
BUENOS AIRES - ICANN PUBLIC FORUM
Thursday, June 25, 2015 – 14:00 to 17:30 ART
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

VOG: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We're going to start our public forum in just one short moment. Once again, please take your seats. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like you to welcome ICANN board chair, Dr. Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Good afternoon. Welcome, everybody. This is the public forum. It's a little hard to distinguish this public forum from the endless series of meetings that we've had that have all felt like public forums, I think. As everyone knows, this is a session that is designed specifically to give everyone a direct line to the board of directors and to the rest of the community without formality, without filters.

Today's forum will run about 3 1/2 hours. We're going to run as briskly as possible. We have a formal board meeting scheduled at the end of this and then cocktails for everyone after that.

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.

I'm conscious that there are some people with flight schedules this afternoon. And we do want to get through the formal part of our program later.

Public forum is not a replacement for the public comment process and the other mechanisms that we have for feedback.

Do continue providing your formal feedback on specific issues that are open for public comment using the online system. It's the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committees, supporting organizations, and staff members. Brad White, our director of communications for North America, is going to give you an overview view for how questions will be fielded. Brad.

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Steve. For those of you who have been in a public forum before, you pretty much know the drill. For those who have not, we'll just go over the rules very quickly. The emphasis here is to hear from as many people as possible and particularly new voices.

If you're in the room and you have a question to ask, we have two microphones. We're going to ask that you queue up at one of those microphones.

If you're a remote participant, we're going to ask that you shoot your questions to an email address. Engagement@ICANN.org. It's a little bit different than some of the other sessions where the remote participants raise the questions in the Adobe chat room. This allows us to manage more precisely the questions coming in and the sequencing and make sure they don't get lost in the conversation that's going on.

If you've been to one of the meetings previously where there are the video remote hubs, we're doing that here in the public forum again. This has proven quite successful. We have a series of video remote hubs in these locations around the world. And, as participants weigh in, we will take those questions. We've tried to set up these hubs. These have been set up in coordination with the Internet Society and also various academic institutions around the world. We've gone out of our way to try to set these up in areas where there is not necessarily easy access to high bandwidth or it's very expensive to get on high bandwidth. So we hope to be getting some questions from some of these remote hubs.

Now, when you speak and you're at the microphone here, please remember three things. I'll be the first to admit that I fail on the first one, which is speak slowly and clearly. Give your name, who you're representing, if anyone.

In terms of the standards of behavior, the bottom line on all of these is simply be respectful, listen to people, remember that everybody has a difference of opinion on a lot of the issues that we're dealing with. This is the place where we want light, not necessarily heat.

It's always difficult to balance trying to get points out on one side and hear from as many voices on the other side. So we've adopted the rule of twos in previous public forums. We're sticking with that. The upshot is you'll have two minutes to ask your question, make your comment. The Board will have a two-minute response time. If you've got a follow-up, you've got one follow-up. That can be two, and again the Board will take a two-minute response. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Brad.

Before I turn the floor over to our first board facilitator, let me describe how we've selected the subjects for the time blocks.

On Tuesday, which is often referred to as Constituency Day, the Board spent a lot of time talking to the various groups about specific issues of greatest concern to each of them.

There were two issues of interest that ran across many groups. Not surprisingly, they were the new gTLD program and the IANA

stewardship transition and accountability. So for this public forum, we wanted to go with those subjects of greatest community concern. And we've allocated two blocks, one for those two things. And then the third block will be open for any other subject of interest.

Repeating, we're trying to encourage dialogue, not merely provide a soapbox. Questions are preferred. Comments are allowed, of course.

So, with that, I'll turn the floor over to Cherine Chalaby who will facilitate the first hour on the new gTLD program. Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. And good afternoon, everyone.

We will start the session on questions and comments on new gTLDs.

So there are two microphones here in the middle. And, if you'd like to come to the microphone, please do so.

And please state your name before you ask a question. Thank you.

STEVE DelBIANCO:

Okay, Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Steve DelBianco from the business consistency at ICANN. We met with the Board on Tuesday. Only a small subset of the Board was there for this really engaging discussion.

The new gTLD program was around the concept of mandatory public interest commitments that translate through to the registrar and the obligation to investigate and respond to reports of abuse.

BC is keenly interested in understanding and helping this community work that out. So are a lot of other ACs. (off mic)

It's come up in every single Congressional hearing that I participated in. It was even mentioned in the markup.

So what does it mean when investigate and respond is vital to us? And we surfaced the notion that the BC wants to know whether or not to engage as ICANN compliance figures out the parameters of what it means to investigate and respond.

One of the answers we got on Tuesday was that it was really between ICANN and the contract parties. While I might buy that as a literal explanation, figuratively, look, ICANN, the other side of that contract, is us. And the business constituency includes

registrants and end users who look to ICANN to enforce that aspect of the contract in a way that empowers us to get appropriate investigation and response.

So we would look to understand how ICANN compliance and the Board would want the rest of the community, not just the registrars and registries, how the rest of the community engages constructively and transparently in a dialogue to figure out what investigate or respond needs to mean to ICANN. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Do you want an answer now?

STEVE DelBIANCO: (Off mic.)

CHERINE CHALABY: Why don't they call on -- is Allen Grogan here? Yeah, Allen is there.

STEVE DelBIANCO: It's Allan's answer, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: I know. But we're putting him under the sword again.

STEVE DelBIANCO: So the answer is that it's really between the contracted parties --
(off mic)

CHERINE CHALABY: You're asking a question, clearly, how do you involve the
community clearly in this investigate and respond sort of issue.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you.

ALLEN GROGAN: So, respectively, Steve, that wasn't my answer. My answer was
the contract is between ICANN and the contracted parties. But I
invited an open dialogue with other interested parties in the
community to seek input about what those terms mean and
how ICANN should interpret and enforce that.

So you're leaving off the second half of what I said, which is I
have been engaging with multiple members of the community.
I've been doing that before ICANN 53. I was doing it at this
meeting. I invite the business constituency or any other
interested party to contact me and let's have a dialogue.

STEVE DelBIANCO: The bilateral discussions in not transparent public comment
period process? (off mic)

ALLEN GROGAN: So right now I'm having dialogues, discussions, with a bunch of interested parties. Where that goes in terms of whether it eventually leads to a public comment, I haven't determined yet.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Steve. Steve, Chris Disspain wants to add something.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Steve, just because I think it's important that we correct the record. I know what you said at the beginning was you said this at the session on Tuesday and there was only a small subset of the board there. That's not actually right. Most of the board was in the room. Just a small subset was sitting around the table. I just think that's important. We didn't not turn up to the session.

STEVE DeLBIANCO: Appreciate that. And the BC appreciated that new format because we went eyeball to eyeball. I only thought those around the table were in the room.

CHERINE CHALABY: Next speaker, please.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Good afternoon. Michele Neylon. I'm chair of the registrars stakeholder group.

Just following up on Steve's comments about the discussions between registrars and Allen Grogan, just so we're clear.

At the moment, Allen and the registrars are discussing in a frank and open dialogue trying to tease out what the issues are, what the -- how we handle certain things. And, you know, if that evolves into something on Allen's side where he wishes to issue an advisory or wishes to engage in something else with a wider community, that's something that Allen will be looking at. However, from our side, we are actively engaged in discussions with him just to see if we can understand what the issues are being presented to ICANN are and to see how best to address them.

And, taking my chair hat off, speaking as a member of the board of the Internet Infrastructure Coalition, member of APWG, and somebody who moves around in other spaces in the anti-abuse space, some of us are looking at organizing some kind of dialogue, potentially in Dublin, to look at improvements to abuse reports; in other words, the format of the reports, the minimum amount of data that reporters should be presenting, be that to hosting providers, registrars, or network operators so that we can address the reports in a more efficient fashion. By

"address" I mean respond. I don't mean taking anything beyond that. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Michele.

Next speaker, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun Ojedeji from Nigeria. I'd just have a questions relating to the gTLD program. I'd like to know what is the status of .AFRICA? Who is actually in charge of .AFRICA right now? Because it looks like this has taken so long. And it looks like ICANN is not in charge of this process, and I need to get updates on that. When are we going to start actually signing up for domain for .AFRICA? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Stay where you are. Sorry. So I'm going to ask our legal team to tell you what is the status of the current IRP panel discussion. Amy or John, do you want to say something?

MIKE SILBER: Cherine, while Amy is coming back, I would just like to make one comment. That is part of the issue around independence and

accountability requires a certain element of independence and accountability as those processes run.

CHERINE CHALABY: Amy.

AMY STATHOS: Thank you, Cherine. The hearing on the independent review was held on the 22nd and 23rd of May. We're at a process now where we expect that the panel will be issuing its declaration sometime in July or later. But we anticipate, hopefully, sooner rather than later.

As soon as the IRP declaration has been issued, it will then go to the ICANN board at its next available meeting. And the Board will then consider the declaration and decide how to act upon that declaration.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. It will also be published on the ICANN Web site as soon as it's been provided.

AMY STATHOS: That's correct.

CHERINE CHALABY: Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Just for anybody who hasn't been following this closely, there are competing applications for .AFRICA. And this is under litigation at the moment. So that's the context of what Amy provided is that there's a hearing underway. That's why this has not proceeded as quickly and as smoothly as other applications. It's an unfortunate aspect of the fact that this is a open process. And we have recourse provided for people who are unhappy with results in any given stage. And, in this particular case, those avenues of recourse are being exercised. And so it just takes a fair amount of time to walk through all of those paces and see where the process takes us.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Steve.

Next speaker, please.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: My name is Thomas Lowenhaupt. I live in New York City, and I'd like to speak about the public interest and city TLDs.

On April 19th, 2001, a resolution I introduced was approved by a local governance body in New York City. Entitled "The Internet

Empowerment Resolution," it called for the development of the .NYC TLD as a public interest resource. Now, a little over 15 years later, .NYC is operating with close to 80,000 names issued. One might imagine that I'd be standing before you filled with delight and joy. But the opposite is true. In New York City, in all these years, there has not been a meaningful public hearing about our city's TLD.

We're not alone in that regard. This past Sunday at a gTLD meeting held right down the hall, I asked the representative from .PARIS about public engagement in developing its name allocation plan. She responded that there have not been any public meetings.

How might we improve this situation and insert the public interest? I believe an effective process is before us, the multistakeholder model.

When ICANN again begins accepting applications for cities, a fundamental requirement of the process should be that all stakeholder groups have had a meaningful opportunity to participate in consensus-based planning process. A meaningful opportunity to participate in consensus-based planning processes. Any application for a city TLD should detail how it embodies the informed consent of all stakeholders. Informed consent.

Such a plan would define the public interest.

Thank you very much.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much. And I'm sure these comments and these suggestions will be taken into account in the current reviews that are taking place. Thank you. Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is not a comment on what you've just said. I've just been asked by interpreters and the scribes if we could please speak a little more slowly so they could take their transcript. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. Next speaker, please. Mention your name first.

RUDI VANSNICK: I'm Rudi Vansnick. I'm the chair of NPOC, the not-for-profit operational concerns constituency. I will be brief so I hope that the Board can use our time to respond to our questions. Acknowledging the first round of the new gTLDs has not given enough space to the community and the community-based applications. We hope ICANN will recognize the need for much more attention for all the gTLDs trying to help underserved regions and especially those touching upon people, citizens, and

youngsters who could be unable to participate actively in the Internet ecosystem.

Back to 2009 during the debates we had at -- that time I was still part of the at-large. The not-for-profit community stressed several times the need for a specific slot for community-based and oriented application and give them some priority in the process.

This did not happen and created a lot of unsatisfied groups and Internet users.

In the perspective of what can or should be done with the auction funds, perhaps it could help if the community-based applications could get the support they deserve to serve their respective communities with delegated gTLD strings.

We have two questions. NPOC is eager to know how ICANN is planning to safeguard the support to these specific TLDs. And the second one how the ICANN board will ensure that applications will receive the appropriate attention and support in the second round.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Bruce. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN:

As Mark is pointing out, it's not the second round. It's about the fourth round, I think. We've already had several rounds of gTLDs.

I think the key point here is that it's actually not the ICANN board role to set policies with respect to community-based TLDs.

That's the GNSO's role. And I know I chaired that GNSO process in its early days. And I certainly know the intent was to start -- once the current round was over, there was a lot of pressure to try to get that completed.

The GNSO would be open to starting to look at some of these other situations in more detail. So I think the starting point for you is to actually put your question through your representatives in the GNSO and ultimately through to the GNSO Council. Because that's where that process will be managed. You're mostly talking about revising or creating a new policy with respect to community TLDs. And that's the GNSO's role.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Unfortunately, at that time we didn't exist. NPOC was not yet a constituency. So I will come back for the second question in the IANA transition.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Don't go yet. You mentioned the use of the auction money, so I want to pass this to Steve to talk about that.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Cherine.

So the issue of what to do or how to use the auction funds has been separated out entirely from the gTLD process, per se. And we've now started a open dialogue and community-based dialogue on that.

The decisions about that are down the road a bit in front of us. Certainly, one of the possibilities might be in the -- along the lines that you're suggesting that they should be used either to facilitate various aspects of the next round or various aspects of helping people in developing countries and other places. But that's really going to be quite a separate discussion.

Okay. Anybody else on the Board wish to say anything on this issue? Okay.

Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

WERNER STAUB: Werner Staub from CORE. My point is related to the previous points made. I might start with the -- sorry -- the accountability

proceedings that currently are taking place in ICANN that have held up a number of community-based applications. It is interesting to see that we have parties that use those proceedings claiming ICANN is to be accountable to them in order to stake another claim, namely, that they themselves should not be accountable to anyone.

That is, essentially, the point of community-based applications. A community has internal processes by which its leaders are accountable to the members of the community, which may be very large, but the essence is that they have a process.

And, if a TLD was supposed community-based, indeed it was about accountability, the ability in the end to remove those in charge of the TLD and replace them with people who are -- I mean, who are acceptable to the community.

Now, if a party uses an accountability process to state that they do not need to be accountable because this specific TLD, they do not regard in this community because something is not enough for the definitions that state -- see as essential. Everybody should be reminded that the essence is accountability. So the question is really who is going to be accountable effectively knowing that ICANN itself cannot handle it? ICANN cannot be in charge of things like rugby or CPA.

[Timer sounds.]

Only the communities can.

CHERINE CHALABY: Do you want to respond? Okay. Thank you. We'll take your text, and we're not in a position to respond now.

Next speaker, please.

Sorry. Excuse me. I'm told there is an online question. So if you don't mind, I would like to take it first and then come back to you. Is that okay? Okay. Brad, online question.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have three questions from Adrienne McAdory, president of from Atgron. Question one: How and when was the rights protection mechanism document communicated to new registries and new gTLD applicants?

We signed our contract 1 October, and the RPM document was released on the ICANN home page on 30 September. It was never reportedly directly to us by ICANN during contract negotiations or at any time after. We were informed about the document during a random conversation with a registrar when communicating our proposed sunrise plans.

Question 2 --

CHERINE CHALABY: Brad, just wait. Let's take one question at a time.

Akram, do you want to answer that first question, please?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Hello? Thank you, Cherine. We do not comment on particular applications. But if there is an issue with your application, please reach out to the CSC and we will answer your directly. Thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Question 2: Similar to a question about the RPM document, we would also like to know how and when the specific TLD startup form required to accompany the TLD startup plan has been communicated to new registries and new gTLD applicants. We were informed that the form could be found on the ICANN trademark clearinghouse Web page after we submitted our startup plan and waited five days for ICANN to inform us our submission was incomplete.

CHERINE CHALABY: Akram?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Again, this is specific to an applicant. We will take it offline and address these concerns. Thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Final question. Question 3: We do not agree with the board's denial of our board reconsideration request. What is our next avenue of objection? Do we need to initiate the mediation process detailed in the Registry Operator Agreement, Section 5.1? Or is there another ICANN mechanism we must pursue first?

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Amy, do you want to -- No?

AMY STATHOS: I'm going to answer the same way Akram did. This is with respect to a specific applicant. If they want to submit questions through the CSC, we will respond appropriately.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Amy.

And now back to the queue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa. I am the vice chair of ALAC, but I am speaking on my own behalf.

Seun just asked about the question about .AFRICA, and the answer was trivial. It is in the hand of the panel, and we are waiting for the outputs.

This is normal, and no one will argue about that. But how long it has been in the hands of this panel? And is there a hard stop for this process? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: So the question is how long has it been in the hands of the panel? And is there a hard stop for this process?

Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Tijani, let me maybe pick this one up because it's something that I'm very passionate about. And I think I share some of the same frustrations as others in the community do. It's one of the difficulties that we've been having as a board when we are looking at things like independence and accountability, is that it's very difficult to insist on an independent accountability process.

And then to say, well, we've got to control the independent accountability and tell them how to respond to us and how to behave and what the restrictions are or are not.

And to some extent, this goes to the bigger accountability issue that we're having at the moment. It's all very well to say everything needs to be independent next to ICANN. But if the

process is truly independent, then the panel can set their own rules. And the panel has decided to go outside of some of the strictures and processes that are built into the existing ICANN rules.

And in the interests of following accountability processes, we followed along with that because the answer -- or the alternative unfortunately has been to say that we at ICANN or the ICANN board actually doesn't believe in that. And that's totally contrary to where we are at the moment.

So at the moment, we're in the hands of the panel. And, unfortunately, all of the timing and all of the guidelines that are built into the existing IRP rules have been pushed, delayed, extended, and stretched sometimes because of circumstances. We had one of the previous panelists who passed away. Sometimes it's because the panel chooses to be -- run a process which has been different to what was set out. But we followed it along. And I would just say, please learn from this lesson in designing future accountability mechanisms so that we don't possibly recreate some of the problems we already have.

[Timer sounds]

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Mike. Next speaker, please, on my left.

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Thank you. Again, on accountability, at the beginning of this week, Mr. Secretary Strickling commented --- seemed to go ---. Well, some may say it is tough at the top. But I can imagine how he feels because board directors, like Presidents and ministers, are chosen from among our best and on taking office seem to receive nothing but complaints.

While I don't think you're pariahs, and I hope you don't feel like that, you are our best. And we are very grateful for the work that you do.

Nonetheless, neither directors nor ministers are kings or saints, which is why we have constitutions to establish fundamental norms and provide effective and enforceable means of redress.

The search for enforceable accountability reforms should be seen in this light. It is not a mark of distrust or lack of faith in our leaders, but it is a sign of a community that has the maturity and the self-confidence to make provision against its own mistakes and to create the means to correct its own errors.

In short, it is in our willingness to accept enforceable means for correcting our errors that we will demonstrate that we are the kind of community that can be trusted with the responsibility for safeguarding critical Internet resources as a multistakeholder community. Thank you.

[Applause]

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. Could the next speaker wait for a moment. We have an video question. Is that right?

BRAD WHITE: That's correct, Cherine. We have a question from Dietmar from Valencia, Spain.

Go ahead, Dietmar.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Good afternoon or good morning from Valencia, Spain. My name is Dietmar Stefitz. I'm a creator of the domain .CLUB. So thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to participate as a hub in this public forum of ICANN.

The remote participation through hubs should be extended and should be further promoted so that everyone may know about ICANN and may know about new gTLDs.

Many of the assistants know Valencia because they have been in one of the domain in Europe conferences. So in this conference, we generated the domain in Europe .CLUB which is devoted to expanding the awareness of domains as well as TLDs.

Our motto is 1 million domains for 2030. It is very important that ICANN should invest in the future in the programs that, including our group, should be spread out in the whole of Europe through participation and public talks throughout Europe.

To that effect, I want to thank the representatives of ICANN particularly to Andrea Beccalli and Jean-Jacques Sahel because they have introduced us into this labyrinth of acronyms. And we hope in the future the representatives of ICANN help us in our communication task so as to be closer to the whole world to an important portion of the world that is the domain names world. Thank you very much.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. And thank you for the suggestion. Anybody -- there's no question here, just a suggestion.

Anybody who wants to comment?

Thank you very much for the suggestion. Next speaker.

JODEE RICH:

My name is Jodee Rich. I am the CEO of the CEO registry. I would like to start by thanking the ICANN board and the whole ICANN team for the gTLD program.

I think at one level it has been an incredible success, and you have made a beautiful baby that is creating identity, community, and network throughout the world. And I'm very, very excited about its potential.

A curious artifact of the program is that the biggest winners financially so far have actually been the losers of the auctions. Over \$100 million has now gone to the losers of the auctions. That is five times more than the first year's revenue that we have calculated from the sale of gTLDs. And with 6 million gTLDs sold, we think that less than a million of them are actually resolving.

So we have this beautiful baby that we've made that has such potential, but my view is that we've actually just left it out on the street.

And I think that unless we create awareness for the people on the street, this is going to be a very, very slow and painful process for all of us. If you were to ask people in Buenos Aires or New York or London or Sydney, Australia, what a TLD is, no one knows. No one knows what a TLD is. And we need to fix that.

It could be fixed in a number of ways. It could be fixed by brands. We just need a number of brands to get on the bandwagon. I think the brands are being extremely cautious, and I think that's a problem.

Or it could be fixed by an ICANN awareness program, and I request that ICANN --

[Timer sounds.]

-- very seriously create a program so that our beautiful baby becomes known to everyone out there. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay. Thank you. Stay where you are, please.

Bruce and Mike in any order.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Just one thing, I guess, just for clarity for the community, that the auctions that you're referring to, Jodee, are private auctions between multiple applicants for the same name, which is separate from auctions that ICANN has run. And the funds aren't distributed to anybody as yet.

And then with respect to growing market awareness -- and you mentioned Australia -- I have noticed actually that AusRegistry has been doing radio advertising for .MELBOURNE and .SYDNEY at sort of peak-hour radio programs in Australia. So they are actually marketing their TLD.

And I think ultimately each TLD operator needs to reach out to their respective communities and inform them of the potential

of their particular name. I'm not sure it's ICANN's job to do the marketing of particular TLDs.

CHERINE CHALABY: Mike.

Do you want to respond?

JODEE RICH: Can I say something, which is I violently disagree with that. I think your comment that it is up to the individual operators is a very naive comment, and it doesn't understand how much money it takes to market a global brand.

We need \$100 million plus. A radio program in Melbourne, Australia, is not going to get the message across.

This is a -- this is a new thing that we have created, and people need to be educated about it. And it has such potential, and we have spent so much years building it. And we are leaving it out there on the street, and we need to all get behind it or it will not happen.

CHERINE CHALABY: Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

Sorry. I thought it was on. If I can just respond quickly on that point because I think we're faced with a difficult situation and that is understanding what our role is in all of this. And I think that if the community tells ICANN that it's its role to actively solicit opportunities and market domains, then that I think is something the community could do.

I'm not sure I want to be part of an ICANN which is a commercial sales organization to stimulate the growth of TLDs. I thought our job here was coordinating Internet unique identifiers, naming being one of those identifiers and where we provide a policy opportunity as well as some technical coordination that underlies the naming identifier function. And, yes, there are some commercial interests that go along with it. And certainly those are interests that we support -- we welcome to the table as participants in the dialogue. I didn't think that ICANN was going down the route of becoming a marketing agency for TLDs.

If that's what the community wants us to become, then I think there needs to be unanimity amongst the community that that's what we're going to become.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Right. I know you didn't get the answer you wanted, but you've raised a very important point for the industry. There's no doubt about it. So thank you for raising the point. I don't think there's

an appetite for ICANN to undertake, you said, \$100 million program of awareness around the world. So...

Do you have another suggestion?

JODEE RICH: I do.

CHERINE CHALABY: Go ahead.

JODEE RICH: I think we can learn how the Olympics were marketed at the London Olympics. I think that we can -- through the DNA, we can come up with various plans.

And I agree, I don't think ICANN is a marketing organization. But I do think that ICANN can contribute funds to other organizations -- and it may be the DNA -- that run a very coordinated program.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. Thank you.

Next speaker, please, on the left.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Hello, ladies and gentlemen. --- I have attended many public sessions like this. And in several instances where question is raised, you reply that we will take them into account. But there is no track in what way they will take into account and what is the follow-up action.

Without criticizing you at all, I would like to know whether there is a way that the community follow your follow-up actions to see whether any effective step has been taken with the view that we would not bring back the same question in the same public sessions.

That is something just to consider. I hope that you will take this into account, with the proviso that it should be a general way how to track these issue of to be taken into account. This is the simple question.

Another question is that, since I am attending ICANN continuously since several years I have one of the parties on saying that ICANN process, Internet process, is, let us say, open, Democratic, with full transparency and inclusiveness. I have been criticized by people that Kavouss, don't say that all the time because there are some restrictions for some communities or participants or members. ICANN or ICANN contractor, they have some restrictions, an obstacle, to rightly, equally respond to the need and the requirement of some participants or

communities also and so forth. Would it be possible that this should be seriously reviewed in order that we could continue to say that it is inclusive and Democratic? If we make distinction between two different categories of countries or participants, it is not Democratic. And it is not inclusive. So that is serious questions. You maybe raise it. It is maybe not in your hand. You are maybe under some restrictions, obstacle, limitation. Please kindly take it serious because we want to have this ability to push and to encourage everybody for this multistakeholder approach inclusiveness, transparent, Democratic, and so on and so forth, and we should have evidence of that.

Third question, in reply to .AFRICA and Tijani, you mentioned that look, it is not in the hand of the Board, it is in the hand of the panel. How do you see that the new accountability mechanism that now design, innovate, that have more and more and more use of this independent panel would not face with much more severe difficulty than today and this is -- (Off microphone) partisan to this mechanism and they have to see the consequence that we would not face the same situations, number one, and number two, there should be sufficient, clear criteria for the people, for the community that's involved in that process. Not block the process totally, and at the end we come to the point that that invoke -- or invocation was not appropriate

and we have wasted enough time. That is just for this community.

Now, the last question for the Board is the following: There is -- this is very important for the whole community. Now, there is this situation before everybody. The community is dealing with the very complex mechanism for accountability. I don't want to go to all of them starting empowerment of the community, starting the mechanisms to -- for enforcement and IPR. How the Board see this situation if all of them come into force? Do you see any difficulty to implement that? Or you do not see any difficulty.

So it is just good for everybody to know that if we theoretically design all of this, what does the -- what are the practical implementation of that? I give you one simple example. You have the gTLDs, you have the mechanism for that, and now we come to the problems. So why? Because it is not properly being studied. Do we have proper (Off microphone) in order to make sure we don't have the same difficulty.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you, Kavouss. Thank you. Thank you. This is a -- thank you all. I know there are a lot of issues about the accountability on our mind, and it's an opportunity for some of us to raise it at this session but can we keep this session to new gTLD, please?

There will be other forums and other times later to talk about the other subjects. Thank you very much. The Steve, did you want to say something?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yes. The first question about tracking the things that we say we're going to follow up on is a fair question, and I think that we need to look closely at that -- there's a sense of deja vu here because we've had that question before. So understanding the irony of what I'm going to say, we will look into that.

The second question had to do, if I understood properly, about restrictions on participation -- restrictions imposed by various countries on participation in our processes. I think that is exactly what that is, that is, it's restrictions by other jurisdictions, not by us, and there's not, ultimately, much that we can do about that except to be as open as possible and -- which we are.

The third and the fourth questions related to the gTLD program. I'm sorry, related not to the gTLD program but to accountability, and are best taken up in that session. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. Before the next speaker, I understand we have a video question. Do you mind if we take it. Brad?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We've got a question from Mr. Murray McKercher with the Internet Society.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, my name is Murray McKercher. We are coming from Toronto. I belong to the North American regional At-Large organization and ISOC Canada. Thank you for taking our question. We're very fortunate in Canada to have excellent Internet capabilities, but we're aware that in other developing nations they aren't so lucky, but we're aware that a number of folks from developing nations for various reasons are unable to attend ICANN meetings. And my question to the Board is, will you be increasing the support for this remote participation in ICANN activities as we go forward? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Fadi, do you want to answer this?

FADI CHEHADE: Yes. Simply, this is fantastic. Just seeing you from Buenos Aires in Canada enjoying full participation with us is fantastic. This innovation, which has started actually at NETmundial and Sao Paulo and now we adopted it here and other organizations are adopting it, is really making this forum much more open and much more global. So this is a worthwhile investment. We'll

continue doing it, and I want to publicly recognize the Internet Society for its help in enabling these hubs with us all over the world. So a shout-out to ISOC and the ISOC chapters for working with us on making this a reality. Thanks.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Fadi. Next. Next on the right here.

BRET FAUSETT: They switched my mic on a couple of times. Is it working? My name is Bret Fausett. I'm from Uniregistry, (Off microphone) registry operator. I wanted to make one concrete suggestion for the Board that I think could benefit the community around new gTLDs. I have participated in every new gTLD session we've had this week. I've, in fact, chaired a couple of them and been on some panels. So there is a healthy debate inside your community about what went right and what went wrong in the last round. There is very healthy engagement from your senior GDD staff on what went right and what went wrong and what to improve. But there's a timeline that I've seen in a couple of sessions that was put together by GDD staff that shows all the reviews underway, and the last reviews end in Q2 2017. What is to the right of that timeline, though, has not been mapped out yet. And I think the fact that no one has said when you will open up a second window is causing some concern, both with people

who think it's going to happen really quickly and with people who think it may never happen again. And whatever side of the debate you're on as to when it should happen, I think everyone would benefit from having ICANN, sometime between now and Dublin, complete that timeline. I know that it's going to be an estimate. You don't have to tell me that we haven't finished the first round. I still have a bunch of applications tied up in contention resolution, so I know very well the first round has not completed. But I think a lot of people would just like to see where we're going, have someone drop a flag in here on the timeline and say our estimated opening of the second round is blank. I'd love to see you fill in the blank between now and Dublin.

CHERINE CHALABY: Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Our estimate of opening the second round is blank.

[Laughter]

You know, more seriously, there are some commitments, we have a very strong commitment, to study and understand what we did right, what we did wrong, what are the alternatives coming out of the first round or the -- actually we don't like to

number them as the first round. The current round. The idea of trying to estimate a date creates the impression that we are going to move smoothly and quickly from where we are now and just going to wrap up the current round and then move forward with the next one. I think that that's problematic because there are quite a few questions. There could be somebody standing right behind you that says hey, let's not make the same mistakes -- oh, there's one -- let's not make the same mistakes that we made in this round, for whatever value -- list of mistakes they might have in mind.

I think the answer is going to be neither of the extremes that you suggested. It won't be never and it won't be at a date certain that can be predicted with any reasonable clarity here. Probably more useful to keep in mind what the substantive milestones have to be, what questions have to be answered, and people can then make estimates of their own rather than us trying to say well, here's our schedule and all we have to do is fit everything into it.

BRET FAUSETT:

I'll be very quick in the follow-up. I think that's exactly right, if you can't give us the time, give us the dependencies. And then I think the current map does talk about things that you believe, I think you believe, are in the critical path. Let us understand

what those are, and then we can watch them and then tell us maybe you think that it would take 6 months, 18 months after the closure of those critical dependencies to do something else. I think we can --

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll take that.

BRET FAUSETT: My point is just to have a better timeline of understanding --

CHERINE CHALABY: I think that's -- it's me talking. I think that's a good suggestion, and businesses wants some -- some stability and certainty and to be able to manage and forecast a business. I think it's a good suggestion. GDD -- Akram, do you want to -- can we between now and Dublin go beyond this Q2 '17 and put some dependencies where the program is going?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, Cherine. Absolutely. If the Board wants to actually articulate the dependencies that they would like to see done before the program starts, we can actually work with the Board on defining this and get back to the community on that. It's important for everybody to realize that we're -- we're only

mapping right now the issues that we'd like to change. Once we know what we want to change, there will be time that's needed for implementing all these changes as well. And not knowing what we want to change is very difficult for us to assess the time it's going to take to implement those before being able to implement the next round. So there are some co-dependencies, but I agree that if we could articulate what -- what we'd like to see done first, that would help. Thank you.

BRET FAUSETT:

I just want to make sure we don't sleep walk into 2025. Let's move to whatever date we're going knowing where we're going.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. Thank you. Fair point. Next speaker, please. And then after that I'll go to the video. But next speaker.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, let's proceed expeditiously to 2025. Jonathan Zuck from ACT and the IPC, but speaking on my own behalf. I want to thank the Board for its assurances about not jumping into the new round too quickly. I do appreciate that. I mean, Fadi all but called the CSG fools for thinking we would go -- railroad into that. And all I guess I would say is, I would rather be thought a

fool for bringing it up than realize later I was one for not bringing its up. So I'm glad that we're going to proceed cautiously.

One thing that occurs to me, though, is that one thing that has, in fact, completed in this round is the application phase of the round. And I'm just brainstorming here, and maybe this should be aimed backwards at the GNSO and for that I apologize. But to go back on Rudi's point, since we actually know what the application phase looked like, it might be worth studying that because that's where we got fewer than expected IDNs and community applications even. So more or less about the implementation but more about that application phase may be worthy of some study. And it's something that's finished that we could, in fact, begin to study now. And so I think that's something we could have broad community support for.

The other thing that I guess I want to turn around and say to the crowd is that we have a lot of reviews coming up. I had made a mistake, because of the format, of aiming this comment to the Board at the last meeting but it's not really aimed at the Board. There are ten more days left to comment on the review schedule. So I would like to point everyone to the staff recommendations for spreading out some of the reviews because absent some change, we have, like, seven of them scheduled for the next year. So that worries me a great deal, given the amount of volunteer burnout associated with just the

CWG and CCWG. So this isn't aimed at the Board, this is aimed at the community. Please take the next ten days and give your thoughts on extending out some of those reviews and figuring out which ones are really truly critical paths because I don't think we'll be able to get through them. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Any of the Board members would like to respond to these two suggestions? Wolfgang, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you. I think this evaluation and study process is a challenge for the whole community, so we should not wait until an expert panel which is probably not so close to the process, you know, comes with some individual and isolated conclusion. And we should start here and now. I think all the experience, the knowledge, is in the community, the practical experiences. And probably we can organize a bottom-up cross-constituency process where we can collect all of the individual experiences and then massage this into a broader process. So this would not substitute as a better organized process of external evaluation, but I'm -- I'm fully in favor that this evaluation of this big program is a challenge for the whole community. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Don't go away. I think Ray would like to add. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Cherine. I want to echo Jonathan's plea. When we conducted a session yesterday discussing the reviews, the statistic that was put up about the comments and reviews showed that there have been zero to date. And it is very disheartening to hear people complain about overload and then not take the opportunity to comment on schedules and so forth where they could be heard. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. All right. I'll take a video question, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from -- or comment from Mr. Oleksandr Tsaryuk from the Ukraine.

OLEKSANDR TSARYUK: Hello. (Off microphone) We would like to say thank you for such unique opportunity to bring Ukrainian community our contribution to ICANN meeting. We submitted a couple of questions and contribution to different working groups, and during this hub we finished the discussion of the best way of Internet governance ecosystem approach, and we have the

overwhelming agreement between the different group of local stakeholders that multistakeholder approach is the best way for Internet governance in Ukraine. But we still have some doubts on IANA transition, and we decided to have a (indiscernible) next week. Unfortunately, Ukrainian government didn't submit our position to the GAC, but we hope that we will have the joint position of Ukrainian stakeholders on IANA transition. How we could contribute our joint position because we are quite -- we are a little bit late and how to develop this and to keep it -- keep it -- keep it in track on this. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you.

Anyone would like to comment?

Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE:

Okay. We would welcome Audrey Hepburn anytime from the Ukraine to contribute to the IANA transition, and all of you, certainly. It was great to see you sitting there under that poster all the way from Ukraine.

Look, the answer to your question is very straightforward. Every part of the process for the transition is open and inclusive. Right

now, you heard maybe today in Ukraine that in Buenos Aires our community completed the acceptance of the CWG proposal into the ICG. Now the ICG goes into its next period of deliberations. All of these activities are accessible remotely for people to attend, to listen, to participate, and we hope you and all Ukrainian stakeholders will participate in this important process that is going now through its very critical last mile.

So we welcome your participation. Everything is open. Everything is accessible to you online. And if we can help to you in any way, Michael Yakushev, who represents ICANN in your region, is always available to you and I'm sure will be very happy to support you in any way.

Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: We have Thomas, wants to talk on behalf of the GAC, probably.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And welcome to Ukraine. You have, as you have said and heard, made a statement, a support statement for the CWG proposal to be sent to the ICG, but with regard to the accountability work to the CCWG, we have decided in the GAC to send out a few questions that we have started to discuss here in Buenos Aires to all GAC members with a deadline of 10th of July

to give them their views on these questions that we will then compile and send on to the CCWG as an input.

So of course this is also -- goes also to Ukraine, to the Ukraine GAC member, and we're hoping

Thank you very much.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you, Thomas.

We've got eight minutes left, so I am just about to close this -- the line.

Anybody else?

Okay. So one more. So there are four in the line, and I'll close it at this point. Thank you very much.

Okay. Five in the line now. Okay. That's it. The line is closed.

Next speaker, please.

ERICK IRIARTE:

I will speak in Spanish, if you would like to put your headsets on. I know the translation is really very good.

I will put on the table an issue that I thought has been close, but I think it will have more implications than it had at the very

beginning. It is about .AMAZON. Yesterday, the trademark caucus, the Congress in the United States, have sent a letter to ICANN saying that you should review your decision about .AMAZON because of a complex situation, because ICANN is being told that if they do not make that review in a relevant position regarding accountability as well, the process of the IANA tradition will be difficult. So it's curious to understand how the Congress of United States links .AMAZON to the IANA transition with something we may call in some cultures blackmailing.

It's clear that one of the arguments of this letter is that international law, the trademarks should be -- or should have precedence.

So I think that the GAC have found a solution for the Human Rights Working Group and International Law Working Group because it has been now supported by the Congress of the United States.

But this is not following the regular path. The governments of Peru, Brazil, and other governments in the region, based on a ministerial statement of all countries in Latin America, made a statement supported by the GAC. And if I'm not mistaken, the government of United States is member of the GAC.

So within this complex situation, we know that this is a letter, and of course does not go beyond the intention or the willingness of some Congressmen, this letter is put in on the hands of the ICANN boards, the condition to review this decision, because otherwise, there might be problems in the IANA transition.

MIKE SILBER:

Erick, thank you. I think you raise an interesting question. To me, this touches on what's been discussed earlier in terms of reviews, because we've landed up with a number of issues which have been possibly a little more complex than at the time the Applicant Guidebook was discussed and debated and agreed and finalized. And hopefully in a second or third or however many additional rounds we go through, we'll be able to refine and improve the process each time we go through it so that certainty becomes greater. Because to me, the biggest issue is not so much a case of right or wrong, because I don't think those are necessarily terms that are relevant in this circumstance, but, rather, questions of predictability, certainty, and fairness of process.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay. Thank you.

We have five minutes to go and four more speakers, so I think it's going to be difficult to engage in a dialogue, but I'd like people to be heard.

So if you have a question or something to say, please say it. It has to be about the new gTLD. If not, please leave that question for later on.

So next speaker.

Yeah.

WERNER STAUB:

Werner Staub from CORE. I have a point about the next rounds. I've stood here many times arguing for recursive rounds where each time a round takes place, the next round is already announced so the people don't jump on the coupling one but they will actually prefer to have the subsequent round.

Not having this has caused a great deal of damage, actually, but there was other damage as well. Essentially, we might compare the process that ICANN has to that of a building permit process in a public authority.

Imagine a public authority that gives building permits once every 15 years. You know, imagine the quality of urban planning.

It is certainly going to be damaging if we don't have, you know, short periods between rounds and predictability precisely with respect to time probably much more than anything else. Because if you lack predictability with respect to time, the other predictability is probably pointless.

Now, we might actually do this by drawing on the excellent resources that ICANN has now. ICANN has built up a team of experts, you know, in terms of how to handle all the issues associated with this.

What we might do could be to ask the team or somebody in a team to draw up a straw man. Just the way an engineer would design a process. Then we would have a reference -- not saying this is the way that it should be, but we can compare that reference to what people would like to have.

I believe this would be faster than what we did before. When we first compiled rules, then we spent five years trying to translate them into implementation.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you, Werner. All right. Next speaker, please.

I know there's a question online. I'll read it at the end, if that's okay, Brad.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY:

My name is Sivasubramanian. I am from India. I am a new gTLD applicant who has gone through the review and redressal processes so I have some suggestions for improvement.

First, there appears to be several flaws with Board reconsideration and the Ombudsman review processes with regard to gTLD reviews. The reconsideration and Ombudsman process only provide for review of process errors, and not even errors in evaluation or other substantive problems that might occur in the new gTLD review. This results in applicants -- having no recourse other than to apply for relief through a mechanism that does not address anything other than process issues. Second, processes like the IRP are prohibitively expensive for developing countries. ICANN the organization, which is usually on the defending end of IRPs should consider the costs of the IRP for those in parts of the world where even \$1,000 is a lot of money, much less tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Excuse me, Siva. Could you speak closer to the microphone and slower. Thank you.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: This results in applicants having no recourse other than to apply for relief through a mechanism that does not address anything other than process reviews.

Second, problems like the IRP are prohibitively expensive for developing countries. ICANN, the organization which is usually on the defending end of IRPs, should consider the costs of the IRP for those in the developing country. Even \$1,000 is expensive for some applicants, let alone -- a lot of money, much less tens or millions of -- tens of thousands or millions of dollars.

The effect of these incomplete and inadequate limitations lead to a situation where the applicant does not have any recourse, and ICANN makes decisions with relative immunity.

So these are some of the limitations that the staff executive community and Board may have to look into and correct.

Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jordyn Buchanan with Google.

I want to come back to the conversation Jodee started earlier but come at it a slightly different way, because I think I agree with Mike that it is not ICANN's responsibility to be a marketing organization, and it's not really ICANN's core competency either. The industry ought to survive and thrive on its own merit. But if we step a little further back and think about when the program was starting and we were thinking about launching new TLDs, what were some of the objections that people raised, what were some of the concerns people had. One of them was certainly these are going to be confusing, people might not understand them, and it might make life more complicated on the Internet as opposed to better.

There's some evidence that some of that's happening. Some people understand them. Some people don't. I think there's a lot of opportunities with new gTLDs, but there's also some ongoing challenges as well.

And so ICANN has the opportunity, and I would say responsibility, to help people understand that these things have arrived, and that they work and how they fit into the rest of the Internet in order to address that concern that the community identified up front going into the program.

Similarly, some people said these things might not work all the time. We know that. Ram has been talking for years about the

challenges with universal acceptance of the that's another area where I think ICANN could help make sure that challenges that were identified going in at the start of the program get addressed, and we don't just simply toss these TLDs out into the world and hope that the objections that people raised earlier on just magically go away.

So I think that's the way to think about it, not that we want to market them but we want to make sure that we put them out and that we're addressing some of the potential harms that people raised in advance.

And the other thing I'll just add at the end with IDNs in particular. We have a lot of opportunity now. There's a lot of IDNs. People can now get email addresses in their own language, but they basically don't work anywhere. Anywhere. And there's a lot of work that could be done. It's really hard to bootstrap because there's a lot of chicken-and-egg problems. But I think ICANN --

[Timer sounds]

-- has been with UASG but can get additionally more involved to make sure that those technology steps happen so that the promise of IDNs in new gTLDs is realized as opposed to being left on the floor.

Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. Bruce? Bruce would like to say and then Ram.

Thank you, good points.

[Applause]

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah, thank you, Jordyn. I agree with those points. I know this week there's been some meetings on working out a plan of action with respect to universal acceptance, and I think that's absolutely an area we need to put resources into. And the other topic, I also agree with you, which is IDNs. The availability of IDNs in typical end-user software is pretty weak, and, therefore, the take-up has been low.

Some of these ideas in terms of funding programs I hope will be put forward once the Cross-Community Working Group gets going on how to use auction funds, but I'd love to see some ideas come out of that process to invest further in both the universal acceptance problems and also the problems, or it's a sub problem of universal acceptance, but the take-up of IDNs and their usefulness.

CHERINE CHALABY: Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jordyn, for the comments.

The conversations with board members on some of the topics you brought up, I find tremendous resonance with what you're saying. There is definitely a commitment, and I'd go so far as to say a responsibility to ensure that important new areas of technologies get the adequate coverage, adequate resources that are necessary.

ICANN has some demonstrated experience here. It's done quite a lot of work in DNSSEC. It's putting and continues to put a lot of effort into IDNs and it's just starting on the universal acceptance piece.

So I think in the -- if you look at the constructive pieces of either new areas of technology or new things that are being uncovered as a result of the expansion, those are the kinds of things that we do need to commit both time, attention, and energy, not just from ICANN, the organization, but from ICANN the community.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

And Mike wants to say something, and then Mr. Fattal, you'll have the final say in this session.

MIKE SILBER: Jordyn, thank you. Seeing as you followed up on my comment, I just wanted to say thank you. I think the clarification and the direction you were going in was incredibly useful, and I really appreciate it.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. And Mr. Fattal, just a second.

We have a question in French from a gentleman called Pierre Mukadi Mbaya. In fact, there are four questions. A lot of them are about IPv6 and Internet speed and supporting young communities in Africa. One of them is about TLDs. I would like to take this off-line. We don't have time to answer that, but I just want to acknowledge that we've received the question and we'll deal with it off-line.

You thank you very much.

KHALED FATTAL: Thank you, Cherine.

My name is Khaled Fattal. I'm with the Multilingual Internet Group. You may know it as well MLI Group.

First of all, I would like to thank Jordyn for raising the point we just heard about universal acceptance and I would like to thank you, the Board, for actually acknowledging and responding it. At least we have three or four responses, which is exceptional.

Why this is relevant. Because I think when we were talking earlier on about lessons learned, I would like to share with you something that perhaps we can use that experience of lessons that were not learned so we don't repeat the same mistake.

We launched the new gTLDs with IDNs, and many IDNs have been authorized, they're running, but guess what? They don't work very well.

And I think we're finding this out because we're learning from the process as we go forward. And here's the challenge to the Board, and it's an opportunity as well.

There are other critical topics that are not being addressed, and it may not necessarily be within the remit of ICANN and -- or names and numbers. However, and I want to quote Fadi from last November when we were both in Geneva, that some of the issues that need to be addressed like cybersecurity in this new ecosystem, child protection online in this new ecosystem, roles and responsibilities in this new ecosystem. So for those of you who might think this is a pitch for our summit, it's not. I'm actually informing the Board that it is for ICANN to step up and

be involved in these debates, in these conversations to weigh in or what needs to happen because names and numbers are one of the critical -- or some of the critical factors that need to weigh in in making the global ecosystem safer, not only online but also off-line. And there are numerous cases.

So for that, there is an opportunity for ICANN and for the community to step up and show where they sit on roles and responsibilities and on the issues I just mentioned. And the next summit we're doing is in September. It's in South Africa. It's a Southern Africa summit, and we are hosted by Microsoft. You're all invited to weigh in. If you want to step up, say what you wish to do.

Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: All right. Thank you very much. This concludes the session on new gTLDs and we move on to the next session. Suze?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes. I'm Suzanne Woolf and we are moving on now to the block we'd set aside for comments and questions on the IANA

stewardship transition process and the ICANN enhanced accountability effort.

So same rules of the road, same preferences. If you want to speak, please identify yourself, please speak slowly and clearly for the translators and scribes, and please be brief so others will get a chance to speak.

Before we go on, I do want to congratulate the community on a milestone today in this process, that all three of the operational communities have now delivered their portions of the proposal to the ICG. It's a very important milestone. Congratulations to everyone. But it is only one milestone.

[Applause]

It's only one moment along the way, and so we still have work to do and let's continue with that.

Go ahead, please.

STEVE DelBIANCO:

Thank you. Steve DelBianco speaking for Netchoice. I want to talk about an institution that is set by opposing factions who do back-room lobbying and delaying tactics that result in gridlock on policymaking. And I'm not talking about ICANN. I'm talking about the U.S. Congress. And despite that gridlock, Congress

has made amazing progress since NTIA announced the transition 15 months ago. Understandably, the U.S. Congress was frustrated and surprised that it hadn't been adequately consulted when the transition was announced. They reacted by looking for ways to assert their role and leverage to do so. They immediately held hearings. Fadi, you and I, Secretary Strickling, and others were there. They drafted legislation that would have let Congress spend up to a year second-guessing our community proposal after we prepared it and then they passed appropriations measures that restricted funding from NTIA to do the transition.

So look, an amazing thing happened over the last year. Congressional staff immersed themselves in the arcane details of this transition. They started attending our ICANN meetings, and there are three of them in the room here today. And finally, they created brand-new legislations known as the DOTCOM Act, which reinforces NTIA's minimum requirements, and then requires ICANN to implement the bylaws changes that the community -- both the CWG and CCWG -- have asked for. And that was in response to what I and a number of other witnesses asked for. And on Tuesday, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed that legislation and today, just this morning, the key Senate committee approved the same bill. Congress has done its part by backing the community, which

puts the onus on us to deliver a solid proposal, and we're doing that and we have a ways to go. But let's not miss this moment to show some appreciation for Congress backing us and backing the community and the staff members who made it happen. Please?

[Applause]

Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you for that contribution. Next, please.

FARZANEH BADI:

Hi. I'm Farzaneh Badi. I'm an ICANN fellow and I'm not going to follow your agenda. I'm going to talk about something totally different, and also I think putting the general comments and other inquiries at the end of your agenda means you're actually marginalizing the other issues. So I'm going to talk about these.

Those that decide where to hold the ICANN meetings, please, how long are you going to ignore the cries of visa seekers? We have been through so many troubles to get this visa to come to Argentina. I -- my visa was issued on the day, and I was held at the airport because they did not inform the authority.

Some have suggested that I should actually change my nationality and get another one. Well, no. I am going to stick with that Iranian passport and I'm going to -- but what should be changed is your approach, is where you are going to hold the meetings, whether you have actually negotiated with the governments beforehand. Do they know about it.

So the next CCWG meeting is going to be in Paris. They decided this five weeks ago. Do you know how long it takes to get a visa from a French Embassy for Iranian or other nationals that want a visa? At least six weeks. How long do we have to be humiliated?

[Applause]

FADI CHEHADE:

I'm -- I want to start by telling you that I'm very, very sorry about the difficulties you've had. This is not pleasant or interesting. It's very bad. So your -- what you called your humiliation, I'm very sorry about, and I personally apologize for it.

There is a limit to what we can do. Can we do more? We will always be able to do more, and we will try harder.

Believe me, we do not just pick a country to do a meeting without applying all of our abilities to get the government to pre-agree to help us with visas.

We do. We do.

But it's not always simple. Most of the systems that provide visas are used to deal with government -- governments, right? We're not a government, we're not planning to be a government, and therefore, we apply everything we can to enable the visas to be easier.

As I'm sure you know now, some countries are easier than others, and therefore we should -- what you're asking is for us to continue making this a key criterion when we choose locations, and we will do that.

At the same time, I want to tell you that our staff has been working very, very hard on this issue. Even just here, I mean we have coordination teams on the ground working with the Argentinian government to help people with visas.

Are we doing a perfect job? Clearly not, if we leave you this frustrated.

As to the meeting in Paris, which I really would like you to participate in because that meeting is richer and more meaningful when people from all over the world are in it, please do join us remotely, please do participate, as hard as this is. But we do make every meeting possible remotely and if you can't make it to Paris, we hope you will join us remotely.

We do have people in this room from the French foreign office. I'm going to ask them to find you and to see what we can do (non-English word or phrase) to help you get the visa and be with us in five weeks. So everything we can do, we will facilitate and do. And again, my apologies to you and I don't know what else to say. I'm as hurt as you are and we will do everything we can and double down our efforts.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you very much, Fadi.

Next, please.

RUDI VANSNICK: Rudi Vansnick speaking for NPOC, the not-for-profit operational constituency.

NPOC is the youngest constituency in ICANN. In fact, this month we are celebrating that the NPOC baby is becoming four years old. And with that, working with the largest, widest, and most diverse community who is serving millions of citizens across the world, we have constantly focused on engaging our members and are devoting all our resources to enable our community, the not-for-profit, to identify together the operational impact of the IANA transition on our partners.

To date, we have essentially observed the work in progress, combining all stakeholders' opinions and visions, knowing that operations, put together with the tactics and policy, will impact NGOs and the next generation.

Therefore, NPOC will contribute in the last phase in providing the NGOs' concerns and offer full collaboration in making the IANA transition a success.

I note the concerns of the NGOs have a lot of similarities with the concerns of a large portion of the global Internet community such as fundamental rights, education, security, and more on.

In conclusion, NPOC commits to continue to engage the NGOs in the further debate as we improve the presence of our community in the process along the many different actions taking place in the world. Between now and Dublin, we engage [sic] NPOC will bring in as many as possible reactions from the not-for-profit community in a summit in Dublin. Watch us. We will be there.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you very much for those comments.

Next?

IZUMI OKUTANI:

This is Izumi Okutani, the chair of the CRISP team, and I really want to join Suzanne and the others in congratulating the names, the CWG stewardship, in completing the proposal submission, and I feel very positive collaborative-wise in this process and I'm very pleased to see discussions moving forward during this meeting for the ICG.

And I'd like to share that in parallel to the ICG process, we have started dialogue with the leaders of the other operational communities in an informal manner so that we can identify any issues that needs sharing of information amongst ourselves.

And I'd really like to thank Jonathan and Lise for sharing this collaborative spirit, and it's been very constructive and helpful, and the fact that they have expressed they wanted to be considerate of the proposal which have already been submitted by the other operational communities. So we find this very helpful.

We note that in -- on the IPR issue, that the ICG have requested the CWG to, to quote from their word, reconcile based on the proposals which have already been submitted, and we're happy to share any facts or information that we have related to the proposal that we have submitted on the numbers community on the intellectual property rights.

And I'd like to also share the status of preparation on the numbers community since the last ICANN meeting. So we have already prepared implementation -- started preparation towards implementation, which is --

[Timer sounds]

-- developing the SLA text and the review committee.

We'd like to thank the ICANN board for providing this input on the SLA so -- and we are pleased to see that there were no major showstoppers in the comments submitted from the board.

Based on this, I feel confident that we can move forward in finalizing the SLA between ICANN and the RIRs and would like to also emphasize that we want to be conscious of the time lines, including by -- for the three operational communities, so including the numbers and the CCWG process, so that the proposals that we will come up with will be pragmatic, in line with these time lines that we have -- we have -- are trying to work towards. So thank you very much.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you, Izumi, and I think Steve had something he wanted to add?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Suzanne.

The board is not a -- posing -- and ICANN is not posing any problem here. We'll be happy to close up arrangements with the numbers community. And the only issue is the harmonization of those conditions among the three operational communities, which is an issue between them and the ICG and so forth.

The ICANN board and ICANN staff don't have any problem and there's -- we'd go along with anything reasonable that can be put together.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks very much, Steve.

And next?

WERNER STAUB: Werner Staub from CORE. I have a point about the recommendation to strengthen the independent review as contained in the recommendations for a transition. They're

certainly something to agree with. It is also very timely in the context of the fact that it is seen that the independent review is one of the difficult things that we have to deal with now.

The ICANN bylaws already call for a standing panel in -- in doing a review as one of the options that ICANN can implement, actually, without changing the bylaws right now. I would submit that it is time to start that as early as possible because we're actually in danger of getting way more independent review proceedings, actually losing controls, specifically in the context where the rules are not adapted to the problem and very often the parties really affected by the process are excluded from it.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

All right. Bruce, as the board's liaison to the CCWG, I think that's probably appropriate.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yes. Specifically on the independent review standing panel, certainly the Board Governance Committee has discussed that and our plan is to put out a call for expressions of interest to form that standing panel. The only thing we held off on a little bit was just incorporating some of the text from the current CCWG draft in terms of, you know, what direction the IRP panel is going in.

So the process I'm expecting is that we'll send a draft of the call for members to the CCWG for their comment and then we'll publish it publicly and, you know, set up a panel. So essentially we agree with you, Werner, and we'll be working on that in the next month or so.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. Thanks, Bruce.

Next, please.

RICK LANE: Hello. My name is Rick Lane. I'm with 21st Century Fox. There's been a lot of discussion at this meeting about the fear of government capture, and we share those concerns, but government capture can come from a variety of ways. It can be, you know, over the top, you see it coming, you know it's there and you see the interaction. But it can also be done underneath, where you don't see the interactions.

And so therefore, our concern is that governments could try intimidation of ICANN, there could be quid pro quos of "ICANN, you help us here, we'll help you there," and from our perspective, we think what will solve that and help that is transparency.

So therefore, we are supporting the business constituency's suggestion that a bylaw be added to require ICANN or any individual acting on ICANN's behalf to make periodic public disclosure of their contacts with any government official, as well as activities, receipts, and disbursements in support of those activities on behalf of ICANN.

Disclosure of the required information facilitates evaluation by the multistakeholder community of the statements and activities of such persons, in light of their functions as representatives of ICANN.

We think that type of disclosure, we have it in -- up on Capitol Hill with our Lobbying Disclosure Act. We have the Foreign Agents Registration Act in the U.S. It helps create a transparency and a trust that there aren't deals being cut between ICANN and government officials, you know, down the road that we just don't know about, and we believe that this type of bylaw will be critical to ensure the trust that we all want to have with the board, ICANN, and the multistakeholder community. Thank you.

[Applause]

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Sorry. Just a question for you.

It's a very interesting suggestion. Would you apply that to members of the community as well?

RICK LANE: I think, you know, as much transparency as possible is worthwhile, so I think it's something to look into, but what we're focusing on right now is governments taking over and governments raising issues that we just don't know about. And they have a lot more power than an individual. They have a lot more power and influence over certain decisions, be it policies or otherwise, that individuals do not have.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sorry. You may have misunderstood me. What I mean is would you apply that to members of the community's interaction with governments.

RICK LANE: Oh, you mean the ICANN community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

RICK LANE: (Off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Why?

RICK LANE: Why would I -- (Off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But you're part of ICANN.

RICK LANE: No. This is about the corporate structure of ICANN. This is about the resources that ICANN has at its disposal to hire lobbyists, to hire influence peddlers, to do things with the resources that they have at their disposal that other people just don't have.

So this is about transparency of ICANN as a corporation, not ICANN as a community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. Thank you very much.

Next, I guess.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Suzanne. Jordan Carter, .NZ. I appear to have a new day job, which is a rapporteur on the cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability. It's always fun having two jobs.

I just wanted to say two things, really.

One is thank you to the community for the wide range of well-expressed, passionately expressed views on the accountability topics of this meeting. When you look at what's happened just at this meeting, it's felt a bit heavy at times, but the -- things feel clearer to me, I think, as one of the participants is going to have to try and help us get a final draft proposal ready for public comment in the next five weeks, which isn't an intimidating deadline at all. But the second point I wanted to make from the feedback here and the links with the CWG's names proposal is that the Dublin deadline is not an optional deadline. We have to get there in Dublin. We have to have a chartering organization sign off in Dublin.

And that means that over the next 15 weeks or so, people are going to have to compromise. You know, we're going to have to do the work to come up with a good model.

So all I want to say is that unless we want to disrupt the transition and slow it down by a number of months, that's an obligation that we all have.

So my request isn't of the board. It's of everyone who is participating in these discussions. Which is, to go away and be really clear about what your bottom lines are and be really clear that if there's a set of bottom lines that can't be met by a compromise proposal, the thing that we're risking is not more time on accountability. The thing that we risk is the transition proceeding on time or even potentially at all.

So I think it's just a sobering note that I'd like to make, really. Go back. Think really, really hard. Thank you.

[Applause]

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you, Jordan, and actually, I want to go back for just a second. Thomas has a comment on the previous -- the government transparency topic and then we'll go to...

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I just wanted to inform you that actually ICANN is listing all their meetings that they have, wherever they go and talk to governments, whether it's a public meeting like EuroDIG or something like this or whether it's bilaterals, and there's a monthly report produced that is at least available on the GAC site. I think it's probably also available on the ICANN Web site.

So there is actually transparency about when ICANN talks to governments. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. Indeed, to the prior speaker, Mr. Lane, everything -- all of our engagements with governments are listed to the GAC and on the GAC site.

Secondly, we do not have any lobbyists outside the U.S.

Thirdly, our lobbying activities in the United States are disclosed as per the law. So they're completely disclosed. Exactly how much we pay whom is all disclosed as the law requires.

So I don't know what else we can do to be more transparent, but happy to get any further insight from the community. And we're happy to comply.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thanks very much, Fadi. Next and then we have a video hub question.

KAVOUS ARASTEH:

Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh. This time I hope you will allow me to speak.

First two introductory parts. I fully support Farzaneh, her demand that the visa issue is not that you negotiate with each individual country (indiscernible)

When you have an invitation from the country to the host, one of the conditions would be please facilitate, to the extent possible, the visa. (indiscernible)

But this has been done previously by Switzerland for the ITU case, and it works well. In 99 cases it works well.

If they need an invitation letter from ICANN, you will provide an invitation letter to take it to the embassy.

And I'm proud that Farzaneh would maintain its nationality, Iranian. I'm Iranian. I'm proud to be Persian Iranian with the history culture, and civilization of Iran.

Second, I would like to appreciate Jordan Carter plus Steve DelBianco and Becky Burr and the three cochairs of CCWG and the entire ICANN staff. They have made a considerable amount of work during this period.

Now, my question with the previous meeting is still valid, and I hope you answer that question.

The last issue is that I have proposed in the CCWG a compromise approach. We should take a lightweight approach with respect

to this transition. We should not go to the area that we cannot finish. It is unfortunate that, if we go to the NTIA with something which does not have the broad support of the community, that is one of the conditions of NTIA. If that condition is not met, it will be out.

So we have to make every effort that condition be met. In order for the condition to be met, we should be quite straightforward. To the extent possible, simple, not complex, and make it practical. Then we have to do everything possible. If there are remaining questions, there is this workstream 2. We can do that, and there's the time. So let's not miss this opportunity.

And I request the co-chair of the CCWG to take my compromise seriously. I am standing behind that compromise. And there are several other people that are pushing for that compromise. Thank you very much. Muchas gracias.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you. And first Fadi, I think, had something on the visa. And then Chris, you'd like to respond on the CCWG.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. So, just very quickly, all the things you mentioned that we need to do to facilitate the visas, i.e., criteria as part of selecting an area, invitation letters, we do. We go even more

than that. We actually have coordination teams that are positioned in country specifically to work with the foreign affairs departments. This is all happening. I mean, you know that, Kavouss. And there are difficulties, of course, for some passports. And this is sad.

I know that. My dad spent a good 4 1/2 years standing in line to get us a visa to come to America, four and a half years under bullets in Beirut. I know how hard that is. And I respect it. And I know what the lady -- but please be assured that our team is doing everything possible, without ICANN having a flag, to make this work.

And you have my commitment on that.

And, as I hand the microphone to my colleague, Chris Disspain, to talk about the CCWG, I made some comments yesterday in the CCWG room that I want now to underline with something very important.

We -- all of us, board, staff -- are 100% committed and rooted in our work in the bottom-up multistakeholder work that is happening now.

Our raison d'etre and how we can stand in front of the world and say we did our job as staff to facilitate this process or as a board to enable that process is by fully respecting the

multistakeholder process and how it's working. Participating in it, as individuals did from our board yesterday, is to strengthen it, not to weaken it. Laying out the risks that we see forward as staff, as facilitators, is to strengthen. And because we believe in the process we do it. But this is not to take away anything from the bottom-up nature that we respect and that makes us who we are. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Fadi.

And, Kavouss, I just wanted to acknowledge the extraordinary effort that you've made as one of the GAC representatives in the CCWG and your willingness to engage with all of us to try and find a solution. And to say that I think everyone is being heard, including you. And that what you said just now is effectively what you said this morning. I think everyone's taken that on board and is working with it to come to a consensus-based solution. So thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you very much. We should go to our remote question and then back here.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question or comment from Mr. Harol Arcos at the video hub in Internauta Venezuela. Mr. Arcos.

REMOTE HUB: Good afternoon. We are saying hello from the Bolivarian University of Venezuela in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

We would like to thank the participation for this interactive hub and also to take advantage of having this connection. We want to contribute our concerns.

We would like to express our support to what Sergio Salinas from Argentina has said about how ICANN released the domain to the British Malvinas Islands. So you are taking part -- because of this fact, are you taking part within a political aspect that has not been defined and is currently in a dispute. Based on what United Nations says, this is an illegal fact.

A proposal from Argentina is then to establish a working group so as to review the situation as soon as possible so as not to be in danger and not to repeat these mistakes in the future in ICANN. This is how we see it. And this is why we are supporting this vision and the proposal of generating this working space.

Additionally, when we talk about the IANA stewardship transition, we would like to call to your attention the new

relations that are resulting from the service providers, those that manage the resources, and the users.

Because we are worried that -- because we see that the concept of being citizenship -- of being a citizen is deleted when we talk about contracts. Contracts that you have to adhere to is like being in a parking lot or similar.

[timer sounds]

The citizens included in contract should be reviewed so that -- we propose to generate a working group so that, within the legal framework, all citizens around the world, all users around the world should not be affected. And their basic rights should not be affected because they are recognized internationally.

And, if they accept this contract with the corporation, with a domicile outside a country where the services is provided would help rule that contract.

So this should be included in the IANA stewardship transition process. Because this whole process where we are reviewing the protocols may help establish new relationships with users and give rise to the Internet all of us want.

Finally, we have a question. Because this morning -- we understood that we are working in a multistakeholder model. So we would like to ask ourselves, all of us, why don't we use a

similar mechanism to choose a CEO so that it should not be a restricted space limited to receiving emails? All stakeholders may then contribute to the list of criteria and to the nominees.

Once again, thank you very much to the world community. We are working for a safe, stable, reliable, and free Internet. Hi to everybody from Caracas, Venezuela.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I believe you had a comment.

GONZALO NAVARRO: It's Gonzalo Navarro speaking. I assume I have to give an answer in Spanish. Thank you very much for the comments. If I understood correctly, we may -- we may have three different answers.

The first of these answers is I understand the problem of the Malvinas Islands and Falkland Islands have not been mentioned by Sergio Salinas. This was mentioned by Sergio last meeting, and I think that that topic may be raised after the meeting. So one would rather wait and listen to Sergio before saying something in that respect.

Secondly, if I understood correctly what you were saying, ICANN has a multistakeholder model that represents that possibility

that any constituency or any individual willing to participate and willing to contribute may do so in that respect. I think this is something that is in place.

But, of course, we may stress the need to have more information in this respect.

And I commit myself to do that.

We may talk about this offline.

And, with respect to the election of the CEO, we held a session where George Sadowsky, who is the chairman of the committee for searching for the new CEO, he mentioned the guidelines for the community so that the community may express an opinion regarding the CEO.

I think that we may understand -- you may understand that, as it happens in other international organizations, we have to set a criteria for the participation of everybody.

And we are ensuring that this is secure within this model. How you may make your contributions, how you may make your voice be heard.

But there is a general agreement that everyone around the world may participate voting in an international CEO or voting for an international president. I think that this should not be the

case, because it's difficult for me to understand how we might put that into practice. But there are certainly ways and methods to contribute to the committee. And the committee -- I'm not part of that committee. But the committee said that it would be an open process where all the stakeholders may participate.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you very much, Gonzalo, for that. Thank you for your patience.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Suzanne. I am able to stand here. I wouldn't have been able to stand for this long two years ago. Accessibility must be considered for access to the line. There must be a seat available.

Going to the issues that have been put forward, my name is Alejandro Pisanty. I'm a professor at the National University of Mexico, a former board member, and chair of ISOC Mexico.

First, though this may sound dissonant, I want to commend Fadi, ICANN management, and staff for their efforts in compensating for the difficulties with visas in every country where ICANN meets. I've been accompanied to the effort in Mexico meeting in 2009. And it's a really very difficult test. In particular, I want to commend ICANN's continued commitment

to going to countries where most people can be admitted and where no people are barred because of their genetics, which does happen.

On the IANA transition, there has to be a better -- in the coming steps, getting into some more detail, I would appeal to the Board and all other communities to spell out in more detail the failure modes that you're looking at when you speak about capture and other risks.

There is a risk of capture by astroturfing. This is an English word which means artificially seeming that you have a popular or grassroots community which is actually sent out by a company or a country. These kind of models have to be considered with some care.

Accountability is not ownership. Accountability is the ability to say that you are doing the work that you should do to the people that have charged you with it. Effectiveness is the number one accountability that ICANN and IANA have to present to the world. You may be perfectly transparent, but nobody can buy you a drink. Nobody can get you a bottle of water when you're dying. You still have to be accountable for effectiveness. Keep it simple. Avoid being strapped -- sorry -- (indiscernible) like having the IRPs freeze the whole of IANA when it's only about one number or name. That kind of detail has to be done.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you very much, Alex, for that. We're running short on time. So I'm closing the queue, closing the mic line. But next, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. My name is Seun Ojedeji. I work for Federal University of Oye Ekiti. I'm a member of CWG, but I'm speaking on my personal.

So, in a public forum like this in Singapore, I and some other people came to the floor and asked the question about the Board's view on the numbers and protocol proposals that were submitted to ICG. Your response was that there's no significant issue about those proposals. And I think the Board, perhaps, from me got an applause for that.

However, after that meeting, we all know that there was some interesting surprises that came. We could -- that was variable because of CCWG. We're still preparing a proposal, so there was still time.

However, right now there is no time.

So I will put the question to the Board right now: Do you have any issue with the CWG proposal that has been submitted to the ICG? Could you respond to that, please? Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Steve, I'm looking to you to comment on the question.

The answer is no.

STEVE CROCKER: Mike first, and then I'll comment.

MIKE SILBER: I think the answer, Seun, is it's not really up to us. It's up to the ICG now. What we do or say at the moment is of very little significance. I wish the community sometimes would regard us that way a little more often. The ICG has the difficult task of putting this all together. It's not us.

STEVE CROCKER: I'll just add to that. We're not -- we don't have any heartburn here at the Board. We're watching the process coming together. We see the proposals from three operational communities. We understand that the ICG now has the task of knitting them together and harmonizing.

There's some small differences. We hope that everybody's able to work that out very smoothly. We're quite comfortable.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you.

And next, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek, VeriSign and chair of the registry stakeholder group. I'm not here to advocate any position or get into any specifics or recommendations about the work of the CCWG accountability. But I would like to, perhaps, reflect on the work of the last week and the work of the last many months.

But, first, I think we do need to congratulate the naming community for coming together around the CWG transition. All five chartering organizations unanimously supported the recommendation that has now been submitted to the ICG and the numbering and the protocol parameters communities have been patiently waiting since January. And I think this is a momentous day in that all three of the operational communities have come together to submit the proposals.

And, in the words of one of the cochairs of the ICG, the ICG is now on the clock.

So congratulations to the whole community.

On the accountability --

STEVE CROCKER: Just a second. Yes.

[Applause]

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Steve. So, on the accountability process, I'd like to take a moment to thank Fadi directly for the clarifying remarks that he just made regarding the commitment to the multistakeholder process. And I would like to note that what is happening right now is the multistakeholder process at work successfully working towards consensus.

I made comments on Sunday at the session with Secretary Strickling and the panel speaking about ICANN accountability, the history.

And I said at that time that I was confident that the work of the CCWG accountability would result in a proposal that meets the needs of the community based on bottom-up multistakeholder consensus processes, meet the five criteria outlined by NTIA, and get it done on time.

I felt confident about that then. I feel more confident about that today, a week later. Less than a week later. So Jordan Carter made some excellent remarks a little while ago, and I fully support and endorse everything he said. But optimistically, you know, he gave some cautionary tone about timing and the need

to focus and the recognition that the timeline is critical. And I completely agree with that.

But the CCWG accountability is hard at work. I sense there is good will among all participants to get it done, to reach compromise, to reach consensus. And that's the work that we're doing. We made progress this week. We'll make more progress in the next two weeks. We'll make more progress in Paris in the middle of July, and I believe we will get this done. Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you, Keith, and thanks for being -- for your service on the ICG. You're right, you're on the clock. Next, please.

JIA HE:

Jia He, ICANN fellow. I'm on the learning process as a newcomer and I followed accountability sessions a lot this time. From my observation, besides the proposal itself, efficiency and trust are very important and they should be enhanced, from my point of view. Why? Because ICANN is the player to coordinate global Internet critical resources in Internet ecosystem. We hope ICANN can coordinate it efficiently. It is not efficient to fire or recall ICANN Board because of each bad policy decision made by ICANN Board. It is costly on time and money. CCWG should clarify that in which situation the community can use the power

to fire and recall the Board member or the whole Board and make the ICANN system more efficiently for global Internet communities.

Additionally, I think efficiency is based on the trust. The accountability mechanism or any empowered community model we are designing should not make ICANN Board lost the trust from communities. Otherwise, why do we need ICANN Board?

And another thing I want to mention is about translation. I'm a Chinese, and I notice that not too much Chinese people speak in the microphone because while the reason is that we have language problems. Even me. I can speak English, but I cannot understand too the whole -- sorry, the whole content of our meetings. I always feel lost in the meetings. Even though I followed the accountability meetings a lot, but I lost it. Even though I have some background of it, but I also lost it. Because I found that there are few translations in the -- in the accountability sessions.

[Timer sounds]

So -- sorry -- in order to have more Chinese community engagement, I hope we can improve the Chinese language or the other languages a lot. Thanks.

[Applause]

KUO-WEI WU: I would like to answer your question, and actually in the public forum you can actually use English because we have interpreters and I can understand Chinese. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: First of all, sorry, I can't speak in Chinese, but I just want to say, thank you for having the courage to stand up and speak. Thank you. Thank you for coming to your first ICANN meeting. I hope you come to many, many more. I don't know, you said your English wasn't good. I don't know what would be good English. This is pretty impressive. Thank you. I want to propose something to the Chinese community that is starting to coalesce and come to ICANN meetings. And I will encourage my staff to help with that. Maybe we should have, either pre-meeting or during the meeting, a chance for our staff to brief Chinese speakers at our meetings in more detail as to what is happening at the meeting. Maybe some special guidance because of, like you said, it's not just language, it's context. It's understanding what is going on. We welcome you here. We're very happy you're here. You should know that. And we will do our part, and I will talk to staff about what we can do to aid you to be more effective at the meeting. Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, thank you. And I think Mike had a comment.

MIKE SILBER: Suze, thank you. The one thing that I would really encourage is non-native English speakers to make us native English speakers do some of the hard work for a change. We have fantastic translation facilities and we're really trying our best to improve the translation services at the meetings. So please, feel free to use your native language. And let us do the reading and let us put the -- on the headphones for a change so that you're comfortable in communicating using your native tongue.

I wanted to just respond on one issue, where there was a comment made about spilling the ICANN Board around making bad policy. And I couldn't let that go, because if the ICANN Board starts making policy, then we should be spilt. Because the ICANN Board is not here to make policy. This community is here to make policy.

[Applause]

UZANNE WOOLF: Thank you, Mike. And you're our last speaker. Sebastien, we closed the line ten minutes ago, but there will be another session, so please come back then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'll be the first in the next line.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck from ACT, but speaking on my own behalf. I think we underestimate the value of the public forum as an accountability mechanism because I suspect about this time every three months it would be pretty easy to convince the Board to just resign. So I don't know why we make such a big deal about it. And I do support Fadi's recommendation of doing more briefings. I think contextualization and also decreasing the size and tidbits of information associated with different policies is going to be the key to better participation and periodic participation that is part of the community accountability that we often hear about.

What I came up to respond to though was Fadi's comment about the lobbying. I guess if there is another step that could be taken, it might actually be coordination. I mean, I know that we worked very hard to make sure that this transition was politically acceptable in Washington. Others in the room did as well. And so it may be taking a few leaders in the community and incorporating them in the meetings with your lobbyists or even taking them on meetings with them to lend credibility to the meetings. You know, so incorporating the community into

your lobbying efforts might be the next step to take beyond just the legal reporting.

So I just wanted to follow up -- because it looks like Rick has gone. I wanted to follow up as sort of the next step of transparency may just be cooperation in that area. But I -- as I was coming up, I heard something else, and I really feel that I need to say something about it. As we have all these discussions about trust and everything like that, with Alejandro's comments, Chris' comments after the, you know, public comments to the CCWG transition proposal, and Fadi's comments the other day, all three made mention to some form of special interests. And I think that that's a very dangerous dialogue to be having in this context. Everyone has been engaged very long hours and very transparently in this discussion and are making their case in a very public way about what kind of accountability they think is necessary. So I think these oblique references to special interests, interests inside the U.S., and then astroturfing are very deleterious to the effort that we're all trying to proceed with, and I think they're divisive and I think they are a dangerous conversation to have and I think you guys should quit saying that. Thanks.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Just saying thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: And that -- that's actually the end of this block. Thank you -- thanks to everybody for your comments, and I guess Steve is up next.

STEVE CROCKER: Yep. Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Suzanne. We're going to take a short break, but before we do, I'd like to acknowledge some folks who are too often unrecognized. We've all noticed the booths at the side of the room, but a few -- but few of us have met the interpreters who work in those booths. Nor do we fully understand their very vital function, even as they try to understand us. So let's take a quick look inside those booths.

[VIDEO PLAYING]

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ – Director, ICANN Language Services: People in the audience have really very little idea about what goes on in the booth. We have a total of 32 interpreters. It's a high-pressure job, by all means. What goes on in the booth is very intense. It's exhausting.

YULIYA TSAPLINA – ICANN RUSSIAN Interpreter Team Member: Interpreters do not just translate words. Otherwise, it would have been automated a long time ago. We only render ideas, which means that in order

for us to interpret, we need to first understand what is being said. And that requires a great deal of preparation and really focusing on the task at hand.

IHAB ZAKI – ARABIC Interpreter Team Member: It is one of the most amazing things that the brain can do. And you have to practice to do it. Somehow it becomes very natural after a little bit because you automatically don't think anymore. You know, it comes in, sifts, and goes out from the other way, right away in the other language, without having to stop and think.

YULIYA TSAPLINA – ICANN RUSSIAN Interpreter Team Member: All the technical terms that we have to learn for ICANN, all the acronyms, and oftentimes ICANN is an alphabet soup. All that makes our job significantly more difficult because we need to prepare so much for every event.

IHAB ZAKI – ARABIC Interpreter Team Member: Yes, it does take some studying, some rehearsal, some sitting at home and going through them, practicing them, trying them in front of the mirror, in front of somebody who helps you, until you start getting used to them.

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ – Director, ICANN Language Services: Well, we have two people in most of the languages; however, there are certain languages that require three persons in the booth.

YULIYA TSAPLINA – ICANN RUSSIAN Interpreter Team Member: What we do requires a great deal of focus and concentration, like I said earlier, and so, the

human mind can't really do that for an extended period of time. We work in 20- to 30-minute shifts, depending upon the complexity of the assignment, and so we switch every half hour.

I do love my job. I think it is one of the most interesting things in the world and it is definitely the most interesting thing that I could have found for myself.

IHAB ZAKI – ARABIC Interpreter Team Member: You're traveling the world, you're meeting fascinating people, you're learning fascinating subjects, you are interacting with the most wonderful human beings around the globe in every aspect. It's just -- it has all the ingredients, and you get paid for it. So what more do you want?

Goodbye.

[Applause]

[Standing ovation]

STEVE CROCKER: We're going to take a quick break. Return in about ten minutes. Please do come back. Thank you.

[BREAK]

VOG: Ladies and gentlemen would you place your seats in order for the Public Forum to begin. Once again, lots more questions and answers.

Time to take your seats so that we can get our Public Forum section to begin.

Thank you.

We'd like to begin our Public Forum. We've got a lot of work to get done. If you would all be kind enough to take your seats. We can get the Board in their positions, and we can start our meeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We would like to get our next section of the program started to give you all the time that you need for your questions and to receive answers.

Once again, please take your seats so that we can begin.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: ICANN board members. Calling all ICANN board members.

VOG: Ladies and gentlemen I would like to introduce once again ICANN Board Chair Stephen Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

Before we take up the rest of the business in this Public Forum, we are going to look ahead a little bit and have a presentation on the next meeting place in Dublin -- Dublin, Ireland -- for ICANN 54. Our host for the meeting is INEX. For those unfamiliar with INEX, it's a not-for-profit association that provides technical platform over which traffic is exchanged over various Internet networks; that is, it's an Internet exchange.

As a preview of ICANN 54, I would like to introduce INEX CEO Barry Rhodes, who will in turn introduce us to Ambassador Justin Harman, Ireland's ambassador to Argentina.

Barry.

BARRY RHODES: Let me begin by saying how much I enjoyed the past five days in ICANN's public meeting, particularly as this is my first visit to Buenos Aires.

It's been a pleasure for me to meet many of you who have stopped by the ICANN stand. My colleague, Angela Butler from the .IE domain registry, and I have been overwhelmed by your enthusiasm for the October ICANN meeting in Dublin, and I'm delighted to see so many of you wearing our lucky shamrock pins showing your support.

I'm chief executive of INEX, Ireland's Internet exchange, and our association is extremely proud to be hosting the first ever ICANN meeting in Ireland.

We will do our very best to make this a great meeting.

The convention center Dublin where the meetings will be held is a brand-new conference facility in the heart of the city, just 20 minutes or so from Dublin airport. An iconic building, its atrium is six floors high and overlooks the River Liffey.

The delegate hotels are located within five to 20 minutes' walk from the convention center, and the whole riverside area offers a wide choice of restaurants, coffee houses, and bars.

An important point that I know you will approve of, INEX, with the assistance of other sponsors, will be hosting a gala night, which we aim to make a memorable experience for all attending.

[Cheers and Applause]

Here is a small taste of what awaits you when you come to meet us in Ireland.

[VIDEO PLAYING]

[Applause]

BARRY RHODES:

As Ireland's Internet peering exchange, INEX has witnessed the many benefits of the expanding Internet usage throughout our country.

Our members are a mix of the local Internet service providers from large international players through rural fixed wireless providers, and some of the largest national and international content providers.

For those of you planning to attend ICANN 54 in October, INEX wishes to show you the best that Ireland has to offer.

I want to assure you that Ireland is very welcoming of all conference delegates, and whilst most delegates will not require visas to visit Dublin, if your country does, then please go through the formal process as soon as possible so that we and the ICANN staff are able to assist you in you encounter any issues.

And if there is any other way that we can help make your trip successful and memorable, do please make contact with us.

I now have the immense pleasure of introducing you to the Irish ambassador to Argentina, Justin Harman, who is here to extend the official invite for you all to come and visit us at ICANN 54 in Dublin.

[Applause]

AMBASSADOR JUSTIN HARMAN: Good afternoon, Buenos Aires.

Good afternoon to the ICANN community.

Warm thanks to Barry and, indeed, to ICANN's leadership and community for giving me this chance to address you today.

First, congratulations to Buenos Aires and to our hosts in Argentina for the marvelous organization of this meeting. It is appropriate for the next meeting to take place in Ireland since our two countries, Ireland and Argentina, share many historic and contemporary ties.

I'm delighted to join INEX to officially kickstart the countdown to ICANN 54 in Dublin.

We're delighted to be welcoming the ICANN meeting and community to Ireland. We hope it's the first of many visits.

Ireland has long been known for its green landscape, its music and dance, its literary giants, its warm welcome, and, of course, the craic, which is the Gaelic word for having great fun, which, of course, we are very good at.

We have all that and more, and here is a short video of what Ireland has to offer the ICANN community.

[Video playing]

What makes Ireland great? Is it this? Or is it this?

Is it the rugged sands of ancient Eire or the (indiscernible) of computer fire. Our legion of genius (indiscernible). And then new geniuses who've never even lifted pen.

There's the (indiscernible) with the gift, the eyes with glint, the talk and the wit. Great to do business with.

People. Talent. People. Talent.

Passion. Rebellion. Innovation. Education. A famous welcome by the hundred thousand. An emerald isle.

So European, the green.

What makes Ireland great makes Ireland great for business.

AMBASSADOR JUSTIN HARMAN:

As you just saw, an amazing number of Internet businesses now call Ireland home. With great credit to our inward investment agency, IDA Ireland, nine of the top ten international Internet companies employ tens of thousands of people in Ireland.

We're especially proud that alongside these global names, Ireland boasts a thriving Internet and technology ecosystem where many innovative startups flourish.

This doesn't happen by accident. Ireland has invested heavily and over many years to support innovation and growth.

How do we do this? First of all, through IDA Ireland we support businesses to set up in Ireland as their international base. We have easy access to European Union markets, a large and experienced technology community, a multilingual workforce, the highest proportion of science and engineering graduates in the OECD, and a corporation tax rate of 12 and a half

You can see that Ireland has a lot to offer a growing business. We're very much inspired by the words of our Nobel Prize winning poet W.B. Yeats born 150 years ago this month, "Do not wait to strike till the iron is hot but make it hot by striking." And that is what Ireland has done, and it's what we will continue to do to keep our country as one of the best places in the world to live and do business in.

And if you attend ICANN 54 in Dublin and don't want to leave, we make it easy for technology professionals from around the world to live and work in Ireland.

Since 2012, we've offered what's commonly called the tech visa. This visa lets approved companies recruit from across the world and bring their employees to Ireland with minimal paperwork and delay.

So if you attend ICANN 54 and you want to make the move permanent as either a business owner or employee, Ireland can make it easy for you and support you all the way.

When you attend ICANN 54, you will be right in the heart of Ireland's Internet community. Right across the River Liffey from the convention center is where most Internet businesses are located, a place many call Silicon Docks.

We recognize ICANN's essential role in defining the future of Internet naming and numbering and how each of you tirelessly contributes to making the multistakeholder model work.

We're especially proud to be hosting ICANN at such a critical moment in its development. The world is looking on. We will do everything to make sure that we can support you in a successful and enjoyable meeting.

So I'm delighted to extend to each of you an invitation from the Irish government, from our vibrant Internet industry and from Dublin itself to join us at ICANN 54 in October. We will do everything to ensure ease of access, including through special accelerated visa arrangements.

A hundred thousand welcomes will await you.

Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Well, we unfortunately have to return to business here and complete what we have to do here before we can move on to Ireland.

We come to the third segment in the Public Forum. This is any other business.

Gonzalo Navarro will be facilitating. I don't understand why there's not a long line in front of us, but it's forming; right?

Okay.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Okay. We'll have a line in a second.

I will facilitate in this session, but in Spanish and in English as appropriate.

So we are going to start with our remote hub. So we have a question from Spain, I think?

BRAD WHITE: That's correct. We have a question from Dietmar Stefitz in the video hub in Valencia, Spain.

REMOTE HUB: Hello again from Valencia. I will speak in English and then in Spanish.

Many domainers, members of domain-in-Europe club, would like that the registrant have a free, unrestricted, usable field in their (indiscernible) registrant section.

We think this is a very fair petition because in the end, the registrant is the one who pays for the domain. It would be great that ICANN could think about it.

And now I comment in Spanish. We would like to take this opportunity to offer, through the IANA club, our support to our companies and organizations so that they can create or set up their project in our city as a pilot city.

We started working in 1974, we started working with IBM since then, and since then thousands of engineers have worked in our city.

This led to a very wide ecosystem of talents in our industry, in the I.T. industry. We use an international educational institution that has worked with Chinese organizations and it's also an example of technology in the classrooms. So we are open to any proposal.

Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much for your comment.

Board, who wants to take the first question?

Okay. We will take that as a comment and we move on to the queue.

Thank you very much again.

Thank you.

SERGIO PORTO:

I will speak Spanish. Please, your headphones.

Thank you for this opportunity for this time so that we can speak about a subject that we had been bringing up in other meetings. I am Sergio Porto. I am chair of the Argentine Internet Users Association and the Latin American Federation of Internet Users. I am a LACRALO member, and I chair the ccTLD working group in LACRALO.

I would like to give you some historic background. In 1998 -- '97, 1997, when the ccTLD table was published as part of the ISO3166, .FK was given to the Falkland Islands government or Malvinas.

In the last meeting held in Buenos Aires, we said that ICANN had no reservations in -- in some -- regarding some U.N. positions, although this table is the table used by the U.N., but the U.N. has certain reservations in terms of the Malvinas or Falkland Islands.

And ICANN said that no innovation was possible or had been possible for many years. That was the U.N. position, sorry, and ICANN did not take this into account. On the contrary, what ICANN did was to assign a ccTLD to a territory that is still being disputed when the U.N. determines that nothing can be decided on that matter. In our previous presentation --

[Timer Sounds]

-- and we're still waiting for a reply after two years' time, we requested the following. We want to have the possibility to set up a working group on this topic. This is my proposal. I hope you understood my proposal. Maybe you did not understand it last time and hence the delay in replying. Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Sergio. I believe that your proposal is better understood this time, your petition, per se.

I don't know if any -- I don't know if there's any board member that would like to reply or make a comment?

MIKE SILBER: I think there are two issues. And apologies that I'm responding in English. I think the first is that this is not a single issue rule,

but I think you're asking a more general question, which is how do we take into account the U.N. rules around disputed territories when it comes to implementation of ISO codes.

So my recommendation is that we engage with the ccNSO. And as one of the two ccNSO appointees on the board, I'll happily undertake that initial engagement.

Let's engage with the ccNSO and see if the ccNSO feels it is able to take that work forward.

If it doesn't, then it will come back to the board. Let's try and find another way to take that work forward.

The only thing is that I think we must take it forward on a general basis rather than trying to address one specific issue because I think the whole point of the multistakeholder process is to try and implement processes of generic application because this instance may be instructive and useful for other territories currently or into the future.

So, certainly I'm willing to accept that responsibility and to report back together with staff as to how we're moving forward on that process.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much for your reply. This is what we have been waiting for. So we really appreciate it, and we will continue working on this topic. Thank you very much.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Sergio.

Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I am very pleased to be able to take the floor after -- after the video on language services showcasing our interpreters because this is a tool that we do need to use since we have them here and their job is really very good.

A while ago, the topic arose in terms of how to use the different - - how to help the different language communities. Let me tell you that there is a new meetings strategy that will be in place as from next year, and specifically this meetings strategy defines two types of meetings, two types of sessions that will be run in parallel.

One of them will include the five regions and the other type of session or meeting -- sorry, it will take into account the five regions working in the five languages used within ICANN.

I think that when Fadi says that in these meetings we can address the different language communities and let them know about the main issues or core issues being discussed within ICANN is really a big step forward so that everyone can understand the discussions going on in ICANN in their own language, in their own community language. And I wanted to bring this up because this is really important. Thank you very much.

PHILIP CORWIN:

I'm Philip Corwin. I'm making this statement as counsel to the domain investors and developers of the Internet Commerce Association.

When the board met with the GNSO Council on Sunday, you heard strong expressions of concern from many councillors regarding the decision of GDD staff to propose that the PDDRP and especially the URS be the starting point for the renewal of legacy gTLD agreements.

They felt that this action amounts to repudiation of the community's understanding, that the question of whether the RPMs would apply to legacy TLDs in the more than 140 domains would be settled through a PDP and that this action amounted to de facto consensus policy through the contracting process in violation of the bylaws.

Similar the concern -- the comments just filed in the disclosed form for .TRAVEL's renewal were overwhelmingly against this action and in favor of taking those RPMs out of the contracts.

The concern, of course, is that the same staff who made the decision to propose these RPMs in the RAs will be the ones to review and react to the comments.

Another concern is that GDD staff may already be planning to advocate turning the URS into a UDRP on steroids. On June 17th, the "World Trademark Review" reported that a senior GDD manager told an audience in Hamburg, Germany, that suggestions that the remedy be changed from suspension to transfer, quote, will be considered in the next round, unquote. Yet, we have not even had the policy staff issue reports on the RPMs. And the decision of whether any of them should be changed is one that is for the community to make, not staff.

I.P. interests have suggested a variety of changes to the URS that would convert it from a narrow supplement to the UDRP into a version of the UDRP on steroids with very limited due process rights for registrants.

Certainly trademark interests might have adequate means to deal with infringement, but their rights must be balanced against those of registrants.

So I have two requests for the board. The first is to make a commitment to the community that any further alterations of the new gTLD RPMs will be made through a standard PDP with the entire community involved because we're far past the implementation stage. And it's now clear that these decisions will implicate legacy top-level domains as well.

Second, if GDD staff go ahead and finalize the contracts with those RPMs, I would like the board to take an up-and-down vote on approving those contracts. I believe the board needs to own that decision and in that way indicate whether you believe the staff action is or is not acceptable. Thank you very much for considering my suggestions.

[Applause]

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much.

We will take those suggestions. Thanks.

Brad, we have a question?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have an online question from Aaron Pace with Dotless. All the short, good, new gTLD extensions that people would be willing to pay for have already been allocated. With that said,

the next round will most likely be specifically for, quote, brand owners and trademark holders, end quote only. Is there any clarification to when the, quote, brand owners' round will be?

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you. I think that we covered that question in the previous session about new gTLDs, so I think that we should not go there again.

Mark. I'm sorry, gentleman at the right.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? This is Seun Ojedeji from Nigeria speaking on behalf of myself.

I just checked my Ireland consulate in Nigeria, and they mentioned that to get a visa I should apply 12 weeks prior to the events.

So while it's good to hear from the ambassador about the speech, when to apply, it's also good to also let you know about the realities that some of us would have.

My second comment is in relation to the fact that post-transition, some of these accountability reforms that have been recommended once implemented, we obviously require that

diversity within the community is assured. We don't want a situation whereby the community, in quotes, gets captured.

And I hope that the board is also going to increase its efforts to ensure that the community views are represented in diverse ways because all of us within this community don't have equal access to resources to participate. So it's important that you include the support that will ensure that people with limited would also be able to participate and make their views known.

[Timer sounds.]

My third comment is that, please, let's not have any more surprises from Marrakech. Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much.

Mark? Sorry.

FADI CHEHADE: Sorry, Gonzalo.

Just to assure the community that we have very good coordination occurring right now with our Moroccan community, with the Moroccan government. We met -- they came here. The minister sent a special envoy to meet with us

here to ensure. We have very good coordination with the community and the government.

So right now all plans are moving forward towards Marrakech. Of course, things do happen and hopefully nothing will happen, but our planning and our coordination is early and is working very well so that we can have a very successful meeting with you in Marrakech.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Fadi.

Mark?

MARK CARVELL: Good afternoon. My name is Mark Carvell. I represent United Kingdom and its overseas territories on the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC.

I regret that I'm required to take up time from this important public forum to respond regarding the allocation of country codes for the Falkland Islands and South Georgia.

The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia, and South Sandwich Islands and their surrounding maritime areas. Nor about the island is right to decide their own future, the right of self-determination

as enshrined in the U.N. charter and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights.

The Falkland Islanders have stated they wish to remain an overseas territory of the United Kingdom.

In the referendum on the islands held in 2013, 99.8% of those who voted wanted to maintain their current status as a territory of the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom's relationship with the Falkland Islands and all its overseas territories is a modern one based on partnership, shared values, and the right of the people of each territory to determine their own future.

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the previous interventions on this matter. Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Mark.

[Applause]

Madam, you can go.

YOUNG EUM LEE: My name is Young Eum Lee, ccNSO Council from .KR but speaking on my own behalf.

Like most of the people here, I would also like to express my great appreciation to everyone that worked so hard to lead the first solid stepping stone towards a true globalization of the Domain Name System based on the multistakeholder model. And I'm truly grateful that Fadi was here with us to provide full support during his process.

My statement actually is about the composition of the IANA functions review team of the CWG proposal, especially with regard to the CC representatives. I fully support the principle of designating one member to represent the ccTLDs that are not a member of the ccNSO because I know that such a mechanism is important to build up a welcome atmosphere and ensure the participation of the ccTLDs that are currently not members. And I'm hopeful that such a mechanism will maybe even encourage them to join the ccNSO because I think that the interoperability and consensus-building spirit of ICANN will be enhanced by encouraging those CCs to become a member of ICANN.

However, I'm worried that it could also work to discourage them to participate because since there are so many more ccNSO members able to serve compared to the non-ccNSO members.

And during the ccNSO meeting here, we did discuss the possibility of adjusting the composition of the IFR, possibly because it may not adequately reflect the ratio. But I would

especially like to stress that we rethink the two ccNSO member and one -- I mean, non-ccNSO member -- ccTLD rule as early as possible.

[Timer sounds.]

At least to make the one non-ccNSO -- ccTLD member rule become an option rather than a mandate and hope that the ccTLD can build up enough trust in a global ICANN to come together as one. Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Young Eum, thank you. You raise an interesting -- you raise an interesting point. I think we should bear in mind that there are a number of ccTLD managers who, although they're not members of the ccNSO, do participate in the ccNSO. And, indeed, the ccNSO chair of the committee was a non-member of the ccNSO but nonetheless participated.

But I think your point about making it optional rather than mandatory is an interesting one, and obviously it's something

that needs to be discussed in the ccNSO. So thank you for raising it.

MIKE SILBER: If I can add to that, I think the composition of some of these panels hopefully will get a little more attention because I'm inclined to go even a little further than Chris in that some of these panels, I think may not be -- while I think the purpose is well understood, I think the design and composition may be a little bit like an elephant being designed by a committee.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Gonzalo.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Michael Palage, Pharos Global. I would like to speak on the topic of the URS and its potential incorporation into legacy gTLD operator contracts. There was recently a closed public forum in connection with the .TRAVEL registry incorporating this RPM. In the interest of openness and transparency, they are not a client. This is just someone speaking on behalf of other registries that may be impacted by this precedent that the board may take.

I agree with a lot of the comments that Phil Corwin had spoke about earlier about needing to involve the multistakeholder process where you are mandating something upon a registry. I think that's an important safeguard that has been enshrined in ICANN's operations for the last 15 years.

But I think this needs to be distinguished --

[Timer sounds.]

That was a quick two minutes.

[Laughter]

GONZALO NAVARRO: No, no. Go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE: If I can, I think this needs to be distinguished with what is happening here with .TRAVEL. Here a registry operator is basically proposing to incorporate something. And the reason that this is significant has to do with sort of a unique nuance of U.S. trademark law. Under 15 U.S.C. 1114, Section 32, there is a safe harbor provision that basically registries, registrars, and registration authorities can avoid liability in connection with a domain name dispute if they have a reasonable policy.

Now, what has happened over the last 15 years which I think is a good thing is 15 years ago a reasonable policy for a registry operator was down here. It was known as the UDRP.

In the last couple of years, we've now seen heightened policies, URS, mandatory sunrises, PIC DRPs, other things.

So the idea that a legacy operator would want to raise its policies to be deemed reasonable with his peers in the community is a good thing. And I do not think it would be in ICANN's best interest to interfere with a registry operator implementing a provision that potentially could safeguard it from liability. So I think this is important.

I guess my ask here of the board is, I know a lot has changed since my time on the board. Previously any type of contract renewal with a registry operator would require a briefing memo.

If, in fact, the .TRAVEL contract does require a briefing memo, I would hope that this particular legal issue is taken into account because it is significant, as I said, not for this TLD registry operator but my other clients that may want to sit there and afford itself of this important legal protection.

Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Mike. I think that we are just closing the queue, in case that you want to join, and we are going to extend this session up to 5:40, because we started late 10 minutes.

So Brad, we have a question?

BRAD WHITE: We have a question on line from Paul Foody.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: ICANN has raised 58 million from 13 contention set auctions it has so far resolved. As there were 233 contention sets, of which only 29 remain unresolved.

What action, if any, has ICANN taken to calculate the total sums changing hands in other resolved contention sets, and what efforts have been made to determine how much of that money went to bodies with ICANN connections?

For example, Rightside, which I understand was previously United TLD Holdco Ltd., which applied for 26 TLDs, list their on line accounts gain on other assets net due to payments received in exchange for withdrawals of our interest in certain gTLD applications of 4.2 million in 2013, 22.1 million in 2014, with a further 7.2 million reported for the first quarter of 2015, totaling 33.5 million.

Can ICANN confirm this information is correct and, if so, provide the names of the TLD contention sets Rightside withdrew from to make over \$30 million gain?

Or failing that, simply how many contention sets Rightside have so far withdrawn from?

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Mr. Foody. I think that that's a really specific question to --

Akram?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Hello?

Yes. I think that it's important to note that there are -- the auctions that ICANN performed as an auction of last resort to facilitate resolution of contention sets were -- the funds from those auctions were put on the side in a fund separate from ICANN operation and they were not given back to any of the applicants.

So the contention sets that were resolved outside of ICANN, we have no information on how they were resolved or what are the - - if there was any settlement on those. We have no information on that.

Regarding the information on Rightside and how many -- and how many withdrawals they did, all this information is available on the new gTLD Web site where you can go and search on the applicant and find out what the status of each application is. Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Akram. Bruce, do you want to...

That's fine. Thank you. Please go ahead.

KRISHNA KUMAR RAJAMANNAR: Hello. Krishna from India. Second-time fellow. This question is to Fadi.

I've been following your speeches and this is with reference to the one that you made in Columbia (indiscernible) on the future of multistakeholder Internet governance.

You said Internet governance needs an overhaul and new methods to be brought in, and you are tired with the usage of the words "multistakeholder" and "multilateral" labels, and you also emphasized on the need for a polycentric model of governance, and this left me confused because when I finally thought I figured out multistakeholder model of governance, I mean, we are already talking about a new form of governance.

My question is: Is a polycentric approach an upgraded 2.0 version of multistakeholder model or is it all new? And if it is all new, what is the key difference that you find between these two models?

And this is a significant question because you explained to us on how long it took to get governments to endorse the multistakeholder model and now you are talking about a whole new model.

Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you so much for your question, and sorry you have to follow my speeches, but I appreciate your question.

Let me just clarify.

My comment on the labels was because much of the debate has moved to labels, as opposed to substance. So I was making the comment that instead of spending time fighting, "I belong to this label and you belong to this label," and governments feel that they have to fight with us over the meaning of the label -- we've had people from different governmental organizations say they're multistakeholder.

So labeling is a terrible way to collaborate.

So I was inviting people at this university event in New York to get away from labels.

As to your question regarding is polycentric a new version of multistakeholderism, these are two completely different things, right?

Multistakeholder is an approach. In fact, I would almost argue it's a spirit. It's a way of doing things, of working together, of bringing all voices to the decision-making process.

Polycentrism, which is a new label we are using or a new model we're discussing, is still very early in its definition and there are now a couple of scholars working on it, and just keep watching for the academic as well as policy environment to continue to define what is polycentrism.

But without too many labels, it simply means highly distributed. Highly distributed as opposed to centralized. Because we don't believe centralizing Internet governance solves anything. Distributing it keeps it light, keeps it nimble, and keeps the focus on solutions that serve the users rather than solutions that serve the big players who can afford to be at a global level. Thanks.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thanks. Please. Go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: (Speaking in a non-English language). So I'm not going to confuse our translators any more.

No, I just wanted to say on behalf of the relatively small Irish community within ICANN, that I want to thank the meetings team and the board and staff for choosing Dublin as a venue. With our recent joining of the GAC and Ireland's technology sector is exploding, I think it's a very apt time to be coming to Dublin and I hope that everybody that comes will have a great time. It's a fantastic city. I live in Dublin myself and I hope that everybody has a really great time in October.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much.

Please, sir, go ahead.

JORGE CARCAVALLO: Hi. My name is Jorge Carcavallo. I am from Buenos Aires, living 25 years in Brazil. I'm so happy because I was waiting 15 years to be here again.

I leave my career in ICT innovation to go to work with the bottom of the bottom of the bottom of the society parameter, the people with disability. 1,000 million people around the

world. 80% of them are either unemployment, disemployment, subemployment, poverty, and misery.

This affects 3,000 million people. 1 million with disability. Father, mother, brother, any combination of two, and the professionals.

Most of the problems are a communication and information problem. I will make -- give you an example.

The next year will be the 10th anniversary of the Declaration of the Rights of the People with Disability. I would like to know how many of you know this declaration.

So how will humanity respect the rights and necessities of half of humanity if they don't know access at convention?

So I'm very sorry. I'm very nervous to be here. Many committees received me. They are fantastic, from disability and civil society, human rights, and I'm doing one thing for myself. I assume the responsibility.

I decide to invite ICANN to lead the bill force task --

[Timer sounds]

-- a mega force task of the ICT community to work in a big scale with the disability community to start to build the mega innovative tools the community need.

I have a simple paper I will leave with your team, Carole, and I'm very appreciate to be with you. I hope to be in Dublin and I hope to be in the last meeting in Africa.

Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Gracias.

[Applause]

We have one online question.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Kieren McCarthy.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Following Mr. Chehade's comments about all of ICANN's lobbying information being available, I have looked and all I can find is a small section in ICANN's tax form which says, quote, the organization utilized the services of a staff registered lobbyist and two government affairs firms during the year ended June 30, 2014, for a cost of \$576,138.

Could you please name the staff registered lobbyist and the two government affairs firms so we are able to see what records exist under their names with respect to ICANN?

GONZALO NAVARRO: Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: We'll send the answer by email and help him find the links.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Okay. Thank you. Elliot?

ELLIOT NOSS: Elliot Noss with Tucows.

I would also like to speak about the URS.

Mike Palage makes a very good point. He describes well the danger in rights mechanisms being negotiated directly between GDD staff and a registry, especially as it relates to the large legacy TLDs.

The new gTLDs will compete directly with a very specific string like .TRAVEL but that is not the case for the existing I believe north of a hundred million registrants who are not subject to U.S. trademark law other than through the provision of rights mechanisms that are contained in the registry agreements.

We do not want to make a slippery slope. Rights protection mechanisms for the legacy TLDs especially are a matter for the community to decide, not any national government.

And what I would like is to hear from board and staff that they will make sure that GDD staff is instructed on that.

And it is also a great opportunity to use this as a lever to finally bring the UDRP more formally into the fold, look at review and look at contracts.

The UDRP is generally a very big success. It also has some real problems, and we should be looking at those just like any other important mechanism that we do inside of the ICANN world. Thank you.

[Applause]

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Elliot.

Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah. Simply to say that what you and Michael Palage earlier said is spot on. We -- I will take this to heart with Akram and the team to make sure we -- for example, Michael's idea of briefing memos, so that we do things with clarity I think is a good one. Let me follow up with the team and I owe you and Michael clarity on that. Thanks.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Fadi. Thank you, Elliot. Sorry. Akram.

WERNER STAUB: Werner Staub --

AKRAM ATALLAH: Apologize. Just one clarification.

We do deliver briefing memos on every contract before we actually sign it, and so I just want to make sure that everybody knows that this is a practice that continues to happen and that we, you know, will not -- I will not comment on negotiation with other parties on their contract here. So thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you. Werner?

WERNER STAUB: Yeah. Werner Staub, making this as a personal comment.

It's about the ICANN Web site. You know, this is a huge undertaking. This is a lot of effort because the community depends on it. And it has been improved over time, but unfortunately as with all improvements, you know, sometimes you make steps backward.

And if you look at the URLs of the ICANN Web site, just to give one example, we've made a couple of steps backward.

I can read a URL, for instance, here. It's about the page for correspondence.

It's called www.icann.org/resources/pages/correspondence-2012-09-24-EN. That's the main page. That's the landing page where we're supposed to find the correspondence, and it actually has happened to most of the pages.

Some people who know more about the ICANN Web site know there are a couple of shortcuts, if they happen to know that you could go icann.org/correspondence, you would get there. I suppose many people here actually do this.

But most people on the outside have no idea that there's such a shortcut.

We should look at the usability of the ICANN Web site, not just for the URLs. There are a couple of other ones. Some of the ones that are just trends and we should actually resist it, such as putting everything into PDFs. For some people, it is extremely difficult --

[Timer sounds]

-- to use the PDFs. For instance, people with hearing -- with reading problems want to listen to it. The PDF is not going to read it in the correct order because it's -- you know, it cannot distinguish the columns from lines.

And finally, we've got new opportunities where we could actually help people get access to the incredibly good material that we have, such as the audio and the transcription that we have here. If we match them by timestamp, they would become much more useful.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you. Brad, we have one more --

BRAD WHITE: We have a query from Natalie Coupet.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: U.N. interpreters translation guidelines are not implemented. Could we have a time line when they will be fully implemented? Can you also explain the mechanisms in place to ensure timely translations?

GONZALO NAVARRO: Does staff want to take that?

FADI CHEHADE: If the person could send us a little bit more detail as to what he or she has in mind --

>> (Off microphone.)

FADI CHEHADE: It's a she. Natalie. If Natalie could send us some detail, be happy to respond to her, but I am not sure specifically what she has in mind.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much.

PAUL ZAMEK: Hi. I'm Paul Zamek. I'm with Dot Music Limited. Constantine has already submitted a comment on our behalf electronically but it was submitted too late so I'd like to just address this in this particular session.

Just to provide some context, I would like to state that Dot Music is the community applicant for .MUSIC that will shortly be under CPE. We're very happy and very privileged and very proud to state that we have -- at the moment our community application currently has the support of relevant music organizations that represent over 95% of all music consumed globally, and

appropriate safeguards, including meaningful music tailored copyright provisions, to protect the global music community which is probably under siege as you guys probably know. It's -- everything's changed.

So it's been a really fantastic couple of days here in Buenos Aires. We'd like to thank you very much for all the positive things that have been happening. We're thrilled with the way things are going. We're very confident. We're very happy. Can't wait for Ireland. I had a chance to meet with Barry, and as you can see, we are looking forward to a great meeting in Ireland, in Dublin, and we're also looking for some great music.

And the last thing I wanted to say on behalf of our team was that -- the very, very last thing to say is that our community and our constituents look forward to a fair evaluation and we share the concerns raised by the GAC. Thank you so much for everything. Have a wonderful evening. Bye-bye.

[Applause]

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much. Same to you.

So I -- we have no more questions. I was informed that the bingo is done, so we can move. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Sorry. I was concerned with something else. What?

>> (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: Well, we'll do both.

Thank you. We are -- we are done, amazingly, on the time that we had set we were going to finish.

We're going to take a super brief break, five-minute stretch, and come back and we will reassemble for a formal board meeting. We have a handful of items to discuss and several that we will pass fairly quickly, and things are moving along very smoothly here. Come back in five minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]