
BEIJING – BOARD with ccNSO

Tuesday, April 09, 2013 – 10:00 to 10:45

ICANN – Beijing, People's Republic of China

LESLEY COWLEY: Good morning, everybody. We're going to start. And this is the joint meeting of the ccNSO and the ICANN board, and as is traditional, we've exchanged questions or topics that we'd like to talk about. We have four discussion topics from the ccNSO. Earlier on this morning I received just one question from the board, so I don't know if that's good or bad.

STEVE CROCKER: So on behalf of the ICANN board, let me welcome you all. Our focus is -- our orientation is far more interested in what you all have to say than what we have to say. We've gradually evolved from kind of a pro forma here's what's on our mind and here's what's on your mind to trying to shift the focus more and more to hearing what's on your mind. So only in the event that a conversation stalls should anybody feel obliged to take our question. So I'm keen to plunge in here.

LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. Thank very much, Steve, for that clarification. Okay. So first of all, we thought we would update you on the internationalized domain names country code Policy Development Process which is known as the IDN ccPDP from the ccNSO. But you were going to give a verbal update, please.

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.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, just a status update for the board. The PDP is reaching its final stages after six years, so that's a good thing. That means the council will decide upon the recommendations during this meeting on Wednesday and afterwards the ccNSO members will have a vote on the -- on the recommendations from the councils and hopefully by Durban the recommendations will be passed on to the board for implementation. Now, the IDN PDP has, in fact, two components to it. One is the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and this part of the policy will replace -- or the intention is to replace the fast track process. The second part is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO because currently they can't become members. And if you compare the overall policy with the IDNs with the fast track process, there are a few changes, and I think the major change is the introduction of a two-panel review process for confusing the similarity of strings. The second part is a more thoughtful description of the process and procedures, again linked to the confusingly similarity and a -- and the third element which is clarified as well, this policy's only on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. The current procedures and policies regarding the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs applies to IDN ccTLD strings as well. So that was my update.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Bart. And let me add a further comment that will become relevant later. We're quite pleased with the fast track process, it has to be said, and it's certainly viewed as a success by many in the community and that is because the community saw an urgent need that had to be addressed and felt that the Policy Development Process would not be quick enough. So whilst we had a formal Policy Development Process, we also had the fast track. And I think it's very important for us to note

that was the best way forward for IDNs and to note that we have a way that maybe we could use for other issues where appropriate. But we're happy to take any board member comments or questions.

STEVE CROCKER:

I'm -- I couldn't be happier. This has taken a little while and it's been needed and just extremely happy. I was forming questions in my mind and every one of the questions was answered as rapidly as I was asking, greater visibility, greater recourse in the event of dispute about the outcome. And did -- I had that thought about the impact on ccNSO as an organization and so I'll be watching there. I don't see any real issue at all. The -- I'm guessing that every one of these IDN ccTLDs will fall under the same general framework of rules that the existing CCs that they're not under contract with ICANN, that they are subject to the general set of rules about the relationship with the government of the country or territory and community support and so forth. And so it will be very interesting to see that.

And you did tick off that this replaces the fast track. Is this also the fulfillment of the so-called Framework of Interpretation?

LESLEY COWLEY:

No. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Lesley. Yeah, no. Just a -- just on the -- just on the closing of the fast track, Steve, the issue on the administration side -- or you're right, each of the IDN -- the IDN ccTLD is a ccTLD, so it's in the same

basis -- the difficulty for the ccNSO is, just take one example, it is technically possible that you could have up to, say, 12 or 13 IDN ccTLDs in India and therefore how many votes do they get? How do you split the vote? What do you do in the context of running the ccNSO. So that's the -- that's the logistical side of the challenge from the administration of the ccNSO. And in respect to the Framework of Interpretation, since you brought it up, no, that work still goes on. Keith -- we may be talking about it a little bit later, I can't remember. No? Okay. We're not. Well, it's still happening and going reasonably well, I think.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Thank you. So that was our update on that one. If that made you happy, Steve, then this theme will continue. So colleagues will recall long-standing discussions around financial contributions and financial information from ICANN. And there has been significant progress, positive progress. Took us a while. And Byron was going to provide an update.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Lesley. Yes, I'm actually very encouraged with the work that we've been doing with ICANN. In particular our finance working group which, as you know, has spoken to this audience a number of times over the last two years. We received what I think is some good news from the finance department and from Xavier, but let me back up a moment. As many of you know, this journey has been the better part of a two-year journey from Nairobi where the previous CO indicated that the financial contribution being made by the cc community was not where it

needed to be and, in fact, it was significantly more. The number thrown around was \$12 million, and that sparked the genesis of the finance working group, to look at what is the actual cost associated with supporting the ccNSO that ICANN incurs and then the other side of the equation, within the ccNSO itself, whatever the number ends up being, how will that be justly allocated, given that there is a very wide and divergent range of country code operators in terms of size and in terms of corporate governance and, of course, associated revenues.

So we've been looking at that over the last -- literally over the last couple of years and there's been a few turns along the way, which of course we've shared with this group. We're a couple of CEOs in, a couple of CFOs in, a couple of financial systems in, but I'm very pleased to say that in the discussions that we had with Xavier on Sunday, I think we made some very, very good progress. Fadi has been very open to this discussion and very transparent and willing to hear some of the messages that we have been trying to articulate in terms of the shared values that we bring between ICANN itself and cc operators in our own domestic environments. And the fact that as cc operators in our domestic environments often we are running our administering our own small version of ICANN domestically. And I think that Fadi has heard that message and that evolution and the discussion has made both parties more open to that message and the notion that this discussion is not just about money, that there is a value exchange between the parties that is greater than just the dollar flow between them. That CCs as operators give credence to the notion of ICANN as a global organization, that we're the feet on the street in every country, that we operate our own IGFs, and support our own Internet communities

domestically. And that that has value for ICANN. And that of course ICANN brings value to us, from a global perspective.

But during the discussion and the evolution of the discussion we started to break down those different elements into really very specific elements that ICANN supports financially that are related only to the cc community, like the Secretariat. That there are some shared elements that we clearly, as a community, receive benefit from, like the IANA function, or corporate governance, the board itself, and we should have some role in sharing the expenses associated with that. And then there's a third element, more than the global ones to which I just refer. Much more difficult to quantify. How do you monetize the value of a country code operator putting on its own IGF and what does that bring to the multistakeholder model? Very difficult to quantify that. And I think in discussions with Xavier and with Fadi and the finance -- the Finance Committee within the board, we've evolved, both parties, our understanding of that and what it means to have that exchange of value.

So the ccNSO clearly believes that we should be paying our way in terms of specific costs associated with us, and Xavier has been able to clearly present those numbers. In discussions with Xavier and with Fadi and the finance working group -- or the Finance Committee, we've come to terms with we're going to be okay with acknowledging that in that global set of expenses we need to be okay with the fact that it's probably a wash. We bring value to ICANN, ICANN brings value to us. It will be very challenging to put a specific dollar value on it. So let's just accept the fact that there's an equivalent exchange of value there. Leaving us with that middle bucket which is those shared expenses that

every community or constituency within ICANN should share some portion of those expenses, like IANA, like the governance function, like the meetings themselves, ICANN meetings themselves. And Xavier on Sunday was able to provide us, really for the first time, specific numbers associated with that, which was great progress. And I think the other key element here is the -- Fadi's blog from March 18 after the ccTLD round table where he specifically came out and said to the effect that we should not be letting the pure financial relationship get in the way of our common interests, which is the health and functioning of the Internet globally and in our own domestic environments for cc operators. And I think that was a major turning point, that acknowledgment and understanding right there, as well as the more tactical one that Xavier has been able to truly produce concrete and meaningful numbers in that shared bucket.

So we believe in the ccNSO that we've made very significant progress forward. We're not there yet, but we can see the horizon. In coming to conclusion on what I can only describe as a journey around the contributions and the contribution method of the ccNSO into ICANN, both from a shared value as well as a pure financial dollar contribution.

So that gives you a sense of, I think, where we're at right now, which is well, well down the path. However, that path will extend through Durban, and we'll have more to report at that time.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Byron.

STEVE CROCKER: As you said, more good news. Somebody want to comment? Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I was just going to no more than say congratulations on this progress on both sides. And just going back to Prague when I remember, Byron, your face when you at the last minute would change from the expense model into the value model, thank God this happened at the time. But I think you are quite right in saying this is not just about money, you know. There's a value contribution from both sides. And it's fantastic progress and very pleased.

What are the next steps, as you see them, between now and Prague -- I mean, what do you expect from us more in terms of getting this model finalized?

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, funny you should ask. We've just been having that discussion this morning within the ccNSO, and obviously much of this information is literally hot off the press for us. So we're still digesting as a finance working group and as a community. But I think the key is that we see -- we see that we have the information that we need, that we've been asking for, since Prague and before, and that's sort of the part A of the discussion. And then there's the internal part which is now that we have a concrete number that we can all tie our hat to, how do we distribute that equitably, given the wildly divergent sizes and operating methods of the registries within the room? And we had some good discussion this morning. You know, there are complexities like some registries have an exchange of letters or (indiscernible) contract with

ICANN. How would that play into a voluntary banded model? Those are the much more granular detail discussions that we'll be having over the coming month, months, to be able to make a concrete recommendation to the council, our ccNSO council, hopefully by the end of Durban. But also socializing it and discussing it with the other constituencies within the ICANN fold. And ideally getting to conclusion somewhere between Durban and the next meeting.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Cherine, you will recall, I think, one of the very first times I met you we were asking for financial information, and it was more than before Prague. I dread to think how many years ago it was. So we have been extremely pleased and somewhat surprised to now receive that information that we can then go forward with some information to inform our discussions.

BYRON HOLLAND:

And I just want to say, going back to Prague, of course we had some tough discussions there and Xavier brought forward some news that we didn't necessarily want to hear, but I think that tough medicine has -- has been very valuable for us and has really helped, and we're seeing the benefit of that now.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Anyone else?

MIKE SILBER:

If I can interject. I think one of the interesting things before I joined the board, this discussion has been ongoing I think before many people in this room, when they first arrived in the organization this discussion has been ongoing. What I'm very pleased about is some of the underlying issues. While the question of providing accurate financials has been going on for close on ten years, the underlying debate and the recognition of mutual benefit that both parties bring to one another has taken a lot of the heat out of the financial debate. Yes, it's useful to understand the actual costs associated and to make sure that the cc community covers the costs that it brings to the organization, but recognizing there's mutual benefit across the board really, I think, has been incredibly helpful. And I'm feeling a lot more love and a lot less tension.

>>

Is that his personal remark?

LESLEY COWLEY:

How on earth do I follow that one? Okay. Moving on then to -- back to earth with the evolution of the ICANN and ccNSO working practices perhaps. So we wanted to talk with you briefly on this subject. The ccNSO, as you know, has been doing a great deal of work on our work program, organizing ourselves and ensuring that we have the match between capacity and policy and issues that we want to address. And that's been an ongoing task, very ably supported by the Secretariat. And we have a wonderful mind map and project plan via the ccNSO Web site for anyone that is interested.

But we've been thinking about how to deal with our workload and how to prioritize workload. And whilst we have sorted our own workload, as in the ccNSO working groups and so forth, we are often kind of surprised by requests, either from the board or from other SOs and ACs for comment that maybe we didn't know were coming and for obvious reasons haven't then planned. So we've been thinking about how we deal with those and have developed something that sounds very grand Gordon Eisenhower matrix. It's really not that impressive though it has a grand name. It's really about us prioritizing whether something is urgent and important -- excuse me -- or if not, if it's not urgent and it's not important, it's very unlikely we will -- we will get round to doing it in effect.

We have also put in what we are calling a triage group which sounds like a first-aid committee but really the triage group is our tool really for deciding on our prioritization of work, deciding what to do with a request for comment or a request for policy guidance or information.

And we are -- we are going to see how that works, but that is our way of dealing with incoming requests as it were to the ccNSO.

And what we're trying to do is improve efficiency and effectiveness of the ccNSO and very mindful that it is also the aspiration of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the ICANN policy process, too. We have been thinking about that.

Let me take you back to the fast-track comment earlier because we think that may be a methodology that at times we could use more where there is community support for a matter needing urgent policy and parallel track, the formal process that we have, the PDP. So we

have experience of doing that. We have lessons from applying that. But that may be a model that we can think about using in the cases where there is support for urgent policy to be made.

Another comment, though, that has come up through the ccNSO community is that sometimes there will be a desire to move more quickly than maybe some of us are comfortable with and particularly there is some concern that roundtables or task forces may be perceived by some to short circuit the multistakeholder process. So I think it is important to flag that and to think through as a community how we can retain the good bits of the multistakeholder process but develop ways of developing policy more quickly where there's support for doing so.

So we just wanted to flag that as an area, I think, of future work and the ccNSO stand ready to play our part in that.

Bertrand?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, thanks. Oops. I want to piggyback on this, on the two elements because, first of all, the experiment of the fast track IDN exercise was in my view extremely positive. And one of the reasons why it was positive is because it was a cross-community working group that was really engaging the actors from the onset. And I was at the time in the GAC. And it is a wonderful memory of having participated in that.

It's one rare case where people from the GAC were actually participating in a working group. I mean, Manal was there as well.

And the discussion was what ICANN discussions should be on most cases. And I would even argue, even if a lot of people are resenting that, that one of the reasons we had so many problems with the development of the new gTLD program is because it was a GNSO PDP and not a community-wide PDP.

If we had had working groups that involved some people from the GAC and from the rest of the community from the onset, it would certainly have worked better. And I'm very encouraged, as I said, in the discussion with the At-Large just before now, the approach that has been taken in the expert working group on new directory services is a perfect example that, once again, when you start a process, having participants from as many stakeholder groups as possible to frame the issue is an essential part of making the process viable afterwards. And it is in particular a response to the argument that this has nothing to do with circumventing. This has to do with framing the issue correctly at the beginning and allowing the different actors to participate appropriately. Otherwise, you launch processes. People define their positions in their silos before they get around the table and it's harder to make them agree.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Bertrand.

Steve, you wanted to come in?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I've become a bit concerned with the words that are occurring multiple times about the bypassing of the policy development

process, stated as if it is a fact. And I want to make kind of two points about this.

First of all, what may appear or seem to be bypassing in the eyes of some may not seem that way to others. So I think we want to be very careful about what the observations are, what the facts of the matter are and if, in fact, there is a kind of clear-cut, undercutting of the PDP and the rules associated with that, then we need to deal with that. And, on the other hand, if it is a comment or a charge that's made that isn't, in fact, substantiated, then I think that cause as different kind of harm and that we should try to deal with that.

A certain amount of confidence and communication and tolerance, I think, is needed throughout this whole process. There's not anything that's perfect.

The other thing that does need to be addressed from time to time is that while we strongly subscribe -- and I'm not just talking about the board, I'm talking about all of us, the whole community -- to the bottoms-up multistakeholder process with accountability and transparency and the policy development process associated with all of that, that there is no guarantee that those processes will, in fact, lead to positive conclusions.

There's a certain amount of gaming that takes place sometimes. There's other kinds of stalling. And we need to be prepared from time to time to examine how well that process is working. I'm not suggesting that that's a license to go undercut it, but it is also a requirement that we are continually monitoring how well that works and looking to see if there's imperfections in all of that.

Bertrand, you made reference to the expert working group that's set up. This is to help frame a well-enough defined question to put into the policy development process not to subvert it or go around it. So it is intended to be helpful as opposed to contrary. Now there has been some confusion about all of that and, indeed, I have seen words describing what the steps are going to be that I thought were unfortunate that looked as if we were going to go directly from the expert working group to putting requirements into the registrar agreement. Can't happen that way.

But, anyway, the point is that while we subscribe strongly to the PDP, I'm finding myself a bit uncomfortable about the charge made as if it's a fact that we're undermining it and perhaps doing it sort of in a continual way. And I just don't think that that's -- certainly not the view of the board. And we bend over backwards not to do things like that.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Steve. That's reassuring because the first item on our list was the closure of a very long process of the IDN PDP.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Lesley. You're right. I agree with what Steve said. It is really important, too. Language, the words you use, are incredibly important.

And I want to be really clear, what Lesley has been talking about and the reason why the fast track worked is because there was a PDP underneath it. That's not circumventing any -- in other words, the PDP was launched and then the fast track sits above that. It is really important.

The other point I would make just to echo Steve is often "You're circumventing the PDP" is code for "You're not doing what I like" or "You're not doing what I want." It is really important to be very careful about how we use the words.

Thanks, Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you.

Anyone else? Okay.

Let me move on to the last item on our dance card, which is the strategy on Internet governance post WCIT. We've had a number of WCIT-related discussions in the ccNSO and very much are viewing WCIT and all things post-WCIT as a priority over what will be probably the next five to ten years, which is why we're fixated, it may seem, on what is the strategy of ICANN and others post-WCIT.

Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I think, firstly, it's important to acknowledge ICANN's strong engagement in the WCIT process in Dubai last year. And, also, understanding that WCIT is just a chapter in an ongoing series of Internet governance events.

We have previously asked the ICANN board to provide us with its strategy for ICANN's engagement on Internet governance.

To date, the responses that we've received have been really confined to listing the meetings and the people's names from ICANN who will be engaged in the IGF, which is very, very useful. But it is not a descriptive strategy.

It would be very useful for the ccTLD community to know and understand ICANN's strategy and its high-level principles for engagement on Internet governance issues.

Many ccTLDs are engaged in their own country sub regionally or regionally in IGFs. And for them to have a greater understanding of ICANN strategy and principles would potentially assist in harmonizing these activities.

So we again ask the question of the ICANN board: Is there a clear articulated strategy for Internet governance engagement for ICANN? Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Keith, I very much like that statement. So I'm going to put some people on the spot.

Nigel, you have walked in at a perfectly opportune time. In addition to yourself, who from ICANN staff is currently in the room?

Yeah, let me ask you all to stand up for a minute. We got -- good, we got a good set of people.

Read back, if you will, that last part, Keith. No, stay standing.

[Laughter]

I didn't tell you to sit down yet.

[Laughter]

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I like it when people are standing like that. Okay.

It would be useful for the ccTLD community to know and understand ICANN's strategy and its high-level principles for engagement on Internet governance. Many ccTLDs are engaged in their own country, sub regional or regional IGFs. And for them to have a greater understanding of ICANN's strategy and principles, it would assist, potentially harmonizing, the Internet governance activities.

So a clear articulation of ICANN's strategy and principles would be very useful to us.

STEVE CROCKER:

So thank you very much. And now you can sit.

And so, Keith, and everybody, I want you to understand that what you have just seen is not policy. This was implementation.

LESLEY COWLEY:

So we don't yet hear the strategy.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think there is an acceptance. It is pretty clear from Steve that there is an acceptance that the request is perfectly justified and should be responded to but perhaps not in this moment.

LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. We'll come back next time and ask the same question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, you won't. No, you will not. You will not need to come back next time and ask the same question.

LESLEY COWLEY: I'm sorry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fadi is walking slowly to the microphone, I think.

LESLEY COWLEY: Bill.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Lesley. As chair of the Board Global Relations Committee, I can say we are making progress. I feel the staff is making progress on this. I feel the board is making progress on this. We have turned our attention clearly to it. We are certainly nowhere near what I would call an end state. Well, "nowhere near" is also an overstatement.

We are approaching an understanding of this, I think. But point taken.

It does require attention both at the staff level and the board level, and it's getting some now. Thanks.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. I have Erika and then Gonzalo.

ERIKA MANN: Just to continue what Bill said, I think it is extremely important and the indication how many ICANN people participate in the various WCIT forums actually show the interest and show that there is a big interest to define what you call "strategies."

Everyone has to be very careful with the word "strategy" because this whole environment is a moving environment and it is very hard to be defined from our very narrow point of view.

But like Bill, I think we will get there. The most recent meeting which I had the pleasure to attend with Nigel -- I'm not sure if Nigel is in the room, which we attended in Rome where Hamadoun Toure invited to understand the post-WCIT meeting and the post-WCIT environment, preparing the next round of talks which he is interested in, I think it was extremely interesting to hear how pleased he was about the way ICANN participants now.

There is an understanding -- And this includes the whole community. There is a kind of willingness from both sides actually to define and to understand their respective role, which I think is already a major step forward. It is certainly not what could be achieved, but it is a very difficult environment. And I don't have to tell this to you.

LESLEY COWLEY: So, Keith, I don't know if you wanted to respond on that point and then Gonzalo and then Olga.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think again we are getting an acknowledgment of the number of people in the meetings being attended. But there is not -- the question that we have, we're acknowledging ICANN is firmly engaged. But going back to Bill's comments, I think -- can I then ask, since this is the third time that we've actually asked this question in three successive meetings, can we put a time frame around when we might expect to see a clear articulated strategy from ICANN on the topic of Internet governance?

FADI CHEHADE: We do have a strategy. The problem is that we have not had a forum to share it with you. We have done it, for example, right now as we are speaking here. We have a very intense exchange between us on our strategy and the regional RIRs, where we're sitting with them and aligning their strategies and ours.

I think -- as Byron referred to earlier, we've had a bit of a block between our work and the ccNSO work. I think we're over that block.

Right now we are just entering a new phase where we are extremely aware of the possibilities of working and learning and learning from the ccNSO community.

Just, for example, look at the registrar agreement we got closed yesterday and we celebrated with some champagne. A lot of what

inspired this is the CC world, we went and told my team, This is a world that's much more mature than us. Let's go learn from them.

On your specific request, I'm right now proposing that we establish a mechanism at your request in the way you prefer where we actually regularly share with you where we are, not only on WCIT matters but on all of our government and intergovernmental -- international governmental organizations engagements. We now have a monthly report that Tarek and his team prepare. We share it with the chair of the GAC. We can do the same with you and share with you our strategies and learn from you and coordinate with you where reasonable. That's my commitment to you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. I'm mindful we've got a bit of a queue developing.

Chris, you wanted a quick response?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fadi, thank you. Firmly wearing my ccTLD hat, that's a report on what we're doing as opposed to a strategy.

FADI CHEHADE: (speaker off microphone).

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right. There is --

FADI CHEHADE: (speaker off microphone).

LESLEY COWLEY: Gonzalo and then welcome to Olga.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Lesley. As former chairman of the BGRC when these questions were coming, all I want to say is that your questions were channeled in the proper way to staff. Of course, this process, as you can see, takes time. It is important to find the right manner to pass the information or to inform you or to engage you in the international process.

So I -- since you are going to have -- receive this information, as Fadi has pointed out, or you are going to be engaged in this process, there is nothing else to say but you were here in a proper manner. And let's see what the future is departing for us in this regard. So thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. It is appropriate to add that we're not trying to hold you to account or report to the ccNSO. It is the feeling from the CCs that this is a long-term hole in terms of Internet governance, and we're trying to get out of fire-fighting mode.

Okay. Olga and Bertrand and then I will be overrunning which will be awful.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: Thank you, Lesley. And I won't repeat Fadi's commitment to establish the coordination, which I agree we very much need to accomplish. But just to give you some idea of what that coordination might look like. I think we certainly need to organize ourselves between overarching objectives that together with you we want to achieve on Internet governance as well as taking into account that for individual milestone meetings on the topic, depending on the context of the meeting and the attendees, the objectives of that meeting will be different. So we will be preparing things like position points and talking points for the individual meetings.

And I very much look forward with Bill's guidance and coordination to coordinating not only those viewpoints and action items but the implementation of them at the milestone meetings.

LESLEY COWLEY: Bertrand and then we will let Keith have the last word.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: A few high-level elements regarding what has happened the last few months, one has been an explicit decision of positive engagement and the debate that took place within the board and actually within the board with the staff around the question of what Fadi should do at the WCIT was very catalytic in this regard because there was a real question of whether he should go or not, what he should say or not, what he should talk about or not. This helped establish firmly the notion of proactive engagement that led further on to the creation of the regional debate and the discussions.

And one of the direct outcomes of this is what I think is a remarkable achievement for ICANN in general, not as a success for ICANN but a remarkable element, is the presence of the very person who was so instrumental in the WCIT process being for the first time in the GAC this week.

That is a tremendous change in terms of recognition of the legitimacy of the space. So positive engagement is one.

The second thing was during the series of meetings, there is the WSIS +10 that took place in Paris. And ICANN has organized while ISOC and other partners had organized another workshop, two workshops on enhanced cooperation that I believe have strongly held established the fact that enhanced cooperation is not this keyword but that it is actually happening inside ICANN and the RIRs.

And I believe that the CCs could pretend (phonetic) that they are also implementing this, which is diffusing part of the heat.

There is another point, but the last one I want pick, that needs further discussion because I think it's very, very valuable is the notion that the CCs are instrumental in spreading the network of Internet governance forums. And this has not been taken into account enough in the discussion including in the panel on Internet governance processes that took place yesterday, a little bit before yesterday. And it is an element that needs to be explored further.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Bertrand. As a result of this conversation, we have a much clearer understanding of the question we have asked and we will anticipate a response in due course.

I think having skirted around the issue, we've got down and dirty today. So we look forward a report back next time we ask the same question.

MIKE SILBER: Why do you look at me when you say "down and dirty"?

[Laughter]

LESLEY COWLEY: So, can I just be precise on one point that, Bertrand, that may be a transcript error but you said "CCs pretending" something further back. So CCs have been very active and involved in WCIT, which is why we're keen ask this question.

It is a transcript error. Good, good.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Don't worry, it is a transcript error.

LESLEY COWLEY: I apologize we have overrun, but it is a very helpful discussion from the CCs point of view. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, once again, thank you. A point I make repeatedly, the purpose of these sessions is to actually get into real substance, frank, direct, informal. And I think we have accomplished that and made some progress. I'm very pleased. So with apologies about how tight our schedules are, I think this has actually been a very helpful and positive engagement. So thank you.

[End of Session]