
DUBLIN – ICANN Public Forum
Thursday, October 22, 2015 – 14:00 to 17:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats so we can begin our public forum.

Thank you very much.

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

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Hello. Welcome to the ICANN 54 public forum.

Some think the public forum is all about the Board. That's not really the way we see it. It's actually about you. We want to hear from you. We want to hear from you, the community.

This session is intended to give all of you a direct line to both us, the board of directors, and to the rest of the community without any formality, without any filters. And without the ability to change slides somehow.

There we go. Next slide, please.

Good.

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.

Today's forum, today's public forum is about three and a half hours, and we have structured this to maximize the number of people we can hear from. This is not intended to be a replacement for public comments that ICANN seeks on various issues and policies. If you want to weigh in on a specific issue that is up for public comment, we invite you to use our online system. It's the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members.

Now, Brad White, our director of communications for North America, is going to give you an overview of how the questions will be fielded.

Brad.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Steve.

As you can see, we're going to have two -- Can you hear me?

MULTIPLE VOICES: No.

BRAD WHITE: How about now?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

BRAD WHITE: Actually, you're probably better off not hearing me.

As you can see, we'll have two microphones right here for questions and comments in the room, so please queue up right here.

In terms of remote participation, there's a couple of ways that those who are joining remotely can ask questions. One is via email. The email address is engagement@icann.org.

We're also going to have, as we've done in the past for those of you who have been to a public forum, we've had remote video hubs which have been quite successful. The feedback that we've received after we've --

(Feedback noise)

BRAD WHITE: That's the feedback right there. So based on that, we're doing more video hubs.

We're going to have video hubs this time in Sao Jose dos Campos in Brazil, Bogota, Islamabad, there are two in Nairobi and there's one in Dubai.

When we get questions from those video hubs, we'll queue them up and they'll be able to ask their questions, obviously, in real time.

In terms of the rules governing the session, again, those of you who have been to a public forum know the bottom line is just be respectful. Be respectful of the speakers. There's an expectation of courtesy on both the online participants as well as the people in the room.

When speaking, do three things. Number one, speak slowly and clearly. This is for the sake of the scribes. This is where I always go wrong. I'm always getting nasty texts from the people up there in the booths saying, "Brad, slow down. Speak clearly." So learn from my mistake.

Give your name, who you represent, if anyone. Again, standards of behavior: Just be respectful. Just be courteous about everybody who is speaking.

You'll basically -- We've adopted the rule of 2s in the past. We're sticking with that. That basically means you'll have two opportunities to speak. You're limited to two minutes. There

will be a timer on that. The Board will have two minutes to respond. This is all oriented toward fielding as many questions and comments as possible.

If you have a follow-up, you've got two minutes, and again, the Board will have two minutes to respond.

The Board facilitators who will be handling each hour block are all from the European region. We try to pick the Board facilitators for the region where the meeting is.

So that's the basic overview.

Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thanks, Brad.

So as he said, we'll have three blocks of time, roughly an hour long, give or take, facilitated by different board members. During each of these time periods you may ask questions about any subject of community interest.

We have not, as we have sometimes in the past, we have not allocated a particular slot of time to particular topics. We could not begin to estimate whether to allocate all of the time to the CCWG or, feeling that everybody would be exhausted, no time at

all, so we're going to leave it entirely open here. But any topic, whatever you want, in any of the blocks of time.

Feel free to begin queuing up right now at the two microphones.

This is about dialogue. It's not about a soapbox. Questions are preferred. Comments are allowed.

But with that, let me turn the floor over to Erika Mann and Jonne Soininen, who facilitate the first hour on any subject of interest.

ERIKA MANN:

Hello. Such a pleasure to do this. You will have -- what Steve forgot to mention, you will have today five person -- five board members actually supporting you. All are from Europe, different countries. The first is Jonne from Finland, myself from Germany, and then the next session will be chaired by different board members.

With this, the mics are open. Feel free to come. Please be so kind, mention your name and the organization you're coming from.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you very much. My name is Fiona Asonga. I'm chief executive officer of the Telecommunications Service Providers Association of Kenya. I participate in ICANN largely through the

ASO, but I'm not speaking here on behalf of the ASO. Today I am talking on behalf of the ISP community that has tried to engage within ICANN and found challenges, partly because when I sent, for example, my members an email on ICANN and I show them the structures, when someone goes to their Web site, the first thing they see is the supporting organizations and the advisory councils. Amongst those, there is none that is written or quickly identifies connectivity providers, ISPs, and the like.

You need to know the inside workings of ICANN to know that that group has been put somewhere in the GNSO, which makes it very hidden. It took me many years to figure out where that was. I started getting involved in ICANN in 2009, and I figured that out when I got involved in the ATRT process, because then is when I found out, oh, there is -- there really is an ISP constituency, but it is hidden somewhere.

And I've looked through ICANN documents to see how the structuring is done. I don't find the information to guide on how -- if, as a community, we felt we wanted to change the structure, there is no guidance on that. There is a lot of guidance on review processes, and this -- but the review process guidance does not touch on structural adjustments.

I don't know at what point would be the best time for us to relook at our structures, especially in view of the processes we

are involved in right now, but I know at some point in the future we shall have to look at the structures for proper global community participation.

And that means when entities are coming on board --

[Timer Sounds]

-- it's clear where they are supposed to be and where they plug in.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Can we come back to you on this one? Because I think it really needs a little bit more careful reply instead of giving it right quickly. Is this okay with you?

FIONA ASONGA: I don't expect an answer now. It's just something I'm putting on the floor for the Board and the community to think about and our way of getting feedback.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Jonne, please.

JONNE SOININEN: Okay. The next one, please.

ADAM SCHLOSSER: Hi, my name is Adam Schlosser. I represent the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which represents the interests of over 3 million businesses and organizations.

So in the interest of being efficient, I'm going to read a statement from my phone on the accountability plan. It's more of a statement of where the U.S. business community stands.

So we support an accountability plan that has binding enforceable mechanisms. The accountability plan's legitimacy rests on its ability for the community to not just provide input into ICANN's plans but to ensure that ICANN stays true to its mission and that it meaningfully upholds its commitments enshrined in its bylaws and contracts.

So long as the designator model makes this possible and is not unnecessarily complex and burdensome such that it is impossible to implement, then we support that model moving forward.

The CCWG plan represented a great demonstration of the importance and benefit of the multistakeholder model. The Board should be considered one part of the community, but not one that outweighs a broad consensus otherwise.

While getting the accountability proposal right is more important than any arbitrary deadline, at some point it must be recognized that there will be some uncertainty in the plan. So while we believe that the next draft of the accountability proposal must be open for public comment, we should possibly consider an accelerated timeline and recognize that while the plan raises a lot of questions, as long as the key accountability pieces are in place, which is meaningful, binding, legally enforceable accountability, then we should consider it time to move forward.

The IANA transition should not happen separately from the accountability plan. If the multistakeholder community's plan is disregarded, then this may give credence to some of the voices calling for more government control, which is concerning. And if the final plan is something which meets these criteria, the U.S. business community is very prepared and committed to advocate on --

[Timer Sounds]

-- behalf of it with the U.S. Congress.

Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you very much.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thank you very much. Name is Richard Merdinger. I'm the vice chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, and I'd like to read a prepared statement from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group to the Board.

At ICANN 52 in Singapore, a bottom-up, grassroots initiative began around universal acceptance and asked to be recognized by the ICANN community as the UASG, or Universal Acceptance Steering Group. Focused on global outreach on the acceptance of all TLDs, we asked the board of directors to support our effort with staff resources. After the Singapore meeting, we drafted a charter and entered formal formation, receiving the staff support we requested to get the effort under way.

At ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires, we held our inaugural all-day workshop detailing to the community our methodologies and proposed ways of moving the ball forward on universal acceptance. Just last month, ICANN approved our detailed budget request designed to support our work with the funds to make an impact. Now, after a second successful workshop with

the community this past Sunday, we have a set of concrete action items with owners and deliverable dates and stand poised to move into the action phase of improving the state of universal acceptance.

This is a great example of an effort that is truly bottom-up with a community driven mission that has an impact that should be felt for generations. We appreciate the continued support of the Board, and the members of the UASG wanted to take a moment to thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Would you like to continue, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. Good afternoon, all. My name is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, a coach and alumni of ICANN's fellowship program from Nigeria. My comments this afternoon is more of an appeal than a question for the Board.

In view of the recently adopted new meeting strategy and plan for ICANN's public meetings, it is my understanding that there are proposals to align and restructure the fellowship program in line with the (indiscernible) and letters of Meeting B. It is for this cause that, I as a alumni, fellowship alumni, elect to request the Board to put its weight behind Mama J's focus -- proposal,

rather, on the fellowship structure for meeting for Meeting B. Having listened to her proposals I believe it will go a long way to help enhance Meeting B's focus of SO/AC policy development process during the four-day meeting. Furthermore, they are a large community, business users constituency of GNSO, and, indeed, all communities within ICANN stakeholder ecosystem stand to benefit immensely from continuous engagements of ICANN's pool of fellows who could be engaged to identify and help on both new ALS within their regions aside from serving in other ways or as ICANN Ambassadors.

The fellowship program have witnessed tremendous growth on their journeys as we now have a web of fellows helping to provide leadership within various structures and working groups within ICANN. One recently -- only recently, this meeting measured up to qualify -- Only recently at this meeting, measuring up to qualify for ICANN's most prestigious award, and yet a board member with a history from the fellowship, I can only pray that the board support's Janice on her plan's for the fellowship program at ICANN's Meeting B, and it has the blessings of the fellowships (indiscernible).

Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Fadi, would you want to say something?

FADI CHEHADE: Just to second everything you said about the fellowship program. And it's a crown jewel for ICANN, this program. And we -- As I said on Monday, we are the fortunate benefactors of our first board member who is a fellow, Lito, and also -- here he is, who will soon join us at this table, and also, of course, the winner of this year's leadership award.

As to the specific proposal that Janice is working with you on for Meeting B, I am looking forward to see it. We will review it, and we will give it every support we can.

Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: I want to recommend a little bit different procedure than we typically do, because it's so difficult to see our fellow board members here. It's just a simple wall, so it's very difficult to see who wants to make a comment. So back to the previous speaker, and Kuo would want love to make a comment, or Ray. So one of the two of you, I really can't see you, so please indicate who else would love to say something.

RAY PLZAK:

Thank you, Erika. Regarding universal acceptance. The problems facing universal acceptance are the same problems as those that IPv6 has been facing since 1999 in terms of the goals of who to get involved with, who to get to, how to get the word out, at what levels to do it, and so forth.

In the Board session on Tuesday, constituency day, we spent some time discussing this aspects then. Although I would not necessarily recommend doing exactly the same things that the regional registries have been doing in terms of how and what means they have been using to promote IPv6, I think there's an awful lot of lessons to be learned there.

And so I would recommend that there be some communication between the universal acceptance folks and the regional registries. You've got over 15 years of experience here, so there are probably some things that you could learn from.

Thank you.

ALKHANSA MOHEMED NASR:

Hello, my name is Alkhansa from Sudan. It's my first ICANN meeting, first as a fellow.

My question is how -- how ICANN, you -- how ICANN manage to receive complaints from all its stakeholders? And what is the most kind of complaints raised to the Board?

Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: I'm not sure really how to answer that. Maybe Fadi could answer on how many complaints we get and on what?

FADI CHEHADE: Yes, since I'm being reminded I'm the cause of most complaints.

[Laughter]

JONNE SOININEN: That wasn't my point, but thank you.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: So, first of all, to the young lady, thank you very much for your question, and my answer is going to be very clear. We receive a lot of problems from the community concerning this problem.

Especially as far as the registries and the registrars and how can they -- they deal with the users around the world. And this is the most important thing we are following. And we have a department, complete department, called the compliance department who is in charge of dealing with this. But as far as

this board, most of the questions that come to us come about our work and how do we cooperate with you and how we can present our services, and we always try to improve our work with you. And I thank you very much for coming from Sudan, a country that needs -- that we always concentrate and support all the users in Sudan. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you. And I think we have a remote participate now. Brad, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question, actually a series of questions from John Poole, the editor of domainmondo.com. Why did ICANN become a member of trademark lobbyist group INTA, as disclosed by Professor Milton Mueller in a tweet dated October 14, 2015? When exactly did ICANN join INTA, whose membership list is not public? How much has ICANN paid INTA, including membership dues? Please identify the ICANN officer who authorized this transaction and what other lobbying organizations ICANN has joined as a member, the date it joined, the ICANN officer who authorized each identified transaction, and whether and when the ICANN board of directors was informed of any of these transactions and the reason none of these memberships have been heretofore disclosed by ICANN. Whether ICANN ever

inquired of legal counsel whether such membership in own nonprofits -- excuse me, in such advocacy and lobbying organizations were violative of ICANN's own nonprofit status under California law or the Internal Revenue Service code of the United States of America, whether ICANN has in place an ethics code or conflict of interest policy for the ICANN corporation, its staff and officers which would bar ICANN from expending funds or becoming a member of such an advocacy or lobbying organization or collaborating with such organization's members who regularly engage in advocacy concerning issues within ICANN's mission and purpose. And finally, explain how ICANN, its staff and officers are now disqualified from participating in any ICANN rights protections review, particularly after ICANN staff coached, in quotations, into membership how to lobby ICANN in the upcoming rights protection review as revealed in the article cited by Professor Mueller.

MIKE SILBER:

If I can possibly intervene on that question before we hand over to staff, if they have a more substantive review. I think there were a lot of very dense questions asked over there. And it's incredibly difficult if somebody's expecting an answer to that series of questions, having been read out scrolling up on the screen, to actually answer all of that comprehensively. So can I really suggest that if you want to ask that sort of multi-part

question in this sort of forum, you send it through way ahead of time so that staff have an opportunity to prepare the detailed responses? Because I don't think it's capable of being answered on the cuff. And then when we say we'll get back to you, then people get upset with us. So really, help us to help you in the form that questions are asked. If you want a general answer, I think we can ask staff to address that question, but if you want those detailed responses to each and every sub-item of the question, let's make take that part of it offline.

ERIKA MANN: Fadi --

FADI CHEHADE: Shall I answer this in Arabic?

ERIKA MANN: Yes, we had an exchange in the board, so please give the answer.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. So I think following my colleague's good comment, we promise to take the transcript of this question and to get back to the -- ask the person who laid it out with an answer. But at least the high-level -- if I could just give a high-level view of this, we have joined INTA as a nonprofit organization status which costs

us 600 U.S. dollars per year. It gives ICANN employees that are interested in utilizing professional educational programs the ability to access the many, many INTA publications and resources, and to also receive significant discounts when attending INTA meetings. So we do have staff members and board members who have individually and on behalf of ICANN attended and participated in open conferences of INTA for many years. This is way before, you know, I started. So this has been an established activity.

INTA meetings and conferences, frankly, offer us something specific called continued -- continuing legal education which is required. And ICANN has over 20 attorneys across our staff who, by requirements of the bar, need to continue their education. And so they use this very small fee to basically access a vast amount of courses. It saves us, all of us, a lot of money for them to get this access.

Now, I just want to be clear that ICANN has not taken any position on any INTA policies. Has not. And we have not attempted to influence or develop INTA policy positions.

Now, as an INTA member we are entitled to one vote out of something like 1,000 at meetings of the association. But ICANN -

-

[Timer sounds]

-- has not exercised that voting right ever. So just to be very clear on it. So that's all it is. However, the questions were numerous. We will take them and address them fully to the person who sent the question. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. Please.

PADMINI BARUAH: Good afternoon. My name is Padmini, and I have a question and a comment on behalf of the Center for Internet and Society India. Our question is, we wanted to ask the board why when you were asked by the NTIA to create a draft proposal with VeriSign on its root zone maintainer role, why did you not pass on that mandate to the community, to the CWG which already exists, and ask the community to draft out that proposal with VeriSign? Because since ICANN claims that it is an inverted pyramid we expect that the board and staff will not take unilateral actions without the knowledge of the community. The comment I had is a message I had made earlier, but I'm reiterating this with new data. Today more than 50% of the Internet users are in the Asia-Pacific region and less than 10% are in North America, but when one studies diversity within the ICANN community and in the different ICANN processes there is a severe lack of diversity and it is dominated mostly by people

from the United States of America. For example, we analyzed the IANA transition and studied participation data from ICANN, NRO, and IETF's lists related to the IANA transition, and of the substantive contributors, of which there were 98, we found that 1 in 4 were from the United States of America, 4 in 5 were from countries which were part of the United Nations, Western European and others groupings, and only 5 from the 98 were from the Latin American and the Caribbean zones. 4 in 5 were male, and only 21 out of these 98 commentators were female. And 4 in 5 or 76 of 98 were from the industrial, the technical community. And only 4 were identifiable as speaking on behalf of the governments. And this is a problem that is pervasive in the ICANN community. 66% of the business constituency at ICANN, as per your own data, are from a single country, the United States of America. 3 in 5 registrars are from the United States of America.

[Timer sounds]

624 of 1,010. And only .6% of the 54 countries in Africa. And we would like it if you could make it this your top priority because ICANN's legitimacy depends on you being truly globally representative. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Fadi, clearly yours.

FADI CHEHADE: I did have something else this afternoon that I need to run. No. First of all, many thanks because your comments are substantive. Let me start with the second one on diversity because you know that this is very close to my heart, and I think that ICANN has made huge strides in diversity in the last three years. But we still have huge strides ahead of us. So we couldn't agree more with you, and the facts and the data you gave me -- you gave us is near my heart and near many of this board's heart. We really worry that we need to open up ICANN and allow and enable everybody to participate.

The fact is, however, that we -- there is nothing in ICANN that prevents those who want to participate to come. So let's start with that fact. Is it difficult? Sometimes, yes. Are we doing things to improve that? Yes. Let me just give you one example in Asia. Today I signed an MoU with Thailand where we will start localizing a lot of what we do here in their language, in their understanding, with a local partner. We did it in Japan. We did it in Korea. And we're already seeing the change in participation from those countries. So this is a project for all of us. Are we committed to it? I can assure you we are. I can assure you we are. We need your help. We need everyone's help to increase

the diversity. And by the way, 21 out of 98 is miserable, but it's better than most places for women. It's good. We need more of you, especially smart ones that come in and give us data and facts and research that allow us to fix our issues. So thank you for your contribution on that.

As to the first issue, the point you bring up is about where does the role of ICANN staff and management start, where does the community's role stop. There is no question that we are an organization and a place where policy decisions have to happen bottom-up. Major governance changes have to happen as we just did bottom-up. But there are many, many implementation activities that we do that cannot be, in practice, brought back for a bottom-up process. We have to make decisions and advance them.

What we did on the VeriSign discussion is very much to start implementing what the community asked us to do.

[Timer sounds]

And that's all we're doing. We're just -- and nothing happened yet. We're just discussing things with them so we can figure out, if the community gives us the go-ahead and the transition is moving ahead, how do we get things done. But frankly, that line between what is bottom-up and what is done so that we can implement what was given to us as a bottom-up direction is

where we make our decisions. And sometimes we disagree exactly where we are on that side of the line, but that's okay. But in general, this was a decision we made for the right reasons, so that we can serve the community's requirement. Okay?

ERIKA MANN:

I saw that Asha would love to make a comment as well. Asha, where are you?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Right here. Thank you, Erika. And Padmini thank you very much for bringing that up and for the hard work you put into doing the analysis and coming up with those statistics. Very admirable and very useful indeed.

So you know very well, I'm very much supportive of more diversity in ICANN participation and not only in ICANN meetings but between meetings. Because a lot of work is done between meetings. So you mentioned some statistics about the CWG participation. We had one -- 156 people that we -- we had seen that signed up for the CWG. A third of them were from Asia. And then for the CCWG, 191 people signed up. A quarter were from Asia, representing 48 -- overall 48 countries.

So now having said that, signing up is one thing. Actively contributing is another. And this is where we need -- where we

need your help. So there's only so much board and staff can do in terms of getting more diversity in our member -- in our numbers, but the SOs and the ACs also have to do their part in encouraging different members -- more -- members from different parts of the world to join their ranks. So thank you for bringing that up, and let's keep at this. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you. And sir.

BRET FAUSETT: Thanks. My name is Bret Fausett. I'm an employee of Uniregistry. But I stand here at the microphone today more as a long-time member of the ICANN community. I stood down at this meeting from my tenure on the GNSO Council, and I wanted to share with you some thoughts that I have that have been in my mind the last few weeks as I contemplated leaving the council and what was going to go forward.

When ICANN was formed, one of its features was that it was able to operate at Internet speed. The private sector was supposed to lead and we were designed to be faster than government. I wonder if that is still true.

I worry that we have lost the ability to work quickly. I worry that a long-term threat to ICANN's viability is that it loses its ability to work in a quick and efficient manner.

We designed the UDRP once upon a time in three months. I don't ever think we'd get back to the place where a small group of people can get together and design something and implement it so quickly. I count as fortunate indeed that we have now thousands of participants here, and that we can't all fit into a small room. But I also worry that we've gone to another extreme. In the next few months the GNSO will launch a couple of policy development processes that may well take years. I don't stand here today with a solution, but I wanted to use my time to get you, and probably all of the ICANN community and ICANN constituency bodies, to think about what we can do to work in a quicker and more efficient manner. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN:

Thank you very much. And that is -- of course, efficiency is one of the concerns that we always have to keep in mind.

ERIKA MANN:

Sir.

ZAKIR SYED:

My name is Zakir Syed. I'm an ICANN fellow from Pakistan, but I'll be speaking in my personal capacity. My question is actually related to IANA transition. As we all know NTIA's recent announcement March last year in which NTIA actually communicated to ICANN that the transition proposal must have broad community support in the four principles. Two of them are related to the multistakeholder model and the -- the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS, while the rest other two are about meeting the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of IANA and the openness of the Internet.

Now, when ICANN we speak -- we hear quite often that we do not have control on the content on the Internet. So if that is the case, then how NTIA is expecting ICANN to maintain the openness of the Internet if it does not have control on the content or the Internet at all? And this, by the way, actually takes me to the recent announcement of NTIA in which it says beyond 2016 we have options to extend the contract for up to another -- for up to additional three years. So do you share the thought that this could possibly be one of the reasons for NTIA for not being in a position to be able to let the transition process be completed by September next year or maybe soon after that? Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Looking to my colleagues. We come back to you. Let me make a -- let me make a very short comment. Fadi, you want to say something? Go ahead. Please, no, go.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: So thank you very much for your question. And the openness of the Internet is a broad term that can apply to almost many of the layers that we function in. So when NTIA said that one of its important criteria is to ensure that the transition does not impugn on the openness of the Internet, it means that we don't end up with a -- an environment at ICANN where we are introducing policies or mechanisms that restrict how the Internet operates at our layer. They were not talking about the content layers or other layers. So you hear, for example, the discussion on where ICANN's role should be in copyright infringements or IP. So to the extent that what we do does not start creating policies that infringe on these things and infringe on the openness of the Internet, then we're okay. But they're not talking about the upper layers where we have no remit, where we have no responsibility.

Now, if you were asking whether this is being used as a mechanism to extend the transition, I don't think so. I think this is being done in good faith, to ensure that what we do ends up

leaving the system where it is open and accessible for everyone. But I don't think there's any intent by NTIA to use this as a mechanism to trip us into another three years. NTIA's presence here can confirm and everything they have said at this meeting that they're deeply committed to get this transition done right and hopefully within the community's timeline of September 30, 2016. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you. Sir, you're next.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. My name is Russ Mundy. I'm here in a personal individual capacity. Known -- I know many of the board members personally, and thank you for all of your hard work that you do. I know it's a lot.

My primary involvement with ICANN has been with Security Stability Advisory Committee. I've worked on a number of cross SO and AC kinds of things, and I have found them to be very informative and educational about how other parts of the ICANN system works.

Last week I was privileged to participate in a leadership training program which was extremely useful. Although I've been involved with ICANN for, well, 15 years basically, I have often

done everything from the SSAC perspective, even on the joint groups and committees. And although the others are very interesting, educational, this was an extremely effective activity, and I would urge the board to consider supporting it and even extending it, if you can. I don't know what the costs are, but it was an extremely useful activity.

One of the things that we did discover for a number of the people in the -- the training program and was my personal biggest take-away was that although we have a Code of Conduct for ICANN and in this forum there are some things that are put in place to sort of constrain things nicely, but as someone who is involved in doing some of the leading of some of the groups, one of the things that I discovered, along with several of the other people, is there's no real enforcement mechanism. If someone is getting out of line, if you will, from the Code of Conduct, what is the leader of a group supposed to do?

[Timer sounds]

Okay?

I would urge the group up here and the staff to consider looking at how some enforcement mechanism can be put in place and train leaders of the groups to be able to use it.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you very much. The comment especially on the leadership program is good, that the education was good. And we do support it. And it's a good idea to basically try to extend it further. So let's try to see about that.

On the other part, this is maybe something that the whole community should discuss, what are the appropriate enforcement mechanisms. And also these mechanisms should then be trained to the new leaders that come into this community. Thank you.

RUSS MUNDY: Good. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: We have one board member that would love to make a comment.

Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, thanks.

Russ, thank you. I just wanted to support what you said about the leadership program. As you know, I came and spent the morning with you and I thought it was really, really interesting and an opportunity for open and transparent conversation in a sort of collegial environment. And I absolutely agree with you. I think we should carry it and make it bigger, if we can. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Please.

WISDOM DONKOR: Thank you. My name is Wisdom. I am from Ghana, ICANN fellow, ICANN information booth lead.

My question is: There is a whole lot of hullabaloo surrounding .AFRICA. So I want to know how ICANN is dealing with the .AFRICA issues.

And then Africa need a clear response in the subject regarding promotion of Africa's domain name industry. Africa needs to know the state of the processes that is going on within the .AFRICA issues.

And number two is ICANN is getting close to becoming an independent. And we still have some loopholes that need to be filled.

Now, what are those loopholes? One of the loopholes is engagement. It looks like we are not engaging enough in our various regions. So what can we do for us to be able to engage enough? I'm looking at a kind of -- we have a common platform. Almost everybody is doing -- somehow doing engagement in various regions. But then when we do those engagements

(indiscernible), we don't have any database that catches those engagements for ICANN to be able to send information out. So if maybe ICANN can look into it and then come up with a common database where any person doing an engagement somewhere, people can go on to the platform, register, and then start engaging with ICANN.

[Timer sounds.]

I believe when we do this, it can also add up to the speed at which we want to achieve our objectives.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Wisdom, thank you. And thanks for the intervention. I suppose as a fellow African, I have been asked to address it.

So I heard three questions. The first is on the .AFRICA issue. So the IRP has been held. Unfortunately, there were delays in the IRP process for a number of reasons. But the decision was received. The board acted with alacrity to accept the decision of the panel and to move ahead with the process.

So as was clarified in the later IRP, the decision did not instruct us how to do it. So we looked at the result from the IRP and immediately resumed the evaluation process that had been suspended during this process. And at the moment, it's going through. And both applications are going through the process. One has reached a level. The other one is in the process of getting there. And then it will need to go through in the ordinary course. And that's as it should be.

The second question you asked was in terms of growing the domain industry. You may have seen that there's a fair amount of intervention that's going on. So a couple of weeks ago, I was very pleased that having taken some interaction with the community, ICANN has waived the insurance requirement for registrars. Now, that was an issue that was raised very much within African and other places in the developing world as not actually giving any consumers any protection and placing additional burden on them.

There is also a lot of discussion that's going on in various fora that are happening in terms of growing the domain name industry.

On the last issue of a database, I think that's a very good idea. I think improving communication is always a good idea.

[Timer sounds.]

I'm not sure it should be an ICANN initiative. I think there's a lot of outreach training, interaction that's going on within the RIRs, within other ISTAR organizations. And I think it's worthwhile chatting with the engagement staff to see if we can find possibly a slightly more neutral platform rather than an ICANN-controlled platform where we can all feed in our events, our initiatives into such a platform so it's not controlled and people then have the perception that you've got to follow an ICANN-friendly agenda in order for us to disseminate your information. But, still, I think it's a useful idea. And I will chat with the staff about it in terms of what can be done.

JONNE SOININEN: Okay, thank you. The next one.

AARTI BHAVANA: Good afternoon. My name is Aarti Bhavana. This is my first ICANN meeting. I have a twofold question about public interest on behalf of the Center for Communication Governance in India. Firstly, I'd like to know how the board takes into how public interest factors into its decisions.

And, secondly, I would like to know -- I know there's some work being done on developing a definition for "public interest." I would just like to know how that's progressing. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN: I will have a quick crack at it. The second part of your question regarding defining the global public interest, that's part of our strategic plan to do so. Right now, though, there is a limited capacity in the community to work on too many issues at the same time. So right now most of the focus is on the IANA transition and also on the ICANN accountability.

But certainly I think one of the next major projects in our strategy is to actually have a community effort to help define "global public interest."

In terms of how does the board take that into account, the board is pretty diverse. So it actually has people from different regions of the world. It has people with different areas of expertise. And each of us tries to take a view when we're looking at a new policy to decide, using our own experience, whether we think that new policy is in the public's best interest.

ERIKA MANN: It's a tough question. I mean, we are all working on this since years. And maybe there's no single answer to it.

Let me move over here, the next one. Then we'll go to remote question.

Please.

LISE FUHR:

Good afternoon. My name is Lise Fuhr. And I'm one of the two co-chairs of the CWG IANA stewardship transition group.

The other co-chair is Jonathan Robinson. He could unfortunately not be here today.

I have a common statement to read to the community and to the ICANN board. As part of the IANA stewardship transition process, each operational community, protocol parameters, numbers, and names, has been working to develop their proposals and to plan for the transition. But there are some areas where we have to coordinate.

For instance, the communities have worked together in the area of the IPR for IANA trademark and iana.org domain. I want to convert -- convey a message from all the chairs of the IANA stewardship transition working groups from the names, the protocols, and the numbers. We have collaborated and continue to collaborate to ensure the consistency of the transition effort.

We are now nearing the implementation state of the effort and the three operational communities are committed to working together to develop an implementation plan based on our proposal for the IPR and any other areas in the proposal which need coordination among the three operational communities.

My fellow chairs from the other groups will present themselves.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Izumi Okutani, Chair of the CRISP team from the number resources community.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Nurani Nimpuno, vice chair for the CRISP team for the number resources community.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko, Chair of the IETF.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Andrew Sullivan, Chair of the Internet Architecture Board.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Let me thank you in the name of the board for the excellent work you have done and continue to do. Thank you so much.

We have a remote question next, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Question from Oleksandr Tsaruk representing himself from the Ukraine. Can we consider for an ICANN bylaw that each individual have an equal right to be online? Without this, we cannot realize most of our human rights? Therefore, for ICANN bylaw, free access to Internet is the basic human right in the cyber age.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you for your question.

The access to the Internet is not really in the scope of ICANN as such. We are about names and numbers. But this, of course -- the access to the Internet is an Internet governance question. It's an important question, and maybe it more appropriate to a forum that deals with more broad issues such as the Internet Governance Forum.

PHILIP CORWIN: Good afternoon. Philip Corwin. I wear many different hats within the world of ICANN. The one I'm wearing for this

statement is in my capacity as interim chair of the business constituency and one of its two GNSO Councillors. I would note in passing one of my other hats is as a proud member of the Internet Committee of the International Trademark Association.

Just referring to a previous question, on behalf of the BC, I just want to make the board and the assembled community aware that in our discussions, we've been looking at the preliminary issue report on a policy development process to review all rights protection mechanisms and all generic top-level domains, which is quite a mouthful. And this basically tees up first: Are the RPMs developed for the new TLD, are they effective? And should they become consensus policies?

The second part of this is: The UDRP, which is the oldest consensus policy in the world of ICANN, developed very quickly as Mr. Fausett referred to, and is the only one that's never been reviewed.

It's our preliminary consensus that these two issues, the effectiveness of the RPMs and whether they should be consensus policies, and the UDRP review and potential reform should proceed on separate parallel tracks. And there are two main reasons for that.

One, each of these on its own is a complicated and daunting subject. And trying to do all of this at once combined could be

too much to adjust and too much for any working group to grapple with.

Second, we believe there will probably be a desire, if it can be done, to review the RPMs and make any changes before the second round of new TLDs. And we wouldn't want the UDRP hitched to that and be given short shrift or having to deal with the question later on of separating them.

So it's our consensus view -- and we, of course, as is our practice will share a very comprehensive statement with the community on this report that these should proceed separately.

[Timer sounds.]

Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Erika.

Firstly, I think that's a decision for the GNSO, as to how it decides to manage its policy development work. So I think that

hopefully there's members of the GNSO Council in the room that will hear that.

I will make the general comment, though, that I think you're right. You need to be looking at both the new mechanisms that were created, the URS and sunrise processes and things, as well as looking at UDRP.

And to put it in perspective, the new mechanisms, effectively .5% of the namespace, and UDRP represents the other 99.5. So UDRP has certainly had a massive impact. And, as you say, it has actually been operating for more than 15 years.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Thank you very much. We look forward to working with the board and the community as we grapple with these complex trademark protection issues.

ERIKA MANN:

Akram? No, you're fine? Okay.

Next.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Good afternoon, distinguished board and good afternoon, community. My name is Jimson Olufuye. I'm the chair of the Africa CC Alliance, AfICTA. AfICTA is an association of ICT

companies, an association of players in the industry in Africa, to three countries in Africa.

AfICTA is a member of the business constituency of ICANN. In fact, we happen to be the first African entity to be a member of the business constituency. And our membership is growing. Currently three and we are in process of getting in two more people.

So I'm making this statement on behalf of the BC, the business constituency. The BC reiterates the importance of having diverse voices at the table, something the ICANN community and ICANN as an organization will say is a priority. The BC has worked extremely hard in our trades and businesses from around the world over the last few years committing time and resources to this effort.

This year alone over \$15,000 have been spent to reach business stakeholders within Africa and in Asia.

But this work needs to be expanded. Budgets for options to companies in the global south has historically been a very small part of ICANN's overall outreach effort. Especially as ICANN transitions in this year of Marrakech, this event in Africa, we feel it is time to expand the outreach, not shrink the budget. We should expand the outreach budget to bring more private sector players into the table and participate in the process.

So in a time where ICANN is flush with resources, we should be investing some of these resources in concrete efforts to help build participation. A number of speakers have spoken about this.

So for this fiscal year, we have been forced to choose either to renew core financing or to get ICANN support for a single outreach event. So we need access to both sources of funds. And even more to reach out to this underrepresented group. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN:

Thank you very much. And I think Mike has a point on this.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Jimson. A useful comment. One -- well, two issues of -- or two data points rather. The first is I would question if ICANN is flush with money. At the moment, we're dipping into our reserves to pay some significant legal bills. And I would really caution against an impression that we are flush with money.

Yes, there are auction proceeds. And, yes, there's a process to actually engage with how those auction proceeds should be disbursed.

And if you are talking about auction proceeds, then I suggest you get involved in that process and make your voice heard there. But petitioning the board is not going to let -- make us release any of those funds for any purpose until the community has spoken.

And the second one is I don't think there is any attempt to cut budget. But at the same time, I think your view is very well-taken. And as I mentioned to Wisdom earlier, I do think we need to communicate better. I do think we need smarter allocation of funds. I think we need to work with the community on the best use of ICANN funds because sometimes parachuting people into events is less helpful than actually helping the organizers support their local events.

And I think that's useful as part of our African engagement and the African strategy update that Pierre has been leading for us to continue that engagement, and not just with the civil society or the technical community who are involved there, but I think business is a very important part, given that Africa is the fastest growing region in the world at the moment. I think that building those relationships with African business is absolutely critical and I'd really -- I'll engage with Pierre to see how we can try to take that forward.

ERIKA MANN: We had a hard time to understand you fully, so what I would recommend, that you are so kind and send us your question by email again so that we can give you a more complete answer than we probably can do now. I don't know.

Would you want to respond, Fadi or Mike? Or Mike and Fadi?
No?

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah. We'll do a duet quickly.

ERIKA MANN: You will do it by email?

FADI CHEHADE: No. We will wait for the email. However, at the end of the question, to the gentleman in Kenya, you asked whether ICANN will have a hub in Africa or an office in Africa, so let me just be clear.

ICANN has only three hubs, and we do not intend to have more hubs, per se.

The hubs -- Los Angeles, Istanbul, and Singapore -- are operational hubs where we have staff from different parts of the

organization so that we can manage our core operational functions around the clock, and that's how, for example, today we have 24 hours a day, 5 days a week, support for our stakeholders by telephone in many languages, because that is happening across these three hubs. That's an example of the service that is delivered across the hubs.

And the Los Angeles hub handles North and South America time zones, the Istanbul hub handles Europe, Middle East, and Africa time zones, and the Singapore hub handles Asian and Oceania time zones. That's we designed the system.

Now, if you're asking whether we plan to have an office in Africa just like we have offices in Geneva, in Montevideo, et cetera, I think this is a very good "ask" and a very reasonable request. We have taken it into consideration at this meeting for the first time. I will be reviewing it with our team and our staff, given budget and other commitments, and if we can, we certainly would like to see an office for ICANN somewhere on that great continent. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN:

Thank you, Fadi. Sir?

STEPHEN COATES: Thank you for the time. My name is Steve Coates. I'm an employee of Twitter, Inc. I'm a member of the business constituency.

Building upon what my fellow member said, Phil Corwin, on the RPM reviews, I would like to make a suggestion that we work on a parallel path going into Round 2 with the CCT and the RPM reviews, and also suggest perhaps an expedited process for dot brands.

So moving forward with a single registrant closed dot brands which may not need full CCT or RPM review process that will allow us applicants who are not -- who did not participate or were not around during Round 1 to take advantage of some of the security benefits that operating a dot TLD have, as well as some of the DNS innovations that can be explored in that process, which I think will help ensure success of the TLD program.

JONNE SOININEN: Maybe Cherine can answer this?

CHERINE CHALABY: Well, there's been quite a lot of discussions and requests about when the next round should be, should we have a special round for brands first and so on, so I don't think we are -- we are in a

position to make that statement at the moment because the reviews are currently taking place. But I take your input and I understand the purpose of it, so not really in a position to make that statement at the moment. Thank you.

STEPHEN COATES: I appreciate that. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Let's move over here, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Erika, can I --

ERIKA MANN: Sorry. Bruce?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Halt.

ERIKA MANN: You want to say something?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. Just --

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. Chris, not Bruce.

ERIKA MANN: Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: -- briefly wanted to say that it is -- what Cherine said is right, but it also a matter for -- really for the GNSO to make policy on this. So if the GNSO wants to have a process for considering the possibility of having a brand round, then that's something that they could work on. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: Please.

JYOTI PANDAY: Good afternoon. I'm Jyoti Panday. I'm from India and this is a follow-up question.

On behalf of the Center for Internet and Society, I want to ask the board: Why when asked by the NTIA to develop a draft proposal with VeriSign on its root zone maintainer role did you not pass on the mandate to the community? Specifically, will the ICANN board seek public comment on the approved

proposal before it enters a testing phase? After all, ICANN cannot claim that it is an inverted pyramid where all decisions start from the community and flow up to the board when on a crucial issue like this the ICANN board and staff have not taken the community --

ERIKA MANN: Can you slow down a bit? Can you slow down a bit?

JYOTI PANDAY: -- when on a crucial issue like this the ICANN board and staff have not taken the community in confidence nor invited its participation?

Thank you.

My specific question is --

ERIKA MANN: Can you please speak to the mic?

JYOTI PANDAY: My specific question is: Will there be a public comment period before the plan enters the testing phase?

FADI CHEHADE:

So thank you again for a good question and an important one, but as I said before, this contract is an implementation contract. We sign implementation contracts like this all day on many, many matters, including major facilities and so on.

So you -- we are confusing where the instructions and the direction come from the bottom-up process and where our staff of 300-plus people need to implement those.

So this is an implementation decision. We're just getting on with fixing the contracts and being ready to implement exactly what will come in the ICG proposal. Everything we will do will be in the spirit of the ICG proposal.

Which contractor we use and how we finalize that contract is part of implementation. So I think this is -- this is where the clarity should be, that we -- we are functioning very much within our role as implementing the community's bottom-up proposal, and that's exactly what's happening here.

In terms of this particular contract, because I think people are focused on that, it's important to assure you that if ICANN moves forward with implementing the ICG proposal, working with VeriSign as the contractor who will perform those functions, we will make sure that that contract, like any good contract we sign, does not bind us to that contractor forever; that we have the

ability to revise that and do what is right per the community's requirements. So that -- I can give you that assurance, at least.

However, for the time being, all of us would agree that the stability and the calm passing of the baton from the U.S. government to us needs to happen with the least amount of changes and that's why we chose to continue working with VeriSign to finish the transition --

[Timer sounds]

-- and then we'll have the ability to revise this as we see fit in the future per community input. Thank you.

JONNE SOININEN: Thank you. Now we have another video hub question, I assume.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Mr. Lucas Moura in the video hub in Porto Alegre, Brazil.

Mr. Moura?

REMOTE HUB: Hello. Lucas Moura, next inventor from Buenos Aires. I am talking from the remote hub in (indiscernible). We are a company that work with many financial institutions from Brazil

and our question involves the privacy protection service, and we believe in the importance of privacy protection service. For example, when related to human rights and free speech. However, this service is being used by fraudsters to hide themselves and we would like to have a better way to report fraud like this and also get some response.

Furthermore, the validation and verification of registrant data should be faster when related to domains created only for malicious purpose. That's it. Thank you very much.

JONNE SOININEN: Yes. Thank you very much for that statement. Does somebody want to add to that? I guess not.

ERIKA MANN: Please. It was a comment more than really a question.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, if I could --

ERIKA MANN: Mike?

MIKE SILBER: -- just respond very quickly, I think that Allen and his team are doing a lot of work on the compliance side. The only comment that I would make is that ICANN is not a regulator, which means we do not take complaints of that nature. If there's a compliance issue, then we will take those complaints in terms of compliance with the RAA, but if it's a criminal activity, then people actually need to make use of local law enforcement, and law enforcement have particular channels to manage some of these issues, but people can't expect ICANN to step into that role as law enforcement or administrator and then also have a role as the bottom-up policymaking forum and coordinator of some technical functions. The two processes are incompatible.

So let's just be clear of what our mandate is, and then we must fulfill that mandate effectively and efficiently to avoid consumer harm.

ERIKA MANN: Please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. This is Leon Sanchez, and first I want to thank for letting me actually come into the line, as I was late because we all -- we just finished our statement. This is the co-chair statement from the cross-community working group on

enhancing ICANN's accountability for the Dublin meeting, ICANN 54, and members and participants of the cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability met in Dublin, Ireland, from the 16th to 22nd of October, 2015, at ICANN 54.

Over the past seven days, the CCWG accountability has held more than 25 hours of formal meetings, with additional discussions taking place in various SO/AC-led sessions in the hallways and oftentimes over meals and drinks.

After some voiced concerns with the speed of progress leading into Dublin, we, the co-chairs, called on the community for full mobilization and reinvigorated dedication to making measurable progress over the week in Dublin. We are extremely pleased to announce that the community tackled this challenge head-on and succeeded.

In what the group has coined "an environment of collaboration," CCWG accountability members, participants, ICANN board directors, external advisors, legal counsel, and interested observers came together to identify outstanding issues in the second draft report and move towards consensus on solutions.

A summary of key decisions and agreed-upon next steps are outlined below.

On the sole designator as reference model for enforcement, the group reached broad agreement to move forward with the sole designator as the new reference enforcement model for the next draft proposal.

The group will next attempt to finalize patching the model to alleviate any outstanding concerns on their next draft proposal.

Decision-making model.

The group began defining a consensus-based decision-making model which includes a community consultation period. Discussions on the topic were informed by concerns raised in the public comment on the second draft report about unintended concentration of power.

On the independent review process, the group confirmed support for the proposed IRP enhancements and is now moving into the implementation phase. To spearhead this phase, a drafting subgroup with expert support will be constructed to develop and draft bylaws and detailed operating procedures.

On the community power that refers to review and reject of the budget and operating plan, the group has identified a balanced process and approach for the one-year operating plan and budget, which was an outstanding item coming into Dublin.

On the community power of recalling individual board directors, the group confirmed a decision method for removal of a director appointed by the nominating committee and a separate decision method for removal of a director appointed by an advisory committee or supporting organization.

In the mission and core values, the group confirmed its support for clarification of the mission statement and articulation of the commitments and core values. An example of our clarification includes ICANN's ability to enforce agreements with contracted parties subject to reasonable checks and balances.

On human rights, the group reached consensus to include a general human rights commitment into the bylaws. However, further work is needed on language and has been tasked to the human rights working party.

On the incorporation of Affirmation of Commitments into the bylaws, the group finalized outstanding details of the incorporation of the AoC review into the bylaws. There is high confidence that these bylaws are nearly ready for consideration in terms of implementation.

As regard to Work Stream 2, the group adopted a focused list of Work Stream 2 items with an emphasis on transparency requirements. There was also broad agreement to bring some of these transparency requirements into Work Stream 1, in

consideration of the discussions around the sole designator enforcement model.

In regard to time line and next steps, the CCWG accountability has had intensive discussions on the group's work plan, anticipated progress, and next steps towards finalization.

As such, the group has adjusted its time line in a manner that attempts to balance the various time line constraints both inside and outside of the community.

While details are still being solidified, the time line is rigorous and will likely keep the CCWG accountability busy through the winter season. However, the co-chairs, members and participants of the CCWG accountability, understand the importance of and will execute an inclusive, open, and bottom-up process.

The current time line proposes posting a high-level overview of recommendations and a summary of changes from the second draft proposal for a 35-day public comment period on 15 November 2015.

Alongside the 35-day public comment, the CCWG accountability will submit these resources to the chartering organizations for initial feedback.

The CCWG accountability plans to issue a full detailed report, including annexes and in-depth documentation, midway into the public comment period for roughly 20 days of consultation.

After synthesis of the comments received, and assuming no major changes, the group currently projects submission of Work Stream 1 recommendations to the ICANN board in late January 2016.

We sincerely thank the community for their dedication to our unprecedented goal. We'd like to give special recognition to the GAC, ALAC, ASO, and SSAC for their comments and -- on our proposal while in Dublin.

In addition, we are grateful to the volunteers, support staff, advisors, and independent counsel who put in a tremendous effort this past week.

They deserve and have earned the community's greatest respect and the deepest recognition.

The CCWG accountability co-chairs, Thomas Rickert, Leon Sanchez, and Mathieu Weill.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Leon, wait a second. Wait a second, please.

[Applause]

You should have the whole group with you and your two co-chairs as well.

Let me thank you very quickly. I think it's outstanding work. We know how much incredible work and effort you have put into this and how much more needs to be done. This really will help to bring us together, and the outcome, if we -- and I'm hopeful that we will succeed at the end; it looks quite positive -- will be excellent for the whole organization.

I know that Steve wants to say something and maybe -- and Bruce as well. Let me hand first maybe to Steve and then to Bruce.

STEVE CROCKER:

Leon and your co-chairs and everyone in the CCWG, and everybody in the ICG, the IANA plan, the CRISP, and the CWG, I have a long speech to give. Thank you.

[Applause]

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yes. Certainly, I'd like to also thank you. Also note that the Board's been sort of following this work very closely, particularly

over this past week. And we've been discussing it, basically, every day as a group.

I do want to reiterate what we said on Sunday in the CCWG working session. And that's to reiterate that the Board is broadly supportive of the new community powers. Also, we are supportive that these new powers need to be enforceable.

The Board is also very encouraged by the work as we develop the details behind those powers. And the Board is very supportive of further exploring the details of the sole-designator model.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Jonne and I will now conclude the first round and hand over to Markus and Bruno. Just one observation we would love to make. We noted so many new faces, which I think it's important for this organization to see new faces and new persons participating. So thank you so much for coming here.

Please, Markus and Bruno.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, we'll continue with the next question.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

An old Irish proverb. May you have the hindsight to know where you've been, the foresight to know where you're going, and the insight to know when you've gone too far.

I will add that, in order to do any of those things, you need data. And while -- and metrics. So, while I don't expect a standing ovation from the Board -- that's a tough act to follow -- toiling in the shadow of the IANA transition, there's been a very engaged working group that's involved the contracted parties and the ALAC and other members of the GNSO to make some steps to improve the use of data in policy making, the DMPM Working Group, through updates to the templates that are used for the issue reports, the chartering and the final reports of working groups so they make better use of data, templates for requesting data both from outside sources and inside sources. They just recently went through a public comment and then final submission to the GNSO where it was voted on unanimously and supported. So this will be on your desk before too long for your consideration. And so just wanted you to know that that was also going on while the accountability stuff was happening. And accountability begins at the working group level. Right? Accountability to the facts. As Mark Twain said, get your facts straight first and then distort them as you like later.

So we're hoping that we contributed to making that happen, and we're looking forward to your consideration of our proposal.

[Applause]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We did.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jonathan. We appreciate your effort and we support it. Next.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Good afternoon. My name is Naveed. I'm from Pakistan and an ICANN fellow and coach. This is my fourth ICANN meeting as I'm talking on my personal behalf.

Coming from the region which ICANN, I mean, puts into the saying Middle Eastern adjoining countries, if you see the globe, you will find that this region is kind of the most challenging region that ICANN can have. Because it has such a diversity from rich countries like GCC and as poor as some African countries and some more countries where war is going on.

So kind of it's a very challenging country with a lot of Internet users from in one country and as low as, like, six persons in Afghanistan, you know?

So my question is: If I see the stakeholder engagement group staff that ICANN has, it only has two at the moment. And those

two -- I mean were hired -- like, one of them was hired, like, three or four years ago.

My question is: If ICANN is doing something to increase the kind of -- the staff members there in order to engage more with the community, because this is absolutely required. You need to bring more people to use the Internet. You need to make them introduced to the domain name industry. Because they can't see the potential there. So the question, again -- I'm rephrasing -- if ICANN is doing something to have more engagement in that region. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you for the question. There are challenges, we understand, in that region. I'm not sure whether anybody from staff would like to answer.

ERIKA MANN:

Maybe Tarek.

FADI CHEHADE:

Simply to say you are right. There's never enough engagement we can do to reach our vast world. However, we have, compared to, frankly, even a year ago, we have put in a lot of resources to reach as many people in the world as we can. Our

engagement activities continue to grow. But also there are, frankly, budget limitations that don't allow us to expand as much as we would like. But we are engaged. And we have our office -- our hub in Singapore, which did not exist two years ago. Now has tens of people trying to reach out to the region and to engage. So more to be done. But we're committed to that. And we're committed to reach the people in this region and look forward to community's help as well in that regard. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you. Your comments have been well noted. Over to the other microphone, please.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thank you. My name is Donna Austin. I'm from NeuStar. I'd like to make a statement on behalf of the registry stakeholder group, noting that we actually haven't had time to run this by the group. But I have a fairly strong idea that they will support this statement.

Registry stakeholder group notes your advice in the GAC communique from Dublin regarding the process for the release of second level domains with the new gTLDs consisting of two-letter country codes. The registry agreement contains two grounds for the release of such letter-letter combinations at the

second level. The first is by agreement with the relevant country, and the second with permission of ICANN subject to implementation of measures to address confusion with the relevant country code. This is a process under discussion and relates to the second round.

Grounds for objection submitted by government should indeed be fully considered. This does not mean that they must be accepted as a matter of course.

Comments submitted by GAC representatives which do not go to the confusion of country codes have no place in the process.

This matter has been outstanding now for more than a year. Actually, I think we're getting closer into the 2-year time frame on this. And we urge the ICANN board to instruct staff to proceed with the process and not to bow to unacceptable government pressure.

I just want to give some background to this issue just to give you some context.

This situation began around March 2014 when registry operators started submitting RSEPs to secure the release of two-character names at the second level. These requests could not be finalized as we understood the GAC advice was pending on the issue.

In October 2014, the GAC provided advice in an L.A. communique allowing for the release of two-letter codes subject to an opportunity for individual governments to object.

In December 2014, ICANN started its new process to enable registry operators to seek authorization to use the two-letter combinations.

So, just to finish up, I think the GAC has provided advice on this issue about four times. The process for this has been changed -- I think if we change it now -- it's five times. The registry stakeholder group has provided comments to -- it has written to the Board and also ICANN staff on this issue at least four times and brought it up in sessions with the registry stakeholder group and GDD for, I think, about the last eight or nine ICANN meetings. We -- the real problem we have with this is: When does GAC advice stop? So when is the end of the cycle? There's been four bites at this cherry that I can remember. And we think that's unacceptable. There's a process in place now. We'd like it to move forward. We don't want any more delays with this. Thank you.

[Applause]

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you. Chris would like to answer, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Donna. So the GAC advice has kind of arrived only overnight. So I'm not going to really say anything other than please make sure -- I'm sure you will -- that you'll get that signed off and sent to us as soon as possible. I think the Board is fully aware of the time this is taking. And we need to try and find a way through it. So send us that, and we'll move forward from there.

But I did want to -- I just did want to acknowledge that we did -- we do understand that this has been going backwards and forwards quite a few times. Thanks.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. The GAC chair would like to speak. Please, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this question. As you rightly said, there has been a GAC advice last year that these country codes, two-letter country codes could be released if the GAC -- if the respective countries would give their consent to.

The advice had been accepted. And we -- the GAC members have been relying on a procedure that would follow that advice.

And we had to -- the GAC had to intervene several times because it felt that the procedure of implementing with this did not respect the advice in the sense that, in particular, for countries that do not have the resources to run, we had hundreds and hundreds of registries. And watch out for when they were planning to release this and intervene, that we were asking for procedures that would actually allow -- de facto allow, not just on paper, but de facto allow governments who would like to keep these two-letter country codes for them not releasing them on second-level domains, to actually have the possibility to exercise what they thought they'd be given as a right. And, as long as these procedures are estimated by us that they do not work, we'll have to continue with advice insisting that this is done in a way that governments can actually do what they thought they should have the right. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Can I respond to that just very quickly? Thank you, Thomas. Should I turn to my right?

Thomas, I accept that the governments think that they have rights at the second level for a combination of two letters that make up a country code. The registry operators do not share that view. We understand the rights that there's national sovereignty associated with the ccTLD at the top level. We

acknowledge that. We recognize that. But a letter-letter combination at the second level is a different -- it's a different situation. So we don't believe that the same rights exist. Thanks.

[Applause]

SEUN OJEDEJI:

This is Seun, for the record. ALAC member. Also an ICANN fellow. But I'm speaking in my personal capacity. One of my questions has been answered, and I'd like to thank the Board for their support of the current CCWG direction.

I'd like to just raise here that there's the fact that, going forward, it is only the Board and the staff that will understand what the organization interest is. And it is only the community, excluding the Board and staff, that will understand what the community interest is. It is important that we keep a balance of these two.

And of these two views, early enough in any process that are going to be involved in.

So I encourage the Board and the staff, in any future process that we want to engage in, please your view is very important because you want to understand the corporate interest very much. And it is important that we get this early enough in any process irrespective of how the community feel about it. So I

encourage you to participate in our processes early enough so we can actually make -- maximize the time better based on what has happened in this current transition.

My question -- one question I have. There is this NTIA announced that was going to be parallel process to this in line with this transition, which, actually, we're under the corporate agreement with VeriSign. Have you heard anything in that regard? And have you been actually tasked to actually initiate a multistakeholder process for that as well? Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Anyone on this? Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Seun, let me be very direct with you, because I know you like straight talk.

Making a statement that the staff and the Board look after our corporate interest is, frankly, just -- I would like for the record to say I've been at ICANN for nearly four years. I sincerely do not remember once going into a meeting in which either legal, staff, or counsel or the Board said, "Let's figure out what's in the corporate interest."

I honestly do not remember once this being the dialogue. Quite the opposite almost. Every time we meet, where is the community on this? What can we do to meet? So, if I misunderstood you, please tell me. But I must assure you this is not the way we think.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah. I think -- this is Seun, for the record. I think you misunderstood me. My point is that we, as a community, at times we are so ambitious we tend to bring in a lot of things at the same time, which is also -- which is our interest. But, again, we need to also recognize that the organization needs to live, needs to be sustainable, needs to be -- needs to survive. And you guys are the ones that operate this. So it's good that we understand the issues early enough so that we don't just keep proposing things that will actually not work. That is my point. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

I'm very glad you clarified this. On that point in fact, then, we are completely in sync. And what you're asking us to do is to be even ever more clear as to what are the things we're engaged in? What are the pressures we're feeling? What are the budget limitations? What are the implementation risks that we're facing? So that, when we're engaged with the community, the

community has full transparency as to what is it that's driving our decision making? I agree with you. We'll do more of that. You have my commitment on this.

As to your second question regarding the VeriSign matter, please appreciate that how we implement the community's requirements in the ICG proposal has enormous number of details that need to be worked out. We're trying to get all of this done now that also we are delayed in getting some of these things nailed from a proposal standpoint. And yet the community has set the timeline to end on September 30th. So there is an enormous amount of thinking and planning and administrative prep and how we're going to get there.

And, in fact, in fairness to NTIA, they told us, hey, are you thinking about these things? Why don't you sit down with VeriSign and start thinking about this so that we are not caught at the last minute saying "we don't know" and "we'll try this." And there are some fundamental issues that we need to address in the software, in operational procedures, in processes. Because now we have one of the three players in the triangle removed completely. And it was the player that connected both of us. Because we didn't have a connection with VeriSign. So there is a fundamental change in how this is all working. We're trying to do the minimum amount of change to maintain stability. And I think all of us agree on that but yet maintain all

the flexibility we need so that, as we finish this phase and things are stable, which is our number one job, we can go back and revisit this together with the team and say, okay, is this working? How else can we do it to serve the community better? You have my assurance of that.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Let's move to the other microphone, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Alberto Soto, LACRALO chair. For your ears and less complication, I speak in Spanish.

Alberto Soto speaking. So that you can relax a little bit, I will not speak about these complex issues. And I will speak about some of our needs. So you can relax for a little while.

In LACRALO, we hold events, regional events, that are quite overwhelming in terms of timelines and in terms of the cropped timeline, because we have an 8-week time window to apply for the program. So, please, can you review that? Because ICANN is not using the resources properly, and we cannot sometimes attend certain regional events.

Some of our ALSs have very little resources. They need to perform outreach and engagement and they cannot even fund a

Web site. So can you -- I'm not speaking about funds, but can you please contribute some working hours so that you can design a sample Web site for those ALSs that cannot afford one. As LAC RALO chair I can perfectly coordinate this initiative and we will follow up on this with the rest of the RALOs in our meeting because we face the same issue time and time again. Having a Web site means having a domain online and hosting and that entails a certain cost. So perhaps we can have a block free of charge for those ALSs that lack those resources. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: I thought it was going to be a relaxing moment, but I'm not sure anymore. Okay, please.

CHRIS GIFT: This is Chris Gift with Digital Services. I can stand up -- no, I don't think I can. There is a model for that. We do have some regions that have produced Web sites using their own resources with some support from us. So I think that's perhaps like LACNIC and so that's perhaps a model we can follow going forward. I'll follow up with you, Alberto.

MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Are we to the other microphone?

AMADOU LV:

Hello, everyone. My name is Amadou Lv. I come from the telecommunication authority in Senegal, and I am quite simply very happy to be here, contrary to others who were not able to make it here. They were high-level representatives that represented the governments in Senegal. They came from the telecommunication ministry, and some of these delegates were not able to make it here. So I would like to bring something -- I tried to bring something, but quite frankly I would like to speak on their behalf. You know, people who are from Mali, from all of these sub-regions in Africa, from all of these personalities who work at a very high level who could not be here and bring their contribution to this meeting.

This is something that was mentioned at the GAC meeting. But I would like to repeat it because it would really be good to be able to solve these issues once and for all so that these countries might be represented. Because it is -- there is a gap there. There is something missing because these countries cannot be represented. We come from countries where Internet penetration is very weak, right now the use of smartphones and tablets is just starting. I am talking about countries where central administration are still using generic addresses such as gmail and Yahoo! and so forth to work with strategic information, strategic data. People are not aware really what

telecommunications industry, the Internet industry really is. So I would like to use this opportunity to say that if we are not able in Marrakech to use the meeting to really gather these personalities and make them understand the importance of these topics so that we might really give an impulse and help people move forward.

I think that we need to reiterate our trust towards people who have been working for several months towards our goal. You know, that trust is fundamental and it is something that represents a great challenge for the community. So I would like to repeat again, please help us. Help us so that people might simply just be here in order to speak and to claim what they need to claim. It is really serious in today's world, in 2015, 2016, that people are not able to come to a meeting. And I think that you took note of that, but I hope that I can see that happen, actually happen in fact.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you. George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: -- I've worked in your area of the world and I understand some of the limitations that you have. One of the reasons we rotate our meetings among regions is to allow people to come to a meeting

closer to their home. And as you know, we'll be in Marrakech, which is fairly close to all of the countries you mentioned, and we hope we'll get good representation from people from those countries.

I'd just like to point out also the fellowship program which allows us to bring people, regardless of distance, to ICANN meetings, no matter where they are. And I know that we have had many fellows from Africa -- from the African region as well as other regions where the Internet isn't so well developed. And we hope that by seeding those countries with people who know ICANN and are able to be knowledgeable in the area of names and numbers and Internet governance we will -- we have contributed to the development of the Internet. There's a lot to be done, and we hope we can contribute in these ways on a continuous basis. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yes, sir. I would like to tell you that we are very happy to have you here. But I would like to know what are the reasons why the other personality -- personalities were not able to be here. The reasons are quite simply that the Visa was refused. The Visa request was rejected. So there's -- this first point. Secondly, of course, the means. But at least that official governments might

be able to be here. I don't think that Senegal is the only country that was faced with this problem.

MARKUS KUMMER:

I understand your question -- questions in English. The Visa issue is always an issue. Whenever you go to a conference. Now, with the U.N. there's a system in place where all member states have committed themselves to give Visas to a U.N. conference. But even there you end up having problems. I think the only places where it really works well is the headquarters of the U.N., New York, Nairobi, Geneva, Vienna, because there the governments have adapted their own internal legislations to the requirements of the U.N.

Now, this is what it is. ICANN is not the U.N. and that was one -- decided that way to have a system that is somewhat different. But the problem definitely is recognized, and I would like to pay tribute to the Irish government. They have done an awful lot to facilitate many individual Visa cases. But the problem is, the system in place makes it sometimes very difficult. And even I organized conference under the U.N. flag. Even there, you enter -- you are running -- you run into problems. Governments sign an agreement with the U.N., but then the information doesn't necessarily trickle down to the embassy or the consulates. The Visa officer doesn't know that he is supposed to give a

conference, and all this is not in place with ICANN, but is definitely something staff is looking into and obviously the more contact you have with the host country early on with the foreign ministry to alert them, look, if you apply for a conference, please help us to get the Visa. But this is not based on international law. This is based on voluntary cooperation as so much is in ICANN. But we have understood your problem and yes, this is taken seriously, and the next host has already promised to do the utmost to make it easy for high-level participants to arrive. This is an important issue

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Merci.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Marcus. I think that we have an online question.

BRAD WHITE: -- a question from Kieren McCarthy directed to Fadi Chehade. At the last public forum in Buenos Aires I asked if ICANN would provide details of the lobbyists it hires in Washington, DC and the amount it paid them. Fadi said that ICANN would provide those details in an email. Unfortunately, I never received such an email.

I have since done some research into this issue. ICANN provides some public records, as it is required to do under U.S. law, about its lobbying. It also lists the amount it has spent on lobbying in its tax forms. According to those records, ICANN has hired three main lobbyists, including one staffer, and spent \$576,000 in 2014. However, it is also the case that ICANN has hired a significant number of other lobbyists over the IANA transition and has used a loophole in congressional rules to not publicly disclose them. Most significantly, ICANN has hired, at the cost of millions of dollars, former National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. There are also reports that ICANN also hires further three lobbyists, including two former senior commerce department staff.

While ICANN ensures that the community does all of its work on the IANA transition in public and with full transparency and considering that ICANN has specifically raised concerns about the money being spent on legal advice for the accountability working group, will ICANN commit to being similarly transparent about the people it hires to carry out its work and the amount of money it spends on their services? As a specific suggestion, ICANN could live up to its stated goals of transparency by introducing a budget line item simply called "lobbying" and introduce the real amount it spends on outside lobbying

companies. Will ICANN staff commit to the same level of openness that it demands of its community.

[Applause]

[Timer sounds]

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah, Kieren, I had asked you to send me a letter asking me for what you want, and you never did. So I ask you again, in front of the whole community, to please write down exactly what you're looking for. If this is what you just asked, great. If you want to publish an article with the question, do. Send me the question, and we'll answer you. It's that simple. But we did not get a formal request from you. We told you at the time everything we do is on the Web site. It is on the Web site. That's how you found your numbers. That's how you gave the facts you just did. So we are transparent. So please, if you have specific requests, send them in writing.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you, Fadi. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I hope that my question won't be quite as heavy, but last time that I asked a question, it wasn't a light question. We will see.

My question is the following: As we come into the new year we will organize the meetings a little bit differently. This topic is close to my heart, as you might already know, and I think that this is something that we should start in good conditions. The most important question, I think, for the community is the June meeting, the B meeting. How will we organize this meeting? I would like to ask you to think about innovating or creative solutions. This meeting is something that you have wished. These meetings will be shorter. They will be focused on a topic. So we will need to be creative. We cannot necessarily duplicate such a meeting -- a meeting such as this one in just three days. It is not possible. So I ask you that you might really think about it. Work with the teams who organize the meetings in order to innovate and do things differently from what we do today. And I think that if we do that, we will succeed and we will move forward and organize the better -- the meetings in a different way and a better way.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you very much, Sebastien, for your call to -- for us to be creative.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: -- are dear to my heart too since you and I worked together on it in the community working group. And yes, there are lots of

things going on to ensure that the meeting B is innovative. I know that Nick and his team and other staff are working closely with the leadership of the At-Large and the SOs and the GAC to -- to come up with a program that will enable those SOs and ACs to do the work that they need to do, but also to outreach to the community and to cross -- to spend a lot of time in cross community issue-driven discussions. So check in with the ALAC leadership, and if there's a -- if there's anything else you need to know, send us a -- send us a note. Thanks, Sebastien.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks, back to the right microphone or stage left. Yes, sir.

PAUL FOODY: Hi, Paul Foody. Ladies and Gentlemen of the board, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here in Dublin. There's been a huge amount of work attempting to meet the still extremely demanding revised NTIA timeline. However, one of the conditions of the transition was that it support and enhance the multistakeholder model. 13 months ago in Istanbul Larry Strickling defined the multistakeholder process as one that brings stakeholders together to participate in the dialogue, decision-making, and implementation solutions to common problems or goals, a key attribute of which is the full involvement of all stakeholders. There are roughly three billion

Internet users and millions if not hundreds of millions of domain name registrants. Yet the second draft of the CCWG accountability proposal drew just 88 public comments, most, if not all of which, were from ICANN stalwarts. I'm wondering what efforts has ICANN made to measure the extent to which it is fully involving all stakeholders in order to ensure the massive amounts of work currently being done and being proposed has the necessary legitimacy, the NTIA is reasonably expecting?

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you for this question. Well, I suppose the complexity of the process was so overwhelming that it would have been asking for something impossible to achieve to involve the global stakeholder community. I mean, just follow the process and this was -- even for insiders, I think it was a very complex process. But who would like to answer anything? Yes, please. Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Yeah. Thank you, Markus. And thank you, sir, for your question. I couldn't agree with you more. It's very important that we get responses, contributions, from more than the regular people who do get themselves involved. So I -- I don't know whether you -- you heard the statistics, I showed -- I shared earlier. We had, you know, 156 people signed up to contribute to the CWG.

We had 191 people signing up to contribute to the CCWG. And I would like to see that number increase, of course.

PAUL FOODY: How many of those people were at ICANN more than 18 months ago?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: I don't know.

PAUL FOODY: You don't know.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: No, I don't know. But I would like -- that's why I made the comment earlier, that I would like the community to get more involved, different SOs and ACs to do their part and get more people from all over the world to be involved. And not only coming to ICANN meetings, but getting involved by contributing to the different working groups in between meetings. Because when you contribute, that's when you get heard.

PAUL FOODY: You see, the same meeting in Istanbul 13 months ago, and I believe that Fadi was at the meeting, Mr. Strickling said that

there's no rush, we will extend the process for four years. Right now I think in order to -- to give this process the necessary legitimacy, ICANN would be much better served making sure that the global public is being served, that they're aware of what is going on. Because right now it looks like way too many people who have been involved in ICANN for a very long period are crafting something which affects the whole world. And of which the majority, the vast majority of which, people are completely unaware of. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, and on more practical terms can I close the queue? We have a break at a quarter past 4:00. And yes, we go to the left microphone. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER:

Hello, Milton Mueller, internet ICANN stalwart, as Foody would have called me. I just want to start out by saying I think I'm looking at a spillable board or maybe a semi spillable board. At least we're anticipating that great opportunity as we look forward. I don't know whether you like the word "spill," "flush," "fire," but I just think it's going to change the nature of the

relationship between your community and the board. And not in a bad way. Not in a confrontational way. I think that's a good thing.

But as part of the transition there are a lot of details, and I just wanted to address a comment that your CEO said. He described the ICANN/VeriSign contractual relationship as a matter of implementation. And in many respects, he's right in the short term. I totally understand the need to get into the details of managing this relationship. However, it's more than that. And as you probably know, there's a long history of people calling serious policy issues implementation issues and then proceeding to make policy by fiat. So you kind of raised some alarm signals in my mind.

So in my opinion the ability -- the inability of the CWG to talk about the relationship between ICANN and the RZM, not in the immediate term but in the long term, was a failure and a loophole in their proposal. And I'd just like to clarify that, if I could. So when you talk about changing that contract in the future, it's like will we know -- will there be a fixed term? What will be the criteria for changing it? Could ICANN take that over by itself? There would be a lot of opposition to that, for example. And concentrating all of that power in ICANN's hands.

How is the jurisdiction issue connected to the contractual contracting of the root zone maintainer? So anything you can say about that, I would appreciate hearing at this point.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for the question. I think Fadi has actually answered.

MIKE SILBER: Bingo.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

MILTON MUELLER: I thought that Mike was saying that Fadi has actually answered that when he said "bingo." And I'm not sure that he has. So why don't we let him answer the question.

MARKUS KUMMER: Definitely let him answer it.

Just to your comments on the spillable board, as long as you just spill us and don't kill us, then we're okay. In one of the sessions, somebody actually mentioned killing the board would be a really serious matter.

MILTON MUELLER: That didn't quite get consensus in the committee. Almost.

[Laughter]

MARKUS KUMMER: Fadi, do you want to take it again?

FADI CHEHADE: I'm always very worried when Professor Mueller says he has alarms going in his head. That's what you just said.

MILTON MUELLER: It's better than the voices.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: Yes, we're certainly -- your concerns are important, and I appreciate very much your point.

Look, I think that we are very, very early in the stage. We were just trying to get ahead of this important implementation detail. And you're right, we have received -- what we've received from the community is what we're trying to implement. If it's not in the proposals, then we implement based on what we got. And

right now we have clear requirements that are being refined and finalized in these proposals. And we don't want to wait till the last minute and then figure out, oh, my goodness, there's no way we can get this done in time.

So some of our administrative preparations are simply so that, frankly, we're not caught off guard at the last minute.

My driving direction to the team is let's not stay completely, you know, blind to what we need to do till the last minute and then say to the community, Oops, sorry, we're just not going to be able to get all of this tested and done in time, which would be a shame, given that we know that the community has asked for the contract to sunset on the 30th of September.

And the second thing is to retain the maximum flexibility for us in whatever arrangement we do in the short-term just so that we can maintain the stability of the system.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, the flexibility is what bothers me. Would you say that ICANN could take over this function itself in the future?

FADI CHEHADE: No. This is not the intent. We believe that the separation of roles between what ICANN does and the other party is healthy, is

good. I mean, we went from three parties to two. And we think that maintains a certain level of checks and balances and stability that is healthy.

[Timer sounds.]

So I hope this helps, Professor.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Bruce would also like to...

BRUCE TONKIN: I just wanted to pick up on Milton's comment about spillable board.

First, I think it's worth recognizing three board members are leaving today. I will be leaving around this time next year. In any given year, a third of the board can be replaced just through the normal appointment process. Within two years, 2/3 of the board can be replaced. And in three years, all of the board can be replaced. So we're certainly not here forever.

With regards to the new community powers, there's broad support across the board for both removing individual directors, if they are not removing their job. In fact, the board already has the right today to remove an individual board director who is not doing its job. And we also support the ability to remove the

whole board if in the community's view the board is not doing a good job.

So we're not here permanently, and we fully support the ability to remove us if we're not performing to the community's expectations.

MARKUS KUMMER:

And Cherine would also you like to chime in, please.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Yes, I'd like to. I think Milton mentioned that with these powers, there will be a change in the relationship between the board and I suspect he meant also board members and the community.

I sincerely hope that this is not going to change the behavior of board members on the board. I've said it in many meetings. Board members, when they come on the board, they have to act in the best interest of all stakeholders. And this is something we must preserve as an organization, the independence of board members when they're acting on the board.

So I want to make sure that you did not imply that that would be the case. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Wolfgang, yes.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I just want to add one point which is not for today but for tomorrow in workstream 2. If we have this criteria for the board members, we have to have the same criteria for members of the council and the committees. Accountability is not -- the project we discuss is not about removing power from one place to another. This is sharing power, so that we have different checks and balances in the system and not to hand it over from one place to another one. This would be a wrong perception insofar the SO/AC accountability is a very important point for the workstream 2. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

Now we have a time management issue. Would you agree that we start -- we can give maybe to Steve an opportunity to talk and people behind him will then start after the break the next session, if that's okay with you? Okay.

So, Steve. We may not answer your question, but you can say your question.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you. Steve DelBianco with the business constituency. The BC spent most of the last week and much of the last year focusing on the future of ICANN's accountability. But we don't want to lose sight of the present of ICANN's accountability today. And so much of today's accountability is a function of the compliance and enforcement of the contracts we have in place today that are in operation.

The BC continues to reiterate the importance of contract enforcement in a multistakeholder model that depends upon contracts for so much of what we do.

What the question or request I might have to the board is if there were to be a review or decisions and revisions on how the corporation interprets the enforcement of contract provisions in place today, that that would be broadly inclusive of the entire community and published for public comment. And we'd appreciate you considering that as you move ahead on the interpretation of current contracts. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. We have taken note.

And can we hand over to our master of ceremony to introduce -- I think we are going to see a video.

You can come after the break. We start with you. You will be the first speakers after the break. Just remember where you were in the line.

Thank you for your patience.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Bruno and Markus. We are going to take a short break.

Before we do, I would like to take a minute to acknowledge a very special program and the person who has made it such a success. I'm talking about the ICANN fellowship program.

If you will turn your attention to the projection screens, we will show you why this program helps define the heart of ICANN. It's short and very moving.

Roll tape.

[Video]

VIDEO:

This is the next generation. They are the ones that are going to take the work to the next level. When you introduce yourself, when you introduce yourself as a member of the fellowship program, you have put yourself in a different place in the eyes of the community. Right away they're saying, "Wow, this is my

next potential councillor." "This is my next potential At-Large leader." "This is my next potential working group member."

>> The fellowship program is an amazing journey actually. It was brought about for capacity-building so that we bring more volunteers into the Internet space, into the ICANN space.

But what's happened is we've formed a family within the community of ICANN. We have fellows from all the developing and least developing nations.

>> I'm from Ethiopia.

>> I'm from Kenya.

>> I'm from Argentina, from Buenos Aires.

>> I'm from China.

>> South Africa.

>> I'm from Sudan.

>> It gives an opportunity for people from developing countries to come here to learn and to bring back to their own community what is taking place on a global level.

The starting point for me to be involved in ICANN was really fellowship program. And fellowship program is a family, and I mean it when I'm saying it.

-
- >> I feel humbled. I feel grateful. I understand what they need because I get to know them as people.
- >> We simply call her "Mama J" because she's mother for every single person here. And we are truly coming here as a family and to see her and hug her as our mother.
- >> When I hear "Mama J," it just makes me feel like I did something right, that they feel at home. They know they have a family, and they know someone has got their back.
- I tell people all the time I'm the luckiest person at ICANN. I have a job that I'm completely passionate about. And the passion steers me. It makes me understand. It makes me feel.
- >> She teaches us how we can be passionate.
- >> Whenever she is telling about something, what is going on in ICANN, she may cry. She may have tears in her eyes. At the same time, she may smile.
- >> We don't call ourselves a community for nothing. That's exactly what we are. We are a community. We work together. We depend on one another. And it is a human element after all that is connecting all of us.
- >> She is a true -- truly an inspiration for every single person who is coming here.

[Video ends]

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Where is Mama J?

FADI CHEHADE: Janice, could you come up here? Where is Janice? Come up here, please.

Come up to the front.

(Standing ovation).

ERIKA MANN: Well done. Well done.

Well done.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. We will take a short break. Ten minutes. Be back here and then we keep going.

[Break]

STEVE CROCKER: Oh, we're over time here. Let's get started.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the third and final round of the public forum in Dublin at ICANN 54.

STEVE CROCKER: Excuse me. Just a minute, Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm over here. Hi.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Sorry.

STEVE CROCKER: What you're seeing is the same thing that I know everyone is feeling. We're eager, so eager, to get on with this and bring this to a close.

In March, we'll be traveling to Marrakech, Morocco, for ICANN 55. In that context, it's now my honor to introduce, His Excellency, Ambassador Anas Khaled, the ambassador of the Kingdom of Morocco here in Ireland. Ambassador?

[Applause]

ANAS KHALES: Thank you. Good afternoon.

On behalf of the Kingdom of Morocco I would like to take this opportunity to announce officially that my country will hold the 55th conference of ICANN in Marrakech in March 2016.

Hosting the ICANN conference for the second time in Morocco after the 2006 session reflects the importance given by my country to contribute and to achieve the objectives of your organization.

We see in my country the organization of the next conference in Marrakech as a tribute to Morocco and to Africa.

Africa, for us, represents one of the top priorities for Morocco to which His Majesty the King, Mohammed VI, grants a great

importance. An importance illustrated by several visits to sub-Saharan countries to launch and consolidate partnerships to achieve human and economic sustainable development.

We are very proud as Moroccans to host the next conference in Marrakech, known as the land of dialogue, diversity, and rich interaction between cultures and civilizations.

I wish important progress for your work and welcome you to Marrakech for the next conference to maintain the momentum of your efforts.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

To give a further glimpse into the preparations for ICANN 55, I'd like to introduce Dr. Aziz Hilali.

Dr. Hilali is professor and the chair of Mediterranean Federation of Associations of Internet, the chair of the African at-large organization, and vice president of the Internet Society in Morocco.

Dr. Hilali?

[Applause]

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you.

Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy and honored to be once again in front of you to present the location of the 55th reunion and meeting of ICANN which was postponed last year and will happen next March in Marrakech, and I would like to thank my ambassador for being with us today.

I would like to welcome you once again in our home and to tell you how happy we are to welcome you in Marrakech, and this is a great opportunity to thank all of you supporters after the decision to reschedule ICANN 52. In the name of the general director of the Moroccan regulator, who was able to be with us today, unfortunately, I would like to reiterate in front of you his engagement with all the national authorities to do everything possible so that the Marrakech meeting will be a great success, equal to the ambitions of Morocco and the entire African continent.

I have the pleasure to announce that in this wonderful opportunity, a gala dinner will be offered to the ICANN 55 participants by the Moroccan regulator, the National Agency of Regulation -- of Telecommunications Regulation. We are very proud that this meeting will be on African soil. It will be a strategic event for our region, particularly now in this very

important period for the future of the ICANN organization, and I am sure it will have a strong impact on us Africans, because it could be the opportunity for all the stakeholders to think together about those questions relative to policy development, and it's going to be the opportunity for Africa to become a source of proposals for Internet governance.

The Marrakech meeting will be important because several important events are scheduled around this meeting.

For instance, a high-level GAC meeting on Monday, March 7th, 2016, third edition, the first one in Africa.

We will have the participation of dozens of ministers and of the ICT industry and digital economy.

African ministers will also -- are also scheduled to meet on Sunday, March 6, to identify the means and the actions that they can do to increase the benefits of our global digital economy in Africa and to promote the collaboration between public and private sectors in Africa.

We will also have the fourth version of the DNS forum from March 4 to March 6 as the president of the AFRALO African at-large and the Mediterranean Federation of Internet Association, which is an ALS, part of ALAC, and as you know, started this project.

We will be very glad to see you participate in our numerous African activities scheduled in Marrakech all along the week with social and cultural activities and animation that will showcase the values and the culture, Moroccan culture, and African cultures.

Consequently, I am convinced that our Marrakech meeting will be a great asset for the major objectives of ICANN to be better understood, better appreciated by the decision-makers coming from our region. Public and private decision-makers.

ICANN is very attractive and a good omen for the strategic -- the objectives that are searched and looked upon by the governance of our region.

Dear colleagues, I am sure you will enjoy the city of Marrakech, and I hope you'll be able to stay longer in Marrakech and in Morocco so that you know what hospitality is all about, that you get to visit our beautiful hotels and good restaurants and our beautiful popular squares.

Thank you very much for your attention. We have a video coming from the tourism council about the city of Marrakech. Thank you very much.

[Video starts]

VIDEO: One thing people really need to pick up on is Morocco is a wonderful place. It has a great tourism history, but outside of that, there's a rich nomadic culture that I don't think a lot of people know about, and that when they do come here, dig a little deeper, you know. Go out into the sub-Saharan and tap into these tribes that have been around for so long and have so much kind of knowledge and culture to give to us that a lot of times we don't even get to hear about.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Aziz.

We're going to continue to discuss issues of community interest. Our board facilitator for this final block, Wolfgang Kleinwachter.

Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Steve. Does it work? Yeah.

We have still 45 minutes to go. The queue is there. You know, we're making good progress, I think. We're stumbling forward.

And before I ask Elliot to start with the question, let me make a very brief comment to what Bret has said this afternoon when he said we spend too much time nowadays compared with the early days.

In the early days, you know, this was not really a multistakeholder process, and to be fair, multistakeholder cooperation is more painful than one stakeholder cooperation. We should recognize this and not to have dreams which has been gone. So we have to look in the future and the future is much more multistakeholder.

This is just a comment, and Bret, I hope you will understand this, and now Elliot.

ELLIOT NOSS: Mike, I think, was waiting before the --

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, I don't --

ELLIOT NOSS: No, no. I insist.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you. Mike Palage, Pharos Global, and actually, Wolfgang, I want to pick up on that and as well to Chris' comment in response to Bret.

ICANN -- I appreciate the board's commitment to the multistakeholder model and the recognition that it does make things more complicated in reaching consensus. And the point I want to raise is, as the multiprocessor -- as the multiprocess -- multi-participant process gets more complicated, it gets harder to make decisions and it will be -- it will require you, the board, to take action in the face of decisions.

So to Chris' point, in Section 1.1.6 of the applicant guidebook, it talked about a next round proceeding within the first year after the close of the first round. We kind of missed that date.

And if you read forward into 1.1.6 of the applicant guidebook, they recognized that there would be a need for an evaluation period, but the key in the evaluation period said that we will hold delegation of the second round of applicants until the review is complete.

So what's key here is they didn't say we're not going to accept applications in the second round until the reviews. They basically knew that it was going to be a forward progress.

Now, the reason I think this is important is the recognition of if the community doesn't take action and if it doesn't reach consensus, which is a real possibility -- within the GNSO yesterday they were unable to elect a new chair because of some internal conflicts. Consensus was not reached in electing the chair.

You need to -- you need to consider what you are going to do with your fiduciary obligation to the board.

And with regard to con- -- points of disagreement, one needs to look no further than the GAC communique from last night, which has been raising this same point since before Beijing. These were points raised in the first scorecard before -- before Singapore.

These points haven't changed.

So while this week I have appreciated a lot about stress test 18, I submit to you that the new stress test is going to be how do you resolve those points regarding sensitive strings, the protection of geographical identifiers as TLDs, and the protection of communities as well as -- and developing economies. Those are four points that I do not believe consensus will be reached within the community, and you, the ICANN board, are going to have to make a determination on that.

And this goes to the point of your accountability review mechanisms. You're going to be forced to make decisions that will probably make some people in the public sector and in the private sector unhappy, and how will those people that are unhappy feel? Will they have the same trust in those accountability mechanisms as you do right now?

Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: (Off microphone.)

MULTIPLE VOICES: Microphone.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Yeah. Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Michael, thank you for all of these questions and the points.

On the four items, obviously sooner or later some determination has to be made. There's no doubt about that. The one thing we must avoid doing is doing policy that we impose.

So I think here there will be a path forward and we need to come to a certain point in time when this determination happens, sure.

In terms of the next round, you know very well that, yes -- you read 1.1.6 back to us. Thank you.

The issue, as you know, is that there are current reviews in process, and there are -- we don't know the final outcome of those, and there are different points of view in the community. The community is not sure about this. There's one part of the community who says, "Wait until all the reviews are done. You learned your lesson." And then launch the next round and launch it, you know, with an Applicant Guidebook, which is better and more accurate than the first one.

There are others who says you don't have to wait for every review to be finished. You can, actually, look at the individual reviews and look at some element of them that are necessary to launch a next round.

And then there are other sectors who say, "Well, let's launch with a brand in a new round before anything is done." So it is not that easy. At the moment we're still waiting to see where a lot of these reviews are coming up. We have to look at them at one stage. And then it is more, in a way, a policy by the GNSO to

say when the next round should take place rather than the Board imposing it.

But I think all of this has to come into a melting pot at one time. And then it's going to be made. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay. By the way, the lady was first in the row. But it's okay now. I give the floor to Elliot.

ELLIOT NOSS: Elliott Noss, Tucows. Many in the room are aware that, between Buenos Aires and today, registrars have created a unified abuse document that has now been broadly shared with members of the ICANN community, intellectual property, law enforcement, civil society, policy, and others. That document is intended to create a start point for a dialogue that helps to solve a lot of the problems that we talk about regularly in this community.

But I'm greedy. And I want to go for more.

Whenever we engage with security or law enforcement communities around significant issues of cybercrime, inevitably, they know exactly who the perpetrators are. They know who they are. They know where they are. And they know their past practices with amazing detail.

The challenge is in getting at them. So I'd like today so say that what we need to do is to encourage the GAC and all its members to start to take the issue of cybercrime that we deal with the little entrails of down here back into their national governments and deal with the much thornier issues of extradition and extraterritoriality.

Now, I know that this is a long process. I expect to be here in the public forum in the 2020s talking about this issue. And I hope that by the mid 2020s, we're all here celebrating progress on this issue. But I want to be clear that, without that progress, all we, as registrars, as web hosting companies, as ISPs can do is keep sticking our fingers in the dike dealing with some of the damage without solving the bigger problems. And so any way that we can help you guys deal with this very tricky political issue of tying cybercrime to trade and broad extra territoriality, please let us know. Thank you.

[Applause]

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I think, Elliot, the applause says everything. I can only encourage you to going forward with this long-term perspective. If we have finished the transition on accountability, a lot more issues will be on our table. I have called this workstream 3.

Probably your topic is workstream 4. So let's look forward.
Thank you. Next one.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Hi, my name is Andrew Sullivan. And I'm chair of the Internet Architecture Board. The mission of ICANN currently has text that ICANN -- and I quote -- is to coordinate at the overall level, the global Internet systems of unique identifiers. End quote. That's not precisely true any more and hasn't been at least since the protocol supporting organization disappeared from ICANN.

I'm wondering whether the Board is open to changing this part of the mission since it's open anyway in the CCWG process

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER:

Thank you. Suzanne, do you want to reply?

STEVE CROCKER:

I think I'm the designated hitter here. Andrew, thank you very much. There's been a somewhat uncomfortable disparity between some of the words that we use to describe ourselves and some of the words that our close friends use to describe us.

We have -- and we've -- some of us have been paying attention for a while. The good news -- I think it's extremely good news -- is that over the last relatively short period of time, we have built

a much stronger technical team, step one. And step 2 is would are we have actually got them connected to the communications process. Harder than I would have liked it to have been. But it's now there. And it's been one of these behind the scenes things of where we've been pressing.

So I think that, going forward, we're going to try to align our words in a more careful way. There's always a lot of equities about how many words you use to describe yourself which, you know. But I think some greater precision and adjustment of the nuances is well in order. I'm not sure exactly -- as I speak, I don't know exactly what's going to happen with respect to the text that you quote. And, in addition, with the CCWG process underway, everybody is holding the pin. I can't tell whether it's multiple pins being held by multiple people or multiple people holding the same pin or some in between thing.

But your point is understood. Your point is appreciated. And over the next few months I'm hopeful that we'll begin to see some adjustments, some fine points in there.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

So just as a quick follow-up, strictly, you didn't answer my question, which is: is the Board open to changing this?

STEVE CROCKER: Oh, more than open.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Phil.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes. Good afternoon. This time I'm speaking on behalf of the Domain Investors and Developers of the Internet Commerce Association.

On September 28th, in disposing of its consent agenda, the Board approved the renewal registry agreements for .CAT, TRAVEL, and PRO, including Uniform Rapid Suspension by contract, notwithstanding the fact that the majority of comments filed on those renewal agreements had been in opposition out of concern that this was creating consensus policy, de facto consensus policy by contract.

On October 13th, the ICA filed a request for reconsideration. That decision -- I would note in passing on that same day the business constituency and the non-commercial stakeholder group joined and submitted a joint request for reconsideration.

Now, we very much appreciate the very serious consideration that the Board gave in its decision and the statement it made that its approval of the renewal registry agreement was not a move to make the URS mandatory for any legacy TLDs and would be inappropriate to do so.

But I would point out, then, between your action and the filing of request for reconsideration, policy staff issued this very thick initial issues report on RPM review for all TLDs in which they said there were two overarching issues, policy issues in that review, one of which was -- and I quote -- whether any of the new RPMs such as the URS should like the UDRP be consensus policies applicable to all gTLDs and the transitional issues that would have to be dealt with. As a consequence, transitional issues that were not considered were dealt with by the Global Domains Division when they made their decision.

So I did have a polite dialogue with the head of the GDD when he appeared before council over the weekend. He said they intended to keep trying to press registries to renew, to accept the URS and the other RPMs when they renewed. They have very substantial leverage, particularly, when a registry needs strategic changes in their contract to remain viable.

So my request to the Board -- and I can read the writing on the wall -- but you have many opportunities under the RFR to

summarily dismiss on procedural grounds. I do hope the Board will recognize this is an important policy issue and respond on substantive grounds. Thank you very much.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Phil. Bruce will take this.

BRUCE TONKIN: Just a quick comment. The Board Governance Committee has yet to actually consider this matter. So certainly can't give a resolution on the reconsideration request. But I will make the general comment that, as these agreements come up for renewal, some of these agreements were created more than 10 years ago, some of those date around 2004, 2005. And so a new registry operator could renew the agreement, essentially, under the current terms. Or they could take on one of the new agreements that's already been out for public comment and in place with many registry operators.

So at least my understanding is that these contracting parties have voluntarily agreed to enter into the agreement in the new form, the new gTLD agreement because they feel that that is more favorable than the agreement they're currently operating under. Anything in between those two choices, they would have

to go out to a full public comment process. And that's not something they wish to have entered into.

So I don't think it's something that should be taken as a method that it's a fait accompli that everybody must put in those new mechanisms. But I think it is a fact that these contracted parties voluntarily entered into those contracts, and the Board approved them.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you. And we look forward to, hopefully, a substantive response on this issue.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Bruce. Thank you, Phil. And we have 25 minutes left. So I would close the queue now. And go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. Can I? All right.

Thank you. My name is Mary Uduma from Nigeria. And I'm speaking both as my personal capacity and speaking on behalf of Nigeria.

First, we want to appreciate the fact that the Board is a listening board. I attended the ICANN meeting for the first time when

there was no translation, you can only speak English. And, if you don't speak English, good luck to you.

But the Board listened when we asked for translation. And the Board was able to make sure that those of us that don't have -- that are not English speaking will be able to follow why anything -- even when it is Adobe meetings, that we get translation. So kudos to the Board for that.

We also talked about reaching out. And we can see that the Board came up with this strategy of having vice president engagements. And this has helped a lot.

Our governments today now know about ICANN. They can express their concerns about what they don't like in ICANN. And I think it's a good thing that has happened. Our region in particular -- apart from being in Geneva, our region, in particular, the VP has been reaching out to our government. And we have been expressing our positions or our feelings towards ICANN to this.

And we can now see that there's feature in the DNS industry in our region. Our businesses are now trying to come up to be there. And we have seen that the fellowship has increased and next-generation.

Well, there's something that the Board has not done. Even when Cheryl was the chair of NomCom, she did not bring many women to the Board. So I want to see more women sitting there. That's one of the things the NomCom that the Board will still encourage.

Second is the new meeting B. I hope hosting of meeting B will be light enough for those of us who have been clamoring to host ICANN meeting will be able to host ICANN meeting. If you've been to Africa and have not been to Nigeria. I don't think you have been to Africa. So I want to see your faces in Nigeria. And we're hoping by 2019 that we'll be able to host the B, meeting B in Nigeria.

And we also want to see for Africa seeing the presence of -- more presence of ICANN in Africa. If we can get an engagement office or a hub, we'll appreciate that. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you very much. I can only underline that the Board is committed as much as possible to towards diversity -- geographical diversity, language diversity, gender balance, and whatever. So please help us to implement this so there is no barrier from the Board side.

And thank you for your invitation to come to Nigeria. This would be a great moment if ICANN could come to Nigeria.

Next.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

Good afternoon. Christa Taylor from dot TBA in Canada. I just have a couple of comments for consideration for the board and community. I understand the use of auction funds is open for comments. And I would ask that they be used to strategically and financially benefit the new gTLD ecosphere. Registration revenues have not yet reached the tipping point, and implications could be severe if they're not utilized in some other manner. We still need to build and work on the bridge to the outside world to minimize the risk, which brings me to my second point.

We have been here for a week. And yet, if we go down to the street to the coffee store where we all visit and you ask the person working behind the till if they know what's going on down the road in the conference that's going on and, generally, they have no idea.

And, even if you take out the ICANN shirt and you put it up and you say, "Does this give you any idea," and some of them

actually think that we're in the aluminum tin can business of processing food.

So one of the things that I think we could do is simply let's reflect our shirts in some really great fantastic manner and the enthusiasm that we have here and all these amazing technology that we represent. Thank you.

[Applause]

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you for the quick points. And Cherine will take the first part of your question.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. Regarding the -- what to do with the auction money, I think this is -- we are committed that this is going to be a community decision. And the Board is not going to direct where this money is going to be. So you got to give your input. I think the GNSO is going to, you know, undertake the work there and make a recommendation on this issue. And they use the community input as a whole in that. So that's an important thing. Thank you very much.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Rinalia and Erika wanted to make a statement.

ERIKA MANN: Not really a statement. But I liked your second comment very much. But let me, you know, say maybe that the picture is a little bit more diverse. I don't know with whom I had this experience in Los Angeles. They -- the guy who was actually working at the desk in the hotel, when he heard about ICANN, he said, "Oh, my God. You are the best. You're the stars." So he meant the community, everybody, not the Board. He didn't even know about the Board. He said, "You are the future."

So I think you're right. We have to pay attention to this. But the picture is probably more diverse than we imagine. Thank you so much for your comment.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: We have four online questions. Brad, can you --

REMOTE INTERVENTION: First question is from Kieren McCarthy. A quick follow-up on Fadi Chehade's response to my question. Mr. Chehade said that he had asked me to send an email asking for details and that ICANN had not received one so no information on the money spent on lobbyists has been sent. Unfortunately, that is simply not true. If you look at the transcript of the forum, the sole

response was, "We'll send the answer by email and help him find the links."

So two questions. One, does ICANN believe it is only obligated to provide information over how it spends its money in response to community demands.

Two, will ICANN commit to the same level of openness that it demands of its community by introducing a budget line item called lobbying and introduce the real amount it spends on outside lobbying companies?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay. Fadi, can you respond once again?

FADI CHEHADE: Sure. Mr. McCarthy, let me set the record straight again. We have published the links in a tweet, as we said. If you had more questions, you should send them. Your question earlier, you should know, was not accurate. It included many mangled facts. For example, you listed companies like RDM, the company of Condoleezza Rice, as a lobbyist. They're not lobbyists. You're mixing things. So that's why I said, send us a very clear letter, exactly what is it you need, and we'll be very happy to answer you clearly.

And in terms of details, just for the rest of the community, our lobbying activities by law need to be disclosed. We disclose them. They're on our Web site. Could you show the link, please? If you go to our Web site, you could pick up straight from our 990 form exactly how much we spent last year on lobbying. This year, we're on track to spend a little more than that, close to \$700,000. And by next year, my guess after the transition is that these costs will probably be halved. So this is just to give you a sense that this information is out there.

Now, you had mixed other firms we use, consultants, professional services, and those costs are part of the transition. So if you go to the second link, please Xavier, you will see also that we publish all of our costs on the transition. It's on our Web site. I know you know where they are. And everybody knows how to find them. Please go look at them. And if we need to provide more data, we're happy to do so. So please, if there are further questions, we'll be very happy to answer them. But lobbying is lobbying. It's defined as working with people that help us with government affairs. And that lobbying is disclosed fully clearly. Other activities are also disclosed as part of our projects, and if we can be further clear to you, don't hesitate to let me know.

[Timer sounds]

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Fadi. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Hi, I'm Alissa Cooper. I'm the chair of the ICG. I wanted to return to the comment that Paul made in the last section of the public forum where he was asking about the breadth of engagement in the IANA stewardship transition because I've thought that the responses provided by the board were slightly inadequate and could benefit from some further elaboration.

So I think Markus said -- you said that it's difficult to engage in the transition process and then Asha cited the numbers of people who have engaged in the names groups. And as it turns out, the engagement in the transition process has been actually much broader than just within the ICANN community and the names community. It's been about the entire Internet. There have been scores and scores of people who participated in the numbers processes, coordinated by the regional Internet registries, via email and meetings and phone calls. Same thing from the protocol parameters process coordinated by the IETF, loads and loads of people engaged in those processes. And likewise, the ICG received many comments from people who had never attended an ICANN meeting, some of whom clearly didn't know what ICANN was. We actually received more or -- or close

to twice as many comments in our comment period as the CCWG did in its concurrent comment period. We received more than three times as many comments as NTIA did the last time they did a -- a public notice of inquiry about the IANA functions contract. So I think it's really important, as the people -- some of the people who are going to be defending the transition proposal hopefully in the end, that you're able to reflect the breadth of participation in the process. Because I really feel like this is in some ways a gift from the rest of the Internet community to anyone who has to defend the proposal, including the board. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank very much. And I think this will help some people in the community to understand better how multistakeholder works from the bottom. Thank you very much.

RAHUL SHARMA: Good evening. My name is Rahul Sharma. I work with Data Security Council of India, which is a NASSCOM initiative. And I am a returning ICANN fellow, but I'm speaking here in my personal capacity. All right. Thank you.

So I have three questions for the board. One is, in ICANN's strategic plan for fiscal year 2016 to 2020 page 22 mentions that

ICANN encourages all stakeholders to implement the principles endorsed at NETmundial. So with the endorsement of Internet NETmundial principles, thereby endorsing --

RAY PLZAK: Excuse me. Can you speak slower?

RAHUL SHARMA: All right. Is the endorse of NETmundial principles thereby endorsing definition of each principle from a bottom-up process or by a board recommendation. And since following well-defined principles are core to the Internet operations whether ICANN going forward would consider framing its own set of principles by a bottom-up process or adopting any current set.

My second question is, most of the ICANN forums are open and free to join, but not all. For example, for being an RSSAC caucus member statement of interest from candidates is a prerequisite and only after a pre-screening, review, and recommendations are the candidates with the related backgrounds invited to join. Is there any specific reason why RSSAC has a different treatment and if ICANN is considering to remove a barrier to make it more open for participation?

My third question is, so much has been already been spoken on the role of root zone maintainer in the four and a half days and

also in the public forum and that ICANN will consider it only after transition is successful because we don't want to change too many things at one time as it could hamper the stability of the Internet. However, I would like to humbly disagree with due respect to Fadi's statements on two counts. So when he says that the wording of RZM contract is equal to an implementation project awarded by ICANN, it's not right because functioning of - - when functioning of a root is vital to one world, one Internet which is, in my sense, more sensitive than any other implementation project.

[Timer sounds]

Second is I have understood that RZM is only operational or performed by well-defined process. Can board consider commissioning a balanced study on the potential future impact that could try to answer main questions like can this be performed by an organization outside U.S. jurisdiction? How will the stability be impacted as contract will be between ICANN and RZM that are both private sector organizations and hypothetical questions like, what will happen if current RZM ceases to exist? What is the backup plan for that.

UNKOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you very much. You know we have just 12 minutes left and it will be complicated to answer all the questions in detail. My proposal is that you send your concrete question by email and we will reply in writing to you because we have still the queue here. I think if you send us the concrete question you will get a -- an answer to your concrete question.

RAHUL SHARMA: Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you very much. Khaled.

KHALED FATTAL: Thank you, Wolfgang. Khaled Fattal, the Multilingual Internet Group. I wasn't planning on speaking today, but the intervention from Elliot Noss of Tucows impressed upon me to come in and speak because I think the topic he raised is absolutely critical, which is cybersecurity.

I might sound like I'm actually lecturing the board, but as in the past, please take for whatever it's worth. It might challenge you to think what the remit and the mandate of ICANN is. And I think

as we move forward in this new ecosystem, that conversation needs to be had.

In fact, Fadi on Monday morning, when you showed that diagram about the mandate of ICANN and the roles and responsibilities where the remit ends and where things -- where it stops, the issue of cybersecurity, Ladies and Gentlemen, is critical. More critical than you could ever imagine. In actual fact, the new threats that will happen and are already happening on the DNS, which is part of what ICANN does in regulating or coordinating that namespace, is no longer just the space where hackers come in to hack to plant flags. Nor is it the place where people come in to steal credit card or identity theft. They'd still continue to do that. Nor is it for industrial espionage, traditional cybersecurity threats. It's the place where those who actually want to hijack airplanes and hit buildings no longer need to hijack anything. They can just go and do this. And let me just share with, they will go after whoever is vulnerable. And so far, almost everybody is vulnerable.

So if -- if we come to terms and we agree that nothing good, bad, or ugly on the Internet happens without the DNS, then guess what?

[Timer sounds]

The remit or what needs to happen, whether it's part of the ICANN mandate or whether it is something that ICANN needs to weigh in on, cannot carry on without being significantly addressed because the future of this new ecosystem of the Internet and of communities around the world is at stake.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you. I think, my opinion, the board and the whole community is aware about the risks, and we have to take this very seriously. Let's work together. Thank you. Next.

KHALED FATTAL: Thank you.

LIU YUE: Good morning. My name is Liu Yue. I come from China. I was -- I come to ICANN meetings, it's been five years. I've learned a lot of things. I would also like to thank all of the people from the board who can speak Chinese and also B.C. and also APAC people. I would like to thank you on behalf of myself. Thank you for your wonderful work.

Second, in the CCWG process and also IANA transition process, we could see that recently we see some budget data. We could see that the budget is exceeding and we have spending a lot of

money, such as \$6 million. And I also have attended USG meetings and GPAC meetings. We could see the GPS -- GSP meetings have only spent a little bit of budget, so we hope that more and more lawyers from China can be attending to the USG meetings such as the Nigeria member told us that we could add more developing countries, more developing people -- people from the developing countries to join this area.

We will say the CCWG work is to improve the accountability from ICANN. I've done a lot in this area. We hope that we can compare that what we have done over the past few years, how much we have spent and how much we have done also. We are a multistakeholder model. What we do today we need to focus that we need to cooperate between SOs and ACs. I still need ten seconds. I'm sorry.

I would say the most important thing for accountability is that we need to promote accountability through community. We need to make sure that we have improved the trust of the community. Because if we can't do this, we can't reach consensus. So this is my personal view. We hope that ICANN board can respond to this. Thank you so much.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you very much. Somebody, Asha, Kuo, want to give a brief statement. There were many questions, many questions.

KUO-WEI WU: First of all, thank you for your question. Your questions I would like to respond. First of all, thank you for your trust to ICANN and also for your past contributions.

Second, just now you talk about the budget. Maybe more lawyers can join. If we could have this kind of opportunity we would definitely ask more lawyers to come. And also for this time, maybe you know that this issues has a lot to do with the laws in California. That's why we need to have a lot of lawyers in California. Of course, in the future we would add more lawyers from other countries into this whole process.

In addition, in future communities mutual trust is very important. We need to improve this area. We need to enhance this area.

So all of your views have been heard, and thank you so much for supporting us. Thank you so much for your comment.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Kuo. And we have another online question. Brad, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Question from Ali Hadji Mmadi of Comoros. We do not have the same priorities because of war, political, social, et cetera. And we do not have the same size in terms of use and access to the Internet. Often people in these areas are victims of political decisions who nevertheless consider developing their businesses through the Internet with a governance model that best meets user expectations. What is the ICANN policy to involve decision-makers in these regions?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Who wants to take this? Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Sure. So just quickly, we are very engaged with decision-makers in business and government circles around the world. Every time our team reaches out in the local communities, we do that. I'll give you an example that also would satisfy our African community.

As part of the ICANN meeting in Marrakech that's coming up, we are organizing -- the government as well as local business

leaders are organizing a half day before the ICANN meeting to bring together the leaders of the digital economy in Africa at the governmental and business level and they're bringing students from all the main universities in Africa to hear them with new ideas for technology and digital development. So this is not an ICANN event, but we are -- we are watching around the ICANN meetings a growing set of activities that will support local -- reach out to the business leaders.

So again, we're very engaged in many regions, and you know in your region, of course, we have people there. Please connect with them, and they'll share with you our plans and activities to reach the decision-makers.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Fadi. Next.

RICK LANE: Thank you. My name is Rick Lane. I'm with 20th Century-Fox. I wanted to respond to Fadi's give-and-take about lobbying, and he's factually accurate, which is there are definitions of what is lobbying. The Lobbying Disclosure Act has a very narrow definition. And the money that you report is very limited to your actual lobbying of Capitol Hill. Also, it requires that you lobby on -- you list what issues you have lobbied on. So the IANA

transition. But then it's very broad in who you lobbied, house, Senate, NTIA, Department of Commerce.

The next one that he showed was the tax form. The tax form is much broader. Includes grass-roots lobbying, so if you're trying to get other groups to join you and you're paying those groups. Also includes state lobbying.

The third one is the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That's the one that the U.S. uses where if you are representing a foreign government in front of the U.S. Congress or any agency, you have to file with the Justice Department. The reason for that is that the Justice Department and Congress and American people want to know if there is undue influence by foreign governments on the U.S. Congress. Those filings are very detailed. They include who you met with, how much money you spent on expenditures, what you talked about, and I think that's what this community is more looking for. Not the LDA or your -- your tax because those are just dollar amounts. They're not really meaningful. What's really meaningful is what were the issues discussed? What were the resources? And the other important thing to know is, those filings are only U.S. centric. And ICANN has told us over and over they are about the world. And we like that.

So if you're only filing about what you're doing in the U.S., what about meetings in China, Brazil, Argentina? Anyplace else in the world that doesn't have, by their federal laws, the requirements to register lobbyists or require those expenditures.

So I think what we're asking, and the B.C. actually asked for this in its recent filing --

[Timer sounds]

-- says that we want to add an additional bylaw that requires ICANN, or any individual acting on ICANN's behalf, to make periodic public disclosures of their contacts with any government official as well as activities, receipts, and disbursements in support of those activities. Disclosure of those would enable the entire community to evaluate the statements and activities of such persons in their role as representing ICANN and, in fact, the ICANN community.

So the answers were very narrow that Fadi gave about U.S. lobbying law, which I'm in charge of our lobbying ethics and our lobbying filings so I know them very well. But we're talking more broad. Worldwide.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I think your point is clear, and Steve will react.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your speech. We'll look into this.

RICK LANE: All right. Thank you. And hopefully it's part of Workstream 1 and included as part of the bylaws. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Sorry. If I may just clarify, we do not have lobbyists that we don't disclose. Period. Let's just be very clear. Any lobbyist we pay is disclosed.

RICK LANE: Right but --

FADI CHEHADE: All the lobbyists we have are in the U.S.

STEVE CROCKER: Let's -- Fadi --

RICK LANE: I think it's important though because this is an important point because there's a definition of lobbyists but it's not people who influence outside of the U.S.

STEVE CROCKER: Stop. Please stop.

RICK LANE: This is actually wrong.

STEVE CROCKER: Please stop. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: By the way, your speech is on the record, so it means everybody can read it. Michelle, and then we have the next online question. Okay.

TOM SMYTH: Okay. Hi. My is Tom Smyth. I'm a small ISP in Ireland. I'm a member of INEX. And thanks to INEX and ICANN for coming to Dublin. Welcome. Just a -- I'm speaking on my own personal capacity here.

I found most of the sessions very interesting, but I was curious about some of the closed sessions. And I would like that insofar

as practical free, if you could have some sort of way to open up the sessions where, let's say, people wouldn't -- could just observe and, let's say, the deliberations and the considerations that -- at the various different groups that were working in closed session. So it's just a -- just for people who are attending. I know that obviously the good work that you do afterwards is published. But it would be just nice to see, from a community point of view, to observe, let's say, the hard work that goes on in those sessions.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you very much. I think this is for Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: There's always a balance between trying to provide an environment for people to get some work done versus trying to make things so open that everybody is participating in everything all the time.

We struggle with that balance. We continue to struggle with that balance. Certainly at the board level, we have heard loud and clearly that there's a desire to learn more about what the board does. Sometimes the board would like to learn more about what we do.

So all I can say is that it's just not a trivial question. We do take it seriously and we are working hard on it.

TOM SMYTH: Just to clarify, the question was asking, Steve, in the case of being able to observe like where we are told don't butt in on the work at the meeting but actually just observe the deliberations as well. Just to make clear that I wasn't saying open it up to the floor but when you are actually trying to get through a heavy workload.

STEVE CROCKER: Understood. Thank you.

TOM SMYTH: Thank you very much.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you.

Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele Neylon for the record and all that.

Speaking I suppose with the hat of the chair of the Registrars Stakeholder Group, one of the topics that has come up at previous public fora from various stakeholder groups is one that we've addressed in the past. It's one that we've addressed a lot throughout the course of this week -- weekend and week, has been the subject around abuse, the entire concept of the content police, concepts that registrars are being asked to do certain things. And just to say to the audience here and to the board who -- some of you may not have been present when we were with you earlier this week.

At this meeting, as promised, I did manage to organize to take the law enforcement guys out for a beer. We have engaged with law enforcement agents in a number of different fora, including a meeting there yesterday afternoon. We've engaged with the public safety people. We've had side meetings with a number of people from different communities who have expressed concerns around how we operate. And the invitation is there. If any group wants to talk to us, we're happy to do so. We are here. We are part of the multistakeholder model. We are committed to it. If a group wants to raise an issue to us, they can talk directly to us, not via the board.

Elliot Noss from Tucows spoke earlier. And he's mentioned this document that we have been working on. And the document will serve a number of purposes. It will help to both educate

registrars of varying sizes. It will help to educate reporters. Those people that wish to report instances of abuse and other badness, as it were, on the Internet, not just how they should interact with registrars -- [Timer sounds.] -- but also who they should report to when it is not the case of the registrars. If anybody has any questions for us, please reach out.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Michele. I think this is a good invitation.

And we are now ten minutes late. The last question and then we bring this session to a close.

No? Lady disappeared?

Okay.

Is there any more questions online, Brad?

BRAD WHITE: No, we have no more questions online.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay. Then we can close the session. Thank you very much.

Back to Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, everybody. This concludes the public forum of ICANN55. We will take a super brief break and reconvene here for our board meeting and recognition of some important community leaders. Just as fast as we can make the change, come on back and we'll start right up. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]