
LONDON – ICANN Public Forum
Thursday, June 26, 2014 – 16:00 to 18:00
ICANN – London, England

>>

Ladies and gentlemen, would you kind enough to take your seats? We'd like to begin our public forum. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats and we'll be able to start our public forum. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, once again, would you be kind enough to take your seats so that we can begin our public forum. Ladies and gentlemen, once again, would you be kind enough to take your seats so that we can begin our public forum.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome ICANN board chair, Dr. Stephen Crocker.

[Applause.]

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. So we've done things a bit differently this time. We have an abbreviated session because of the two extended sessions earlier today, one on accountability and another on the transition of the IANA stewardship.

Because this is shorter than previous ones, we'll basically be opening up the mics for any subject of community interest. That is, in the past we tried to organize topics in advance. And, in a common sense way, we

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.

did a big-time version of that by taking the two big topics that we were sure were going to take attention, organizing separate sessions of that.

So what we're interested in in this session is whatever you want. It's been suggested to me that we're not done with the IANA stewardship transition; we're not done with ICANN accountability. And, if you want to raise those topics, that's perfectly okay. However, I think, in deference to people who have interest in other subjects, I'd like to ask you to hold those off toward the end, if possible.

The public forum is intended to give the community a direct line to the board of directors and to the rest of the community. You're talking to each other and not only each other in the room but each other across the entire world as much as you're talking to us. No formality, no filters. It cannot be -- it is not intended to be and cannot be a replacement or an add-on to the public comments or to any of the formal public policy development processes and other mechanisms that we have. This is a sort of an additional line of communication.

Brad White, our director of global media affairs, will now give you an overview on how questions will be fielded. Brad.

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Steve. As Steve said, we're doing things just a little bit different this time from other public forums. If you saw, if you attended the earlier two sessions, you've got a pretty clear understanding of the way we're going to do this session. You can queue up at these two microphones. Remote participants are going to join us in two ways, basically. They're going to come in on the usual form through the

chatroom. And we'll also have the remote video hubs that we've organized with the help of our sister organization, the Internet Society.

They have video hubs in all these cities which you can see projected up here. So it's possible we'll get questions or comments from around the globe. We're, basically, going to follow sort of a 411 pattern. In other words, every four or five questions in the room, we'll take a remote participation question, a video hub. It won't be exact, but that's basically it.

There's a few hints when you're at the microphone. Speak slowly. Speak clearly. And, believe me, the scribes hate me because they're always telling me to slow down, so I'm the worst offender here. That's just for the sake of the scribes so that they can capture your words. Give us your name. Tell us who you're representing, if anyone. And also these are the standards of behavior that kind of rule public forums and have for quite some time.

The upshot here, the important bullet there is the third one. Treat people civilly, in other words, be respectful. That's the bottom line.

The timing is the same as it has been in other public forums. It's what we call the rule of twos. You've got two minutes to make your statement or ask your question. The board will have two minutes to respond. We'll have the timer that we've had in the previous public forums. If there's a follow-up, two minutes. And, again, the board will take two minutes.

This is part of a balancing act. As you're aware, this is the largest ICANN meeting in history. So we're bending over backwards to try and

accommodate as many questions and comments as possible. So it is very much a balancing act. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. As we said, we're going to have two facilitators, Sebastien Bachollet and Erika Mann. Before I turn the floor over to Sebastien, let me ask those who have questions to begin queuing up at the microphone. While you're doing that, let me emphasize that we're trying to encourage dialogue, not a soapbox. Questions are strongly preferred.

With respect to questions, we will try to provide what response makes sense to provide in this forum. That is, not just say thank you and go on. If we can answer it, we will. And, if we can't answer as fully as the question deserves, we'll take it on board and provide responses at some other time.

Also, again, with respect to using the time wisely and deferentially with respect to everybody else, if a point has been made, it's not absolutely essential to come back up and repeat it. That is, if the point has been made, it's not essential to come back up and repeat it. Shall I say it again? If it's -- right.

So, with that, Sebastien, you're in charge.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I need to add at least one thing is that all of you must have a headset. Because one of the goals of this meeting is to allow you and us to speak in seven different languages, not just

English. Then I urge you to take headset. I know that you can read in English. But, if I speak in French, it's interpreted and then it's written in English. And you have two times the possibility for errors.

Then I will switch in French, if you allow me. And even if you don't allow me.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: What is that in French?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Although -- or even though you don't allow me to, I will turn into French.

On the slide on the screen we see there's a mistake. 15 minutes -- well, you know, 16 or 15 minutes after 4:00 and from then up to 5:00, if that is 15 minutes, then we are working magic here. So things are getting better, but -- okay. 15 minutes. 15 minutes are not 45.

So, please, start taking the floor. We have several languages -- English, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, and Russian. So, please, do use these languages. So you have the floor. You can approach the microphones. Feel free to take the floor. And start lining up so as to give us your feedback. I don't see there's an endless list or line of people wanting to take the floor. Thank you, Cheryl, for being the first one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not speaking on my behalf. I am speaking for Fatimata Seye Sylla from Senegal. She has a question that I will be reading out. Fatimata had visa problems and couldn't join me at my Nominating Committee. So I'm acting as a proxy.

ICANN's vision of One Internet One World implies equity, equal access, control and trust. However, developing countries don't have the technical means to protect their rights to privacy as much as western world despite ICANN's continued effort, along with other key players in the Internet ecosystem for equity via engagement and capacity building activities.

What else can ICANN do in the policy side to continue to build trust and maintain security over the Internet for everyone and every country after the recent revelations? Without trust, the stability of the Internet and the slogan One World, One Internet -- One Internet, One World would be jeopardized. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Steve, you want to --

STEVE CROCKER: Mike, you want to start with an answer to that?

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Steve. I think that's a really interesting question and one that goes to the heart of ICANN's core mission over here. And that is ICANN is here to coordinate Internet naming and numbering resources. So there may be certain areas in which the allocation and coordination

of naming and numbering resources may have an impact on privacy. But ICANN, fundamentally, has only impact on privacy when it comes to information in WHOIS and now with the next-generation directory services. And even then that's going to be primarily in the case of new gTLD or in generic names rather than in the case of country code names which -- where we can provide guidance, but we can't impose.

As somebody who in my day job I work for an operator, the answer is you comply with local laws. The IETF is working on some interesting technical standards development around privacy and accessibility of information and the ability to intercept certain elements of the data set around information transmission. But ICANN must be a participant in that discussion. Ultimately, it can't actually provide a solution to the issues raised because it's not within our remit.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Mike. Wolfgang, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: One very good proposal was made in the at-large summit where some speakers remembered all of us that in each country, developing country, you have a ccTLD, you have recognized at-large structures, you have a small group of ISPs, you have some academics dealing with these issues and some other groups. Very often, these groups on the national level are totally isolated. If these groups are coming together on the local level, they could create a certain starting point for developing a multistakeholder model on the national level which would have a great

policy influence both on the national level, on the regional level, and in the end after the day also on the global level. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Let me add to the two excellent responses from Mike and Wolfgang. Mike focusing on the limited mandate that ICANN has and, within that limited mandate, that we do, in fact, attend to privacy issues; but we're not in charge of the whole Internet. And Wolfgang emphasizing that there are local structures that may be very well-positioned to be the focal point for these kinds of discussions around the world. Agree with both of those.

And then, in addition, one of the purposes of NETmundial and the set of activities around and continuing from that is to provide forums and mechanisms and organizations that can deal with the very large set of big, hairy Internet governance issues that are well outside of ICANN's mandate. And so I would urge participation and forceful attention to these matters in those kinds of forums. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Madam, please.

XIAOHUI ZHANG:

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Xiaohui Zhang from Chinanet. I believe that this Internet and IDN is including and has helped out this multi language. But they still face a lot of problems such as the browser. And the other item here is also have problems. This not only they're

affecting the use of the IDN. Also for the people who register and registry, it's an object to them to overcome.

So this meeting is historically the largest. Other than the registrar and register, they also have other -- they also have a lot of --- so good afternoon. I'm from CONAC, Xiaohui Zhang.

I believe IDN it's helpful for the non-English speakers and their network development. However, IDN, in the application portion worldwide, they still face a lot of challenge such as browser and the email application. They still have a lot of problems. Those problems not only impact IDN operation. Also, for a lot of people whose operating IDN also registrar or registries, that's the optical for their business development.

[timer sound]

So this time we have the biggest meeting in ICANN. Not only there's a lot of registrar and registries, but also they have people from Microsoft and Google companies. We hope this problem will draw a lot of attention from ICANN, and we will put more manpower and organize and coordinate all the multistakeholder parties to solve the problem. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you for your statements. I would like to ask our specialist on this subject matter who speaks your own language to address you.

KUO-WEI WU:

Just like you said, in ICANN we're fully aware of this problem. Just like what you mentioned, in the last couple days, Google in the United States, they have a big convention. You have already heard Google has already committed a big resource for the development of this application. I think that itself will be helpful to solve the problem. But, not only Google and Microsoft, in the Chinese-speaking world, we should have a lot of resources put in for this development. That's also a business opportunity for you. So we're not only depend on Microsoft and Google to solve their problems. So, if we believe IDN is a good opportunity, then the Chinese should put in their resources for the application and to serve our Chinese-speaking world. Thank you.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

You wanted to make a statement. This is your turn.

MARTIN PABLO SILVA VALENT: --- I'm a member of the stakeholder group. My question is the next one. I've been participating in the group, and I don't really understand why it's assigned the way it is assigned.

I am a member of the non-commercial stakeholder group, but I'm not a member of the not-for-profit operation constituency nor the non-commercial user constituency. So, basically, I'm from a third group that I'm not clear what it's doing there. And I don't fully understand or it's not clear about all the process of the decision making aside the NCUC or the NCSG. And my question is why is it like that? And why aren't NGOs

exclusively members of NPOC, since that seems to be the place where they should be represented? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for the question. Anyone who want to answer? Part of the answer is that we are starting review of the GNSO. And inside this review, I am sure that you will be able to raise a question. And, as a reviewer, we'll do decisions work to take in your cultural input and the input of the other stakeholder within the GNSO. Ray, please.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you. Thank you, Sebastien. Excuse me. I'm fighting a cold.

The constituencies, for example, in the NCSG are organized inside the NCSG. So it is a self-organizing effort. If there's sufficient interest of persons inside the NCSG to form a constituency such as the one you suggested, then it should -- there's a process by which you can do it. So I think that you should look into the NCSG first and see what your options are there.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Yes, Wolfgang wanted to add an answer. Wolfgang.

Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: No, I just wanted to remember that this is a long history. It started with the domain names supporting organization and then it was divided into two supporting organizations, one was the GNSO. This was divided later

into two houses and the non-contracting house was divided into two stakeholder groups. And this is the process. And now we have to look forward and bring your concerns to the GNSO review.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Wolfgang. Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: Good afternoon, Amadeu Abril i Abril, terror of the scribes worldwide.

[Laughter]

I am so glad to be here after so many years calling this the speaker's corner. Finally we are close to Hyde Park so we feel at home.

What I wanted to say, I have a couple of questions for the Board Governance Committee, I guess, whatever name it has now, regarding the ombudsman role. As far as I understood the ombudsman is here to help and defend us, ICANN stakeholders, when we feel that the procedures within -- ICANN procedures or the ICANN staff or board, somebody within the ICANN structure is doing something that we have no other recourse to, you know, challenge somehow so we need the help to deal between, you know, us and the ICANN structures. Lately we were seeing that the ombudsman is being used, unwillingly or willingly, but it's being used, as a challenge to objections, decisions in the new gTLD procedure. I don't think really that this is something that the ombudsman is intended for. I say that's an appeals chamber or something beyond reconsideration for objections. And as there is one and another and another one, gTLD -- new gTLD being put on hold

because there is something with the ombudsman, I would like knowing from the governance committee what the position regarding this new appeal procedure that's not written anywhere.

The second part is that this is acceptable, which probably it is because we don't know, so you know, we need to know the outcome of each investigation. It's very surprising that in this case which is not a stakeholder and established structure but somebody challenging adversarial procedure. The ombudsman is making reports, final reports, provisional reports, letters to the board without never contacting the other parties, be it the dispute resolution provider, the panelists, or the other parties involved in the procedure. And here I think we have a real problem. This was normal when he was dealing with challenges between a concrete party and the staff, for instance. But I don't think in this other scenario we can go without even noticing, without even notifying to the affected parties that they are put on hold because there is an investigation by the ombudsman because somebody asked his help. And nothing happens. So I would like knowing the position of the Board Governance Committee on this issue and whether this has been addressed, raised to their attention so far.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Amadeu. Before giving --

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: One final comment, it's a pity, Brad, that you explain all the rules but you usually forget the very important, Abril/Chalaby rule which is non-native English speakers have an extra minute.

[Laughter]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Amadeu. Before giving the floor to Bruce, who is the chair of the Board Governance Committee, I would like to close the line. We will have a second part for question and I don't want too much people stand up.

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: I'll stay here.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Bruce, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you, Sebastien. So firstly, the ombudsman actually has the broadest powers of all of the accountability mechanisms in that it's -- the reconsideration process is quite narrow, as is the independent review tribunal. The ombudsman is basically looking at fairness. And in doing so, the ombudsman investigates each case to see where there is fairness and tries to find a resolution between the parties involved. We as the Board don't get directly involved in those cases, but the board Compensation Committee does meet with the ombudsman at each of the public meetings, and as part of that meeting we ask for information on what feedback has been provided by the parties that have been involved in cases. And have that feedback collected in such a way that it does not identify the individuals. So those are the mechanisms in place today.

There is, as part of the ATRT2 recommendations, a recommendation to review the ombudsman function as part of the other functions of accountability, and certainly any feedback that you have can be provided into that context. But I would say that the specific feedback you have, Amadeu, you should provide directly to the ombudsman, and we would certainly be interested on what sort of feedback you get in that -- in that environment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bruce.

JIAN CHANG: Am I allowed to speak two times, in Chinese and in English? Just kidding. This is Jian Chang. I'm Jian Chang from the ZDNS. I'm talking on behalf of myself.

--- number one, a multistakeholder model. My company strongly supports the multistakeholder model and believes that it is the right approach to governing the Internet. However, we do think the meaning of this model and the way the model is implemented should be more specific. For some parties unwillingness to support this model doesn't necessarily mean that they reject this idea but maybe just because the uncertain about the meaning of this model, of its meanings. Therefore, I think a clarification needs to be done, including but not limited to this importance. For example, the role of each type of stakeholder and the mechanism that they make decisions, either universal multistakeholder model across issue areas or the model where it is in different areas. Or the stakeholder equally important in all issued areas or all their roles

actually vary across different areas. So we believe that a more clearly illustrated multistakeholder model will facilitate a wider acceptance of this model across the world.

Number one is enhancing accountability. We are pleased to hear that ICANN has emphasized the importance of accountability a lot. We appreciate ICANN's efforts to engage the local Internet community via various channels such as regional offices engagement centers and MoUs. We think --

[Timer sounds.]

-- as more affected parties are included will be more ICANN be accounted for so we do appreciate that effort, and the more it be done to enhance the accountability. Thank you.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: There's no one size fits all multistakeholder model. All this goes back to the definition which was adopted by the Tunis Agenda in 2005 on the basis of a recommendation of the United Nations working group on Internet governance where it was said that all stakeholders should be involved in policy development and decision taking, but it was not said how. And the experience in the last 10, 15 years have told us that it depends from the issue. That means you have to build the model around the issue. And the multistakeholder model works only on the

basis of a number of principles, like transparency and in particular the bottom-up process. That means you can find the right model for a specific issue, only in an open, transparent bottom-up discussion process. And insofar it will be different indeed from issue to issue and the basic criteria are all laid down in the Sao Paulo principles from NETmundial where you have such a framework, you know. If you want to develop the multistakeholder mechanism for a certain issue, follow the Sao Paulo principles step by step and you will end up with a very good model which will work. Both on the global and also on the regional and national level. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Wolfgang. Madam, please.

>>

--- on behalf of the B.C. we'd like to make two simple pleas for two words that are very close to our hearts. Transparency and understanding. Understanding, I'm told that we have more than 3,000 people here. I'm told that in the last two days alone we had 51 sessions. Only 29 had a published agenda. And only 10 had published speaker lists. Now, this means that some of my colleagues who are, if I can say seasoned ICANNers, didn't know what the sessions were about so I'm not quite sure how all of the new guys knew.

Transparency, we love scribe feeds, and many, many, thanks to the scribes.

[Applause]

Absolutely. But we often find ourselves trying to capture them in the room and of course the connection goes down. Another plea, can you please get them up as soon as possible when the session finishes. It doesn't matter they're still rough, because this means while we're actually here at the same time if there's a misunderstanding or something that we need to talk to our colleagues about, we can go and find them because here in three weeks we've all gone back to our own countries. So two pleas to staff, please.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you. Your request is reasonable and I think that people in charge of organizing the meeting have taken note of your request so that things will improve regarding the two aspects of your request in the next meeting, that is having a published agenda for all the meetings and also quickly posting the scribe feeds. Thank you very much for your comment. Okay. Go ahead.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI:

Thank you, Sebastien. I wanted to agree very much with the last comment, and we should all take back and try to together to improve upon that. And I actually want to add the notion of the quality of the agendas that we put together. So our volunteerism really has to be challenged to make sure that our agenda are wholesome, fulsome, and include everything that we really want to dialogue on so that we can use our time in the best way possible. So thank you for that last comment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. May I ask if there are an online question? Brad, please?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a query from Andre Schappo. Why does ICANN not lead by example by having a set of new gTLD domain names in addition to the standard icann.org? Appropriate domain names could include icann.website or one using Chinese IDN TLD or Japanese IDN TLD, et cetera.

>> Softball question.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I believe we do not have an answer nowadays because our effort is mainly focused on implementing or launching the new ICANN Web site, icann.org. However, this question is absolutely valid. This is a topic the staff will be working in the coming months. That was not the priority nowadays because the priority was to launch the new ICANN Web site. And I hope you like this new Web site. I'm pleased if you have input or feedback. The staff in charge of the Web site will be more than happy to receive your feedback. Thank you very much.

STEVE DeIBIANCO: --- from the business constituency, and we first brought the issue of singular and plural new TLDs to your attention roughly a year ago in

China. And then we've reached the point now where the decision -- a pending decision for the board needs to be made now before it's really too late. And I've been following closely the agenda for the NGPC to figure out the thinking, and it's very difficult to understand. Again, we're talking here about game and games, kid and kids, .HOTEL and .HOTELS all being delegated. There's roughly 24 pairs like this. And it seems as if the board only wants to look at a few of those cases where one of the expert panels came up with inconsistent determinations for a single string. But the inconsistency that the B.C. is trying to point out to you is that allowing photo and photos to both go out but deciding that you're going to put .PET and pets in the same contention set is inconsistencies among the pairs. That's one form of inconsistency. And the ultimate inconsistency would be that you realize the mistake of this and decide not to allow it in the next round. That still leaves -- that's the ultimate inconsistency. And the inconvenience comes on the part of users who were confused. Was that for luxury.hotel or luxury.hotels on the back of that bus. What did I hear on the radio or see on the TV? And it's really damaging to registrants who now have to spend to compete with the identical domain names in a TLD that differs only by one letter.

So there's such a thing as a decision being ripe for the making. But if we don't move quickly, the delegations are upon us and this decision moves beyond ripe, all the way to, well, inedible and maybe even to rotten, and it's going to end up hurting us and our credibility around the world. So when can we see a decision on the inconsistency on singulars and plurals?

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Steve.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Cherine Chalaby, the chair of the new gTLD program committee.

CHERINE CHALABY: I don't have an immediate answer for your question, but we're going to read the text and we'll respond immediately afterwards to your point. Okay?

STEVE DeBIANCO: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Next in line, please.

LUCKY MASILELA: Thank you. Name is Lucky Masilela from South Africa ZACR. .AFRICA, actually for us .AFRICA is not just another gTLD but it's a project for the continent. And it needs to be seen as such, as a project for the continent. Last year in the 25th of May the organization of African Unity celebrated its 50 years and this also ushered a new journey for the -- for the association that was coming in place to replace the

organization of African Unity. And in discussion was the future of the ICT on the continent which was pivotal in those discussions. Those discussions have not ended. This year again on the 23rd of May, 2014, Africa was celebrating that .AFRICA is going to be happening. The deputy chairperson of AU was equally echoing the need for such a project on the continent. In his statement, when he echoed and supported this, he was equally very eager to see this project happening. And for us .AFRICA is one of the greatest projects on the continent. It is not just a project. It is a greatest project. It's equal to the dams that are built to provide water in the villages. It's equal to the roads and bridges that are built to link villages. It's equal to the electricity that is built to supply power to the villages.

And this one of the very critical projects that encompasses all of the above. It is a vertical.

This project that we talk about is going to provide growth for the ccTLDs on the continent. This project is going to provide content, which is very lacking on the continent. This project is going to address numerous ICT projects.

It must be noted that this is Africa's hope. This is Africa's hope for resurrection, and we hope this is not taken away from us.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Please conclude.

LUCKY MASILELA: We hope this is not deprived. We hope again that it is not denied from us.

And as I continue here -- I need another half a minute, say. As I continue, I want to hear --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You have a long queue behind you. We have said two minutes. Please accept this rule for everybody.

LUCKY MASILELA: I will call it very quickly, sir.

As I conclude, I want to ask if the house doesn't agree that this is Africa's resurrection. And if it does, then we need to hear something different, an applause or something of that nature.

And also, I want to assure you, this house gathered, that as ZACR we are very ready. We are ready to launch this project as we are ready to launch the dot cities which will be launched on the 1st of July this year. We are very excited. We are prepared ourselves with multiple practice rounds to get this thing correct.

I thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Mike Silber, please.

MIKE SILBER: I don't think there's much to respond because I think that my friend and colleague, Mr. Masilela, has said most of what needs to be said.

I think it's just to recognize, firstly, Lucky, you may have seen him previously in his capacity as a board member of the ZADNA, but he is now the CEO of the ZACR and his presence there is welcomed.

It's unfortunate that this effort has been hamstrung by initiatives which are not positive. But at the same time, it's one of the realities of the multistakeholder model that having set a process, we need to abide by the process even if it creates unfairness to one or more parties.

And we're working with staff to monitor the process, and staff has committed to doing everything that they can to try and speed up the process; that this not be held up any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. We have a hub ready to talk.

BRAD WHITE: That is correct. We have a question or a comment from the hub in Bondo, Kenya.

REMOTE HUB: This is Richard from Bondo City, Kenya.

I just wanted to make a few comments based on this informative meeting that you have there. As you know, Kenya (indiscernible) fall within the still-developing space (indiscernible), and we are kind of meeting some challenges that just try to compromise our utilization of this important resource.

Now one thing that is becoming a little bit more confusing in (indiscernible) of this critical resource is the issue of having content placed in the Internet infrastructure and now compromised (indiscernible) us. That is a security issue.

I don't know what ICANN has, as the body that is overseeing Internet management, what plan they have for security, and of course also for developing economies like where (indiscernible) into. Because like when I ask, like where I come from, there are (indiscernible) constituency, and our most interaction with Internet resource is how we can benefit from sharing resources, and that is fundamental to our experience and also the research communities that we usually collaborate with.

So I just wanted a little from the ICANN forum what they have in place in regard to security pertaining to the question of Internet resources.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for your comment.

Okay. We will take your input, and if there are any answer, we will try to do that later.

Next online, please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. My name is Keith Drazek. I'm chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I have here with me today the leaders of all, yes I said all stakeholder groups and constituencies. We have Rafik Dammak from the NCSG, Elisa Cooper from the business constituency, Michele Neylon from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, Tony Holmes from the ISPCP and Kristina Rosette -- sorry; Kristina Rosette from the IPC.

I'm happy to report that the GNSO community took up Fadi's challenge from the opening ceremony to seek harmony this week in London. Instead of a song or two the statement we are about to read represents an unprecedented, yes an unprecedented event. It only took us 50 meetings but I think the rarity of what you're witnessing this afternoon sends a very strong message about our views.

The GNSO community, with all of our diversity and occasionally competing interests, has come together to unanimously, unanimously as a community, support the following.

The entire GNSO joins together today calling for the Board to support community creation of an independent accountability mechanism that provides meaningful review and adequate redress for those harmed by ICANN action or inaction in contravention of an agreed-upon compact with the community.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

This deserves the Board's serious consideration. Not only does it reflect an unprecedented level of consensus across the entire GNSO community, it's a necessary and integral element of the IANA stewardship transition.

True accountability does not mean ICANN is only accountable to itself or to some vague definition of the word. It does not mean that governments should have the ultimate say over community policy without regard to the rule of law. Rather, the Board's decision must be open to challenge and the Board --

[Timer sounds]

-- cannot be in position of reviewing and certifying its own decisions.

KRISTINA ROSETTE:

We need an independent accountability structure that holds the ICANN Board, staff, and various stakeholder groups accountable under ICANN's governing documents, serves as an ultimate review of Board staff decisions, and through the creation of precedent, creates prospective guidance for the Board, the staff and the entire community. As part of the IANA stewardship transition, the multistakeholder community has the opportunity and responsibility to propose meaningful accountability structures that go beyond just the IANA-specific accountability issues.

We are committed to coming together and developing those recommendations for creation of these mechanisms.

We ask the ICANN Board and staff to fulfill their obligations and support this community driven multistakeholder initiative.

Thank you.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Thank you very much.

May I give the floor to Steve Crocker, the chair of the Board.

STEVE CROCKER: Boy, that's louder than a hum.

[Laughter]

Thank you very much.

The dialogue about accountability mechanisms has been under way for quite some time. It's part of what the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations have been about.

I've been watching and following the dialogue for quite some time, and clearly with respect to the accountability discussion that's under way now, this -- the essence of what you have come together to say is an idea that has been sort of appearing from the horizon and getting ever closer.

Personally, I'm actually in strong agreement with you. The challenge will be to go from the concept to specific embodiment. Exactly how one creates that, how one populates it, et cetera, et cetera, there are a

number of things that can go wrong. You can create another mechanism that's just competitive with the decision process we have, and that wouldn't be good.

But the -- In essence, I would say that there's a -- as evidenced by the clapping in the room, but I can also tell you from other conversations, reasonable understanding of the point that's being made. And I personally am looking forward to how this evolves.

So on behalf of the Board and on behalf of the entire community, we applaud the fact that you all have come together. We know that you don't always all come together on other kinds of issues, so it's noted and understood and appreciated.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

Brad, you have online question?

BRAD WHITE: We do, from Daniel Nanghaka. with the ISOC Uganda chapter.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: What plan does ICANN have for Africa? The issues being discussed are mainly global. Can we look at collaborative involvement of views and policies that govern name assignment of TLDs in this region? The distribution should follow standard procedures of registrations,

especially of country TLDs, and now we have .AFRICA TLD. The IANA processes are not clearly understood by the key stakeholder.

Is there an awareness plan to bridge the knowledge gap of ICANN, IANA, IETF, amongst all the others?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess it's a deep question, and I don't see anybody willing to answer, but it's -- there are two questions here. It's how to understand the full working of ICANN, IANA, IETF, and so on and so forth, and the specific question about the new gTLD and one specific about .AFRICA.

I will ask Mike to take the mic, please.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Sebastien.

I think it's a really interesting question and one that we're all faced with within this room because all of us were newcomers at some stage.

I think the critical thing is firstly, ICANN publishes a lot of material. There's a lot of work being done in terms of outreach, material, information, Webinars that explains what we do. At the same time, it's very difficult because the temptation amongst many newcomers is to want to jump straight into the debates and discussions while they're not necessarily fully apprised of what's happened over many years.

So my suggestion really is for this individual and more generally, is to try and frame specifically what information is required, and amazingly enough, a lot of it is available out there on the interwebs. It's an

incredible repository of information. And when there are specific questions, and they are detailed required, to apply for a fellowship potentially to come here so that they can see the process in action, or a fellowship for the IETF meeting, they are available. But also to reach out on various of the lists and to be open and honest. Please, those who have a history and expertise, share. And then it's incumbent on those of us in this room who have a history and an expertise to be willing to engender the next generation rather than dismissing them as newbs and ignoring their questions because they don't have the 15 or 20 years of background that we do.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Mike.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Yaounde, Cameroon.

REMOTE HUB: (Indiscernible.)

BRAD WHITE: Cameroon, we're with you. Are you with us?

And that's what you call an awkward moment.

[Laughter]

BRAD WHITE: Cameroon, we're with you. Are you with us?

Sebastien, I suggest we take a commercial break and come back to them.

[Laughter]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. You will do the item now? Okay. Go ahead, please.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: This is brought to you by .MUSIC.

So my name is Constantine Roussos, I'm from .MUSIC, and I have some issues that I'd like to talk about, bring to your attention.

So I would like to talk about Amazon. They submitted an exclusive access application for .AMAZON which conflicted with the Amazonas geographic region.

GAC, the NGPC, and the Board deemed the Amazon application unacceptable and denied it.

Furthermore, GAC, the NGPC and the Board deemed exclusive access for generic strings as unacceptable, and resolutions were passed to this material change to be disallowed.

Furthermore, as you may be well aware, a music community objection was filed against Amazon since we deemed exclusive access TLDs were harmful, which is consistent with GAC and ICANN resolutions.

That said, last month, Amazon submitted change request changing the very position they aggressively defended in the community music objections. So they deleted all the exclusive access language in their applications.

So ICANN accepted these changes, deeming them immaterial, and they deemed that they met and balance the seven change request criteria under Section 1.2.7 of the Applicant Guidebook. And let me refresh that criteria. Was there explanation for the change request? Was there evidence that the original submission was in error? As we know, since Amazon defended their position aggressively in the community objections, it was not in error.

Were other third parties affected? We know we lost hundreds and thousands of dollars in these objections.

Would it result in precedence? I think they will.

Is it fair to applicants?

So basically we're going to be engaged in CPE, so if we don't pass CPE, maybe we should get a chance to do a change request to meet those 14 points.

Was there materiality?

[Timer Sounds]

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: Yes.

So all we're asking is for transparency, fairness, accountability, and consistency, and we do feel that ICANN is discriminating against certain applicants in favor of others.

We don't know if they're feeling sorry for Amazon losing their .AMAZON and giving them special favors for other strings to pass change requests, but we want to know why these change requests were accepted and how this doesn't harm us.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for your comments and question.

I think it's really a question to be answered by staff in charge of this program.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: We filed a reconsideration so you guys can work on that. We'd like to know the real reasons why they were accepted.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay.

My problem is that we have a long queue here, and I would like to give the chance to everybody to express. And --

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: -- that's the reason why I suggest, and I'm sure they will do; that staff will answer your comments and question at the later stages. Not to jeopardize this time we have. It's short. Because I am supposed to close in one minute my session, and then I would like to have at least two other speakers. Not to say the others in the line will not speak, but maybe it will be under the authority of Erika.

Next on line, please.

JASON POLIS: Hi. I'm Jason Polis. I've been trying to get a Greek email address for the last 25 years, so I have a group of five related questions.

One, what is the current status of the Greek language domains on the country code top-level domain fast track?

Two, when can we have a Greek language domain?

Three, are there any further impediments?

Four, what is there left to do?

And five, how can I help?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will give the floor to Chris to answer. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I don't think I can answer all of those questions, but I can tell you that the -- as I'm sure you're aware, there was an application for the Greek IDN as a country code, and that that hit a few problems.

I can also tell you that a -- specifically to deal with problems of that nature, a process was created by the ccNSO that has the effect of being a second look, if you like, at the application in a slightly different way.

I can tell you that that application -- that the application for -- it's actually -- I think it's epsilon lambda. Epsilon lambda has gone through that process and I believe that a report and an answer will be made public very soon. I can't tell you exactly when, but I suspect it will be within the next couple of weeks.

In respect to your general questions, I don't know, and I don't know when you will see a Greek TLD. I don't -- I can't remember if there are any Greek IDNs applied for in the gTLD process, but specifically in respect to the IDN of the country code, that's the answer.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Additional answer from Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. This is Ram Mohan.

You had asked a couple of other questions: What is left to do and how can I help.

One of the things that you can do is help form a language generation panel and start to get to work on identifying the specific issues that

affect the Latin script, and Greek in particular, but the Latin script in general. That's really what you can do to help and that will inform the rest of the process.

JASON POLIS: All right. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Next one, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thank you. I'm Jordyn Buchanan with Google. Just briefly as was noted earlier, I'm glad -- I hope everyone knows that once he gets his Greek email address, by the end of this month Gmail is going to be the first major mail platform with full EAI support, so you'll be able to email back and forth with Gmail users at least.

All right. I want to talk about name collision, though.

First of all -- so three points.

First, just to urge the NGPC to rapidly bring a conclusion to the name conclusion topic. I won't belabor the point but it's gotten to the point it's significantly affecting not just applicants who are affected by name collision and strings affected by name collision but the auction schedule which was initially premised on predictability as a criteria and so on.

I've heard that you guys are looking for input on the proposed framework, and so I'd like to make two quick points as input so that you guys can rapidly get to a resolution.

The first is that you may want to consider -- I think we need to very carefully consider the currently proposed requirement that there's an indefinite ongoing requirement to react to collisions that result in a threat to human life. I think infinity is a long time and as time goes by, the balance between the victim of the collision and the -- and perhaps an incumbent registrant or registry operator changes, and so the situation that makes sense today may not make sense in 5 or 10 or 20 years and so I think that's an important consideration for you to consider.

Second point I'll make -- and this is brought up by both the SSAC as well as a number of public comments but I haven't seen addressed by either the JAS report or staff -- is there's significant nexus between the name collision issue and rights protection mechanisms.

It affects both sunrise and claim services, and right now what I'm hearing from the staff is predominantly that the current RPM requirements document already addressed this topic, but that's simply not the case. That RPM requirements document was written before any of these name collision frameworks were taken into account. I've heard a number of times this week the suggestion that registries can simply allocate but not activate names --

[Timer sounds]

-- which is perhaps true but is not what any of the registries are doing. Certainly not in the claims period. So please make sure you consider this issue as you drive this topic to conclusion. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you very much.

Somebody want to answer? Or we do like the first one, we ask the staff to report an answer -- to answer later? Sorry. It's time for me to -- okay. Jonne.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah. Jonne Soininen.

The answer is we have promised that the staff will come up with an answer to that -- some of those questions. I think it was in this meeting. And like we discussed already on Monday in the session on name collisions, we are gathering feedback and we will take this feedback back into account before the final decision on this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's really time for me to give back the baton to Steve. I just want, before I finish my turn as chair of this meeting, to say how I appreciate the hub system put in place during this meeting and I wanted to thank staff to organize that and the participants to do that.

Now, Steve, your turn. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, Sebastien.

This has been a pretty exciting session.

Before we turn to Erika Mann to facilitate the continuation of the session, I want to introduce Christopher Mondini, vice president of

global stakeholder engagement for North America. He's going to tell us about ICANN 51, which is scheduled for Los Angeles in October. Chris? Take it away.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Thank you, Steve. This is my favorite part of public forum. I don't know about you guys.

My name is Chris Mondini and it's my great pleasure to welcome you all to Los Angeles for ICANN 51.

Los Angeles, which is the birthplace of the Internet and I think not coincidentally of our esteemed chairman, Steve Crocker, and also the residence of our CEO.

In my job, I have a privilege of working with a wide variety of stakeholders across North America. Many of them are in diverse businesses and stakeholders that are both drivers of and beneficiaries of the global interoperable Internet.

So whether that's movies or music or the technology startups that are located in Silicon Valley, there is an incredible entrepreneurial spirit.

In fact, there are some amazing world-changing and disruptive technologies. There is even a machine which you can visit on the street which will distribute to you automatically a cupcake, a delicious American dessert. So it's really amazing. You can actually visit this machine in LA.

LA is also really very, very diverse. You may not know that half of all of the residents of greater LA actually speak a language other than English

in their homes, and of the 10 most spoken languages after English, more than half of those actually use different alphabets than the one that you're reading on the screen on the transcript.

So there are many neighborhoods. They're very diverse. You can dive into a completely different culture, different language, try to find your way around, make sense of things. It's a little bit for me like attending an IETF meeting.

So if you visit LA, I hope you can see how dynamic, diverse, and global it is as a city, just like ICANN: Dynamic, diverse, and global.

And I think I can guarantee that you will have sunny weather, to rival even the sunshine we've had here in London.

For those of you who haven't had a chance to know LA, the friends of ours at the LA Tourist Bureau have provided a video to give you a taste of what is to come. Thanks very much. The video, please.

[Video starts]

[Music]

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

I grew up in Los Angeles, moved away 25 years ago, and now I have to ask myself: So why did I do that?

[Laughter]

We turn to the second half of the program, and Erika, it's now yours.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Steve.

Next in the line, please.

MONA AL ACHKAR: Thank you.

Hello. I'm Mona al Achkar. I am part of the French-speaking community. We all know that ICANN governs and makes decisions, so when we speak about governing, we speak about rules and principles. And of course deciding or decision-making implies a series of necessary principles to reach an objective decision, to some extent.

ICANN, with this transition, intends to contribute to the creation of a regulatory and legislative framework that is indeed necessary on an international level or scale, because we very well know that it is a competent organization, that it has everything it takes to handle this topic. It intends to work from now and make a decision that will contribute to the legislation area, for instance, in terms of international transport.

I have another question.

Why don't we have minimum or threshold criteria regarding domain name issues?

There are some things that are very simple, for instance, in terms of plural and singular versions of a domain name and feminine and

masculine versions or gender versions of the same domain name.
Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you very much. Would somebody like to reply?

I think you raise an interesting point about the regulatory issues. I'm not sure of all the translation I listened to, so let us have a chance and let us review what you said and let us come back to you from the board side in case we think there's something we would love to tell you.

Please, next in the line.

SEBASTIAN ROCCA:

Thank you, Erika. I'm Sebastian Rocca, and I have been supporting the community application of dotGAY LLC in my current capacity as the CEO of Micro Rainbow International and in my former capacity as the expect director of ILGA. Both organizations work worldwide with LGBT community groups.

In this space, I would like to share our experience about the process as a community group supporting a community application.

As a community group, we felt a considerable amount of mistrust both by ICANN and by the objectors to the application. During this process, we have been subjected to abusive and discriminatory language by some of the objectors.

I had the opportunity to read RFC-1591, and as you're about to discuss new rounds of applications, I would like to invite you not only to reread

RFC-1591 but also to really assess the process and the way that community applications are treated, including the community supporters.

I thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

[Applause]

I'm looking to my colleagues. Fine.

Next, please.

JAN-WILLEM DeBRUIN: Good afternoon, dear Internet community. My name is Jan-Willem DeBruin, representing COC Netherlands, the world's oldest human rights organization for lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender people, and we've consulted the states at United Nations. I'm a newcomer at ICANN, as you can see, and I learned a lot this week. Currently, there is some momentum for community TLDs and actually ICANN designed the whole process to get communities involved some years ago, and I would like to ask all stakeholders to understand the true meaning of the first word in "community TLD."

Due to domain grabbing, my community in the Netherlands lost two important domain names. I invite you -- actually, I don't invite you -- to visit transgender.nl and you will understand how embarrassing the Web site is for transgender people.

Due to an auction, also (saying name) came into the hands of a commercial owner. We're renting it now for 150 euro a month to put our own content on it and to prevent it to be an adult site, but the original price would have been 25 euro a year.

To someone -- so someone is making money but it's not the lesbian community.

To us this makes clear the need for a community TLD and for involving the gay community.

COC Netherlands has endorsed dotGAY LLC application since 2011, being the only applicant including our community as meant in the design for community TLDs.

Therefore, I would like to ask ICANN to think about the true meaning, again, of the first word in "community TLD" and act accordingly. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Next in line, please.

Could you do me all a favor? We have to close the line, so if there's somebody who really urgently thinks he wants to -- or she wants to make a comment, please queue in the line. Otherwise, I will ask you, please, just accept this that we will have to close the line as it is in a moment.

Next, please.

SCOTT SEITZ:

Hello. I'm Scott Seitz with dotGAY, LLC, the only community application for the gay community.

I just am going to keep this very brief. I very much appreciate our supporters who are able to come here today and share their feelings and concerns.

In the United States, we have a kind of curious statement, guilty -- excuse me -- innocent until proven guilty.

As a community, we're kind of being viewed as guilty as being gamers before we're considered innocent as being the community, and that's a deep concern for us. And as somebody who works in the community for over 20 years, both as a business and as a supporter, I don't know how a real community would survive this process.

So I would just like to comment and hope that ICANN continues to enforce and look at the community application program, encourage and provide support and help true communities to try and get through this process, because it's a one-time thing. We're not going to do 20 more. And lastly, the interesting part of being inside of a community that has business applications applying for the same name is that we sit as a sitting duck in the comments section, and they are capable of going out and making a lot of different comments. Our comments are all validated. People are calling our constituency and validating in a very transparent way our points and our support, yet no one is validating the complaints and the negative comments that are coming in.

Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Next, please.

WERNER STAUB: My name is Werner Staub. I have a point about accountability, which arguably --

ERIKA MANN: Just a second, please.

FADI CHEHADE: I apologize. If you could hold for a minute.

I just want to say, because there has been a stream of folks talking about the specific application and some of the language that was inappropriate in the -- in the objections.

We have not heard this complaint before today, and we will look into it. So I just want you to know that.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Fadi. Please. Please start again.

WERNER STAUB:

My name is Werner Staub. I have a point about accountability which arguably is one of the central objectives that ICANN must pursue.

Now, ICANN does not live in a world where it is the only one that has accountability and nor is it government's -- I mean national governments are the only ones. There is a network of lines of accountability throughout society worldwide that is mostly well organized, and ICANN of course has to establish new lines and some of them are victims of the fact that we're trying to bloat ICANN. They put too much responsibility upon ICANN. ICANN ends up having to do things that might better be handled at a more local level, and it comes to decisions taken by ICANN and rules applied by ICANN that are inadequate, that there's not enough time by ICANN and resources to handle correctly. They're nevertheless imposed as they are and end up coming into conflict with communities, local governments and so on that do have very clear and credible solid lines of accountability and know what they're doing. My point is that, when it comes that far, the important thing is that the compliance mechanism and also ICANN's action take into account the accountability or the solidity of the accountability of the community's being affected by those compliance actions.

ERIKA MANN:

I don't think there's a colleague who wants to reply to it. I find your point personally very interesting, and I think you're right. But we will continue this discussion because of the accountability debate that's going on. So we will have a chance to have more discussions with all of

you. So thank you so much. Brad, do you want to have somebody into the line now? Yeah?

BRAD WHITE:

Sure. We've got, first of all, a text question from a remote participant, Seun Ojedeji from Nigeria.

The Internet is happening rapidly. And, as this happens, the fate of the developing world seems to be hanging as the developing world is now not being reached at the same rate that the Internet is expanding globally. Considering there is no way that ICANN would have thrived without end user ability to buy and use names and numbers, what is ICANN doing to encourage infrastructure development in the developing region if not setting up copies of root servers? Can some of the funds that RIRs contribute to IANA ICANN be used for this, or can some of the funds from TLDs be used for this?

ERIKA MANN:

Mike, would you like to say something?

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Erika. It's a very difficult question. Because, ultimately, the revenues that are generated are generated from activities relating to names. And our mandate doesn't extend to the question of infrastructure other than, as the question very correctly, raises the question of root server instances. This is a debate, in particular, when we start talking about things like surplus funds coming out of the new gTLD program, if there are any, that would be a very interesting

engagement for the community. But, thus far, I think there are some very good pieces of work being done by the private sector, by NGOs, by governments and others. And, unless we hear otherwise from this community, the sense I have is that it's not appropriate for ICANN to be involved in building networks.

ERIKA MANN: I give back to Brad. I think you have another question.

BRAD WHITE: We have a query from one of the remote hubs in Cameroon, Mr. Augustine Chi. Mr. Chi? Mr. Chi, we have you. Do you have us?

REMOTE HUB: Yes. In Cameroon. This is Cameroon.

(finger snap)

[Laughter]

Again, good afternoon. We have some security concerns. And one of these is: Is there any strategy for true (indiscernible) representation that will cover DNS root servers?

ERIKA MANN: I must admit I did not understand a word. Okay.

STEVE CROCKER: If I might?

ERIKA MANN: You did? Please.

STEVE CROCKER: I take his question to mean that a strategy for a region must include root servers if it's a complete strategy. I hope I haven't misunderstood, but I think that's the basic sense.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Let's put this on hold. We will review. We will continue the discussion. We have the chance, colleagues, please, do me a favor, review what was said. Somebody can give us the script, and then we can come back and answer the question.

Next in line, please. Brad, let us continue first, here.

BRAD WHITE: Erika, I think I just got some elaboration on his question, which I can give you now, if you so desire.

ERIKA MANN: Sorry?

BRAD WHITE: I just got clarification on his question, which I can give you if you so desire.

ERIKA MANN: Please.

BRAD WHITE: Basically, what is the strategy for true geographical representation that will cover root servers?

ERIKA MANN: Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: That fits into what I thought I heard. Can I toss this over to Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. Suzanne Woolf, root server system advisory committee liaison to the board. I understood the question, Steve, to be asking about integrated issues around expanding and providing deeper access to infrastructure including root servers, exchange points, network capacity, as related basics that are needed in order to deploy Internet more widely for more users. And, in fact, to my direct personal knowledge, I've been involved with some of these very terrific initiatives. There's actually a very strong multistakeholder, multi-entity series of activities around building these capacities together. For instance, some of the RIRs have relationships with root server operators to deploy exchange points and root servers to gather and support local infrastructure.

So there are a great many activities. ICANN supports and encourages a number of them. And there are staff here who could give more details

about that. But it's not something for ICANN to lead or originate. It's part of what communities worldwide are doing.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Suz. Please, next.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you. Pierre Bonis from AFNIC. As it's always very good to follow the advice from Sebastien Bachollet, I'm going to speak in French.

And I'm given to speak very quickly or briefly about domain name collisions. I've heard the exchanges and the prior exchanges. And I addressed the board now and not the ICANN staff to remind you of two or three events or developments.

I think that the RSSAC made an initial contribution about name collisions in November 2010. The ICANN board reacted in May or August 2013. I will speed up. In August of 2013, we heard of the first preventive measures that had to be short-term preventive measures in reply to a problem. And we all know that this problem, though critical, has very few -- or is very unlikely to happen. Today we see no way out to the issue of domain name collisions. We have a list of names, but we don't know how we will get rid of these prohibitions to use domain names. This has been ongoing for over a year now. So we would like the board to decide to accept exceptions until we have a way out. Thank you.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. This is a statement on behalf of seven experts: Paul Bernal at the University of East Anglia; Caspar Bowden, independent privacy expert;

Ian Brown of Oxford; Enrique Chaparro of the foundation; Jim Killock of the Open Rights Group; Julia Powells of Cambridge; and former WHOIS review team chair, Emily Taylor.

We are concerned about the privacy implications of the Expert Working Group's report on new gTLD directory services. We hope that there will be external advice from privacy and human rights experts on the significant risks of centralizing personal information and the potential move to a synchronized registration directory service. In the meantime, we ask that the differing opinion to the EWG report from Stephanie Perrin raising from those privacy concerns be given prominence and fully considered by the board, GNSO, and others. Beyond the EWG concerns, we would particularly welcome a commitment to the more comprehensive integration of privacy and human rights considerations across ICANN's activities taking into consideration the very recent Council of Europe report that has been discussed this week and also the opinion of the opinion of the European Data Protection Commissioner dated 23rd June. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Let us continue. We have a long queue. Otherwise, I'm afraid we can't get through. Please. Next in line.

FRED FELMAN: I had no idea how serendipitous my placement was in line. Hello. I'm Fred Felman. I'm the chief marketing officer of Markmonitor and

Thomson Reuters Copymark, and I'm speaking on behalf of Markmonitor. I have two brief points and a request.

First, the current WHOIS system has evolved to serve a simpler domain naming system that no longer meets our needs. Consequently, we're obliged to see the systems failures and successes and objectively correct them relying on the good body of work from the Expert Working Group.

Second to the members of the EWG, thanks for 16 months of service, diligence, understanding, and analysis --

>>

Excuse me. Could you please slow down? The interpreters and scribes are having a difficult time. Thank you.

FRED FELMAN:

Certainly. The complex world of WHOIS and for making tangible, clear, well-founded recommendations for the replacement of the current flawed WHOIS system. We applaud your logical, databased approach and product as well as the integrity with which you reasonably and politely confronted and addressed the community and the concerns in the face of sometimes aggressive discourse here at ICANN 50.

Now, as we consider implementation of a new registration data store, we're far better prepared than ever to create a superior system for registrants and consumers of registration data. And I hope that the result of your data is that we're able to move more quickly through implementation. And now the request: As the community engages in debate and discussion about implementation, I feel it's time for us to

take an expedited, positive, solution-oriented, factual, and databased approach to this important task.

Each and every one of us and the organizations we represent play an important role in the policy development process. We should all vigilantly reject the introduction of hyperbole, speculation in our dialogue, and -- as we implement the replacement for WHOIS.

Conversely, we should embrace data, logic, research as we seek solutions. Markmonitor and our clients look forward to participating in this important effort. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Next, please.

DAVEY SONG: It's my great honor to be here and to make a comment. My name is Davey Song. I come from Beijing Internet Institute. I speak for myself as a guy working on IPv6 transition and development for years. The statement in multimedia could transition to v6 has a top priority globally. But I think many of the audience sitting here does not know that IPv6 is not only a promising solution to meet need of IP address and make Internet simple but also a must have for future Internet. So, as we know -- as we all know, the Internet is a network of networks involving multistakeholders. The transition of IPv6 is more of an industry promotion problem than a technical one.

This is not only the duty and the work of technical organizations like IETF, regional registry, network organization operation. We should make full awareness of the significance of IPv6 in the commercial field and policy making progress.

As ICANN/IANA stand for, it should address the urgency of developing IPv6 at large. I expect more effort from ICANN to support the worldwide development of IPv6 as soon as possible.

So then the example I experienced. It's my 5th time to here to join ICANN meeting. Every time I will pay attention to topic about IPv6. And last year from Beijing, Durban, and Buenos Aires, there is a workshop for IPv6 particularly. But this year in Singapore meeting and in at this time in London now the meeting, there is no topic and no such workshop.

[timer sound]

So, yeah, it's just an example of -- from my perspective. So ICANN is promoting --

ERIKA MANN:

Sorry, sorry, sorry. I think we have understood your question.

Well, understood. Thank you very much.

I'm just looking if colleagues want to respond to it. You would love to say something? Please.

KUO-WEI WU: Let me make it short. Yesterday there is a meeting between -- actually the board had an appointment with -- talk to the ASO and all. I like to share with you a good number. Actually, if you're counting the percentage of providing IPv6, it's actually grown almost 52% from last year to this year. And from (indiscernible) point of view, we have 43% growth. So you're right. IPv6 seems like it's (indiscernible) Coming.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much again. Please, next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC vice chair from Tunisia. I am speaking on my own behalf, and I will speak French.

As an African, I would like to raise two points. First I would like to quickly see 1.6 (indiscernible) .AFRICA. And I wrote in order to have an African entity in order to promote the African ccTLDs and Africa's development.

The second point I belong to at-large. I'm an African member. And at-large has had its summit during the London meeting. It was very successful. But, unfortunately, many African representatives were unable to send representatives to the summit because of visa problems. Fadi presented his apologies at this summit, and he called all these representatives. I thank him for that. But it is a deeper problem.

If ICANN continues to organize meetings in countries where African members have a difficulty to come, then there is a problem of diversity.

And diversity is one of the main points raised by Fadi during the opening ceremony. If there is no diversity, we are in trouble. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:

First of all, allow me to congratulate again to the ATLAS Summit. I think it was greatly appreciated by everybody and particularly by the board.

On the visa, which was a very, very difficult question not just for ICANN but for all international organizations, I'm sure we are looking into it. We'll do the best what we can do from management side to do -- Fadi, would you like to make a comment, please.

FADI CHEHADE:

You know what the problem is. We have done everything in our power to facilitate this. We had a room next to the British authorities in order to have everything ready. But we failed. It is a problem. I don't know what to do.

We will have a meeting in Africa in early 2015, and perhaps we have to deny the visas to the British. I don't know.

But it hurts.

And, as you, I had for a long time an African passport. And I also had this problem. Now I have an American passport, and things are easier for me. But ICANN will do whatever it can to facilitate this. We had a center to deal with the ministry. We had a problem. And we dealt with very many visas, and we were able to solve some of them.

We know that with the center that we have now in Africa and with 17 countries this problem will be eased a little bit. Thank you.

KYUNGHEE SONG:

My name is Kyunghee Song. I'm from Korean government, and I'm speaking here on my behalf. Sorry about my voice. We have considered many discussions for the past six days about Internet governance and our IANA function transition and accountability for ICANN and so on. But at the moment the quality of this important meeting, I think we may need to be back to one fundamental question: What the future ICANN will look like. Do we want the ICANN to do the same role as what they have done so far? Or we want the ICANN to do a larger role that is more than name and numbers? If we don't want the ICANN to develop bigger role, we need to separate Internet governance issues from the issue of numbers and addresses. It seems that we are likely to put high expectation on the ICANN about the realization of the multistakeholder model and the Internet issues.

Maybe it's partly because ICANN did a great role on the formation of cooperative spirit during NETmundial the expectation of the world is getting higher.

I ask all the people here to think about what role we want the ICANN to do at this critical time.

And I also ask the ICANN to be more clear, if possible, about the ICANN's future role. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Fadi, please.

FADI CHEHADE: First of all, Miss Song, I want to commend you because you're the first high-level government official to cue up today.

[Applause]

Thank you. Miss Song is a director general in the Korean ministry. And it's really wonderful to see you do a little bit what we all did at NETmundial. Right here. Lining up with everyone. In fact, you're doing better. Because at NETmundial governments insisted to have their own microphone. Here you're with all of us. So thank you for that.

[Applause]

And I also want to publicly recognize you and your ministry for the great partnership you have with ICANN. It's really fantastic, and we have with you a learning experience of how ICANN can work better with a government and a community that is eager to participate more in ICANN, so thank you for that as well.

Now, in terms of your question, you asked an extremely important question, does ICANN want to expand its scope beyond names and numbers? First of all, the answer to this question has to come from the community, not from us. All of us should decide that. But I will tell you that right now from our perspective, certainly I can speak for myself and board members can as well, the answer is no. We should stick to our remit. Because if we grow further, I think it's not in the spirit of what ICANN was created to do. Now the confusion comes, as you said very

well, because ICANN has been playing a role in the Internet governance ecosystem, as we did at NETmundial, and people are asking so what -- why is ICANN doing this and will ICANN expand its role.

[Timer sounds.]

The answer is no. ICANN was doing this because we are, like many others, IETF, ISOC, et cetera, we're members of an ecosystem and we care that this ecosystem evolves well. We hope that the community will come together and bring other forums and other platforms to enable multistakeholder Internet governance beyond names and numbers. But it won't be at ICANN. Thank you, Ms. Song.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Next, please.

DIEGO ACOSTA BASTIDAS: Good afternoon. I'm Diego Acosta Bastidas and I represent Cultura libre y software libre from Ecuador. We understand that the constellation of users of the Internet cannot be considered to be complete with the bright light provided by all those who use the Internet with the open source standards. I would like to know from the board the following: First, which would be the concrete process required to improve the representation level of the Internet users community? That all the -- in the Internet users in the universe represented at ICANN. And secondly, which would be the process required to analyze the community domain

name application and non-commercial application for this important community. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Okay. You want to say something, Sebastien? Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think it's important to give a quick answer. How to participate, you have seen that during this meeting all the doors are open. So with your groups you can join At-Large or some other parts of the organization. The door is open to you. And regarding the domain name applications, we set up a program for new gTLDs support and it has not been taken advantage of by many but perhaps in the next round, you will have the chance to do that. Thank you. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Brad, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from John Poole who is a domain name registrant. "On our France cultural radio program on 22 February, 2014, ICANN president Fadi Chehade said that he would like to see the creation of a parallel structure for ICANN and the Swiss legal system. According to the ICANN board, or more specifically board resolution 2014.02.17.01 adopted at a special meeting of the ICANN board of directors on February 17, 2014, the ICANN president's globalization advisory group on legal structure was to make recommendations to the board

concerning establishment of a complimentary parallel international structure to enhance ICANN's global legitimacy which the board was to report during ICANN 50, the London meeting. What recommendations were made by this legal structure advisory group and what are or were the board's actions, plans, and responses to those recommendations?"

ERIKA MANN: Fadi, I think you should take that.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah, I think the question is confusing. Two things. What we were talking about on the radio was that we are opening an office in Geneva and to do so we needed to set up a legal position so that we can have employees there, and we already did that. That's how we had to open an office, and we have an office in Geneva now. And Dr. Tarek Kamel is based in Geneva as a result of that. So that's very separate from his question about the recommendations, which deal with the broader issue of ICANN setting up other, I guess, legal structures in other countries.

The recommendations of that panel are public. They're on the Web site. There's nothing further through that. This was just input to the board and to the strategic planning process that is going now. So I don't believe there was any action as a result of that. It's simply good input that we will take. But for now, we do have obviously a legal presence in Switzerland simply so we can have an office and employ people.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you for the clarification. Next in line, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Jonathan Zuck from ACT. As an American I feel like I can be a little bit critical of the L.A. video we watched. I really am waiting for the day when see a montage of the windowless rooms in which we will spend our week in these beautiful cities that we all visit.

(Cheers and Applause)

Sorry, they may be producing that tonight. But -- so Winston Churchill -- it seems appropriate to quote him here -- said that "Courage is what it takes to stand up and speak." He said, "Courage is also what it takes to sit down and listen." So I want to take this moment to thank all of you for your courage. I really appreciate it. That is assuming you're not all playing Candy Crush right now. I don't know.

[Laughter]

But what I really want to say is to thank you for the two sessions that we had earlier today, the one on the IANA transfer and ICANN accountability, because I thought they were incredibly analytical, thoughtful, and productive and constructive and really set a very high bar for how that conversation will go moving forward. So I really just want to thank everyone that was involved in putting those sessions together.

[Applause]

Because I thought that they were very good. And I especially want to thank Dr. Crocker for affirming his commitment that the two of them

were in fact interdependent, which I think is a very important part of this discussion as well. So thank you very much. That's all I wanted to say.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Jonathan. Very much appreciated. Next in line, please.

SOPHIA FENG: This is Sophia Feng from KNET and (saying name), which is a member of NTAG. To echo Dr. Song's comments previously earlier, as one of the biggest back-end registry operator in APAC as well as a new gTLD registry myself would applause ICANN's continuous efforts for better registry and registrar global outreach. And I would also like to show my appreciation that since the establishment of the GDD operation team located in Singapore has done a really good job so far and they bridged a gap between APAC, ICANN stakeholders, and ICANN operation team. They offers a lot of -- plenty of new gTLD registry operator plenty of help in timing and manner.

However, there are still areas we think, you know, it needs improved. We strongly support GDD letters that GNSO has submitted to ICANN and hope ICANN can consider it carefully those areas in the letter that needs -- that suggested would need to be improved.

The two -- two point or two suggestions I'd like to emphasize coming to me personally is the first, a more transparent SLA of GDD that needs to be defined, documented, and shared with the community. I believe the essence of customer satisfaction is about managing expectations. So at the moment the expectation was not clearly defined, documented, and

shared. That's why there's a lot of registries, especially new gTLD registries that launching their TLDs or offered their marketing activities right now are very frustrated with the response of the GATT in certain kinds of questions.

Second point would be a more transparent escalation process that needs to be established to serve as accountable mechanism to safeguard those SLAs that were or are going to be promised. So this two suggestions I would like to get.

[Timer sounds.]

Yeah. I looking forward to seeing a better, faster, and stronger GDD operation team. Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you. Friends, do me a favor. I have the feeling the line is not getting smaller. So please, really let this see as final. No, no, you don't have to move away. Just stay where you are.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

No, Erika, that's staff stopping the line from getting longer.

ERIKA MANN:

I get you. I understood. I understood. Thank you very much. Second, if you can, if possible, please stay below the two minutes now. We have still quite many in the queue. So please, we will try without -- I recommend one minute. Just try to keep it very, very narrow. Please. You're the next.

MWENDWA KIVUVA: My name is Mwendwa Kivuva from Internet Society Kenya and AFRALO. I represent myself and I'll go -- I'll speak in Kenyan English.

[Laughter]

I'm happy to say that this ICANN has celebrated the individual Internet user where most of us belong. At-Large. At ATLAS II showcase the ICANN president Fadi Chehade said, "It's time to put the user at the front of the family." And Steve Crocker, the chair, said, "ICANN should all be about At-Large." End quote. From this we see that the end user should be considered an essential component of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

This seems to contradict the Constitution of the ICANN board where At-Large is only one board position, where the other groups like ccNSO and GNSO each have at least two positions in the board. The argument that has been advanced before is that the board members don't represent the interests of the community but represent the interests of ICANN. But I differ. That is not true. Since the members have the DNA of the Constitution -- of the constituency that nominated them. Board members should represent the public interest, and it's in the public interest for At-Large to get an extra seat at the board. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. Thank you so much. Next in line, please.

ERICK IRIARTE:

Good morning. Hello, I will speak in Spanish. Please, put on your headphones. I am Erick Iriarte. I remember the time when I wanted to speak in Spanish and I had to ask Amadeu Abril i Abril to interpret for me because we did not have simultaneous interpretation in Cairo. We have evolved quite a lot since then. Most sessions have simultaneous interpretation and most documents are translated into many languages so non-native English speakers can engage fully. And that is a great progress that ICANN has made because it shows that ICANN has listened to the community. And in my capacity as the former -- the former LACTLD manager and many other capacities I was always here to criticize you. But today I'm here to express my gratitude because there was an early warning to the .AMAZON domain by the Brazilian and Peruvian government and Latin American governments signed a statement saying that .PATAGONIA was part of our identity, geographic identity. .PATAGONIA did not proceed and the board, you, decided to reach a decision. I don't know if it was a unanimous decision, I don't know who voted in favor of that or against, and it doesn't really matter to know that right here, right now. I do not want to know if you had political reasons, legal reasons, but know that you have a big conflict in store because Amazon no doubt will take legal actions. However, I want to express my gratitude because you went beyond what was in black and white and beyond a simple regulation. Thank you very much.

[Timer sounds.]

ERIKA MANN:

Next in line, please.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you very much. I'm Henri Kassen from Namibia. I'm a GAC member. The new gTLD process such as .AFRICA which the Namibian government endorsed and is eagerly awaiting speedy delegation and financial assistance for developing countries amongst others. This was done as it is an open secret that ICANN desires to increase participation from this important constituency. Information gathered indicates that - - and correct me if I'm wrong -- that no one was actually assisted from the developing economies. So the question now in the next round -- and we presume there will be such assistance again -- what steps will the board take to ensure that such assistance is effective this time? I understand there was an application, but the application was -- was rejected because it didn't comply with the -- some requirements. Thank you very much. There's your one minute, Madam Chair.

ERIKA MANN: Fantastic. And wonderful to have you here from the GAC. Somebody wants to -- please, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Erika, and thanks for the question. The reality is that the board doesn't impose processes like the applicant support process from the top-down. It's a bottom-up process on which a cross constituency working group developed a recommendation. That recommendation had certain flaws. There were, in fact, three applications, of which one was successful. In fact, I think it may have been four, of which one was successful. So does there need to be more work? Yes. Is it board work? No. It's community work that needs to be done. The board is here to make sure the community has done its work and that the

recommendations coming from the community are feasible, affordable, practical, and fair across the community. But ultimately we don't impose our design of a system on the organization but we rather call on the organization to consider the most appropriate mechanism for assistance, financial assistance, technical and other assistance, to applicants as we move into further rounds.

ERIKA MANN: I have two more comments from colleagues, so Cherine followed by Steve.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you for your remark and comment. We sincerely hope that awareness and communication will be much better in the next round and that there will be far more applications from the Africa continent, per se, compared to the first round. So I think there will be much more awareness. People are really aware of what's happening now, and I'm sure there will be a greater take up in the future. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: And just very quickly to build on that, there is a formal review process that will take place in between the rounds where we take the lessons from the first round. This will definitely be one of the agenda items for that review.

ERIKA MANN: Brad, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Erika, we have a comment from (saying name) in the Tunisia video hub. Mr. (saying name)? The hub looks surprisingly like the board

HUB INTERVENTION: Hello. I am from the Internet Society in Tunisia. I agree with my African friends, and I would like to know what role can ICANN play in order to further development in the African continent. Also, are there any specific conditions for routers in terms of security? Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: I have the feeling -- would you want to say something, Suz? No? I think we touched on the question before. So let us move on.

Next in line, please.

Again, do me a favor. Stay to one minute if you can.

VIKA MPISANE: Vika Mpisane from the South African ccTLD manager.

I just have a few questions to ask, and my phone is about to die, the battery. Apologies.

First comment from, I think, Mr. Chalaby about awareness, responding to my Namibian friend. We take it that kindly. We were very disappointed last time when we asked several times to ICANN senior staff to come and do workshops in our region about new gTLDs and there was no response.

I will talk about .AFRICA as quick as I can. As our colleagues have talked about it, we cannot overemphasize the importance of this and what is at stake.

What is particularly important is communication. We were told and we received an email that there has been an RFP process that shall begin and that we shall give time to.

I'm not aware that today these timelines have been communicated or at least indicative timelines have been communicated both to the (indiscernible), the applicant, or to the AUC.

I'm particularly concerned as far as the communication with the AUC is concerned; that beyond a letter that is sent in response to the commissioner, there should be more active communication with them.

We can't be the ones who keep on trying to answer questions that ICANN should answer.

We've been patient, as you may be very well aware. In our bit, we are attacked, we are criticized by the (indiscernible). We pretend that they don't exist because we really don't regard them that high. But we are facing a lot of questions from the national government viewpoint. We are calling to the Department of Communication (indiscernible), so we need at least some communication.

Your bylaws, for example, speak of such things as appointing a panel. We would like to see communication going to AUC about that.

[Timer Sounds]

VIKA MPISANE: Your bylaws talk about constructive engagement. Is that going to be done or not? We need communication there. We can't be left in the dark (indiscernible). Conciliation. Is that going to happen?

So all in all, we saw the letter from the CEO to the commissioner, but we need much more clear timelines or at least much more calculated response that clarifies so that we don't stand in between trying to answer the AUC.

More importantly, it's about governments, and this can help us in the African governments into the ICANN process. Apologies.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. We understood your frustration. Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Vika? Vika? Vika? I appreciate your frustration and I empathize with your need -- your ask for communication. However, I would ask you to understand that the process that is currently going on is a mandated process under the ICANN bylaws that is an external and independent process and must be carried out formally and properly in accordance with its own rules and regulations.

There is only so much that we can do.

I understand that you need -- that you would like to have up-to-date communication, and we will do our best to deal with that. But you need to understand that there are some things that will happen in that process that we simply won't be able to communicate to you because

they will be inside of the process, and that is a matter between the seeker of remedy and ICANN and the independent panel.

But I understand your point and I empathize. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

And I would just like to add, Erika, if I could, I appreciate your frustration but there are many communications going on that you may not know about.

We have spoken to the Commission before the decision came out. I have personally spoken to the commissioner multiple times, my staff has. So we have been communicating, and we will continue to communicate.

VIKA MPISANE:

Could you then add us as at least the others weren't in such communications, as far as possible.

FADI CHEHADE:

Well, I don't know that we can be communicating with every applicant and the parties the applicant is using.

We have spoken to the commissioner, because she sent me a letter, before and after the letter and during the process, and we will do our best to continue communicating with her.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Next in line. Please, try one minute; otherwise, we have to set the clock to one minute.

JORDAN CARVER: Thank you. It's Jordan Carver from InternetNZ. I'll try to be under one minute.

As we discussed stewardship and accountability, my request is, to staff and the board to stop using language about training wheels. Both senior staff and senior community members have been using this language this week and in the recent months. It kind of implies that ICANN should just be left to grow up and to take on all the responsibility for the DNS on itself. And that's not the debate we need to have. We need to have open, and honest, and (indiscernible) conversation about accountability without NTIA in the mix. And that's the situation we find ourselves in. That's why ICANN's accountability arrangements need to change.

It isn't about training wheels. The NTIA presence, the IANA contract aren't training wheels today. They're accountability tools. What we need is a settlement with proper accountable that will be durable across the next period of years.

Trust is essential to this, and so what we need to have is an open, not rushed --

[Timer Sounds]

JORDAN CARVER: -- grass-roots, not top-down process without discussion of training wheels.

Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Next, please.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi, Byron Holland, chair of the ccNSO; CEO and president of CIRA, the Canadian CA TLD operator.

First I would like to recognize this historic event. After 50 meetings, our friends and colleagues in the GNSO have unanimously agreed. Hopefully that's the foreshadowing of things to come.

[Applause]

BYRON HOLLAND: I want to remind all of us in this community and the broader Internet community, when we were at NETmundial we actually agreed upon what accountability meant and requires; that it required mechanisms for independent checks and balances as well as for review and redress. And that formed part of the ccNSO's input into the accountability process.

And we think this agreed-upon definition should be the foundation and reference of ICANN's further work on accountability. Accordingly, we propose that the goal of this process should be to ensure that a system of checks and balances is in place to guarantee that ICANN operates in --

[Timer Sounds]

BYRON HOLLAND:

-- accordance with an agreed upon set of principles and that meaningful redress is available to those who may be harmed by the actions or inactions of ICANN.

With that, I also want to take this moment to recognize the significant progress that ICANN has made in this process from the naming of the coordination committee to the selection of its members, and many other things that have happened. And I would be remiss if I didn't mention the positives that have happened so far, but still the opportunities we have to continue to improve it.

Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you to remind us and for your kind comments.

Please, next in line.

ELISA COOPER:

Elisa Cooper, chair of the business constituency, and I have just two very brief comments regarding the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services. One, we're extremely appreciative of all the hard work and heavy lifting that that group undertook for 16 months.

Two, and more importantly, you should know that the business constituency is supportive of their work, and we very much look forward to delivery of that and the initiation of a policy development process.

Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you so much, and we certainly acknowledge the hard work done. But thank you for reminding us.

Please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Erika. This is Keith Drazek, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, but I'm here speaking in my capacity as vice president of public policy and government relations at VeriSign.

I wanted to just speak very briefly about -- I think it's important for me to tell the community VeriSign's position on the IANA transition. And this is somewhat in response to rumors and sort of things that I have been hearing this week from folks in the hallways and in the community that VeriSign is in some way not supportive of or trying to push back on the eventual transition of the stewardship role. And, you know, we've heard talk of unnamed sources or unnamed groups, elements that are

trying to push back on this. And, frankly, this week, I haven't met anybody who is opposed to this transition. I think folks are actually very excited about it, myself included.

So I'm just going to read very briefly --

[Timer Sounds]

KEITH DRAZEK:

Forgive me. VeriSign supports NTIA's March 14th, 2014 announcement. VeriSign supports NTIA's four key principles. VeriSign Supports the bottom-up multistakeholder process that is now under way and that we have already been very much engaged. VeriSign supports the target date of September 2015 for transition. We support these things provided the multistakeholder community recommendations for ICANN's accountability reforms are accepted by NTIA before the final transition, and sufficiently implemented by ICANN subject to measurable deliverables.

I think this last point is key. We're not saying we feel every last piece has to be done by the transition date. We just need to have sufficient implementation by ICANN subject to measurable deliverables.

Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you for clarifying this point.

Please.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you. Cintra Sooknanan, the vice chair of the Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency.

In the resolutions which created NPOC, the gap in NomCom composition began, and after three-plus years, the Board has failed to resolve this noncontentious and obviously correctable issue. Instead, the Board had twinned this issue with the contentious one for the reduction and regulation of the size and composition of the NomCom as a whole.

The Board is well aware that this will have clear pushback from the community.

We find the Board's handling of this issue to be persistently highly prejudicial to the interests of our constituency and I would like to remind the Board that they are accountable to the ICANN for their inaction in this regard.

NPOC recognizes the ICANN ombudsman as a mechanism for providing such accountability on behalf of the ICANN community and has strong reasoning to initiate proceedings to facilitate the Board's action in the interest of equitable treatment of all ICANN multistakeholders and in finding some tangible and timely resolution to have an NPOC representative on the NomCom.

Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: George, please.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you for the statement. We have dealt with this question when talking with the NCUC. The Board has set up a working group to look at the composition of the NomCom. It's working now, and we expect to have results as soon as possible.

Thank you.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: May I just say, Board, I don't see why the Board would be discussing this with the NCUC when the NPOC is a separate limb.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: NCSG, sorry. Not NCUC.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Clarified.

Next in line, please.

KHALED FATTAL:

Thank you, Erika. Khaled Fattal, Multilingual Internet Group, group chairman. I have two points, and I will be as brief as I can but I also want to be effective in delivering the message.

First, a serious, serious congratulations to the Board, to ICANN, to this body, multistakeholder body that we talk about, and to you, Fadi.

I think in Durban, I throw you all a curve ball and everybody wondered where is this going to go. You remember. I raised the issue of PRISM and the reason that we need to make the conversation of the Snowden revelations public.

The result, we all went to IGF Bali and it was center stage. As a result, we had NETmundial and now we can talk about a transition that is very transparent. For that, I am now a bigger believer in the multistakeholder model, and congratulations to all of you. So I will applaud that.

[Applause]

KHALED FATTAL:

Now, here is another challenge and forgive me if I take another 20, 30 seconds.

The phase that we are entering now of the Internet, which the new gTLDs are a serious contributor to, is what we have been referring to, and most of you have heard it, is the seismic change and its ripples. And not all of it is the new gTLDs, but a significant portion of it is new gTLDs. We're moving from 22 to a thousand-plus. We're going to have about a hundred in IDNs, more than a hundred in IDNs, signaling the birth of the

multilingual Internet we've been championing for more than a decade and a half; advancement in technology; plus user base shifting to emerging markets.

On the other side, we have very little if any processes in mitigating the risks in this space.

So here's the challenge to ICANN. I'm not inviting you. I'm calling on you to weigh in on this issue of cybersecurity, on issue of child protection online, on issue of capacity building in the new Internet, because unless we all participate on this, we will have a major problem. And I wanted this to go on the record.

Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN: Khaled, thanks. It's on the record now.

Thank you all.

One more? Sorry, sorry.

Please.

SHASHANK KANSAL: For once I get to say the last few words. Otherwise, at home the last words are only two: "Thanks, dear."

[Laughter]

SHASHANK KANSAL: My name is Shashank Kansal. Many of you will recognize me, and I got to meet a lot of old friends. Not old as in age but friends from old times.

I was extremely active on various ICANN activities in 1999 and 2000, and it appeared to be going in the right direction --

ERIKA MANN: Slow down. You can't make up the minute in speeding up. Translators will not hear you and can't translate so slow down a bit.

SHASHANK KANSAL: I was extremely active in various ICANN activities in 1999 and 2000, and it was all going well. I stepped away. I've returned after 14 years for two reasons. One, it is convenient location, and also to speak about something I feel strongly about.

I think ICANN is doing great job given the complexities and nature of the beast. I applaud every single person around the world that provides their time and effort for something that is fundamental building block for Internet's connected society.

One thing, if I may humbly suggest, majority of the discussions discussed in various meetings across are about solving the problems -- 20 more seconds. Discussed about solving the problems of today or anticipated in future. However, one thing which I see missing is, for example, when I was in Papua, New Guinea, there are communities of 600 different languages, and those people are not represented not because they are not invited. It's just because they didn't know what to do.

So we should probably have a group thinking about those communities of people who might want to do something. Considering the future will provide them the opportunity.

Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

So thank you all for participating in this session, and I give back to Steve. You want to make a comment.

Bruce.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, thank you, everybody. There are two pieces of business I want to add. One is, most unusually, there was a question that we expected and that we think is important to ask and to answer. I'm going to turn it over to Bruce, and then I have one more thing.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you, Steve.

During the Board's meeting with the Commercial Stakeholder Group earlier this week, there was a question raised about our process for reserving names during the initial solution for the names collision problem. And if some of those names were to be released at some later time, the question was whether the current trademark sunrise process and trademarks claims process would still apply. And I wonder if staff could provide a response on that question.

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Hello, this is Akram Atallah.

Yes, the -- we have clarified before when we put the framework for the alternative mitigation and we reserve the collision names that every registry should actually treat the reserved name -- the blocked names as if they are -- basically read them as registrable. So you can go through the registration process but you cannot actually allocate them.

So if a registry went through that process, then they don't have to do anything more.

So if they put them through the sunrise and claims, then they don't have to go through any more process.

As all reserved names, if they did not do that, when they release them from the reserved list, they will have to do the claims as all reserved names have to go.

So that's the recommendation that was put back then, and this is still the recommendation now.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. And thank you, Bruce, for raising that.

The last thing that I would like to do before we transition to a meeting of the Board formally is to thank our colleagues and friends at the Internet society for the enormous support to our remote participation program and the cooperation and interactions with Pierre Dandjinou, our vice president for global stakeholder engagement in Africa, and

Rodrigo de la Parra, our vice president for global stakeholder engagement in Latin America and Caribbean.

I think this goes beyond an experiment, really, but this extension of our ability to interact around the world is really a very important part of the general strategy that we have of trying to reach out and touch everyone. So I'm personally quite impressed, and I think we all are quite appreciative. And, in particular, the degree of cooperation between Internet society and ICANN is noteworthy. We have many, many levels of cooperation, and this one is something that is quite evident, practical, and quite successful.

So with that, let me close the public forum.

We will take a stretcher, stand up and stretch. But we're not going to take much of a break and we're going to transition into a meeting of the Board.

We're going to begin the meeting of the Board before we open formally as a -- in terms of a legal opening with an acceptance of the ATLAS II communique recommendation -- declaration, thank you, to us. And I expect that that will all be quite exciting.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]