
DUBLIN – Ombudsman 101
Monday, October 19, 2015 – 12:00 to 13:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

CHRIS LAHATTE:

... you are in a [power] disadvantage, because if you have something awful happen to you and you fear reprisals because of the disparity in power, knowing that there is a confidential place where you can talk about your problems is critical to the concept of an ombudsman. So if anybody comes to see me, I have a note of it. I have a case management system which nobody can see except Herb or myself because it's kept separate from the ICANN systems, so we protect the confidentiality of our visitors.

For that purpose, we have that protector of the people element that I mentioned at the beginning. And that means that we're here as a resource for people who, for one reason or another, suffer from unfairness.

So the ICANN ombudsmen: independent, impartial, neutral – very important terms. We review facts. I'm not here as a lawyer or a judge to make an interpretation about some legal principle or some rule. I'm interested in facts and whether the application

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.

of those has been unfair in some way, and so I'm an investigator of complaints about unfairness.

How do I do this? Alternative dispute resolution. Alternative to what? That usually means the alternative to going to court or using a more formal process. And one of the things that I always try and do when we have a problem is to see if the parties are prepared to mediate, and part of my background is as a mediator. Within the ICANN community when groups collide and have differences, I will always offer that.

In addition, if it's individuals who are having a problem with somebody else or with the ICANN staff or the board, then I'll also try and resolve it that way.

We also do things like shuttle diplomacy. In other words, go back and forth between the parties to try and resolve the issue. It's not a formal process, I should emphasize. That means that you resolve the problem by just opening communication between the parties in the best way that you can.

So, where we fit in, you probably heard a great deal about the accountability issues within ICANN, and I'm part of the accountability structure, if you like – the entry level – because you can come and see me or you can go to the reconsideration committee. If you're unhappy with the reconsideration

committee, you can come and see me again. And people often do.

Or the final step is, of course, the Independent Review Panel. And there's a great deal of discussion about that in the accountability working groups. But I'm, if you like, the entry level. It's informal. It's not structured. I'll try not to have any barriers to people who want to come and see me to talk about issues.

So just talking about what the values of the office are – and these are important. The confidentiality, impartiality, independence. I'll emphasize that a bit more. Professionalism. We undertake training in ombudsman duties and skills and the way in which we operate.

We have respect for diversity. That means we encourage everybody to be part of ICANN. From time to time, people rub up against each other the wrong way and fail to respect that and that's where we can come in to try and help. Excellence in ombudsmanship, we try and do the best we can of course.

The office is set up under one of the ICANN bylaws. We have our own bylaw which, sadly, is a little bit dated, but it talks about actions, decisions, or inactions by ICANN staff, Board, or supporting structures. That's interpreted fairly widely to be just

about anybody who's involved in the ICANN community. And because ICANN is not a membership organization, that means anybody who comes to an ICANN meeting is potentially someone who can come and see me at the office. It's intended to be inclusive rather than someone who can only act in very narrow situations.

We also have a role in consumer issues. ICANN, I think, is developing consumer advocates who will deal with registrant issues, but I'm not sure if anything has happened on that yet. So often when people will come to me and say, "I'm having a problem with this," I won't necessarily be able to help them, but I'll always try and find the correct place for them to have their complaint resolved.

One of the features is that we try to be a symbol of good governance. We have all of these structures and the roles and the supporting organizations and the advisory committees. And we also have an ombudsman. The ombudsman is there to make sure that everybody plays fair, if you like, so that there is always someone in the back who is a watchdog in case something goes wrong.

We've been around for a while, 2004. Frank Fowlie founded the office. He was responsible for a great deal of important work on establishing things like the framework. I've been around since

July a little over four years now. Herb is the adjunct. He comes to all the ICANN meetings. We discuss ideas with each other and work as a team, generally.

I mentioned independence. Unfortunately, that's not a terribly clear diagram, but if you see on the top left you'll see in the grayscale "ombudsman." That's where I fit into the organization. I'm not a member of staff. My badge actually says "ICANN Staff" but that's not correct. I report directly to the Board.

Every ICANN meeting, I prepare a report to the board which says these are the complaints that I've been getting in, this is how many, this is where they're coming from, this is what they're about, and I look at any systemic issues which might be causing problems and we have some engagement about that. But the Board doesn't tell me what to do, although occasionally I tell the board what I think they should be doing. But I'm available to everybody within that community.

I must say a lot of my work comes from the At-Large and the GNSO. The more technical organizations seem to get on reasonably well, but they are, nonetheless, available. They can come and see me if they have a problem. I have a website, of course, on the ICANN website. It's actually been renovated, although I'm not sure whether it's quite up and running yet.

On there we have a complaint form and the purpose of the complaint form is so that anybody who wants to can complete that and it comes through to my case management system. In fact, we get lots of complaints by other means. Sometimes people will ring me up. I get e-mails, and at ICANN meetings people will drop into my office, which is just down the corridor. We get a lot of those.

We have a framework which describes how the office operates. There is a logic model, and I'll explain those, and on the website we have some news, speeches, some self-help, and I've also got a blog and a Facebook page. The Facebook page isn't all that exciting, though. On the blog I often place reports I've written and occasionally other contributions. I'm also on Twitter as well.

It's important for you to know what I can and can't do. What I always regarded one of the really important functions is to raise diversity issues – complaints about someone doing something sexist or racist or disrespecting abilities, that sort of thing. People can come to me to complain about delays. One of the things you'll realize as you get more involved with ICANN is that it works sometimes at a very slow pace. People do come in sometimes and say, "Just why has this taken so long?" Because delay can result in unfairness.

People often complain about procedure being unfair. They seek help with bullying. It goes two ways. Sadly, it's sometimes the ICANN staff who get bullied. There are members of the community who aren't always all that pleasant to them, but also members of the community sometimes feel that they're being bullied by, perhaps, the chair of an organization or somebody else. Our office is always available for that, confidentially of course.

I have a document disclosure function. One of the few powers that I have as the ombudsman is that I can see any document within the organization. It doesn't matter what it is. If I say to ICANN staff, "I need to see this document," it must be provided. If someone comes to me and says, "I need to see these documents," for whatever reason, but ICANN staff have refused, then I can look at those documents and see whether the refusal complies with the relevant ICANN policy which is called the DIDP policy. There are reasons why you can refuse to disclose documents, such as commercial confidentiality and a range of other issues. But I have the ability to make a decision and recommend to ICANN that the document be released. That's probably one of my more interesting powers.

Some of the things I can't do: I'm not allowed to look at internal administrative matters. The ICANN staff can't come to me and

say, “Well, I’ve asked for an upgrade to my iPhone and I want the iPhone 6 and I’ve still got an iPhone 4 and they’re being difficult about it.” I can’t deal with that sort of thing, thank goodness. Consistent with that, I also can’t investigate personnel issues, that is, within the ICANN staff. I don’t have any power there. Some ombudsmen do act internally within organizations and look at human relations issues, but not the ICANN ombudsman.

I can’t look at issues relating to membership on the Board. That’s an old one that might be affected by some of the accountability structure discussions. Anyway, it’s in the bylaw. I can’t investigate vendor and supplier relationships. That’s a contractual matter and we leave that up to procurement and the legal staff at ICANN.

That’s how it all works. It’s a slightly complicated structure and all of this will be available if you wanted to look at it in more detail, but it just illustrates how the complaints come in. There’s a decision which results in a complaint or I can start it off on my own motion. Once I look at it, there’s a filtering process. I need to look at whether it’s within my powers to investigate the matter. If it’s not, I say so and close the file. If it’s yes, then I start looking into it. I can either go through a dispute resolution process, mediation, and resolve it by agreement, or I can investigate more formally and I will write a report and make a

recommendation to the affected bodies or the ICANN Board. That's pretty straightforward.

We have an operating model that explains how it works. The objective is that members of the ICANN community receive fair and equitable treatment. We review facts to ensure that happens. How it's actually done is by looking at the complaints, making referrals, using best practices, doing outreach to ensure people know that I exist, it's part of my outreach today, and developing communication tools.

To explain where that all results, I have the website complaint forms, frameworks, and others. The outcome – the immediate outcome – is that it gives the opportunity for the community to make complaints and it raises standards of fairness and trust, we hope, and ultimately it's all consistent with that goal of the safe, secure, and universal Internet.

You probably want to know more about specific cases, because that's something which always brings back into reality. Now, one of the things about my office is that some of the complaints are in small focus. They're not necessarily big issues. And it's important sometimes to have an office that can deal with the small issues. Herb and I were talking about this just a day or so ago. The small issues can sometimes turn into big issues if they're not dealt with promptly.

This was something which happened in the London meeting last year. There was one group who were in a room and the previous meeting had been running late. You've been here, I guess, for a day or so already and you know that there's a lot of pressure on the room space. What happened with this one is the previous group had run late, so the group that was trying to run a session, one of the African groups, were there. Then when the hour came the next group of people came in and were quite rude about wanting to start their session even though the African group had not finished, and they were quite offended.

The real issue was the successive group who was trying to evict them had views that things run on time, and that once the time has been reached, you must observe the rules and move on. The African group operated in a more flexible approach and they hadn't in any event finished what they were doing because, through no fault of theirs, they were running late.

What I did to deal with that issue was I went between the groups to explain to them that there are different cultural expectations. In some cultures you must finish things on time. In other cultures it would be extremely rude to do what's happened. You try and raise awareness of the fact that people do things differently and that sometimes you just have to respect that even if it's not consistent with what your culture says. A smallish

thing, but if it's not dealt with, it could potentially become uglier.

Another big issue that we've had to deal with, although it's hopefully coming to an end, is the new gTLD program. I've been heavily involved with that because people have been complaining about unfairness in the process.

The Applicant Guidebook is a very substantial and complex guideline to how to get a new gTLD. There are many processes, many issues, many things that can go wrong, and they all did, of course, on the way through. People complained about the panel decisions, the arbitration decisions, and they came to me and things happened such as there were time limits to lodge objections and technical problems arose because they were trying to send in very large files by e-mail just before the time closed. By the time the files actually arrived, it was past deadline, so a decision was made to reject some of those complaints.

I intervened and said, "Well, no, you can't do that because that is unfair." There has to be some flexibility when there are human errors like that and the unfairness caused by rejecting the submission is far greater than the need to observe the time limit. That sort of issue arises. People complained about inconsistency in the decisions. They complain sometimes about some of the

decision-makers having conflicts of interest. Again, I looked at those and there are various results.

The other thing that happened is that, after reconsideration, there are Board Governance Committee decisions. They often come to me to review it to see whether the reconsideration was conducted fairly. I'm not an appeal authority. I can't change the decision, but if I thought that the process was unfair, then I would intervene. The same with IRP decisions. I'm not an appeal authority against them either, but if I thought something was unfair in the way that they work, then I would intervene and recommend that something change. Generally out of those, the reports of my investigations, some of which have ended up on the blog.

I should explain that often when I issue a report, the first thing I do is say to the parties, "Do you want this made public on my blog?" or, "Do you want it published, but anonymized?" Some people don't want anybody to know about it. Some people say, "Yes, but remove all of the identification," and others go up in full. Only a limited number of my reports actually get published for that reason.

Just to talk again about – I have more of my cases. Very recently, I obtained permission from the Board to look at the Economist Intelligence Unit who are doing the evaluation of community

priority applications. If you're a community applicant for a new gTLD, and you can prevail with an evaluation from the Economist Intelligence Unit, then you've got a considerable advantage.

The problem is that a great deal of the community applications just didn't make it, and people became concerned. They said, "Is the process wrong? Are they making mistakes? Is there unfairness because of what's happening?" I went to the Board, [sought approval], and said, "I think we have a problem. We need to investigate this."

The other reason I investigated it is that it was slowing down some of the applicants. When you apply for one of the new gTLD strings and you seek one of the accountability mechanisms that has come to the ombudsmen, seek reconsideration, or go to the Independent Review Panel, that means your application for the string and all your competitors for that string – because there's often a group of competitors – that means everybody went on hold, so I decided to say I'm going to look at this in a more generic fashion so that it doesn't slow down all of the applications, which it otherwise would.

I spoke the Economist Intelligence Unit, I spoke to the community applicants, I spoke the general applicants, and I spoke to the ICANN staff. I wanted to get a feel for how the

process worked, whether people were being listened to, whether the applicants felt that they had a proper opportunity to make submissions and that everything that they wanted to say was actually considered. I used social media for that as well, of course, which was reasonably successful, and I got quite a lot of very thoughtful and very helpful submissions.

The first thing I do is I issue a draft report, and sent it out to everybody for comments. I had a lot of feedback. It didn't really change what I said, but it was useful to fine-tune and really home in what the problems actually were. The final report has been published. You can have a look at that on my ombudsman blog website.

In essence, in the report I said the principal issue really was that nobody thought enough about what a community should be to be an applicant. I thought some of the process could have been more transparent, but overall I felt that the Economist Intelligence Unit and the ICANN staff did a great deal of very hard, thorough, and professional work. Overall, there wasn't any unfairness.

There was criticism that people are using the accountability functions for commercial advantage in that process because some of the general applicants seeking reconsideration or IRP

decisions to have another look at the community evaluation, and that's slowed down a lot of community applicants.

I'm not sure there are any community applicants for strings who are up and running yet. I know that .eco is very close to launching, but I think that's the only one so far. Only about 20 came through in the end. The problem really was is that I don't think we as a community thought enough about what a community applicant should be and what advantage there should be and why a community should have some advantage in seeking a generic name.

I've talked to you about theory and practice. Staff need to know me, of course, because I work closely with the staff. They will direct people to me. I deflect issues when people are complaining to staff. There's an importance of the symbol of the office and I'm meant to be the conscience of ICANN.

If something is happening which is unfair, if there's something out there which is difficult, people are being oppressed, not heard, discarded, disrespected, then it's my job to find out what's happening and intervene.

That's how you contact me. That's the office of headquarters, but I actually have an office in Wellington, New Zealand, and

you're welcome to visit me there. Most of the complaints come to that e-mail or via the website on the complaint.

Thank you for listening and [inaudible], which is Maori for welcome and goodbye, but having said that, if you have any questions, let's hear them.

[NGUN MU]: Hi, I'm [Ngun Mu] from India. I have a small question. How did the new TLD policy development process work?

CHRIS LAHATTE: You mean for people making complaints to me? It came in many different ways; people e-mailed. Often at ICANN meetings they called in to discuss it with me. Sometimes I get a phone call. There's many ways that it can come to me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a question, actually. I'm really curious. Do you get any complaints about the ICANN staff's performance? For example, any complaints caused by the contractual compliance and it comes to you from the complainant who is not happy with the result?

CHRIS LAHATTE: Yes, that does happen sometimes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What do you do when that happens?

CHRIS LAHATTE: If someone complains about a staff member, then I usually go through to a reasonably senior level. If, for example, someone complained that compliance staff had been rude to them or done something which was incorrect, then I would go to, probably, Maguy Serad who's the head of compliance and say we have a problem. I would engage with her and the staff member and have a discussion and investigate what happened.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Another question, thank you. What is the turnaround time of the complaints you process? For example, you receive the complaint. How long you're processing it? Just curious.

CHRIS LAHATTE: It's important to try and process them quickly because delay leads to unfairness. You can't say that there's a typical time because the problems are all different. Some of them take quite

a long time. The Own Motion investigation took about ten months, for example. But that's a long time. Generally try and get them resolved within a month or two.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Hi, my name is Karel Douglas from Trinidad. I'm an attorney at law. I've had experience with the ombudsman – not with you, but in Trinidad we have the same system. It's a national body that is set up by government. The only thing about it is in Trinidad, even though it's a nice body and people could go there, it doesn't have enforcement powers.

And this is what my question is. We were discussing recently if someone were to make a request under the DIDP full disclosure of documents, and that request was refused. And that person – the person who was refused – wanted to take it further as an appeal of that request, that denial of request, and they came to you.

Do you – and even as you rightly said, you have the power to look at the documents, you have that jurisdiction to look at the documents. You also have the jurisdiction to make a recommendation to ICANN or the individual who refused it, to say, "Listen, this document, I believe, should be released, and I

think you erred in the sense that it's not an exempt document, as the case may be.”

The question is: do you have the power to enforce that recommendation? So your recommendation being that the document should be released and they still maintain a, “No, I think I’m not going to release it.” You – that is, Chris – you are not empowered. You cannot compel me to release that document. Is that the case?

CHRIS LAHATTE:

That’s a great question. And you’re quite right. I can’t issue something like a court order or binding requirement that it be released. But if I recommended something to the Board, because if staff were being as difficult in this example as you describe and refused to observe my recommendation, then I would probably want to have a meeting with the Board and explain that , no, they’re wrong. I want this released. But that’s as far as it can go.

I would probably make quite a lot of noise on social media about it, as well, saying that there is this document which I have suggested should be released, but staff is refusing to comply with my recommendation. And I would hope by naming and shaming that we could achieve something.

But typically, no ombudsman has power to force people to do things. You'll find in the ombudsman model for national ombudsmen, and also for ombudsmen in different other areas – there's a lot in universities and within corporate structures – they would very rarely have the power to actually impose a sanction, a fine, make an order. We only ever recommend.

KAREL DOULGAS:

Just to add to that question. The other point is the danger of influence because if you are reporting to the Board and you have a decision that is against the Board, so somebody comes to you similarly and says, "Listen, Mr. Ombudsman, I made a request to the Board. The Board refused my request and I want you to take it up on my behalf and investigate it and make a decision."

The question then is are you being a person who has to report to the Board? Of course, your tenure may be linked to Board performance. They look at you and say well, you know... I'm just saying that your tenure may be coming up; your renewal of contract, and you've been put in this invidious position to not query a decision of the Board.

I'm going to say, "Well, listen, you know, Mr. Ombudsman, you are to me – I don't want to say emasculated – but you're not going to take the same force that you should really take because

in the back of your mind, you know that your tenure is up for review next month and therefore your recommendation may be influenced and/or biased by that fact.”

CHRIS LAHATTE:

In general terms during my ordinary operation before renewal, I can only be removed by a super majority of the Board; 75% vote. But the point you make is a very good one. And it is a vulnerability in the office of any ombudsman, and certainly there are colleagues who have suffered from that in their respective roles because they have made courageous decisions. Occasionally, they’ve made stupid decisions, but not too many of those. It can have a dampening effect, and in the end it comes down to the person. Do you have the strength of character to put your job on the line? I hope I never have to consider that, but it’s a very good point.

SHERRY FALCO:

I was just wondering, the two options that are quickest, theoretically, would be the reconsideration request or an ombudsman review of a decision, let’s say. I think the reconsideration request has a certain timeframe, right? It has to be filed within 15 or 30 days from the final decision. So I guess it’s a question regarding, if something is filed with the

ombudsman instead of a reconsideration request, does that stay the timeframe? Does that sort of pause the timeframe before a reconsideration request, or not necessarily?

CHRIS LAHATTE:

I would say it shouldn't, and I've had this discussion with ICANN Legal because I've had people say, "I want to do a reconsideration, but I would actually like you to look at it first, but I'm also conscious of the time limit." And in that case I said to ICANN Legal, "I want the opportunity to investigate this and it would be unfair to refuse a reconsideration request if I say that their complaint doesn't have force or I turn it down, but they should still have the ability to seek reconsideration." And ICANN Legal accepted that, in that case, the time limit wouldn't start running until my file was completed.

SHERRY FALCO:

So it's something they can decide on a case-by-case basis. It's not sort of built into the processes?

CHRIS LAHATTE:

Correct. But it is an important point because it's something that I've felt should be reevaluated in the operating rules for both reconsideration and my office, because you shouldn't be

prejudiced by using one accountability mechanism over another.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a question. Just curious, do you have any sort of metrics of how many cases you process per month or on what geographical – from where exactly you got the complaints and what groups you got the complaints? Just curious.

CHRIS LAHATTE: Yes, I do. I have a case management system which records the nature of the complaint and the country of origin and a number of other things. I produce an annual report each year, which I've just submitted to the Board because it's the annual general meeting. But it's not actually published yet

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not published yet.

CHRIS LAHATTE: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is it going to be published?

CHRIS LAHATTE: Oh, yes. All of my annual reports are on my website. It's just this one hasn't gone through the system yet. There's delays, you see, and I might have to complain about that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CHRIS LAHATTE: Fortunately, no, to the first question. The issue of what an ombudsman does and whether that is protected from legal action is a difficult issue. The International Ombudsman Association has actively advocated for ombudsman decision-making to be protected from legal liability, but it's not exactly clear. A number of states in the United States have passed laws giving it protection, but it's by no means guaranteed. But I live in New Zealand, so...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In that same spirit, have there been decisions between a party and ICANN where – not sort of the collective analysis that you did, that seemed to be a much larger scope decision around the community issue, but I'm wondering a two-party issue – you make a recommendation and then the Board has, in some cases,

followed that recommendation and changed what the staff would have otherwise done. Is that a possible outcome or does that happen?

CHRIS LAHATTE: Yes.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thanks again. I just wanted to ask. That was the question I was going to ask before because, again, the influence. Another question, which is all tied in to the influence/bias question is you've said before that you have to work closely with staff and they must know you. Again, if I bring a complaint to you about a staff member, I'm going to be concerned that, hey, I saw you with the same individual having lunch and that's a good friend because you are – as you rightly said, you have to be known and you work within the organization. Therefore, that arm's-length type of appeal that I want to have, an appeal being, independent and I know independent could also be the perception of independence.

So the fact you are working in the organization, you've indicated that you know this staff, these individuals, personally and they're well known to you, how are you then, in my mind, for me to give me that assurance, that you can address your mind

independently and then treat the same individual as an independent institution – for want of a better word – without a biased perception?

CHRIS LAHATTE:

A facile answer would be to trust me. I know what I'm doing. But it is important to maintain that independence. Of course, I'm based in New Zealand and I travel to all the ICANN meetings. I'm not based in Los Angeles. I do visit there from time to time, so I don't have the actual opportunity to form those close personal relationships. But if, for example, someone had become a close friend at ICANN and then was the subject of a complaint, what I would probably do would be to see Herb and say, "Look, I can't deal with this person. You do it." And that's one of the reasons we have an adjunct, to help with those conflict of interest situations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

CHRIS LAHATTE:

A couple of times I've thought about it, but it hasn't had to actually had to come about for various reasons. But that was for a slightly different reason, because from time to time I get both

parties to an issue coming to see me to complain about each other. Sometimes that could lead to a situation where you should recuse yourself because you might have formed a view rather than being independent and impartial. And if that happened again, I'd Herb would become involved. As it happens, on the couple of occasions where that's happened, we've sorted the issue rather than needing to deal with it more formally.

KAREL DOUGLAS: ...an allegation. Has there been an occasion where an allegation has been made of bias, an occasion like that where you have actually recused yourself and forwarded it to another person or, as the case may be, the adjunct?

CHRIS LAHATTE: [inaudible] had to do so so far. I mean, I can see it happening, but I haven't had to do so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There are a lot of people that share that opinion about the independence of the office. We are not an independent firm that the organization has been hired. We are employees of the organization and our goal is a productive organization, so our

ultimate goal is to see that ICANN is a highly functioning, productive organization; both the organizational 300-and-something staff and the other ICANN, which is the community.

There are two kinds of groups that are involved here. We are part of the organizational staff, if you wish. We are hired by ICANN to work for ICANN and the community. Our goal is to see the organization become highly functioning. There are people that see that as a conflict, but it would be no more than, for instance, the ombudsman that is hired by Coke-a-Cola to ensure that Coke-a-Cola remains a highly functioning, in their case, profitable organization.

So that is something we have to juggle with quite a bit, especially for the people that have a more negative opinion of the organization and they will pick at that as an opportunity – as a fault type thing with the organization. But that’s where the professionalism comes into play and the independence and that philosophy that we carry with us.

I hope that helps a little bit. If we were a complete – and there are organizations that hire firms to do their dispute resolution and they are completely independent. They are paid by the organization, but they don’t work for the organization, if you wish; whereas ours is a little bit more of a gray zone, when it comes to that.

CHRIS LAHATTE: Absolutely. That's how I would do it. A part of your function as a mediator is to help them write the agreement.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Have you ever hindered any case of Net Neutrality and was it that case? Can you explain for me?

CHRIS LAHATTE: Net Neutrality?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Some [inaudible].

CHRIS LAHATTE: That's well outside of my jurisdiction. It's probably out of ICANN's jurisdiction, as well. I should add, by the way, in that paper bag, there are the chocolates that I promised at the [inaudible].

Any more questions? This has been a great session. Not huge number, but some really thoughtful questions that have made both of us think a bit, so thank you for those. And thank you for coming.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]