advise the staff to be very careful about the minutes of all supporting organization's and advisory committee's meetings of which they're responsible.

I think some of the decisions that have been taken by the board and by the supporting organizations are seriously off center. ICANN is the regulator of fair competition between regular registries and registrars and user interests in the DNS market. That is not being done properly today. One of these bright[] days the competition authorities in our governments are going to start asking questions and I really think the staff must have [inaudible] a detailed and authoritative, almost[notarized, record of who was in which meeting at which time which resulted in certain decisions that have been taken.

As Olivier just said, the world is watching us. At-Large is the only countervailing power to the commercial and technical lobbies within ICANN, and unless we get our act together and impose a substantial countervailing power, I think the staff has an interest in making sure that at least the record is clean and the record is straight and the record is available if the need arises.

Olivier, thank you. It's a great meeting and I've appreciate it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. The meeting is far from being finished so we look forward to hearing more from you but this is noted, and

certainly ICANN being a countervailing power to commercial power in ICANN. Sorry, At-Large being a countervailing power to the commercial power in ICANN is something which I think we have assumed for quite a while with more or less efficiency or ability to be heard, but hopefully we are getting heard more.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Allow me to come back briefly, Olivier. Yes, but we can't do it efficiently with the present resources. And from the point of view of the multi-stakeholder model, unless it is done and the ICANN system delivers the public interest, the governments will not accept the results, especially the governments who are not active in the GAC. Even some of the governments that are active in the GAC are beginning to have second thoughts and you can see all the [phish] published by the European Commission because there are incredible decisions being taken which are [inaudible] to common sense point of view, without being ideological about the public interest, but from a common sense point of view, are not justifiable. So we really need to get hold of this and I look forward to discussing it with you in London in a few days' time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for that, Christopher Wilkinson. Next we have Christian. Sorry, Do you need to say something else? Okay, there you're muted now. Next is Cristian Casas.

CHRISTIAN CASAS:

In ICANN, decisions are made regarding international communication policy regarding domain names and numbers. When we created TLDs, ccTLDs, when territories are involved and they have an RIR service, as well, that means assuming taking a position or taking a stand. That is why I understand that the transition request and the formality and the [inaudible] formality, even, that we need to have regarding governments.

For instance, when we say that .sk represents a territory, well, that territory is part of LACNIC service remit or scope. So we need the community to take a stance regarding that issue. Therefore, I believe that formality, transparency, participation, clear and transparent participation or engagement in front of the governments of the world.

Even the Argentine Foreign Ministry sends a letter to ICANN's president and CEO requesting that NIC Argentina should be considered the only valid authority to deal or to govern territorial domains, including the Malvinas Islands, and the Sandwich and Georgia islands. We believe that this has to be part of this transparency period or process.

Argentina will be participating in the ATLAS event so we are requesting a review of the ccTLDs including, for instance, dot-[inaudible], some of which these ccTLDs are backing up or supporting colonialism. So we also request that a working group be created or set up in order to review all ICANN decisions following or in the wake of the decolonization measures adopted by the U.N.

[inaudible] at NETMundial [3:28 inaudible] massive surveillance, so the fact that this meeting took place in Sao Paulo is a testament to what is

going on regarding mass surveillance that includes Apple, Google, Microsoft and similar corporations. so we need to take concrete steps and follow Brazil's example. And we need to adopt a civil framework for Internet users. We need to sanction or condemn censorship and surveillance. So this has to be included in this period and in the debates and discussions within this period dealing with transparency. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cristian Casas for this. I was going to ask Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I was looking for our ccNSO liaison on the call, but I think there was also the framework of interpretation, also, work on several matters.

I know that we have Cheryl Landgon-Orr who was in those discussions and negotiations at the time. Maybe she might be able to enlighten us as to how those ccTLDs are allocated or transferred. That's just a quick bracket to the discussion we're having. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, [5:06 inaudible]. Maureen is also on the call, but both Maureen and I are about to leave because we are attending a pivotal Framework of Interpretation working group discussion where we are hoping to get closer to final reporting from many years and hundreds of hours of community-wide deliberation on that topic. So what I would suggest, Olivier, and I believe it would be of interest to more than just the few people on today's call who might be passionate about RFC 1591 and how delegation and re-delegation, as it is currently termed, is managed

and interpreted by the IANA operator, that a separate briefing opportunity and webinar is set up to bring the community up to speed on this very important issue to so many of us.

It is a very close thing to having a fairly final report out from the working group, and that would be an opportune time to bring the community up to speed. Perhaps that is subject matter that the ALAC could take up with ccNSO leadership during the meeting in London and work that could then be looked at between London and Los Angeles, and with that, I will be leaving it there. But also, I will now be moving into the FOI Working Group. Maureen may stay here a little bit longer, but I will still be in the AC room with audio on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this. And just to be clear for Cristian Casas, what we will do then, is to suggest to the ccNSO when we meet with them in London is that they brief us on the Framework of Interpretation and we have a briefing session specifically on those issues or how ccTLDs relate to sovereignty, etc., and the U.N. and private entities and governments.

Hundreds, indeed hundreds, of hours of discussion have gone into this and I'm quite glad to hear that we are reaching the point when a final product will be made available very soon on this.

Let's go down our queue back to our accountability process discussion for the consultation that I currently on our screen. Next in the queue is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I put my hand up before Alejandro did, or at least before I heard what he said, but I want to comment on one of the things he said because it links so closely to one of the things I was going to say. He made a comment, if I heard properly –and I was having some difficulty understanding – that a lot of the recommendations out of both ATRTs are detailed. They are complex. They increase bureaucracy and do not really fix transparency and accountability problems.

I tend to agree with the first part, but some would disagree with the latter. When I look at things like the rationale that will come along with board motions, that's a world away from what it used to be. I think we're far more the better for it because of things that were recommended in ATRT.

However, he's right in that the recommendations tend to be focusing on details, not on the bigger picture. And, in the ATRT-2 discussions, starting pretty much from the first day, we had a phrase we were using. The phrase was we wanted to see transparency essentially built into the DNA of ICANN. We were not seeing it, and pretty much all of the discussions along the way confirmed that, although we changed the rules, we don't necessarily change the culture.

That's what we have to change more because the details will work themselves out if everyone in the organization truly believes in it. But, there's a lot of indication that's still not the case. And I think part of our challenge in any new endeavors is not just to refine the ATRT-like recommendations, but figure out how you change the culture to make

sure that there truly is openness, transparency, accountability, and that the default is not something that's much more closed.

I don't know how to do it, but I think that needs to be part of the focus. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Are you saying the culture of ICANN has not changed since a few years ago when it was said there was less accountability then there is today?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm not saying it hasn't changed. And certainly, with Fadi's arrival, the tone has certainly changed a lot. I think, however, when you look at how individual activities get carried out, accountability and transparency doesn't end up being on the forefront.

It's easy for us to take some of the ones that affect us most. If we look at, as an example which won't surprise some people, the travel arrangements and things like that. They're just not transparent. They're not accountable. They're a power unto themselves, partly because of overwork and lack of appropriate staffing, and partly because of rigidity of rules that we're told what the rules are but we're not told why they were made.

But there's a host of other things that ATRT looked at where the default seems to be they're not things we can make recommendations on as such, but it's just the matter that the corporate culture seems to be protect the organization, not make the organization open.

I'm not trying to say it's everywhere and endemic, but you find it on a regular basis. And those are the kinds of things that people then use against us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So we have Sebastien Bachollet, who is actually a board member, who is with us on the call. There have been many questions asked as to what happened to the ATRT-2 recommendations. Why is there a new accountability process working group being created? Has the culture of ICANN changed, etc.? There are quite a few questions that have been sent here.

Sebastien, I wonder whether you could comment on this first on the process and where we are at, and also perhaps on some of the points that were raised. Sebastien Bachollet? And you probably are muted at the moment.

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Hello? I guess maybe now you can hear me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Go ahead.

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Okay, I'm sorry. And thank you very much for asking me. First of all, I think this meeting and this discussion, it's very interesting. You've got

some very good people with very good knowledge of the history of ICANN and it's always very useful.

I think, for example, [Alejandro] who was the one who throughout the overall change of ICANN from ICANN 0.0 to 2.0 is a very valuable asset and we need to have his input into this discussion. To talk about Christopher Wilkinson, who has a very good knowledge of the GAC and also of the organization [inaudible].

I could have plenty of things, inputs, to tell you. But, as you know, I am not allowed to talk to you and will still take some time to tell you few things, but not my [inaudible] here. We will find other time to allow me for that.

But, to answer one of the questions, it's where is the ATRT-2 recommendation, and I wasn't prepared to answer that. You know we, the board, gets six months to answer and the board will answer in London. I am almost sure that all, maybe not all for one or two, but I guess that all but one or two will be going through.

Why it takes some time? Maybe because as all of the bodies within this organization, we have the board [inaudible] to do. Maybe also it's because we need to look at the proposal to see how we could implement it, what would be the cost of implementation, and to decide on all that. Not just on if the board is agreed with the proposal, but if the board is agreed with the proposal, its implementation proposed by staff and the budget linked with that. It takes some time to do all this work. I guess it's a reason why in the process for ATRT, it was one year

almost to have the review done by the ATRT and then six months for the board to review the proposal.

It's true it's the same for the other review team. The one on security and stability shared by Alejandro, the one on WHOIS and the future one on the new TLD.

I think it's an interesting question, but I would like you to keep in mind that discussion we must have now, it's not as the ATRT. It's one part of the transparency of the organization. It was never taken into account the full structure of the organization. Therefore, this discussion now must take this into account. That's why I was raising the issue of the inputs possible by Alejandro because he had this very good knowledge of the full organization.

And if you have other questions, I will try to answer them, but thank you very much for now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Just one more thing. You touched on something there. The presentation speaks about the guiding principles for accountability. Does this also open the door to structural changes to ICANN's own set of SOs and ACs? I mean, is this something the board is considering? Are all avenues considered?

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Nice question, and I don't know if my answer is – it's not the board answer. It's my answer. And my answer, it's time to have an overall picture of the organization. Even if we take just the question of

accountability, how we can be accountable if we don't know how we are organized? How is the voice of each and every stakeholder taken into account and how are able to express themselves?

If we wanted to talk about this question, we will have to raise, just for example, the composition of the board. If we raise the composition of the board, we need to raise the composition of this organization. And it's, for me, even if it's not written on the request, it's consequences of the starting of the discussion.

I may be wrong or you may disagree. But I think you, as At-Large, you need to take into account the global picture, the overall picture. It's important and it's timely. We need to do that now. If we don't do that now, it will be too late, not just for At Large, but it will be too late for the organization itself.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for those personal thoughts, Sebastien, and that certainly appears to be joining with what Mark Urban had suggested earlier. We could be more helicopter, more global.

Next is Alejandro Pisanty. Alejandro, you might be muted. Go ahead, Alejandro. It looks as though we have a technical problem with Alejandro Pisanty. We're unable to hear him. Is staff able to let us know? He's on Adobe Connect only. Okay, then it's stopped working, unfortunately, for the time being. Nope, it's not working, I'm afraid.

So, I don't see anyone else in the queue at the moment. And, Alejandro, if you're able to – ah, Alejandro, there you are. Go ahead.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Yes, okay. Thanks [inaudible] pointing out things that I think that works well. I would like to point you on to one more document that I think provides [inaudible] on the ICANN role in the—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If you can speak a little bit further away from your microphone, because it's a bit overwhelming. Your voice is distorted and we can't hear you too well.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. Is this better?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Slightly, yes.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: So I was saying [inaudible].

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And now you've been cut off, now. Oh dear. Certainly the AC room doesn't seem to work well, and now we've lost Alejandro, unfortunately. Okay, let's go back, then, let's see if someone can call out, dial out over to Alejandro and that would be fine.

I see Christopher's hand is still up. Is that an old hand I have kept up, or is this a new hand? It is not a new hand. Sebastien Bachollet, back to you.

SEBASTEIN BACOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. Like that, we will wait for Alejandro to come back, hopefully, on this call. I want to raise one issue because I heard a lot of people talking about ICANN, ICANN, ICANN. And many saying ICANN is something who takes a decision like the board or senior staff and I would like you to really understand that if ICANN is something, ICANN is all of us. It's not just 16 people voting on the board.

If there is no At Large, if there is no ALSes, if there is no member of the ALSes, there is no ICANN. If there is no registrar, registry and other business users and so on and so forth, there is no ICANN. ICANN is a multi-stakeholder global organization and we need to really start to talk about ICANN about a few people. ICANN is all of us. When we talk, it's important to keep that in mind and even to shift our language when we talk, if we can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. We have Alejandro Pisanty again. Alejandro, are you able to speak now?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Yes, I am. Can you hear you?

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: So, as I was saying, [inaudible] must be particularly ready to be accountable in the global [inaudible] if possible. We have to make sure that we [inaudible] At-Large contribution to accountability. We have to be on a [inaudible] the person that's most liable to encouraging conduct that has to be watched must be the most transparent.

We have to realize that, for many purposes, the At-Large [inaudible] one more interested person, not any member who have very clear economic interest, for example, the gTLD registers and registrars, but we also have a competition for ICANN resources like attention, travel support, staff support, [inaudible] support and so forth, where the At Large is perceived as one more interested party. So accountability there has to be built in such a way that the request is credible. An At Large that is not credible hurts ICANN's perception of accountability all over.

Governments can point to the ability of ICANN to manipulate the At-Large to [inaudible] the At Large or the lack of transparency [inaudible] organizations. So we have to make sure of our contribution.

And coming back to Alan Greenberg's response to my first [intervention], I'm not denying there have been important contributions from the ATRT and the ATRT-2 processes, but I think that for the coming phase, we have to look at it all much, much global picture and make sure that we communicate the accountability. Even more than the transparency, but that we communicate the accountability. Be very clear, very simply understood and pass the test of being understood by

government as well as those who are the ICANN and the multi-stakeholder.[inaudible] one government working at the back who is going to be there. It think we are underestimating the size of this challenge. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alejandro. I must admit, I caught most of what you said, or maybe about 70% of what you said due to the trouble hearing you from here. I was going to ask whether it would be possible for you to perhaps submit some of those comments that you've made, just quick summary of it in writing, because you've raised very valid points, indeed.

Okay, we have another ten minutes until the end of this call. Next we have Mark Urban. Mark, you have the floor.

MARK URBAN: Hi. Alejandro stole some of my thunder. My point to Sebastien's very valid statement of principles about who is ICANN and what is ICANN. I think it's important, though, that we look at this discussion about transparency and accountability as an opportunity to get ICANN to not only make as a statement about the fact that the multi-stakeholder model is how it wishes to live, but I think it's important for it to allocate resources to the communities that can provide it the broadest range of options and resources.

To me, the ALAC's real value to the ICANN community – and I think of ICANN as a community, it really should be – is the fact that we're kind of

out in the societal infrastructure that allows for a broad range of information, opportunities, concerns, and potentially some of the challenges that need to be met by ICANN.

That means, oftentimes, though, because we're community-based organizations, our resourcing tends to be thin. So one of the principles we need to think carefully about is, if ICANN is going to move forward into a more multi-stakeholder environment, then some consideration about leveraging the resources that are available is going to have to be part of the principle discussion, as well. I think it's something we can't leave off the table when we talk about transparency and accountability.

If you say, "We're having five different open meetings," but the open meetings are all being held in capitals where we can't get persons from developing nations a place at the table because they can't even get to the table. I think those kinds of concerns are valid and help to develop a principled environment that literally supports a multi-stakeholder model that, especially governments, can live with because they know there's a broad societal consensus as well as a technical consensus.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mark. Just a quick question on a point you've made here. I gather you've had time to read through the NETMundial principles on the future of Internet governance.

MARK URBAN: Yes, the therapy is going very well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do you believe – I mean, are these things, principles, that should be applied directly to ICANN itself and that ICANN should abide to, as such?

MARK URBAN: I think it's important for us to have that discussion. I think if we were going to propose that, it needs to be something that the ALAC gets together and proposes as a community and says, "This is the way ICANN needs to live and needs to operate by," because those principles are guidance that applies to everything they do, versus some of the more detailed recommendations, which tend to be, "We want you to add resources to help [ALAC] participants to fully participate in a multi-stakeholder environment."

That's a very good recommendation, but a principle of "We're going to aggressively support those organizations and the communities of ICANN that need resources to participate in the multi-stakeholder model." That's a principle. How you apply that is then a very detailed recommendation, and those are budget issues that Sebastien was pointing to, as several other things.

But if you start out with a principle of we're going to orient resources to support the multi-stakeholder model and identifying resource-driven needs, that helps to drive where you put those monies and where you put those resources.

Alejandro just put in a great note about accountable At-Large. Our At-Large organizations need to be accountable, as well, and I think that we need to eat our own ice cream first, as it were, and make sure that we develop accountabilities and processes and documentation, metrics to

support whatever principles we carry up to ICANN. I wanted to throw that in because Alejandro put that up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Mark, for this, and it's a very good point you just made. And I just wonder, perhaps, as you know we've got the At-Large Summit coming up. There are going to be a number of discussions. We have thematic working groups that are going to be working on many of these issues.

We also have a set of plenary sessions. In fact, one of them will be speaking about specifically the topic that we're speaking about, which is the accountability process and the future of the accountability process. It might be worth hearing what you've just mentioned here. It might be worth the ALAC considering not only supporting the NETMundial recommendations, but making a statement about that. Perhaps also making a statement recommending that ICANN also abide by these recommendations. If that's what I hear from you, it sounds like an excellent idea. And, of course, there will be a discussion taking place in London about it.

We are reaching towards the end of this call, but we still have a few minutes and I wanted to go through the input that was received prior to this call from Jean-Jacques Subrenat. For this, the input is actually added as a comment at the bottom of our agenda page. If I could ask staff to perhaps point to the agenda page again.

I don't know whether we actually have on our agenda page we actually have that. Do we have comments on the bottom of the agenda page that will be on the screen?

Okay, Heidi, you're unmuted.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Olivier. I believe that [inaudible] posting that, and it looks like the comments are actually at the bottom of the agenda. So there it is there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Here we go. The comment is indeed at the bottom of the agenda. Thanks very much for putting this on the screen. So, the comment was as follows. It mentioned the two main comments. The first one is 2A, the environment that the Internet and ICANN can operate in. So, Jean-Jacques comments say, effectively, while being technical in operational requirements remain crucial for the Internet, security, reliability, capacity for [inaudible], one of the big challenges is now Internet governance in all its complexity.

To remain meaningful, the multi-stakeholder model needs to evolve. Historically, the domain name business has been a driving force, but now it is time to clarify the respective role of stakeholders, including sovereign states. And it also mentions there it is time to place the Internet user perspective at the center of any reform.

I don't know whether this resonates with anyone in here. It certainly sounds like some of what we've heard on this call earlier, and placing the Internet user perspective at the center is certainly I'm sure this

community would be interested in supporting. The clarification of the roles of stakeholders, including those of sovereign states might be something that somehow takes from the NETMundial resulting document.

Secondly, to the positions of important actors in ICANN's accountability, and there briefly mentioning, I'm not going to read through the whole paragraph but I'll simply mention the Snowden revelations having made the global Internet users aware of our fundamental rights and really put a light of the bodies of [inaudible] etc. It also mentions the importance of understanding the motivation and options available to other large actors, like Brazil, like China, like Russia. And more than ever, Internet governance requires general principles.

Again you see here the words formulated at NETMundial could be used as a draft. It looks as though this goes in line with some of the points which were made on this call, that the NETMundial document could be a starting point for the At Large community to push things forward and suggest to ICANN to carry what ICANN does in their own volition.

And then there are also including potential proposals and actions from ALAC in this context. I think this here – have a hard look at the achievements of ALAC through conception by reviewing the real influence of ALAC comments or statements on the organization of ICANN. The number of ALSes versus their effective impact, etc.

I see this here, and I'm sorry if I'm shifting too quick to the other speed, but I see that working together with our thematic groups, we will have, for those who are not aware, there are five thematic groups that

will take place and will have discussions and will have to build a statement each at the At Large summit. One is the future of multi-stakeholderism. That's a more global thing which will probably go along with what's been discussed at NETMundial. The other one is globalization of ICANN and, obviously, that's going to work with the reference of what we've been discussing today.

Global Internet user perspectives, and that falls pretty much in line with what has been said also by Jean-Jacques Subrenat. ICANN Transparency and Accountability. That working group, I hope, will be able to pick up from the discussion we're having today and take it way further and actually come up with a fuller set of recommendations that appears to be the recommendation from today's discussion. And then the A- Large community engagement in ICANN is certainly that could be a good study of what Jean-Jacques has mentioned, which is having a look at the achievements of the ALAC and having looked at the real influence of ALAC through the statements and orientation of ICANN.

I see we are three minutes beyond the end of this call. We'll stay another five minutes or so. I do see, I think that's an old hand from Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: No, no, no, no, no.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is that a new one?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yep.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, I'm sorry, Christopher. I thought that was the hand you had. Please, go ahead, Christopher, and then we'll have Cheryl. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay, thank you. Very quickly, first of all, thank you to Jean-Jacques for this position statement. Secondly, I recall that Roberto circulated to you all some comments that he asked me to prepare on the same themes, which you already have.

Thirdly, yes, we've already said that the multi-stakeholder model needs to evolve. It needs to evolve towards significantly different balance of power and stakeholder mix in the ICANN environment and in the IGF environment.

Then, the accountability, I pass on Jean-Jacques' comments about Snowden because of its common ground now to all of us, but ICANN has to move on privacy, on WHOIS, and basically on what's going to happen to all these thousands of strange domains which will be registered in the new gTLDs in registries which are incorporated in Gibraltar and other strange places.

I see a whole raft of new problems coming up in terms of jurisdiction and normal management of the DNS as a result of the new gTLD program. So we need to keep an eye on that. And it is quite normal for ICANN to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of each of the

supporting organizations and advisory committees. I think it would be good for us to engage in that discipline, because the reasons why At-Large and civil society, in general, in ICANN are not efficient and effective enough is nothing to do with our group. The real problem starts with the nominating committee and goes on right through the composition of the board and the bottom-up process in silos, particularly in the GNSO.

We really need to take these issues head on and say, "Right, we will have an evaluation of the effectiveness of At Large in ICANN, and if it's not effective enough, it is ICANN that needs to move, not At Large." That's all for it. We'll talk about this in London. Thank you, Olivier, for an excellent conference call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher, for your excellent contributions to the conference call. A good start. And I guess the problem that you raised, effectively, would need another conference call that long, or even longer than the one that we've had so far.

I see closing discussion. We still have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And Cheryl, the NomCom has been mentioned just now. But of course there are a whole lot of other [inaudible] see if you would be interested in commenting on these. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

TERRI AGNEW: I do believe Cheryl needed to drop and join another call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay, that's unfortunate. Okay, fair enough. We'll probably have her comments in writing. So, effectively, what we need to be discussing and following on with now is what we are going to do with regards to just the very opening salvo of this very, very big discussion. And I see there is a lot of interest in our community on this.

The opening salvo is the initial response that we're going to be providing to the public comment period that we have in front of us and the effectively asks the questions, the basic questions, which I put on the screen earlier. What issues in the community identified being core to strengthening ICANN's overall accountability and the absences of historical contractual relationship to the U.S. government; the guiding principles, etc.

I will work with Alan Greenberg and anyone else who is interested in contributing to this to go on to the public comments page which relates to this. And the public comment page is on this. I just put the public comment page notation on chat. If you want to bring your input in writing in regards to the discussion that we had today, please put them there as a comment. If you're unable to comment because you don't have a login on the Wiki, which is the case sometimes, then just e-mail them over to the staff at atlarge@icann.org and the staff will be adding it on to the public comments.

In fact, I should really ask for it to be sent to Ariel. Ariel, are you okay with this? Yes, Ariel Liang is okay. So it's ariel.liang@icann.org. As you can see, it's just first name, dot, second name and you've got Ariel in the chat.

Oh, and Peter Knight has put his hand up. Peter, we really are running out of time. If you have a short comment, you may proceed. Peter, you must be muted. I can't hear you on this side. We can't hear you so if you could type in your comment or your point in the chat, that will be fine.

With this, we are ten minutes beyond the end of this call. This was a 90-minute call. I thank all of you for having joined. I hope this was helpful in discussing this issue and in being able to have some input into this process. We have a few more days, I would say maybe another week, where we will allow for comment to be put in writing on the page, on the public comment page that relates to this public comment. Then we will have to draft something and send it to the public comment, Theresa Swinehart and her group.

In London, as you know, we'll have discussion in the thematic groups. We will be drafting further statements and I think that those statements, many of them relating to ICANN accountability and enhancing ICANN accountability, will be channeled into that process. And, of course, we will have many of our community members who will be on this working group on enhancing ICANN accountability. I understand the working group will start its work immediately after the ICANN meeting, so on the second of July, that [inaudible] working group will start its work. Tomorrow, of course, there will be an announcement made by ICANN relating to these issues.

With this, I don't know if there is any other business, any additional things that needs to be added. I don't see anyone putting their hand up apart from Peter. But, Peter, are you able to speak? Peter Knight? Nope. Going once. Going twice.

Well, thanks to everyone. Thanks to the interpreters for managing to keep up with my talking speed and for having remained another ten minutes on the call. This call is now adjourned. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]