
LONDON – ATLAS II Plenary - Session 5
Thursday, June 26, 2014 – 07:00 to 10:00
ICANN – London, England

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...English, and they have said immediately, could they please pass them to somebody who doesn't speak English. There are some more headsets that will arrive in a few minutes, and you'll be able to have your headset.

Just before we start, you'll notice in the AC chat there's a link to a survey, and that's the survey about the Fayre of Opportunities, which Glenn has kindly put together and put online. If you have a bit of time, or whilst waiting, you can fill out that survey, if you remember the Fayre of Opportunities. It was a few days ago. I see nobody remembers it!

There is a technical problem in the interpreters' booth at the moment. I can see them taking it to pieces. Apologies for that, ladies and gentlemen.

SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, while we're waiting, if you are listening to AC, in the room, could you either please wear your headsets and listen to it through your earphones. If you leave it on in the room, we'll be hearing it back through the system and having an echo. If you are listening to AC, please put your headphones in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: While we're waiting for the technical problem to resolve itself miraculously, we'll pass the mic around and in whatever languages you know, just say good morning. I don't know if we can record this? I think

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.

it would be a really good thing, as a sound bite, to be able to have the good morning voices of At-Large. We'll find out what voices are like [speaks gruffly], "Good morning, it was a good night last night."

We'll start over with one end and then pass the mic around all the way to the back. Is the recording on? Let's start with the Antipodes, the furthest part away from the UK is over down under. Cook Islands? No. We're not going to go that... It's too early for that. We have Maureen here. Gunela?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: G'day mate, and [unclear 08:33].

[Good mornings in various languages 08:45].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well done. Okay. Now we know it's a good morning. Some people are saying good morning to themselves. At the next At-Large Summit, because there will be a new At-Large Summit, we're going to ask you all to repeat all of the good mornings that you've heard this morning, so I hope you've taken note. You will be tested. Those who don't make it will not get a prize.

What else can we do?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: On behalf of the small group of people who drafted until 3:45, thank goodness you said good morning. I didn't realize it was morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If we could save this as a sound bite that would be great. Thank you.

SPEAKER: I don't know if you've seen the Fayre of Opportunities video? If not, we'll play it here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Video plays: "After two years of work, to create this Summit from scratch, we've made it!"] It's the first time I'm seeing that video as well. Wow! What a great video. Thanks very much to the video team. They've done a really, really amazing job. Round of applause for the video team please. [Applause]

We've got one more thing to do actually before we all go home – sorry, before we start! What we have to do is recognize a few people who've had some special day this week, in fact all the way back to Sunday and Monday, Tuesday. There are a number of people who had birthdays this week. We're not going to go through each one in turn, but if they wish to do so, they could stand as we all sing "Happy Birthday".

You can sing it in your language. Hopefully the melody is going to be the same between the languages. Yours is not? Heidi, can you take the mic away from Gisella please? Over to you!

GISELLA GRUBER: [Sings "Happy Birthday" in Afrikaans]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For a more traditional one it's... [Sings "Happy Birthday"] What devotion to have your birthday during an ICANN Meeting. Thank you for making it so! I think the problems are going to be sorted out pretty quickly. I don't know what else we can do. We have been given an extension until 11:00, so don't worry, we're not going to miss on any of the things we have to do today.

On the other hand, there are going to be a few things happening afterwards. There is a discussion on the accountability and transparency of ICANN, which will take immediately after this session. At lunchtime we have the ALAC that will meet to ratify whatever they need to ratify for this week – Statements and the document from the ATLAS Summit.

After that, in the afternoon there is a public session on the transition of stewardship of the IANA contract, which is a mouthful at this time early in the morning, but I think I got it right. After that you'll have the public meeting, that will last a couple of hours. I hope that some of you will be able to go, stand over to the microphone and comment on some of the things that you've seen this week and experienced this week at ICANN.

Afterwards there is the meeting of the Board of Directors. I know some of you will already have had to leave to catch your flights and so on, but the meeting of the Board of Directors is nothing of importance. It's boring, says as Director that we have in the room, that shall remain nameless for his own safety.

At the very beginning of the meeting of the Board of Directors, the report that this community has put together and spent a lot of hours on, will be handed over to Dr. Steve Crocker. He's the Chair of the Board. I will say a few words, mentioning the five Thematic Groups that we've

been working on. Then that report will also be transmitted to all of the Board Members.

Hopefully, within the next few months we'll see some action and have some answers from the Board, regarding the set of recommendations that this whole community has put together. We're ready to go? Woohoo! Let's put the mic back and start. Eduardo? Now we're missing Eduardo. Excellent. He must have overslept.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I will just say one word. Unfortunately I will have to go to another meeting. We have a Board Meeting this morning at 9:00. Really, I'm impressed that you are here at 7:00 on the last day of the meeting, still awake. You've done a great and good job. Please keep on doing that in the future. At-Large needs you and ICANN needs you. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastian. Just before we start, interpretation is available to people who are in the room. As far as people who are currently listening to us remotely, this will be fixed very shortly, within the next five to ten minutes, hopefully. Let's get this meeting started and start the recording please.

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. I'm saying this because for some of you it might feel as though it is the evening, but it is a brand new day for us. It's the last day of the At-Large Summit. Welcome everybody. Apologies for the technical problems we had a bit earlier. On the other hand, it's now 8:30 in the morning, so you have

been awake for at least an hour and a half in this room. For those of you that woke up here, yes, someone brought you here earlier.

We have a packed Agenda. The first thing we're going to do is look at the statement of the At-Large Summit, that has been drafted by you; by your communities, by your different Thematic Working Groups. The Statement in itself is divided into two pieces. There is an Executive Summary, that Heidi tells me, five pages for an Executive Summary is not really an Executive Summary. But there is one, which actually is a very shortened, punchy, impactful summary of the points that were raised during this week.

The second part of the report is the Appendix, which has the input from all of the five Thematic Working Groups. They've been a little bit formatted and so on, and the English was checked. I must say, some of the drafters that were present with the final editing team did not remember what some of their sentences meant, which was a little difficult, hence it took a little while to catch the gist, the feeling of what that little sentence meant.

All in all, we managed to capture the vast majority of the input that was here. As I said, the results, I hope, as we'll present to you now, are quite catchy and certainly punchy for the Board to raise its attention on this. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, I don't know if you wanted to say a couple of words on the form of the Executive Summary? I know you were the main architect of this, due to your extensive service and experience in the diplomatic field.

Of course, when dealing with the Board you have to be both diplomatic but also very forceful. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Actually, diplomatic in this sense, representing so many voices, that's the real challenge. The other challenge was how to get, in a short, impactful form, all the ideas, or at least the principle ideas – those that really have the greatest impact on the future developments of the At-Large user perspective in the ICANN architecture.

That is why it was proposed, and we adopted, the idea of having an Executive Summary. I think you should read, when you have time, both documents jointly. One refers to the other. I think that's the way you have to see it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Now, if you look at your screen you'll have the "Second At-Large Summit Executive Summary". I will ask Dev to start reading. Each one of us will read a short segment of it to you, and of course the interpreters will be interpreting it into French and into Spanish. We'll start with Dev reading the first paragraphs, and then we'll change voice so that you don't get used to the voice and fall back into the state you might have been in a few hours ago. I know it was a very hard week. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you and good morning.

"Second At-Large Summit, ATLAS II. London, 21st-26th June 2014. The Executive Summary."

“Five years after the first At-Large Summit – ATLAS I, Mexico 2009 – the At-Large Advisory Committee chose ‘The Global Internet: The User Perspective’ as the overall theme for its second At-Large Summit – London 2014. Internet end users and/or their representatives, as well as many At-Large structures participated in two days of brainstorming sessions in order to develop a range of recommendations and observations on the future direction of ICANN.

“This work was carried out in five Thematic Groups. In the following paragraphs, the ALAC presents its Executive Summary of these recommendations to the ICANN Board and/or ALAC itself, and observations to individuals and organizations, promoting a more inclusive Internet.

“The user perspective: The end user should be considered an essential component of ICANN’s multistakeholder model, as referred to in the Net Mundial multistakeholder Statement.

“Recommendations: (1) Support end users to take part in policy development. (2) Eliminate barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices. (3) Input the user perspective wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN. (4) Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I could jump in? The next ones are observations. They have a slightly different drafting to them. They’re observations. We can make recommendations to the ICANN Board. We can make recommendations

to the ALAC. Making recommendations to the Internet community, I think, would probably be a little difficult, seeing that there are three billion people. These are observations, which of course can be taken up by the Internet community and by us outside of ICANN. Over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Olivier.

“Observations: (1) Focus on education, digital literacy, and the empowerment of the user community and, where possible, on building, maintaining and operating computers and programs. (2) Promote end user digital rights globally and thus re-establish trust in the Internet. Demand effective protection against arbitrary and pervasive surveillance collection, treatment, handling and use of personal data. Permit users to require the deletion of their private data from servers and databases. Ensure compatibility between user rights and the terms of service of private companies serving the Internet community.

“(3) Obtain openness and transparency from each country’s ccTLD or country-code operator. (4) Promote the use by individuals and organization of secure, efficient, easy-to-use, interoperable online identity credentials. Promote web standards favoring user autonomy and security (e.g. XML and web content accessibility guidelines), with the active participation of impacted communities.

“(5) Foster substantial local content beyond [infotainment 38:10]. Ensure access to truthful information and knowledge.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. This is the summary of the recommendations, based on the user perspective. I will now hand the floor over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat for the “Future of Multistakeholder Model” section. Over to you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. I’ll read the rest of the text of this part.

“The Future of Multistakeholder Models: It is imperative that multistakeholder models place the user perspective at the center of the decision-making process, as users will be the primary beneficiaries of decisions made within the overall framework of various models.

“Recommendations: (1) ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders. (2) ICANN should increase support, budget, staff, to programs having brought valuable members to the community. (3) ICANN should continue shaping an accountability model, reaching not only Board Members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.

“(4) ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the roles of liaisons between the different advisory committees and supporting organizations – ACs, SOs – to do away with the silo culture...

[TAPE CHANGE ATLAS II PLENARY 2]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: “...Remains at the heart of the accountability process, in all prospective...” I hear there’s a grammatical correction brought to this. With your permission, we’ll come back to (5) when it’s redacted or changed. I’ll go onto (6) and we’ll come back to (5).

“(6) ICANN’s multistakeholder model should serve as the reference in encouraging all parties to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes places or consensus is sought.

“(7) A periodic review of the multistakeholder model should be performed to ensure that the processes and composition of ICANN’s constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirements in the corporation.” (8) The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.

“Observations: (1) As no single multistakeholder model can serve as a universal reference, the community must foster consideration and innovation of different models, allowing the best possible implementation of MSM for any particular decision-making requirement. (2) The composition, segmentation, silos and diversity of ICANN’s constituent parts should be flexible, as different areas of policy may call for different groupings of interested communities.

“(3) Cross-community cooperation should be the default mode. Segmentation should only be engaged when the MSM is ineffective. (4) The MSM requires efficient processes, clarify of scope, a sufficiently open membership, as well as enhanced engagement between different parts of the Internet ecosystem. (5) Fellowship programs should be

enhanced to enable disadvantaged people and communities within richer nations to participate.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. We have a friendly amendment. I’ll remind you, the final read was very late last night, and so there might be a few small mistakes in there, which we selected to correct this morning – just editorial mistakes. The one I wanted to refer to was Recommendation (5) “ICANN should examine how best to ensure that the end user constituency remains at the heart of the accountability process.”

The word “constituency” in an ICANN context is actually a gNSO part, and of course we’re not only dealing with... There’s no such thing as an end user constituency, as defined in the gNSO. The friendly amendment would be to say, “ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability process.” That’s what we’ve always said and what we’re going to repeat in the public fora of ICANN and in the future. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can we say “end users’ community”?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. We have discussed the term “end user community”, and one of the weaknesses with saying that is that the strict definition of a community is that it’s bound by something. If one looks at the end user community out there, three billion end users, that

means that the next billion might not be included in this. This is why we're looking at "end users" – all together, including the end users that are coming in.

We thought about this. I think it was after a few caffeine drinks. Shall I continue? Perhaps I can do the next part, and that's the globalization of ICANN.

"To pursue its globalization, ICANN must ensure that the entire Internet community is comfortable with its level of access, participation and input into decision-making processes and production of global processes.

"Recommendations: (1) ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where growth is more likely to occur. (2) The next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of live scribing for all meetings and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes, and make translations available in a timely manner.

"(3) ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access, according to various criteria – gender, cultural diversity, and user needs; disabilities, etc. (4) In collaboration with At-Large structures, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend education programs across under-represented regions. (5) ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation, to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and relevant.

“(6) ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflicts between its requirements and relevant national laws. (7) ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure, befitting a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.

“(8) ICANN needs to improve their direct communications, regardless of time zones. (9) ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries, and in conjunction with technical bodies promote credible alternatives.”

That was the section on globalization of ICANN. Next we have the ICANN accountability and transparency. I will hand the floor over to Dev Anand Teelucksingh to read this part to the record.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. “ICANN Transparency and Accountability.”

“ICANN, under its own bylaws, and the Affirmation of Commitments, must ensure that decisions made related to its responsibilities coordinating Internet names and numbers be made in the public interest, and must be accountable and transparent.

“Recommendations: (1) Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language. (2) The role and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.

“(3) Both the areas of the Ombudsman and contractual compliance should report regularly on the complaints they’ve received, resolved, pending resolutions, and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints. (4) There must be a standing oversight body to hold the ICANN Board responsible for its action or inaction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. There’s a small error in this. There was also a small error earlier that Holly Raiche pointed out. They’re just little editorial changes; ambiguities in the text, which may be interpreted differently by different Board Members, and obviously that would weaken the message we’re trying to send to the Board and to our community.

Let’s continue. Jean-Jacques? This is work in progress.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: With pleasure. “At-Large community engagement in ICANN”

“The At-Large community has become one of the largest communities in ICANN, comprised of a diverse group of organizations across all regions, and with various end user interests and backgrounds. Even five years after the first ICANN/At-Large Summit in 2009, the engagement of such a community in ICANN still needs to be improved.

“Recommendations: (1) Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process system, available for use across the ACs and SOs in order to enhance knowledge management; improve the effectiveness of

all ICANN volunteer communities; improve cross-community policy-specific activity; enhanced policy development metrics; facilitate multilingual engagement; create a taxonomy of policy categories; provide policy development history as an aside for newcomers.

“(2) The Board must implement ATRT 2 recommendations 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees. (3) The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify subject matter experts and facilitate policy communication.

“(4) The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone. (5) For each public comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements. (6) ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments and use crowdsourcing.

“(7) ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in the materials, are clearly defined in simpler terms. (8) The ALAC should arrange more At-Large capacity building webinars. (9) In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between user rights and the public interest. (10) The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large community, in-between ICANN public meetings.

“(11) The At-Large community should envisage conference calls with other ACs and SOs in-between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement. (12) Additional logistical support from

ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large Wiki. (13) ICANN should ensure its Beginner Guides are easily accessible. (14) ICANN should encourage open data best practices, that foster re-use of the information by any third party.

“(15) ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, but applicable to short lead-time non-travel requests. (16) The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. (17) ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO Meetings, either at ICANN regional offices, or in-concert with regional events.

“(18) RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. That’s the complete At-Large community engagement in ICANN section. We have a comment from Holly Raiche. Let’s deal with Holly and then we’ll read the last paragraph, which is the concluding paragraph of the Executive Summary. Over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: In (7), really minor, but you need to put the word “and” in. I’ve got two editorial things that I’ll...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They’re small. They’re language things? Great. Let’s have the final paragraph. Jean-Jacques, if you’ll read this one to the record, please?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: With pleasure. For me it's a particular privilege to be able to read this into the record.

“In the course of the ICANN 50 Meeting in London, the Chair of the ICANN Board of Directors and the corporation's CEO, underlined the need to place the user perspective at the center of the organization's work. The ALAC is pleased to convey to the Leadership of ICANN, and its global community, its eagerness to fully assume its role in achieving this objective.” [Applause]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have comments. I see Alejandro Pisanty. We also have Vittorio Bertola. First, is the slash at the end of this supposed to be there, or is this going to be deleted? Or is this a diplomatic way of saying we reserve the right to not remember any of what we've just said and do exactly the opposite?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Short of a nuclear deterrent in diplomatic language, in some countries, that means that's the end of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. That's very helpful. The first person is Vittorio Bertola.

VITTORIO BERTOLA:

Hi. Thank you. I wanted to give some first reactions to what I've just heard. The first one is that of course this is great work, and there are a lot of interesting suggestions. If I were Fadi or anyone from the ICANN Board, I would say, "Okay, but please tell me what the three things are that we can do immediately." There should be some kind of prioritization, if it can be done at this point in time.

Maybe it's just finding two or three things that the ICANN Board can do immediately to help the At-Large and to [receive 00:19:40] some of these recommendations. Of course we encourage everyone in the ICANN community to [take care] of all of them. Then there was a point that I didn't see appearing, which was the point about increasing our own internal diversity.

For example, there's a problem with sub-regional diversity. We have representation of all the different regions, but often inside the region the people that represent the region always come from two or three countries, where maybe civil society and user groups are more developed. There should be an active effort inside the At-Large community to bring people from all the parts of the region, in terms of say some stakeholders, because not all users are the same. Maybe there should be an effort to get broader diversity.

To a certain extent, this could also be achieved by expanding the current participation and representation of the At-Large. When we introduced the At-Large Advisory Committee in 2001, 2002, we decided that 15 people would be a good number, according to the number of user participants at the time, which was more or less 15. Basically all the users participating at ICANN ended up in the ALAC in the beginning.

Now with all these people and organizations that are participating, it might be time to expand a little the size of the ALAC, or even if you don't expand the ALAC, find a way to bring more people from more parts of every region, and more different types of user organizations, so that actually we promote this internal diversity and allow more voices to be heard. This is something that the ALAC also should consider.

I haven't seen any clear requests to governments, in particular, to embrace multistakeholder model at a national level. I'm not sure whether it's there or not. I've seen a call for the ccTLD operators, but I haven't seen a call to governments to adopt the multistakeholder model for user participation, and maybe also to support the At-Large participation in ICANN.

In the end, I believe that it's not reasonable to ask ICANN to pay for many, many more At-Large people to come to ICANN Meetings and fund the At-Large participation entirely. I think that, at least in democratic countries, because otherwise you might have problems, but governments should be actively promoting user and civil society participation in ICANN. Maybe this is something that we could ask them.

Then, this already came up in the discussion, I've seen many requests to ICANN to of course provide more outreach, more translation and more participation. I think we should also try to ensure that whatever we get is used effectively. In the last 15 years we have had a culture of establishing positions. We created the ALAC, the ALAC Chair and the RALOs, which was necessary because we wanted to get some formal recognition. Otherwise we never would have been heard.

Now I think it's time to move to a culture of promoting effective participation and [prizing 00:22:55] contributions. I'm a bit wary of a culture where people are focused on running for positions, and most of the effort is who will be elected to the ALAC next year, how can I get onto the RALO Board... That's natural, but of course this tends to promote dynamics that are more centered on positions, elections and voting, than they are on producing good policy input.

The result may be the lack of policy input we've seen in certain presentations. We were given numbers that say that the actual policy input is still very low, especially from certain parts of the world. That is where the At-Large community will be [charged 00:23:37] by the rest of the ICANN community. We can establish hundreds of positions, but if we don't provide good policy input, in the end someone will shut off the entire process.

The last point I wanted to make is that there's only one thing that really disturbs me in the text I've seen, and I think should be edited. Somewhere, someone has decided to call for standing oversight body above ICANN. Did I get it right? This is really terrible, because it's saying that there needs to be someone somewhere else telling ICANN what ICANN has to do, which is actually what we're trying to avoid with the multistakeholder model.

Equally, that's basically calling for the ITU or someone like that to take a role above ICANN, and tell ICANN what it needs to do. I don't get what that message was that you were trying to convey, but it should be changed, because it can be easily misinterpreted as support for the

inter-governmentalization of ICANN or whatever. That recommendation should be changed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, do you wish to respond? First I'll repeat some of the points that I've heard from Vittorio: the prioritization of the recommendations necessary; increasing our own regional diversity; studying expanding the size of the ALAC; no request to governments at the moment to expand the multistakeholder model – so we should have something on this; promoting subject matter experts; and no support for intergovernmental, multilateral models. It doesn't mention that we support the multistakeholder model as opposed to the multilateral. Over to you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. In response to Vittorio, first a general remark. I happened to serve on the Board at the same time as Vittorio, for a brief period, and I remember he is the fastest speaking English speaker I have ever met. It's always a challenge for people whose native language is not his wonderful English. Now, I suggest that I try to answer briefly to Vittorio's comments about two things – the priorities and the call to governments to adopt MSM.

I suggest that the other points, diversity and oversight above ICANN, be treated by Eduardo, Olivier or Dev. About the priorities. Of course, you're right. We have to have priorities, but you know from experience, don't you Vittorio, as I do, that the Board doesn't want to have a ready-hashed product.

What they want is to be given a sense of the general feeling, and if it's written properly and faithfully reflects things then the Board Members, whose prime duty is a duty of care, is to themselves interpret, and according to their own experience, extract what they consider as priorities. It's the diversity of the Board that then compensates for that. I do see your point though.

The second one I wanted to take up is the call to governments to adopt MSM. Now, as Olivier said right at the start of this meeting, there is a clear difference between the recommendations, which we're empowered to make directly to the Board or the ALAC itself, as opposed to recommendations or considerations. It was our feeling that governments cannot be instructed by us.

It's up to us, as members of our respective societies, nations, etcetera, to influence, if possible, our elected leaders, where there are elected leaders. It is through that channel that we thought the MSM should be expanded and reinforced. Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Alberto Soto has put his hand up, but unfortunately we have a queue with the microphone in the middle, because there's just one staff member to run around. You're very welcome to walk to the microphone and make your comment on the mic.

Let's go down our queue. Let's go with Alejandro Pisanty first, and then we'll start the queue in the middle of the room immediately afterwards. I know – I hate standing in the queue, it's terrible, but at least you're not

carrying a laptop that weighs a ton and a half, which I did a while ago, and that cooks your arm while you hold it. Over to you, Alejandro Pisanty.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you Olivier. Alejandro Pisanty, Internet Society Chapter, Mexico. I'll make only two comments. First, I'll second Vittorio's comment, and then the two comments. One of them is that I believe that this document does not really represent what our users of the Internet are most concerned about, about ICANN, which is to keep the trains running on time, do the work.

Users of the world are much less concerned about how they can get to tell ICANN how to do its work, than by having ICANN do its work; have the domain name system work, expand, become increasingly secure, become increasingly multilingual, and so forth.

Effectiveness should be the first criterion, and of course it has to be done in a transparent way, in a way that respects user rights, in a way that respects privacy or increases a respect for privacy. Effectiveness – an effective, smooth operation and a efficient operation as well are very important.

Second, I hope you can control the text so that we can see the clause Vittorio has already referred to? It's the one that calls for a standing oversight body for the Board. For ISOC Mexico this is a deal-breaker. We will not support anything in the document if that clause stays there, in any form or shape. That clause is our own disbelief in the multistakeholder model.

That clause means that no matter how much we believe in the work, the collaboration, the participation, the effectiveness, the meaningfulness of the participation of stakeholders in ICANN, of the mechanisms of ICANN itself, we just say, “We need someone else to look at this. Bring in the grown ups.” There is no way that you can build that without replicating ICANN or without handing it over to someone else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alejandro. The second comment you made with regard to the oversight body, can we scroll to the location? I’m not sure where that was in the list. “Recommendation (4) There must be a standing oversight body to hold the ICANN Board responsible for its action or inaction.”

The group discussed this at length. We are well aware that there are some calls from some people asking for an external organization to have an oversight function of ICANN activities. Of course, it’s also understood that if you have such an organization, are we just creating another ICANN to look at ICANN, and who provides the oversight of that ICANN that would look at ICANN? Obviously it just gets thing to be more complicated.

In addition to this, trying to dictate an internal oversight body and going into details with regards to an internal committee or an independent committee, or whatever form or shape this might take, was something which vastly exceeded not only the time available to the drafters and the people in this room, but also vastly exceeded the competencies of At-Large itself.

This is something that the whole Internet community and ICANN need to look at, and take time to find a possible solution and something that will not only be robust but also acceptable to everyone. Also, something that will not be capturable by any vested interest. We felt that it was perhaps premature or dangerous for this committee to engage into providing more detailed plans about this.

There must be a standing oversight body left open enough for it to be internal, external... In any case, to focus on further than what it is at the moment. It's a deal breaker for a lot of people, but having ICANN as it is today, without the stewardship of the US Government, as afforded by the AOC, I think that everyone agrees that something, when the AOC is finished, will need to replace the AOC, of some sort.

How it is replaced is something that might take quite a while, and more than just two days of discussions – even though these two days were very long. We felt not having this in the recommendations was basically dropping one of the main themes of this meeting, as you know, and having anything more focused than this was dangerous, because effectively we'd already be engaging in a direction without having taken proper caution. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. I would like to add, Alejandro, to Olivier's comments, another one. It is too brief. It should be elaborated upon, but we should perhaps make clear that this can and should be done only in the framework of the currently evolving transfer of oversight stewardships of the IANA function framework. In other words, that excludes a

government-only or an intergovernmental only solution, which I think is one of your chief concerns, which I share, by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Next we have Garth Graham.

GARTH GRAHAM: I would like to point out that there is a link between transparency and accountability that gives ICANN a major advantage in achieving global acceptability. I've attempted, in the discussion of accountability, to put that into the sense of how accountability works. I admit that I failed. I recognize that I don't really understand how the pen is held, so I didn't get as far in making my point as I would have wished.

The point in essence is this –there is a difference between accountability before the fact and accountability in answering after the fact. ICANN's processes or ways of making policy decisions being inherently transparent gives ICANN an advantage over other organizations in making it clear what it's committed itself to do, and therefore what it has to answer for.

That's accountability before the fact, and accountability after the fact. You already have that in hand. Yes, you've good suggestions for improving it, and it could use improvement, but it's there, and many organizations don't have that. I have placed brief wording of that in the Thematic Group 4 Wiki. I recognize it's probably too late to include the idea, but I would still like to attempt to push it into the Agenda. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Garth Graham. I think that this whole issue of ICANN accountability and transparency is one where we are at the very beginning of the process. As you know, this is all being launched at this meeting, so there will be plenty of chances to put this point across. I gather other people will also put other points across.

Certainly the work is starting on this, and I hope you'll continue taking part in this work, because At-Large will have a voice in all of those groups that are currently being created and that are going to start operation over the summer and beyond. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I was actually the moderator for the group that came up with the concept of – I will not use the word “external” – an oversight body. I have to say, it took a lot of our time, both on a lot of Saturday and some of Sunday, to try to work through what we meant. I can't say we came to a final conclusion. We did not talk about an external body.

We laid open the possibility of either members of the constituency, which is an ICANN term, possibly members of the community, because we recognized that there are other parts of the community – that may not be SOs, ACs, that might be the IETF and other interested parties. We left the term “community” there to be a broader term, but not necessarily external too. Obviously we don't want ICANN staff.

Obviously we don't want Board Members, and we may not want people who've just rotated in and out of ICANN, so that you can't tell whether they're staff or not, but some way of saying, “We want people who are

part of the community” – how that is defined, and left it that vague. It’s a very, very difficult concept to come to terms with. We want it to be some kind of standing body so that it doesn’t have a fixed date when it ends.

We also hoped that we’d never actually have to use it, whatever “it” is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly for expanding on this point. Indeed, this key recommendation is obviously going to generate some feedback, first from the Board, for clarification, and for saying what you mean by “a standing oversight body”? I think at that point the ALAC will have to provide a fuller list of expectations including the various different points that have been relayed just now.

Again, it’s the start of a new piece of work, a new thread, that’s going to expand in the next few months and in the next few years. Roberto Gaetano is next.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you Mr. Chair. I’m going to say a few words on most of the things that Vittorio raised. I think that a series of points that are related to things that we recommend to ourselves to do in terms of improving participation and so on. I think that even if we don’t have a home for these points that Vittorio has raised in the document, I think that they should not be forgotten in our internal agenda for improvement in the next months.

The general concept is that we should not, as ALAC, give the impression that we find problems with ICANN, and we recommend ICANN to do things, and given at the same time the impression that we don't do our homework and keeping our house clean. There were certain things in the report that were pointing at ourselves as actions, and I think that in the next weeks or months that we should do a little more work, but not necessarily put them in the report.

For the priorities, I agree completely with Jean-Jacques that the document should be a full document, and that should not single out two or three points. However, that does not preclude us the possibility now, if we have time, to give the feeling of what the priorities are, and the moment that we have the public forum or other location to verbally provide some input, besides the written document, maybe to highlight three or four points that we think should be the priorities.

Don't alter the shape of the document, but still provide some input to another channel on what the priorities are. Now, to the sticky issue that I left for the end. I think that we should go back to the first principles. We should ask ourselves who we are – we, ICANN, not just we ALAC. Who is the community that this multistakeholder model fully engages in? Is the real community, are our stakeholders...?

Every organization is responsible and accountable to its shareholders, not to a standing body that can be internal or external, but that is seen as a supreme court that can pass judgment. I think in our document we should clearly say that ICANN has to improve the accountability, but also clearly define that ICANN is accountable to the Internet community, and

is accountable to the multistakeholders that are part of this Internet community.

I don't think that it's a good idea for us to indicate this accountability mechanism to take the shape of a body, because that immediately raises the idea of, "Okay, let's go and start the discussion of how the body is formed, five members from here, five members from there," and we're going completely in the wrong direction.

We should endorse the recommendations of ATRT 1 and 2, but make a clear statement that it is the community At-Large, and At-Large not in the sense of the user community of us, but the multistakeholders that are the ones that ICANN is accountable for. In the framework of the IANA transition, I don't think that in itself the IANA transition has an impact on the accountability of ICANN.

The accountability of ICANN was a condition that was set upfront in the Affirmation of Commitments, as a prerequisite to do certain other steps. There's no direct link. I think that this concept of accountability has, as I said, to go back to the basic principle, we should establish the principle that we are accountable to our community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Roberto. Jean-Jacques, you wanted to say a few words on this?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I realize that other speakers in the community may wish to take up the same subject. I have a proposal that I'm drafting, which will hopefully take into account these remarks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Next is Hong Xue.

HONG XUE: Okay, thank you. I'm actually surprised. So many people are interested in this proposal on this standing oversight body. I'm from Group 4. We spent most of our time talking about this proposal, and we're sorry for the confusion. We never meant this is going to be the ITU or an ITU-like body. We never meant it's going to be an inter-governmental process or body. That was not our original intent.

To make it very clear, if you look at the screen, .4 in the recommendation part, I strongly suggest you add two words, as actually shown in our text, it must be a cross-community standing oversight body. In that case it would make it clear. Of course, it's based on the community, it's rooted in the community. My next point is actually about the other activities happening right now at ICANN.

What we mean is a cc standing oversight body; with the cc at the beginning. I know Olivier is being approached by gNSO about their new proposal about an independent accountability mechanism that could be built. This uses another word, the "user checks and balances system". I agree with Vittorio, actually. ICANN has many accountability mechanisms. Multistakeholder policy making is an accountability system, but ICANN is now asking what could be enhanced.

This is something we suggest to be added, in addition to reconsideration, in addition to Ombudsman, in addition to that rarely-used independent review panel we're suggesting here. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Hong. Stay on the mic please. One could add to this recommendation of a standing oversight body a checks and balances system. I think that's one of the things you suggested; a mechanism of checks and balances. The other thing I note is that from several points that were made, this looks as though a lot of people immediately think, "Standing oversight body, oh yes."

"Intergovernmental organization or group of governments," or something – vested interests, which I understand might be a concern. I'll ask Jean-Jacques to try and find some text that will alleviate this concern, because if this community, which is very multistakeholder in nature, and is the end user community, is concerned about this very point, because that's the first point that hits their head, the Board is very likely to have exactly the same kind of reaction.

They are Internet users, at the end of the day, so there's a concern there that you've raised. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: There again I'd like to defer to our colleagues in the line, and I'll try to come to that later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Roberto, I hate to disagree with you, but I don't understand what "accountable to the community" means.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, which part? Same thing? Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: "Accountable to the community" isn't precise. It doesn't mean a particle thing. Hong proposed to add "cross-community", but I'll propose to add multistakeholder. There must be a standing multistakeholder oversight body.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I think we'll definitely put that in there. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthasamy.

SIVA MUTHASAMY: Sivasubramanian from India. The idea of a standing oversight body, as discussed so far, is to make sure nothing goes wrong. With a system of checks and balances, within ICANN, the organization by itself becomes balanced, and there are checks in-built into the organization. The need for a standing oversight body is completely eliminated.

One idea we could think of very strongly is a system of checks and balances, like for example [unclear 00:51:23] government, for example – the American Government – with a judiciary, a parliament, an executive, each balancing the other. If ICANN's structure [matches 00:51:34] with a

user body, which is equally powerful, an executive and board equally powerful, and a judiciary...

Right now we barely have a judicial structure. We have the Ombudsman process and the Board consideration process. If these processes could be expanded to be fair, to be inclusive, maybe by getting one of the judges, then the need for a standing oversight body is also eliminated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. That echoes the points that were made here, and I know Jean-Jacques has added to his text. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I wish I could enlighten more. I don't think anybody will appreciate how many times we wrote, rewrote, redrafted, put words in, took words out, just because it's difficult. I think every time we changed the wording there were legitimate reasons for doing so. It is a struggle that we had a lot. It's a struggle you'll have a lot. We did have "cross-constituency". We threw that away for "cross-community". Then we decided what does that mean?

At one point we had in "independent panel". That went. We've had lots of words in there to try and indicate what we were talking about. It's very amorphous and that's why the words will always be difficult. A body that is of the community, that does have some authority to address crises of some sort.

Originally we had in the possibility of oversight of all of ICANN, but ICANN itself has loads of quite useful and usable mechanisms to deal with anything that goes on in the various component parts of ICANN. This is really not about accountability within ICANN. It's a, what do you do, if at the very highest level something happens that will damage the Internet community?

Getting further than that and adding words is really going to be difficult. When you say you're going to go away and come up with words, I can tell you it's a really difficult task because there are a lot of quite legitimate views to be had. I hear what Roberto is saying. Roberto, your point of view was also talked about a lot. As a group we tried to struggle with what happens in very unforeseen circumstances.

How do you make ICANN decision at the top level somehow accountable to the community? I can tell you, those are a really hard set of words to come up with. We probably haven't done it right and we probably won't do it right, but the concept is accountability within ourselves and within our community to make sure ICANN works.

How do you do that – Tijani's absolutely right – to ask what's the mechanism? I have to tell you. We didn't come up with a firm, clear answer. It's going to take a lot of thought on everybody's part. What we started to do was say "some mechanism" and then on top of that lots of words. Everything you can think of in this room we've probably put on and then taken off.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. I'm glad to hear the discussion about ICANN accountability and transparency, knowing that we will have to supply several people to a cross-community Working Group on ICANN accountability and transparency. Of course, we need to have our own Working Group that will be able to feed those people who'll take part in the ICANN-wide cross-community Working Group on these issues.

The suggestion of making use of the checks and balances text of the gNSO is something I think is recognized. I'm sure the gNSO has extensively discussed the idea of checks and balances and come up with this after an extensive amount of work. I have full faith that that will be something that will have to be added. We'll see what Jean-Jacques comes up with, with regards to the standing oversight body, to clear any ambiguities and make sure we don't cause more harm than good. Christoph Bruch?

CHRISTOPH BRUCH: Just a very short remark in reply to Roberto and all those who think that we may not need an oversight body – no matter to which community we refer, to practically put oversight into action we need someone who can act, which will be a body. I don't think there's any way around that, and I ask the people to consider that. Either it's no oversight, or it's a body, but addressing the community as a whole, as an abstract thing, cannot be put into action. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Christoph. That's noted as well. [Bogdan Manuella 00:57:11].

[BOGDAN MANUELLA]: Thank you. [Bogdan] from [unclear] Romania. I would like to make three comments that are not related to the standing oversight body – not because it’s not important, but I understand that is a text being drafted. The first is related to the observations that we make for the Internet users. I think that the At-Large community should not be mandated to do that. I’m saying that because I’ve heard three Presidents in the last three years – one from a Western Society, another from an Eastern society, both in Europe – talking about wanting to make a civilized Internet.

In one way or another, any kind of observation that we’d make for a regular user could be perceived in this direction. I would strongly suggest that if we want to make this observation, to make it only for ALSes or other Internet groups. It was in the preamble in the beginning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Preamble? Okay.

[BOGDAN MANUELLA]: “Observations to individual users.” It’s a definition of what an observation is. Second paragraph of the Executive Summary. I think that should just be for organizations or ALSes and not for individual users.

The second point is related to the wording for digital rights that you’ve used, in the first or second observation. I’d strongly suggest using the words, either “digital human rights” or “digital civil rights” or “human rights in information society”, which have actually been defined or, for human rights, have been known for a long while.

Digital rights could be understood by the IP community as being digital rights management, which is something totally different, and it's actually a breach of human rights and information society. It's a word that's being used constantly.

The third one – I think the document needs to make clear that the order of the recommendations is not the order of the importance of the recommendations. I'm saying that because I was part of Working Group 5 and that would make us the last, and I don't think that was the case. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Very helpful indeed. These are oversights on our part into thinking critically into how one would read the text. Obviously it's one of the things of why is it in that order? We'd be the first to say, "You can't be serious. The first one can't be what you really mean, and the last one I would have put first." Anyway, over to Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Tijani said that in order to continue the topic he said he was going to give his comments after the speakers, so I'd rather give the floor to him. Tijani said he was going to make his comments after the speakers, so I didn't speak before so as to proceed with the topic, because I'd like to go backwards. I'd rather have Tijani with his comments about point four, and then I'll take the floor, if I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Tijani, would you like to make your comment with point number four, please?

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, I made a mistake. You, then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is some matter of confusion. They both dress very well indeed, and they both have a rather senatorial appearance, and should I even venture out and call is a regal way of expressing themselves. Over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. It's an honor for me to be mistaken for Tijani. Thank you so much to my colleagues from the At-Large community. This has been extremely helpful. I cannot designate myself as the drafter of the modifications you expect because they are of such importance that they cannot be improvised like this. However, I'd like to make a few remarks, to make sure that we captured the essential parts of this discussion, and also to provide, if I may, the way forward.

What is seen as the first problem is the difference between body or entity, and mechanism. I've heard the arguments on both sides and I, as someone as a practitioner of international relations, not only a theoretician, may suggest that in this case, "mechanism" is far better than "body", for all sorts of reasons that you can guess, or I can make more explicit for you if you ask me too somewhere, if we have a coffee break.

I would say that mechanism should be specified. This was proposed to us by one of our colleagues who said, “A mechanism of checks and balances.” This is good because it already exists in various parliaments and various political systems in the world, including in this country where we happen to be. That was the first point. The second point is that this discussion is not leading us to a ready-based solution.

As I see it, this is the start of a study or reflection on part of the ALAC, on your behalf, towards such a mechanism. Please be reasonable, as I’m trying to be, by not expecting this Executive Summary to bring the final solution or the final drafting. We’re on the way. We’re not there.

The third remark I found very important, the remark of our colleague, on what I and others here, on the final drafting committee, wrongly termed “digital rights”. This is something that would of course make our intellectual property lawyers, in other words trademark lawyers, buy a bottle of champagne right away. I take your point. It is very important.

Therefore I would submit to my Chair and to the staff that everywhere where this is mentioned in the whole Executive Summary, “digital rights” should be replaced by “rights of Internet users” or “human rights of Internet users” or “fundamental rights of Internet users”. Actually, I have a preference for “fundamental rights” because “human rights” in some countries it again has a more limited, although very powerful connotation against crime, violence, etcetera, whereas “fundamental rights” includes more abstract things, which do not imply or include physical damage.

Now, the last but one remark was on the sequence of the themes appearing in this Executive Summary. As you may have noticed, there is

no sequence according to any TG, because there's one very important reason for this. In order to be complete and to take as far as possible account of all your excellent suggestions, it was necessary that we take pieces from one TG work and put it elsewhere so that it would flow better.

Maybe we don't even have five large titles. I think we have four. We made sure everything would be included in a slightly different order. Now that I've been going on for ages on these introductory remarks, I'd like to submit to you a draft about this very important question of oversight. It's not perfect. If someone on this table or staff would be kind enough to take note of it, I'll go slowly. It doesn't have the pretention of being something definite:

"To consolidate ICANN's culture of accountability and transparency, as called for in the recommendations of ATRT 2, oversight of the Board's decisions now requires a mechanism capable of providing an effective multistakeholder or multistakeholder cross-community oversight mechanism."

Now, I realize this is incomplete for many of you. Bear with me. I'm simply suggesting a framework for our future thought. What I suggest, because it's very difficult to do multi-tasking and multi-drafting at the same time, may I be so forward, Chairman, as to suggest that on this specific point, which is Recommendation (4), if you agree to take this simply as a starting point then those who have the clearest ideas and the clearest suggestion for formulation about this should send it to staff.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please send it to staff@atlarge.icann.org.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: We will be a certain number of us. I commit myself to passing part of the day on this, if required, so that we can really take into account the precious input of this discussion this morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. As you know, this Statement has to be ratified by the ALAC at lunchtime, so one has until lunchtime to be able to perform those small amendments. On note on your text, your last sentence saying, "...Now requires a mechanism capable of providing an effective multistakeholder cross-community oversight mechanism..."

Again, whilst when we say "cross-community" it sounds as though we're expanding the mandate, we're actually reducing it because we're reducing it to the people in ICANN. I think it's an understanding here that this organization is accountable to all Internet users, whether inside or outside of ICANN. Holly, if you want to say something you might have to go to the mic, or is it to tell me I have to look at Skype or some messages somewhere? We have the text on the Wiki. Great.

Now I have another friendly amendment to make. So far the document is called, in our lack of great wisdom, an "Executive Summary". The reason for this is that at 20:00 it looked as though there was going to be an Executive Summary. An Executive Summary, with five pages and 30 something points is not a summary anymore.

I don't think it will do justice to this document to do a one-page Executive Summary of a summary of all of the work that's been done here, but certainly we have to change the name "Executive Summary" into the name "Declaration", which is what the end document will be called. It will be "ATLAS II Declaration", reminding you that in the declaration it will also have the appendix, which will include the starting text from the work of all of the TGs.

Board Members, community members, everyone when this declaration is published will also be able to see the text from which this declaration was drafted, the source of the text. I think it's important. Of course we'll also leave all the Wiki pages open for people to dig further if they wish.

As you know, the recordings of these sessions will also be online, so it will be possible for any researcher, or anyone trying to find a source of the declaration and find out how the multistakeholder worked in this case to be build this, to be able to look at it. I must say, it probably sounds quite fascinating to be able to go into that. Hopefully. Evan, you've been waiting very patiently. I apologize for the time it's taken. Alberto Soto and then Evan.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you. I apologize for the previous confusion. It was not a reason for quarrelling but a reason for flattering. I didn't want to interrupt before, because we'd been speaking about engagement and accountability and the content of my comment was going to be out of context. We discussed accountability and engagement as areas required to become involved in the multistakeholder model. The RALOs have a

serious problem, which is that they have low engagement, our low participation.

We see these both as a problem and a challenge, and as representatives of the end users we are interested in our relationship with end users and ICANN's relationship with the governments. Any action adopted by governments has an impact on end users. We are aware that any action towards the governments through the GAC allows ICANN to coordinate results based on its relationship with third parties.

It's very much upon third parties on what the outcome will be. It happens that the relationship between the end users represented by ALSes and ICANN, everything that goes on there is an internal issue that reduces participation. We see it both as a problem and a challenge. Our intention is that this document cannot say this, because it's an operational issue, but we should work in a coordinated manner, because we have the same objectives, and we can actually make the multistakeholder model work internally, effectively. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alberto for this comment. I'll point you specifically to Recommendation (18) in the At-Large community engagement in ICANN, which asks for RALOs to encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements, and also looking earlier at the section that speaks about the accountability and At-Large input in ICANN.

At-Large community engagement in ICANN, again, "Recommendation (2) The Board must implement ATRT 2 Recommendation (9.1) regarding

formal advise from advisory committees.” The ATRT 2 is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. That second round of review ended on the 31st of December 2013, and the report, Recommendation (9.1) asks for a change to the ICANN bylaws so that the Board responds to all advice from all advisory committees.

That is something which doesn’t go to the same level as the GAC, with a recommendation that requires a response and a negotiation process, once the GAC has engaged the ICANN Board, but during the discussions, which actually took quite a while on the ATRT 2, there was clear evidence that several of the participants objected to the GAC being treated on exactly the same level as the users.

That unfortunately is a fact, and it was made clear that the Board would not be in a position to pass a recommendation that might endanger its special relationship with governments. I guess that is a wider ICANN and government issue.

Hoping – and we have been told it’s likely that all of the recommendations of the second ATRT will be implemented – we are pushing specifically for the one where the Board has to answer to all of the advice that we provide, all the formal advice that we provide. Therefore, that should bring better engagement from Internet users into the ICANN processes. Over to you, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much Olivier. Considering how late I was up, the time has actually been very useful. I haven’t minded waiting. I was hesitant to mention what I’m about to, but having heard the intervention of

Alejandro and some others, if we're going to be revisiting the issue of the oversight body I'll just give my two cents on this, as I was listening to everybody.

Most places I know that have a board have an oversight body of some kind, and it's called an electorate. We have a situation for instance for at least one of the Board Members, where every three years there is an election. That election, to me, is what I consider to be an accountability measure. Every three years we get to review the performance of the Board Member that's been picked by At-Large. We either choose to vote for somebody else or we return an incumbent. That process worked this year.

When you have boards and they get elected by shareholders, or in a non-profit they get elected by members, this is very often the way things are supposed to work. ICANN doesn't work this way. Once upon a time there was direct elections for all of the Board of ICANN, because of a number of reasons that at the time were very reasonable. There was a process that creating a Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee, in what I consider to be a rather un-transparent process, now picks a good chunk of the Board.

Well, we do have the ability, if we're talking about accountability here, to perhaps revisit that. Perhaps the mechanisms enable us to have more, better direct election of the Board, by the community, than exists now, rather than just one, or some people saying we need a second At-Large elected Board Member, let's take it a step further. Let's perhaps revisit the idea of having the Board, that until now has been selected by

a fairly closed Nominating Committee, and bringing that idea back out to the community.

The Nominating Committee in most organizations is a Nominating Committee. That means it picks a slate from which an election is held. The Nominating Committee does not appoint people to the Board, in most places. It picks from a number of candidates from which you choose. Perhaps ICANN is mature enough to be able to go back to that model that seems to work in most other corporations.

Perhaps have the Nominating Committee actually be a Nominating Committee, rather than what it is now, which is a Selection Committee. I would toss that idea out, if we're revisiting this, because if you do have direct accountability to the community through an election process, then you don't have the need for a separate oversight body. The oversight body becomes the community.

When I see the call for an oversight community, as we're having this conversation it strikes me that the demand for that indicates a lack of trust in the way the Board is currently constituted. To a certain extent the multistakeholder process does this. Some of the Board Members are picked by constituencies. One of the Board Members is picked through an election from At-Large.

That part of the Board is accountable to the people that sent them there, while between elections the people on the Board are not necessarily accountable to the community. Their fiduciary duty or what-have-you is to the corporation. The point is, every three years the community has an ability to say whether or not the people elected to

represent their point of view did their job well, and they get a chance to elect somebody.

I just want to toss this idea out, that perhaps if we had an electorate that actually picked all of the Board, rather than just a chunk of the Board, then we wouldn't need some kind of external oversight – some additional level of bureaucracy – that essentially perhaps do what a direct election would do in the first place. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. There have been a number of comments in the chat. There was one comment somewhere... Here we are. There's a question on the Adobe Connect chat from Javier Rodriguez. The question or comment was, "What we ask for ICANN, we ask too for the ccTLD administrators. ICANN, as a whole, and NTIA, will request that the whole system will be accountable, not only the Board and central ICANN operations.

"Since this is a work in progress, can the table or Chair consult with the audience if we can add accountability to the issues that we request from all ccTLD administrators?" That is a point three on the observation page on page one. Let's turn to this quickly. I wanted to say a few words on this.

the issue of the accountability and transparency and the governance model of country codes and ccTLDs is a very tricky issue at ICANN, due to several factors. The first is that many country codes and country code operators predate ICANN. ICANN was created at the end of the last

century and some of the country codes and country code operators were in existence more than ten years before ICANN existed.

The second fact is that not all country code operators in the world are members of the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. In fact, some are completely independent and refuse to join the organization. This is without emitting any judgment about refusing to join the organization – they are free to join and free to not join, and those that are members of the ccNSO are free to leave if they wish to do so. It's on a purely voluntary basis that country code operators take part in the ccNSO's processes.

The third issue is that country codes in general have a very strong feeling of sovereignty, and when there's a strong feeling of sovereignty it's difficult to impose an external body that tells them what to do. I guess this factor is one that's shared by everyone, and in diplomacy I'm sure the sovereignty is a particularly overarching principle.

This specific point is of course in the declaration, and it asks for openness and transparency from each country's country code operator, but is not able to actually enforce or push this. This is a wish, this is a request, for openness and transparency. Going into further detail might restrict the overall scope of this observation, and asking for the processes of accountability and multistakeholder policy, etcetera, is something that I think and feel – others on the team might disagree – might actually weaken this.

That's because of its focus, in thinking, "Well, because they've focused on so many things they've not touched on the respect for human rights," for example. "They've not touched on making the domain names under

the country code affordable for everyone. They've not touched on those points, so we're then able to do anything as we wish to do so." Hence, having more on this, I think, is probably counter proactive, rather than adding to it.

Jean-Jacques, do you wish to add something? No. Okay. I hope this was quite clear.

The Framework of Interpretation Working Group, if you do a search on it, it's spent six years trying to define the responsibilities of each and everyone with regards to the country codes, due to the very fact that to an Internet end user these are very confusing issues. What is the difference between a generic top-level domain and a country code top-level domain? The fact that the policy takes place in two very different locations is not something that Internet users are aware of.

I'm afraid we're running out of time for more comments, but that's good, because nobody is standing at the mic. The next steps for this is for the ALAC to look at the amendments of the final document. Of course, that's provided we have agreement to move this forward over to the ALAC. I was going to ask if we could do this by acclamation, provided all the points that were made or added, I believe they are significant points that need to be changed, but also they've been delimited properly.

One more person, Alan Levin, on the microphone. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN LEVIN:

Thank you very much Olivier. Congratulations to all of you for this amazing amount of work. It's been incredibly enlightening to see how well the At-Large is working. The final comments about bringing back the elections onto the table, I think is a fantastic idea. On this point of policy, as an African and Chairman of ISOC South Africa, I just wanted to point out that also the GAC have put into their communication the point of .africa, which is now being held up through an IRP process, which may take any amount of time.

Apparently it could take three days or three years. Certainly as Africans we do need an alternative in most of our countries to our cc's, and maybe we should consider putting in some kind of comment about .africa and making that available to African users.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. I absolutely take your point with regards to .africa, and I think it's a good point that the GAC has made. The concern is that the principles that have been developed here are... I hate to call them high-level principles, because that makes us look like we're going on the high chair or something, but maybe a helicopter view of the concerns. Non-regional specific, but maybe I'd say... I haven't got the word to describe this, and I'll explain why.

We have had, in one of the Working Groups, a request asking for further collaboration into a specific type of top-level domain. That Working Group decided not to proceed forward, by the majority of Working Group members, after much discussion or some discussion, decided not to proceed forward so as not to focus on specific problems with the new gTLD process, and its implementation and its rollout.

That's because for one, the Applicant Guidebook was the basis for the implementation and the rollout of the new gTLDs, and that book is long passed. Anything that's happened in the first round could have been a lot smoother, if the Guidebook had catered for all these specific points, but it hasn't, and so we're seeing a number of problems with the gTLD rollout.

We felt that if we were going to go into one of them we'd have to go into all of them, and we'd probably had had to keep you all here for another two or three weeks, because the list is endless. As a result, one of the things that we should do is bank these concerns, and make sure that the next round of new gTLD applications will not face the same problems.

In other words, when a review of the first round takes place, the At-Large community should come together, have a Working Group on this, and make sure that we have a long list of things we'd like to see improved for the next round, so that it doesn't happen again.

Especially, one of the things being – that's an overarching thing – the very, very low number of applicants from under-served communities and from developing countries, which to all of us, even though an applicant support program was tagged in at the very, very end, was something that shocked the majority of our community.

So, I think we'll have to move to the next thing, which is to support this Statement by acclamation, and I encourage you to put your hands together, to move this over to the ALAC, who will meet at lunchtime to ratify the Statement with the amendments.

Now, you thought we'd finished with all of this, but no, we also have a second thing, which is the follow up to the discussions that we had on the second plenary. I'll ask staff to put on the screen the proposed statement regarding the Net Mundial. I realize we have 45 minutes until we close. We've been afforded an additional extension of time due to the late arrival of the equipment and the technical problems that we've faced.

Evan Leibovitch has very kindly picked up the pen on this one, and slept even less than many of us here. I will ask Evan to please read the Statement for the record and briefly explain the points that are laid out in this Statement. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much Olivier. I didn't expect to be asked to read things out loud. That requires a state of alertness that may be beyond me at this moment. I will do my best.

"The ICANN At-Large community applauds the numerous significant achievements of the Net Mundial Conference in São Paulo. The event was a milestone in Internet governance that will be known for a number of accomplishments, including the release of the Brazilian Marco Civil da Internet; an innovative approach to multistakeholder engagement; creative use of technology to give remote hubs equal voice to those attending in person; open and frank commentary from governments, business, civil society, academia and the technical community.

"That these achievements were accomplished within a relatively short timeframe, from the conference's announcement, to its staging, to its

delivery of a statement, makes the Net Mundial achievements even more remarkable. The Net Mundial Statement, a groundbreaking consensus document, includes much that aligns with the At-Large values and objectives. The Statement defines progressive rights and governance principles, and calls for openness, stability, privacy, standards and diversity.

“While stopping short of the fullest possible set of rights that At-Large would have preferred in matters such as surveillance and the freedom to innovate, we acknowledge that in a successful consensus process no single stakeholder will achieve all aims. We thank the leaders within our community who work to assure explicit reference to the needs of end users, and to ensure our issues were largely addressed.

“We also thank the organizers and creators of the event, including Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff, ICANN CEO Fadi Chehadé, his counterparts in the Internet Society, and other members of the One Net collaboration. We especially wish to express our appreciation to the participation of `cgi.br`, itself a multistakeholder example that we encourage to be duplicated in other countries.

“The At-Large community encourages ICANN to learn from the experiences of this extraordinary event. We support the progress of One Net and welcome the challenge of moving forward what Net Mundial started.”

That is the Statement going forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. We now open the floor for comments. I see Alejandro Pisanty on his way to the microphone. Alejandro, you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Chair. I have expressed publicly and frequently some reservations about feel-good approaches to Net Mundial, so I won't dwell in details. Also I see that there's a steamroller [march 01:36:10] and I have learnt long ago to not stand in the way of steamrollers.

I would simple there suggest that if you don't think that the self-complacency and self patting on the back of this Statement could be tarnished by adding a one-line statement that says that the At-Large community commits itself to be watchful in the follow up of the promises of Net Mundial, and make regular assessments of whether these promises are being fulfilled by your participants, and express itself in consequence. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Procedurally consider this friendly amendment to the motion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alejandro. I have a question for you. You mention to be watchful. Should we actually even strengthen this and say "watchful and vigilant" or "vigilantly watchful" perhaps? I'm in full support of the

fact that I've heard many people say, "Yes, Net Mundial, fantastic," but now some stakeholders are starting to think, "It was just a day we said yes, but..." and one of the things that this community might wish to do is hold stakeholders accountable for the fact that they've gone forward with this, and now is not the time to backtrack.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I leave it to the floor and to the steering power you have over the steamroller.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alejandro, could you possibly come over here? I'm happy to work out that amendment with you right here on the spot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Evan of course has managed to now share his load with more people. Thank you for adding people to the drafting team. [Bogdan], you have the floor.

[BOGDAN]: Thank you. I would also share my reservation regarding the Statement, and regarding the Net Mundial Statement, especially for two issues. First, Net Mundial was started as an answer to the Snowden revelations, but the final Statement says nothing concrete in this respect, and this is a major loophole, in that the Net Mundial Statement, it's not what it is in there, it's in what's not there. That needs to be stressed by At-Large, or at least if we make any comments about it.

The second point is that even though a lot of the activities in drafting the Statement were made in a multistakeholder way, the last version of the Statement was actually changed in the last days in a very non-transparent way. This raised a number of comments and reservations from the civil society groups in Europe that we totally share. From our point of view, this Statement from ALAC is too positive and does not raise the issues that have already been expressed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Should we also consider a friendly amendment to that effect? The friendly amendment being that we acknowledge the concerns of the civil society, regarding the limited scope? It's acknowledging concerns I think, because we have a significant part of our community that is civil society. However, I wouldn't want to say that we're against this Statement. The idea is to acknowledge that there are more things to be done, and I'm not sure whether that's really captured in this Statement.

We need to continue pushing forward and do more things, including some of the things that were not in that Statement. Do you have a solution for this or a suggestion, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Going along with what Alejandro's just suggested, in the extra comment, the friendly amendment about staying vigilant, I'll add some comments into that. I'd simply say, in response to the comment that even within civil society there's a debate going on. I've actually been following Milton Mueller, who sometimes I don't agree with very strongly.

Essentially he's come out and said, "Don't spend your time focusing on what wasn't there, spend your time focusing on some of the real significant achievements that were made."

Net Mundial is not the end of a process, it's the beginning of a process. The fact that we started with something, we gained some explicit mention of things – did it go far enough? No. We need to be vigilant. I want to put in the kind of statement that Alejandro suggested, to strengthen this, that we have to watch and we have to push forward with this.

I'm sorry. I will take full responsibility for this being an overly positive document. I make no apologies for that. I believe this to be a stunning achievement. There's a lot more to be done, but this is the beginning of a process and not the end of one. So I would want to treat it that way, and not harp on the deficiencies at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Next on the microphone is Sergio Salinas Porto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much Olivier. Good morning everyone. Just a topic that I'd like to add. In the Net Mundial Statement, there is accurately pointed out several statements related to governance. It would be important to take that into account, to add that there is a differentiation among the different layers of sectors composed in the multistakeholder. We need to take these [unclear 01:42:37] and we need to add that to our document, as it is in the Net Mundial Declaration. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Do you have a specific wording or statement in mind? At this point I understand what you're saying, but I'm trying to figure out how to express this well as an addition to the document. If you have some specific idea of wording I'm happy to work with you on putting it in.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes. When we're referring to the multistakeholder model, we should say that we have Internet users, the civil society, the technical community, the government and the academia. These are the five sectors we should include so that we can have the full meaning and the full sense of what we've done up to now. Companies as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sergio. That's a very valid point to make. There were four lines in Net Mundial. There was the technical community and academia, civil society, governments and private sector. Of course, as an Internet end user I found it rather hard to know which queue to go in. You had a choice. You could go, and you had to get a card that you would put on your badge.

What I did was look, for the first 30 minutes, which one was the shortest line, and found out that the technical community one was the shortest. I managed to queue a lot less than governments. Not that I would have been able to be in the government line, wearing the At-Large hat, but anyway... Over to Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: A couple of days ago I saw Evan and he said I looked like a doppelganger... What did you call me, Evan? Some people call me... He has a great picture. I'll have to share it with you. Go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I've found quite a number of people that suggested Glenn has a slight resemblance, right now, to Milton.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: With a personality. Couple of comments. I think the tone of the document is very positive. It's engaging. It's reflective and definitely respectful. It could have been inflammatory. It could have been provocative. It could have been confrontational. It wasn't. Not to say perhaps it should have been, I'm just making my observation. I have to go back to JJ. He said this is basically a journey. This is step one in the process and really the devil is in the details. We have to look at this document as a great step in the right direction. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Glenn. The queue is now closed. We are going to run out of time, and you won't get presents that we've stacked up in the corner if we continue like this, which is fine by me. I'd be very happy to continue and be able to take those boxes back home, since home is not that far away from me. I can just get a cab. Two boxes, no problem.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's really great to have you all here. What I was going to ask now, providing the friendly amendments have been added to the statement by Evan, is that this community, this At-Large Summit

community, the community of Internet end users, passes this recommendation over to the ALAC who will vote on it at lunchtime, thus being able to issue this as a statement of the ATLAS. I was going to ask for this to be passed by acclamation. [Applause]

Thank you very much. We're going to continue then, swiftly onto the next part of our work this morning. I gather you're all well awake by now, and that's great, because we have to review the ATLAS II Action Items. I invite you all to go to the page of the ATLAS II Action Items. Heidi told me there are very few of them, but of course these are not the ATLAS II Action Items, they're the ALAC Action Items. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

The Action Items are ATLAS Action Items, and also Action Items from the various General Assemblies. I think we're going to review these in about three minutes, and just as a comment that the ALAC and the RALOs will be reviewing these during their monthly meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. The AIs are on the screen. You'll notice the first one is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session. There are two Action Items on that, that were of course to do with our meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. You'll notice that the AIs are now taken up with acronyms, which is as terrible thing to do, but by now you should be well aware of the acronyms, hopefully.

We can't ask staff to take notes that quickly without using acronyms, can we? How quickly can you type Security and Stability Advisory

Committee, rather than SSAC? Right. We've got the two AIs for the meeting with the SSAC. Then we had a discussion with the Communications Team as well. You'll notice the AIs for the various General Assemblies that were held.

The one for NARALO General Assembly is already complete, which is very efficient indeed. There was one for the EURALO General Assembly. After that, ALAC work part one. Hot topic number two, ICANN accountability and globalization. Several Action Items there with regards to the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, and also the putting together of the... It says here, "ATLAS II Thematic Group 4 to draft an ALAC statement on enhancing ICANN accountability public comment."

I'm not sure we've actually drafted a statement on this, but certainly we've made our point known with regards to ICANN accountability and enhancing ICANN accountability. The ALAC is able to submit its statements at any time, so I think that might be just a follow up for the next couple of weeks.

Looking further down, ALAC work part two. Several proposals. ALAC work part two was primarily reviewing all of the Working Groups that we had in the At-Large, and I would really remind you again – please join the Working Groups. You were on Thematic Working Groups. Please join the Working Groups.

In fact, depending on what Thematic Working Groups you were on, we'll send you an invitation to several, or one, of the Working Groups that might fit the type of interest that you had, and fit the contributions that you made in the Working Groups. This is getting very circular suddenly. I think coffee is required. Hint hint.

Next we have the Capacity Building Working Group. A couple of AIs there. There were no AIs for any of the other Working Groups, but of course, as I just mentioned, the incorporation of ATLAS II Thematic Groups into existing At-Large Working Groups was important. Wednesday, 25th of June, which was a few years ago, in 2014, APRALO General Assembly, several AIs. Then the AFRALO General Assembly and the LACRALO General Assembly.

I have to thank all of you for having conducted exceptional General Assemblies in a very short amount of time. I know the rooms were very busy. They had to start on time and finish on time, and so on. I'd like a round of applause for all of you, and for the people who have prepared those General Assemblies.

The Action Items are reviewed, and now we have to move to the next part of our Agenda. I've just pressed the wrong button on my computer, so that might go wrong. These are the announcements with regards to this community and with regards to everything that's taken place in the past week.

First, I'd like to thank all of you for coming to London, for what you might have thought was going to be a number of days to take part in the discussions, to learn, but what you weren't told was that you weren't allowed to sleep, you weren't allowed to leave the room without permission, you were going to be quizzed at the end, and only let to go home if you had proven the fact that you'd learnt a lot of things here.

Of course you're not going to be quizzed, but I have had plenty of discussions with many of you, and many of my colleagues have as well. It really is energizing – and I guess that's where our team get our energy

from – to see that many of you seem to have caught on the bug of the multistakeholder model, the At-Large input and the involvement of this community into the ICANN processes.

We can make a different. It's that reason why we wake up in the morning after only a few hours of sleep. It's why you have woken up that early this morning after a few hours of sleep and perhaps one too many drinks at the Gala last night, which was the only time when you were able to really relax a little bit. Yet, we were the only community meeting up and filling up the building that early on in the morning, having seen empty corridors in the building.

For all of this sweat, blood, tears and headaches that you've had to endure, and the fact you've had to endure me rambling on about things for hours and hours on end, we have certificates that we're going to be passing over to people. We're going to do this by RALO. I want to thank... We'll probably do this at the end. To thank the Organizing Committee, etcetera, I think is important.

Let's first go through the distribution of the certificates. I have to read the following names, all of them. It's all of AFRALO. Please stand up and staff is going to hand these out. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alione Badara, Beran Gillen, Mohamed El Bashir, Amr Hamdi, Aziz Hilali, Philip Johnson, Didier Kasolé, Alan Levin, [Sayed 01:56:23], [unclear], Mercy Moyo, Olivier [Nanazapa], [unclear] and Otunte Otuneh.

If you are in AFRALO and your name hasn't been called, it's because there's been a bit of a fumble on one of the spellings, I think. I noticed that. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: With the certificates we're giving a little gift, and if you don't know what it is, it's a speaker that you can use with Bluetooth. Just to let you know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I forgot the essential thing, which is a round of applause for those in AFRALO. Well done! [Applause] As a show of appreciation you've got this little Bluetooth speaker, which is great for annoying your family, because they won't have a clue where the music comes from. You can hide it under the sofa, and it's great to watch them look for it and think, "What is going on here?"

Next, we move over to APRALO, the Asia, Australasia and Pacific Island's RALO. We have in there, if you could please stand up, [Nemo 01:58:15], [unclear], Ali AlMeshal, Gunela Astbrink, Fouad Bajwa, Dennis Cai, Narelle Clark, Rafid Fatani, Lianna Galstyan, Yashar Hajiyev, [unclear], Maureen Hilyard, [Johangir Hussain], Pua Hunter, Aris Ignacio, Nanxi Ji, [Narina], [unclear], [Sunni Lul], Cheryl Langdon-Orr – she's in the NomCom, isn't she?

Okay. Mahmoud Latouf, Sophie Liang, [Sunny Lui], HR Mohan, Siva Muthasamy, YJ Park, Amir Quayyum, Holly Raiche, Bikram Shrestha, Chester Soong, Ellen Strickland, [unclear] and Siranush Vardanyan. [Applause]

I realize the session on ICANN Accountability has started, so a few people have had to run to the session. If they haven't got their speakers, we will make sure that they receive them. We are looking at EURALO. This is purely the next page that I've found here. EURALO has

also got a long list of people. Do we have the paperwork ready? I think we might have to wait a little bit.

Next person for EURALO. Susie is now running. One-two, left right! EURALO – the European RALO – I call Roger [Baig 02:01:04] Christoph Bruch, Matthieu Camus, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, William Drake, Monique Epstein, [Bastion Goslings], Sandra Hoferichter, [Verna Hillsman], [Marianne Cresper], Wolf Ludwig, [Bogdan Manuella], Yuliya Morenets, Annette Muehlberg, Oliver Pasek, Adam Peake, Miguel Perez Subias, Plamena Popova, Tatiana Popova, Oksana Prykhodko, Caroline [unclear], Jean-Jacques Subrenat, [Geri], Eric Thompson and Rudi Vansnick.

Well done everyone on EURALO. Thank you. Jean-Jacques, you wanted to say a few words?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. I would like to take the opportunity of this mention to EURALO Members to present publicly my apologies to my colleague and fellow countryman, Matthieu Camus, because the other day, during the EURALO Meeting, I was thinking very strongly about some problems of communication I've had over the past few months, with something that's not directly linked with ICANN but with ISOC France.

I offer him here in public my apology. It was not meant for him as a person. It was simply the desire to have more engagement possible on the part of someone like me in ISOC France. I hope you accept my apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next, ladies and gentlemen, I have in front of me a list for LACRALO. My goodness, this is a long list of LACRALO attendees. We're going to go through the list. Let's go through the LACRALO then. If they can stand up please?

Diego Acosta Bastidas, Carlos Aguirre, [Aline Andrade], Raul Bauer, [Niran Bihari], Sergio Bronstein, Fatima Cambroner, Adrian Carballo, Humberto Carrasco, Christian Casas, Javier Rojas, Natalia Enciso, Michael Ford, Jason Francis, Carlos Gutierrez, Silvia Herlein-Leite, Lance Hinds, Jason Hinds, Gilberto Lara, Johnny Laureano, Freddie Torres, Antonio Gomez, Aida Noblia, José [02:05:23], Alejandro Pisanty, Kerrie-Ann Richards, Juan Manuel Rojas, Sergio Salinas Porto, Carlton Samuels, Leon Sanchez, Vanda Scartezini, Maricarmen Sequera, Alberto Soto, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Tatiana Toculescu. Well done LACRALO. [Applause]

Just a reminder, please, when you've received your certificate and speaker, please don't leave, because we have a photo opportunity afterwards and if you want to be part of the picture you need to remain here. We only have a few more minutes to go, so we'll be finished soon.

We have one more region ladies and gentlemen. That's the North American region. I see the NARALO delegates still waiting eagerly for their gifts. I'm afraid there are not enough speakers for everyone, so you'll get neither the certificate nor the gifts. Thank you very much and goodbye. I see a few very annoyed NARALO Members. Let's backtrack.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Excuse me. For the benefit of the termination of this meeting, could I ask you all to sit down please. Olivier is having a very hard time this morning. Thank you for what you're doing, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. The list here is as follows: Sara [Alchere 02:08:05], Jonathan Askin, Kerrie Brown, Garth Bruen, Roberto Castonguay, Monique Chartrand, Randy Glass, Garth Graham, Judith Hellerstein, Constantine [unclear], Thomas Lowenhaupt, Murray McKercher, Glenn McKnight, [unclear], [unclear], Anthony Niigani, Christopher Parsons, Diana Perry, Seth Reiss, Neil Schwartzman, Allan Skuce and Scott Sullivan. Please put your hands together for NARALO.
[Applause]

Over to you Eduardo, for the next two minutes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to thank everyone in this room. Just like I said at the beginning of the ATLAS II Event, this event was put together by the community for the community, and I believe it's been a very successful meeting. Also, I'd like to thank all the volunteers that worked on this. There was an underlying framework that comes from staff that supported this and made it happen with everyone else. I want to thank staff also. A big applause for them for doing this too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I frankly do not know how many hours staff have spent on this, because I don't think I can count to the number of hours they've spent on that.

It's astronomical. If I was Australian I would use a few swear words to augment my thoughts – sorry, if I was Cheryl I would do such a thing. I don't want to offend any Australians here of course. It was just an incredible amount of work.

Thank you Heidi, thanks to your team. You guys were absolutely amazing. I don't know how you did it, but you did extremely well.
[Applause]

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Just to finish up, I want to thank all the Chairs and Co-Chairs of all the volunteer groups. Thanks for the efforts of all these Co-Chairs and Chairs. I can mention a couple of people here. If I miss someone please bear with me – Tijani, Murray McKercher, Fatima Cambronero, Carlos Aguirre, Maricarmen Sequera, Natalia Enciso, Glenn McKnight, and also all the RALOs and the participators in the Fayre of Opportunities that managed the tables, and in fact all of you. Thank you for being here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Eduardo. Next, Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor. We have to be fast.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thanks Olivier. Very quickly, let me express my gratitude to all of you who've been involved in the Mentoring Program, both those in the group, those who volunteered as mentors, and the mentees. Those who were designated as mentees had a lot of experience to share. Their

participation was very active this week. I was being copied into all the actions they undertook, so thank you very much.

The next steps for the mentees, those of you who wish to get a certificate, there is a Wiki that's been circulated among the groups to upload a brief report on this program. There is another Wiki where we request your feedback on the program, so that we can know what you think worked well, what could be improved, and what you would keep as it is for the next issues.

A suggestion that I will be forwarding to all groups is whether we could implement this Mentoring Program at a regional level for each of the RALOs from now on. Thank you very much. We'll keep in touch online.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fatima. This whole Mentoring Program and all of these brand new programs that we've started, thanks to the At-Large Summit, are programs that really need to continue beyond the fact that we've all had this face-to-face program where people can ask other people to help them, and ask all of the "silly" questions. But there are no stupid questions and there are no silly questions.

We've all asked questions, and the only way to learn is to ask those questions, knowing who to ask, primarily. Having this relationship, which often turns into a friendship after a while, or something very quickly. This is really important, and it's something I hope you'll all be able to continue when you reach your communities back home and say, "I've met a great number of people."

You'll have your mailbox full, your LinkedIn has gone beyond the sky and your Facebook page has got pictures and all those things that have happened back in London. It's really great, and the Mentoring Program is certainly one of the things that really helps in this. Next is Gisella, who's going to take us through the other people, the mentors, that we also had for the mentees.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much Olivier. I'd just like to thank our three mentees who've taken part, since Singapore, in the ICANN Pilot Mentor Program. We have our three mentees who are here. I'd very much like to ask them to stand up please. We have Gunela Astbrink, Mercy Moyo and Anthony Niigani. I'd like to thank you. Thank you so much for taking part in this program. Thank you for being very present since Singapore. We've done a lot of work between Singapore and London.

I realize you do have your day jobs, you do have other commitments, and you have been busy attending other meetings here in London. I'd also like to thank the mentors who were there to help you. We have Eduardo for Anthony, we have Maureen with Gunela, and the African Leadership, Aziz, Mohamed and Philip, for Mercy, but I know that Tijani played a big role as well. Thank you again for leading them through this.

We will be submitting their reports that they themselves will be submitting after London. You'll be able to read them. We'll put them up on the website, and I'm sure it will be an interesting report for everyone to read, as well as all the ALSes who have attended here – not only from their regions but from all five RALO regions. Thank you again for participating.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. What happens next is that we're going to have a picture at the back of the room. Please start packing up, or leave your computers and go and make sure that you have that picture over there. Before that, we have one more minute. What we have, lunchtime from 12:00 – 13:00 we have the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting.

That's where the ALAC will be reviewing its AIs, which we looked at a little bit earlier. At that time it will go into slightly more detail. Then there will be the action, which is the ratification and endorsement of the ATLAS II declaration, but also the Statement that we saw about the Net Mundial. Then in the afternoon please come to the Public Forum. It's very important. It's the Public Forum. You are the public. We need to be there in force, and it's an experience as well. It's interesting.

There is a bingo card thing, which some people have. You often see people saying the same things at all Public Forums. It's a great way to interact. Some find it bizarre. Some find it new. It's something you need to experience for yourself.

Before I close, one last measure of thanks, and that's our interpreters. Thank you so much. In the face of adversity it's really great. Thanks very much for the technical team as well, who've done excellent work. We love this new camera system. Really good. Because this is all recorded, this will be providing us with memories of ATLAS II in London in 2014. Thanks very much. This conference, this ATLAS II, is now adjourned! Over to the pictures! Thank you!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]