
MARRAKECH – GAC Meeting with the ICANN Board
Wednesday, March 09, 2016 – 08:30 to 10:00 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

STEVE CROCKER:

Good morning, everybody. One of the real pleasures of being in an environment like ICANN, which brings people from various disciplines and traditions, is learning new vocabulary. So sometime ago I was ushered into the vocabulary of diplomacy, which was explained to me there were only two kinds of meetings -- successes and great successes. And I think we have definitely moved into the region of great successes or maybe even better. So let me congratulate everyone on the really hard and conscientious work that you all have done on the accountability proposal and the truly great success announced last night. I think the entire community and, certainly, on behalf of the Board, we express super appreciation. This is a big step forward. So is there anything left that we have to talk about today?

[Applause]

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.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes, Steve. I think we have a problem with what you say in your letter dated October 15, 2014, the first paragraph, line 2. Maybe if you could start with that.

[Laughter]

No. Good morning, everybody.

STEVE CROCKER: That was -- no, I remember it well. In fact, you just -- I'm sure you're being -- teasing a little bit. But you happen to pick the day that was my birthday. And I know exactly where I was and exactly what I was thinking at exactly the time you're talking about. And there was a cake involved and some other things.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Steve. Yeah, there are a few things we have to talk about. First of all, something that we realized about yesterday is this negotiation that was quite intense was done in the open. We were not closing our doors. We were sitting here. The door was open. People were coming in. And some people who were not working or have not been working for governments were actually surprised that this is actually work that we were doing and actually quite hard work. That was new to some, which was a surprise then to others. But it was actually interesting to see how people that were not used to this reacted as they felt this

was very different from what they are doing in their jobs normally and that it was actually also hard work.

So I think the fact that this was open and transparent was something that was good for us all. And we'll definitely move on towards discussing eliminating the last bits of closed doors that we still have. But this is something that, of course, the GAC will need to decide. But, at least in my perception, it was a very positive experience.

We have taken the effort this time, after the experience of the last meetings with the Board where we felt that it had maybe not been ideal to suggest the topics that we would like to raise with you the day before, because we normally prepare the meeting with the Board the evening before -- what we have done this time is we have worked on the GAC a few weeks before, two or three weeks before, and tried to at least identify some issues that we most probably would want to raise with you in the hope that this would allow you to know what is awaiting you and also in the hope to get more substantial answers from the side of the Board. So we hope that this will also facilitate the exchange -- a more informed exchange. And we have now a tentative list here on the screen. We may have other ideas that pop up during the meeting that people would like to exchange. But this is -- we hope that also this adds that we try to come in earlier, engage

earlier in the process, also in the exchange with you. So maybe we should start with the first item, if that's okay for you.

STEVE CROCKER: Absolutely. And very much appreciated. This is a pretty substantial list. So I hope we can get through all of it. But let's just get started. What's the -- you want to start at the beginning with the first one?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yeah, yeah. There was a question raised yesterday just for information -- because people are curious about how this works. I forget who it was -- how the CEO selection process works. Not in terms of which were the other candidates that you had. And, by the way, good morning, Goran. We're very happy to have you here. Of course, I'm looking forward to working with you -- how this works. What were the criteria that you used? And so that people get an idea on what your reflections were and so on.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me try to give a short answer. And, if necessary, George Sadowsky, who chaired our search process, can say more.

There's a very specific mixture between the amount of information that we make visible in public and the amount that

we keep quite closely held. We documented the process, published what the criteria were, and along the way published some of the statistics.

We set out on a well-documented search process last year very shortly after Fadi made clear that he was going to step down at this point in time. We held public meetings with everybody at the -- I guess at our fall meeting in Dublin.

And we published, as I say, ahead of that the criteria that we were looking for. We published announcements of our search in "The Economist" and through other channels and reached out as broadly as we could to get a wide range of candidates.

The basic statistics are listed on the Web site. And I just copied them down so that we'd have them available. Whoops. Yeah, here they are.

So there were more than 100 candidates. They were distributed geographically, 9% Africa, 16% Asia, 27% Europe, 7% Latin America and Caribbean, and 41% North America. From a gender balance point of view - let's see, where is that number -- 93% male and 7% female. Those are the statistics that we have published. I will add, with respect to gender balance, that we certainly wished that there were a stronger number of -- larger number of women who had applied. And we did not want to make a choice that was on that basis. But we were very, very

sensitive about the number of women and wanted to make sure that we did not exclude any of the candidates. So we tended to be -- you know, to the extent that there was any question, we tended to be shaded slightly in favor of making sure that they were looked at very closely and included through the various stages.

I'm happy to answer any questions. We do maintain a very high level of confidentiality in the process. So, if there are any questions like who were the other candidates or should this be an open process, the answer is that's just not what we do.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much, Steve. Any questions or comments from the floor? Thank you. Then maybe to go to the next item. We keep having discussions -- and we assume that we are not the only one -- about the timing of work and the general workload, probably also the prioritization of the general workload, which is becoming more and more of a challenge for not only small but also for bigger government delegations to cope with. And we do really try to engage early on all processes that are relevant to us. But we are really striving to somehow cope with this. Because there's so much going on in such a speed that, if you, as a government representative, take your job seriously and you do not only consult your bosses or your ministers but, actually, the

other ministries and the other stakeholders in your country, which, of course, takes some time and then try to come to common visions and shared views in the GAC, that it's really very, very difficult to react and act in time that you don't miss important steps in the timelines of these processes.

And we are trying to move and change on all sides. We're trying to work more intersessionally or to have more meetings or -- and but then there's meeting overlaps during the ICANN meetings where people can cope with -- the work intersessionally is difficult, because people have other jobs or other issues in their portfolios as well.

So we -- no matter how we move it around and shift it and turn it, in the end there's a challenge of the workload.

And I'm inviting my colleagues who raised this to maybe give an example of how they work and feed in to add to this. But we feel that we somehow need to have a serious discussion on the workload. And, if the workload is not going to go down, which is probably not something that will just happen, we may have a discussion about priorities and may try to see, together with the other stakeholders in this organization, that we agree on things that we want to advance faster than others so that we can all focus our attention on the things that we have feeling that matters the most to everybody. But we would really want to be

engaged where it's most important and then maybe take more time for other things where we think the world will turn. Without that, we have discussed this at the same time, because this is really something that we care about that we engage. But we need to find ways to manage this in a different way that we have done it before.

So I'm inviting my colleagues to come in, if they can. And then maybe -- I don't know whether you had discussions in the board about this issue. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: I have New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Yes. Thank you, Chair. First, I wanted to comment that I'm sure this isn't a surprise. This is something we've raised in Los Angeles. It's something I'm hearing from a lot of other communities, and it's been discussed a number of times within the GAC. I'm not sure exactly what exactly the numbers are for other communities. We have about 150 members, which is less than half as many members as the GAC -- sorry. The ICANN staff count.

I want to acknowledge, though, that we don't see it the workload for ICANN alone. We certainly need to take into account the priorities other communities have.

What we would like to raise with the Board is what steps we can take to better manage the community's workload, how we can work with the SOs and ACs to prioritize the kind of work that is being undertaken, and how we can come to grips with what the actual capacity of the community is.

Perhaps, if you've asked for an example, the gTLDs work, the new gTLDs work, and the WHOIS work are also scheduled at the same time as the accountability and transition work which will continue, so perhaps that's our most pressing need at the moment. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Thomas. Good morning, everybody. Chris Disspain. Just a couple points. First of all, I want to acknowledge everyone in the GAC.

In the old days, when we used to come up with this topic, the discussions used to be, "The GAC works in this way. Please fit around it."

And we have made huge strides since then. And I really want to acknowledge every single member of the GAC for the

extraordinary flexibility. I know this environment is not usual for most government people. And you really do -- have made a stunning effort to change work practices to fit in.

I think what you -- the point you just raised, New Zealand, is -- and also tied into -- a little bit into one of the other topics you've got in here, which is about meeting B.

When those of us that were on the meeting strategy working group -- and Suzanne Radell was on that and other GAC members as well, if I can recall -- one of the things we talked about with changing the way we structured the meetings, at least with meeting B, was precisely to allow for more time for the communities to get together and do stuff. So the idea -- now, whether this will happen, I don't know -- but the idea is that you spend the first part of the day, say, 9:00 until 3:00, whatever, working on your own stuff and after that you get together and mix. That's just one example. There is no single silver bullet solution to this problem. It's just a question of incremental change and carrying on working.

Two other things: One, I understand that this is tough. But you, as an advisory committee, have done this and continue to do it - - which is to break up and break your people up and go to different things. And I know that's difficult for you. But we've

done it with the fast track. You did it with the CCWG and the CWG and so on. So that's one thing.

And, secondly, we need to work together to try and schedule things in a way that make it easier for you to -- as you've said, there are clashes that make it hard for things to happen.

I wonder whether we couldn't consider the possibility of having a couple of people from the GAC who are interested -- particularly interested in this point sort of join a small ad hoc -- this is not another chance for face-to-face meetings, although we could maybe fix another one, just to talk it through. And I'm happy -- and I'm sure the Board will also be happy -- to get a couple people from the GNSO and also the ccNSO. Just a suggestion. Okay? Thanks.

FADI CHEHADE:

Yes. And I just shared -- this is Fadi. Good morning to all of you.

I just shared with the GAC chair that I believe that one key solution to manage the workload is to make sure that I'm out of here on Saturday. So, hopefully, that will help as well.

[Laughter]

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Fadi. Yes, we will take that into account. I don't applaud you for this, because that would be wrong. But we'll take it into account. Okay.

Actually, yes, Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you very much. I think it's also about sort of the bigger picture of what's -- what's on the agenda for the entire community. So the prioritization, as my colleagues have said, is really important, which also means that maybe you don't have to schedule five, six very important PDPs at the same time and sort of do with the management in a different way.

Because all these -- there's so many PDPs at the moment, for example, that are very important to everyone. And it's very difficult to follow everything and to do what you have to do. Thank you very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And, since you raised the B meeting, maybe we go over to that. And, as we all know, there was a work over -- I think it was about two years or something like that -- to discuss a new meeting strategy with the main reasons or main objectives to, I think, as you said, to have more time to engage with others in

the community but also to concentrate on moving on the work in the constituencies.

And also the second aspect, of course, is to have smaller -- allow to go to countries that don't have such big venues that you can have a very big long meeting but, actually, also to -- that enables or keeps the ability, rather, of ICANN and everybody to go to places where otherwise you couldn't go because the meetings have become too big. And you wouldn't find venues any more that -- in all countries in the world that would make it possible.

And we have also tried to participate in these reflections and have, basically, shared these ideas, supported them for obvious reasons. Because we care about diversity; we care about outreach; and we care about engaging with others.

And, of course, four days is not enough to meet. But then, if you add another day, five days are not enough. Because it's never enough. Because there's so much work that -- however many days you plan, you fill them. And it's still not enough.

So, on the discussion of this length of the meeting, what we were hoping, independent of the number of days, that trying to do something different for once may also help to incite innovation in terms of how people work. And we, in particular, had a discussion also when we are -- continuous discussion when we are trying to make our own schedule more efficient or allocate

time more efficiently, that the GAC several times discussed that it felt that it was not -- maybe not the most efficient way to only spend time, in addition to working in our own silo, to meet others bilaterally and discuss the same issue five times with five different other constituencies bilaterally. Whereas, we would think it may help to give it a try to take out the one or two, three most pressing, most important issues -- sorry -- and try to discuss them with everybody in the same room so that you only have to say something once and everybody else can listen and understand and react. And that goes for the others. And that may be a more efficient way to, actually, not in a confrontational way, as the public forum is set up, but in a way that fosters understanding that it would make us -- give us easier access to know where is the GNSO? Where is the ccNSO? What are their concerns? Why are they proposing what they're proposing? And the other way around, make them understand why are we concerned about something or not concerned? Why do we have a problem? Why are we asking for safeguards or whatever? What is our role? And, if we do this at least at some spots in the program, all together, that may help us all, when we go back to our silos, to, actually, after having engaged early with everybody, to take these other concerns or other ways of work or other duties of the other stakeholders better into account when we do our work. And there would be less need for ex-post

coordination trying to fix things ex-post that we could have done easier if we would have talked to each other earlier.

And so the GAC quite liked the idea of whatever you call it, it was called town hall in the proposal by meeting strategy team. And when we were discussing on how to allocate this time, we were keeping the whole Tuesday free for engaging with the rest of the community. And that interaction may actually be used to do outreach. You can bring new people in and it's probably easier to get new people in and make them understand how we work. If you're not working in silos where you use all the abbreviation, where you in your silo know exactly what you talk about but nobody else does; I guess, in a moment -- to bring people into a moment where we understand each other internally and explain each other internally, that would probably be the lowest threshold to get new people engaged because they understand this multistakeholder environment works from all sides at the same time.

We plan this day for interaction with the others, and then we had to realize last Friday, when the schedules of the different constituencies were put next to each other, that there's actually fairly low overlap between the different constituencies between when they plan to interact and when they plan to work in the silos.

So if this idea of having an interaction with everybody in a limited amount of time is still shared by the others, I think we would need to speed up our coordination seriously in the next few days to make sure that actually we agree on a time that everybody keeps free in their silos to do that.

And so this is just an urge also to the Board that if this coordination doesn't materialize from bottom-up, that this time you may be supporting this from top-down for once to basically help them; say, well, please get together and do coordinate so that we can have this interaction, and then you can go back to your silos to work.

And to conclude this from my side, just a very practical question. On Thursday we are planning not just the future work but also how to organize us for the June meeting. And it would be good if we get as much clarity, let's put it that way, before that on how many days. If there's an additional day, what are the conditions? Is it just that you make rooms available or are there other cross-constituency meetings of whatever sort.

So whatever information, clear information we get, the easier it is for us to plan, and we need to start planning because there is a lot of work to do and the time between the two meetings are short.

I stop here. Sorry for a long speech but I think that was important to us.

Erika and Iran and Chris and Indonesia.

ERIKA MANN:

Thomas, I like this idea very much. Erika Mann, board member.

I think it is a good idea it, and we should have probably done this much earlier, to find a way to have debate circling around certain topics which are really relevant for everybody involved, in one kind of town hall, as you say, meeting. Maybe not townhall is not the right. Maybe a different expression can be found, but I think the concept is understood.

It will definitely create more coherence. It will help that the multistakeholder is better understood not just inside, I think we understand it quite well, but it will give visibility to the outside world as well, what it actually means. And so the visibility will be definitely higher.

So I'm very supportive. I think it will be important to select the good topics at the beginning so that we can test it. So maybe topics which are really -- first of all, I think they should have maybe a short term importance. So something where we really need to sort out something relatively quickly and that we all are

concerned about. So some topics are probably less interesting; only for one or two of the communities.

So, yeah, you will have my support, and I'm sure we will -- we have a board meeting -- if I'm not mistaken; I have to check -- today and so we certainly can discuss this and we'll discuss this there.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. Good morning, everybody, and thanks to the Board for allowing us to have a meeting with them.

I don't think that increasing the number of days solves the problems. We should put emphasis on the efficiency, that we work first in the GAC and efficiency with the common world with others. So we should put emphasis on that rather than the number of days. The more days, the more talk. If it is not efficient, it doesn't help. And we should not forget the cost of the increasing number of days.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Chris Disspain. If I could perhaps make a practical suggestion, since we have this meeting coming up in June, which we all know is now not going to be in Panama, and I believe that the Board, if it hasn't already, is about to pass resolution for the venue, which I think everyone knows where the venue is. And everyone knows that it's a slightly different venue to Panama.

So I wonder whether we could get a small group of people, a couple of people from the GAC, a couple of people from the GNSO, ccNSO, Nick Tomasso, me and another board member on a phone call next week and actually have a chat among -- instead of us interrelating with the GAC and the GNSO and the ALAC about what their problems are, perhaps we could all of us get some reps on a call next week and start mapping out what we can do in Helsinki, or wherever it is we're going, to make this work.

I think if we can do that, and if somebody could be point person from the GAC and just I'll get in touch with everybody and I'll get Nick Tomasso to make a phone call for next week. Or if that doesn't work for people, the week after.

Thank you, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Ashwin from Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Thomas.

I just want to revisit our work yesterday. I think in the near future, the GAC has to set up its PDP and bylaws to make sure that some sort of -- what is it? -- quick mechanism for decision-making is available. Quick, but we can accommodate all member states' concerns. I'm using the words "member states" just like you're using the ITU and other organizations.

So I cannot imagine, if we took something like eight hours, seven hours yesterday to make one response, what about with more workloads and more activities? We have to make something like a letter like that every day or every week or even every month. I don't want to have an office in Los Angeles and sitting there for a few months in a year.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other comments on the B meeting?

Thank you. If that is not the case, I think we can then go to the next item, which is called here ICANN and the global public interest.

Yes, Tarek.

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you, Thomas. I just wanted to say some facts about the work that is going on in ICANN with respect to global public interest within the last period. I am speaking on behalf of my colleague Nora Abusitta. She had to leave this morning, our vice president for development and public-responsibility department. We started some work maybe a couple of years ago, the conversation within ICANN. A strategy panel was built for public responsibility chaired by Nick Weiner at that time, but it was evident when they finished that further work has to be done and explore the topic in relation to ICANN's remit, especially after the transition in a post-transition era.

So we have it within our five-year strategic plan to prepare a public interest -- global public interest framework as part of the community work, and this plan was also endorsed by the community.

Initial conversations happened last Monday in a session that took place. Unfortunately, most of the GAC members could not attend because of the High-Level Governmental Meeting.

Surely governments have a big responsibility towards their citizens in public interest and in issues related to public interest. So we look forward to higher GAC participation within this work that is just starting and community effort. And we'll be sharing very soon the mailing list as well as the details of the Wiki space for the work that has been done.

So this is the update from our side, and I stop.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tarek. I think it is no surprise that the public interest is something of great interest to governments because this is actually what we normally are paid for, to make sure that something like the public interest is emerging or is supported, at least, by what we are doing.

And this is actually a good example about coordinating and prioritization of work. We would have been extremely keen on participating in that session on Monday, but unfortunately, we had something like 30-plus ministers in this room, and we couldn't just leave because we had to have a discussion with

them and it was actually a very good discussion. So this is another example of why it is so important to, before setting up meetings, we keep people informed, we make priorities, we say this is where we really want to have everybody together, and then organize the rest around these peaks.

To come back to substance, as I said this is a very important issue, and there may be different views on what you understand in the public interest, because this is also based on a debate on national or regional levels, based on different cultures that public interest has different connotations. And actually, we had a very good debate with a number of board members, a number of people from the GAC and civil society and also in the IGF in Brazil last November, and that was very informative. And I think we will do our best to feed our experience, our views into this discussion.

So we just, again, ask you to give us a chance to participate. And we're looking forward to having this debate because this is a fundamental thing. The better the understanding of -- We may not need a definition but we may need a concept -- a framework of how to deal with public interest, how to identify something as maybe rather in the public interest or less in the public interest. The better understanding and shared understanding we have, I guess that will also help us being more efficient.

I have Olga who would like to say something.

Thank you.

ARGENTINA:

Good morning, everyone, and thanks to the Board for visiting us this morning. By the way, there was one member from the GAC in the public interest meeting. It was Milagros from Peru. She is working with our working group on protection of geographic names. And in one of our public session meetings of this working group, it was requested by several participants that reviewing the concept of public interest for the protection of geographic names was a relevant issue.

By the way, we're working on a document that I will send it to be included in the Wiki. We are making some adjustment. And also Milagros has been reviewing some other papers that will be relevant for that. So just to let you I don't that one of the working groups within the GAC is focusing on that issue. And I'm already in the email list and I already contacted Nora, and we find a lot of value in that. And unfortunately, I could not attend the meeting on Monday, but Milagros was there.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Further reactions on this?

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Thomas. Just to assert on behalf of the staff and Nora who is leading this effort for us on the staff side, that without, frankly, listening to you, in many ways the stewards of your public interest, we, frankly, can't have a definition that works. We need to learn from you. We need your input. This is very critical to what we're doing.

So you have our complete commitment to engage and engage deeply with you on that so that we can shape this work and make sure that ICANN is rooted in a common understanding of that public interest, in everything we do. The decisions we make, the values we hold.

So thank you very much for understanding that Monday was a scheduling difficulty, but the engagement commitment from us is at the highest level, and we thank you for understanding.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other views on this?

Or comments?

Yes, Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's not on this particular topic, but I'd like to indicate to you I have a statement to make on behalf of the Brazilian government. I look for your guidance for the appropriate moment to do it, whether now or later. Just flag to me.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Go on, please.

Thank you.

BRAZIL: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I was instructed by my capital to make the following statement on behalf of the Brazilian government.

In the interest of time, I will only refer to the most important portions of the statement, the full version of which will eventually be made available.

On behalf of the Brazilian government, I'd like to express our deepest disappointment with the manner through which the President and CEO of ICANN depicted Brazil's positions on Internet governance in his farewell letter addressed to the ICANN board of directors. By referring to the -- and I quote, to "the

pressure from governments such as Brazil to bring the IANA functions under control of the United Nations via a multilateral instead of a multistakeholder governance model," end of quote, he has mistakenly portrayed our positions; therefore, conveying a misleading message with respect to Brazil's engagement in ICANN.

Brazil has, on the contrary, consistently championed that the multistakeholder, bottom-up governance model adopted in ICANN is the most suitable.

In that context, we have unequivocally supported the notion that the existing regime should not be replaced by an exclusively government-led institution.

It is no secret to anyone in this room that in line with the World Summit on the Information Society outcome documents, Brazil is of the view that the post-transition phase should ensure the establishment of appropriate mechanisms through which all stakeholders, including governments, would be able to fully exercise their roles and responsibilities.

Our views on how this should take place may differ from the views held by other stakeholders; however, this should not be interpreted as a rebuke of the multistakeholder model.

Once again, on behalf of the Brazilian government, I would like to underscore our discontent with the ill-informed assessment of Brazil's positions as per the text of the CEO's farewell letter.

The full text that will be conveyed to you also refers to, on the other hand, very constructive partnerships we developed in the preparation and realization of NETmundial in Sao Paulo in April 2014.

We would kindly request that the full text of the statement be posted alongside Mr. Chegade's letter in ICANN's Web site.

Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Ambassador Benedicto. I appreciate very much the statement of your government. And as I have shared with you before privately, I had no intention to position the Brazilian government in any different way than what I have said on multiple occasions, including the many openings at ICANN meetings.

So if the letter that I wrote in closing my tenure for the Board was misunderstood in any way, I offer you a private apology and I give now the Brazilian government a public apology.

I would like to thank you and all the members of the Brazilian delegation, Jandyr here and Pedro as well, as well as the CGI, as well as Her Excellency the President who has done nothing but actually change the course of the entire global Internet governance dialogue when she had the courage and the vision to engage and to do what she did in NETmundial. NETmundial would not have been possible without the Brazilian government steps. And NETmundial, as the United States government said in this room a few days ago, in Larry Strickling's statement, NETmundial and Brazil really shifted the dialogue.

So to you the thanks, to your government the thanks, to your people the thanks. And the Marco Civil and other things that have been done in Brazil are, frankly, a beacon to the world of how Internet governance can be done in a multistakeholder way.

So we thank you for that. And again, my sincere apology. I did not intend to in any way sully the deep commitment to multistakeholder governance that your government has.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Fadi. I think we have a few items on our agenda left that we would like to touch on.

One item is the privacy and proxy services PDP. As you know, of course, this is something that governments care about because our citizens care about, our businesses care about. So I think that was something that was discussed largely in the Public Safety Working Group where law enforcement agencies and other governmental representatives meet. So maybe I give the floor to Alice, one of the co-chairs of this group, to raise this issue. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Board.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the GNSO working group for the great efforts and significant work that has gone in producing the final report on the privacy, proxy, accreditation issues on the policy development process. And I'd like to emphasize that the report contains many constructive and beneficial recommendations.

In a letter to our chair from February from the Board, the Board notified the GAC of the final report and requested the GAC to provide advice on public policy issues raised by these final report recommendations consistent with ICANN bylaws.

Now, it's important to note that the GAC has previously provided advice contained in the 2007 GAC principles on gTLD WHOIS

services, particularly, principle 3 regarding assisting law enforcement authorities and investigations, and principle 6 regarding contributing to user confidence.

In addition, we submitted comments on the initial GNSO privacy proxy working group report which reflected public policy issues, which were considered by the GNSO working group but have not been referenced on this final report.

So the GAC believes that the recommendations contained in the final report raises some public policy issues regarding consumer safety and trust, among others, and will, therefore, be providing advice. But, in order for the GAC to do this and to fully consider these important public policy issues, would like to request the Board whether the Board would be willing to meet with the GAC prior to adopting the final report and would like to kindly suggest that the next meeting to consider and have these discussions would take place during the next ICANN meeting, ICANN 56.

This may provide the GAC the time to consider these issues further and the time for the GAC and the Board to discuss these issues further. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Alice. Any reactions from the Board or questions or comments?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just a question for clarification. What we're talking about is a GNSO PDP, right? Okay. Just wanted to check. Thank you. Alice, would you want to repeat?

ALICE MUNYUA: Want me to repeat the question? The question is to request the Board for time, for more time for the GAC to consider advice on the final recommendations before the Board adopts this final report. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So, just so I can level set, we've got the results of the policy development process from the GNSO. You were involved in the process and provided input. But that does not appear, to you, to be reflected in the final document and you would like time between now and the next meeting and, presumably, at the next meeting to consider whether you can provide us advice.

Are you able to advise us in the communicate tomorrow that you would like time?

ALICE MUNYUA: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, if you provide us with advice in the communicate that you would like time, then I would imagine that we would treat that in the normal way that we treat advice.

ALICE MUNYUA: That's what we'd like to do. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. Chris, it's not only one particular PDP. It's a general questions that the full board deciding on that time necessary, sufficient time take into account difficulty of governments that they have to consult many entities and so on and so forth. And the facility they have available is entirely different of the facility that other they have available. Target sectors and so on and so forth. And even the legal support provide us this opportunity to comment, not only on this particular but any other PDP. And that helps the community to have a better understanding and more cooperative works. So we take that perhaps it will reflect in that sense in the final communicate.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Further questions or comments on this one? If that is not the case, then let's move to the next item, which is probably a bigger -- the next big thing after transition. We hope it won't be as big in terms of workload and night sessions and phone calls and what have you. But it may be quite big as well.

The GAC has -- let's put it that way. The GAC is fully aware of what is going on in terms of discussions. And it's not just, actually, not just the future rounds. But it's also the analysis of the first round that is going on. So, for us, these two things are clearly linked.

And we just would like to recall that there was a -- not just a full consensus in the GAC, but I guess a full consensus in ICANN that, before launching a second round, there should be a serious and thorough assessment of the first round to see what did work well, what did work less well, to develop ideas about maybe drawing on the experience that we now have to do things differently where we realized that maybe we were not able to anticipate some key elements of what was going to happen in the beginning. And, but also to continue with things that we felt or the community feels that have worked well that would be important to keep. So this is just an urge, again.

We have tried to follow, participate, engage early in the analysis, to the extent that it's possible, in the preparations that are now starting or have already started in other constituencies.

We have been slightly busy with other things like the so-called transition and the so-called accountability process that have forced us to prioritize. During this period we hope that Work Stream 2 and the implementation of Work Stream 1 will also -- of course, there will also be some work. But we hope that this will be less work. Because we have a full consensus in the GAC with - - in the absence of any formal objection, that we want to engage as much as we can in the analysis of the first round, in the assessment of the first round, and also, of course, in the preparation of the second round. Because we may go for different tools.

But I think the key issues and also the key values that the GAC feels it has to defend because our people, our businesses expect it from us -- this is not that we're trying to make business a hard time when we ask for safeguards, because people expect us to protect them, protect their rights, protect their jobs. These issues won't go away from our side. We will try to find maybe better ways with you all to find solutions that maximize opportunities for businesses and at the same time create confidence on the user side in these new top-level domains so that, actually, in the end, ideally, we have a win-win situation

where people trust these new TLDs and look forward to using them and, thus, also contribute to the wealth and to the economic growth of this.

But in the end, as I said, the issues of public interest will remain. And there is still -- and I think we can actually take the next issue in this discussion.

There is still dissatisfaction about a few things that have not been implemented or done the way that governments would have liked or preferred or have urged. Other things have maybe proven to be less problematic than we have anticipated or feared in the beginning. So I think it would be important to have a factual analysis of what has happened, actually, on the new gTLDs and to get on a shared understanding what, after the experience that have now, what are the actual risks where we actually need safeguards. Maybe there's some fears that we can say, well, it actually proved that we don't have to have these safeguards because the risk is lower than we thought. In other areas, the risk may be higher than we thought.

And we will do everything to participate in this discussion and try and explain why we may be asking, requesting certain actions also for the second round. And just to also clearly signal that this is, of course, something of fundamental importance to governments, to our people, and to our businesses.

I'll stop here and open up the floor to everybody to comment on this. Thank you. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes. Thank you, Thomas. Well, I think you've clearly captured the fact that the two last points on the agenda should really go together.

You know very well on the Board that the GAC has provided a number of times advice on the treatment of safeguards for highly-regulated strings. And we're not going to come back and repeat that over again.

But one aspect which we thought was particularly useful was your proposal to establish a committee of ALAC and GNSO to review the PICs and to see which best practices could be drawn from those existing PICs and where they could be applied even in the current round as a best practice. So we're very keen on that particular activity.

And we had a discussion with ALAC about this the other day. I forgot now when, but in the course of the last few days. So that's one area where we're very keen to continue the work that has already been done.

I won't repeat everything that Thomas has said.

But the other area that we're particularly concerned about is that there is work that's already beginning in the GNSO on developing a new new gTLD round of which, of course, some beginning preliminary work, by all means, shouldn't be limited.

But there are a whole series of other aspects which have been undertaken with respect to the ombudsman's review of the community applications, for example, where we have seen that there are, of course, a whole series of improvements that could be introduced to any future round. We have the competition, consumer choice, and consumer protection review, which is just starting now, where we think that there will be a number of objective criteria and analysis that result from that review which, by definition, should be brought into any new round and a number of aspects relating to safeguards and consumer protection as well as competition and consumer choice will be brought into that.

So we're very concerned that the Board pay very careful attention to these developments over time and that they take into consideration these aspects. I think that's all that I wanted to add. Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Megan. Henri from Namibia.

NAMIBIA:

Thank you, Thomas. And thank you for the board for meeting us. I just have, I think, my colleague from the EU will probably be more elaborate on the issue. We haven't consulted.

But I just have two feathers that I want to put in the cap of the Board and the ICANN community.

One is that we must know in terms of -- in respect of the future gTLD round, we must know our path to successfully navigate our future. In this respect, I want to note that the .AFRICA delegation process was rocky in the past.

But we thank the Board for the support, especially the decision that concludes the internal processes in ICANN on the 3rd of March for the delegation.

And, secondly, we hope that we build on that experience or learn from the experience. And I think the Board has already done that by indicating their commitment to establish an engagement office in Africa. Thank you very much for that. So we look forward to speedy delegation of the .AFRICA and many African applications in the future rounds. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have a lot of requests from the floor from GAC members. So, if the Board comes in, as Mike wants that, please raise your hands as well. Thank you. Mike, please.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for the intervention, Namibia. It's greatly appreciated. I think you have the commitment from ICANN, the Board, and the staff to not let the litigation issues intervene. And we will pursue the finalization of this issue with diligence and all appropriate measures to ensure that the interests of all parties are protected.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: African Union Commission, is your intervention also on this issue or something else?

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Always on this issue.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. You have the floor.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: African Union Commission speaking. I speak French. French is my mother tongue. So I would like to speak in French.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Of course, please go ahead. We do have the interpreters to that end. So, please, do feel free to speak in French.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: First of all, I would like to thank you for this opportunity. I am not going to repeat what other colleagues have said. I believe the minister of Mali, who spoke on behalf of the African ministers in charge of telecommunications and ICT and -- with regard to .AFRICA -- well, I'm not going to repeat what my colleagues said in the last days. The minister of Angola, for example, spoke about this topic. Representatives of Namibia, Nigeria, among so many other representatives. They have highlighted the significance, the importance of .AFRICA and requested a speedy delegation. Because this is important, not only for our continent but for the entire African people. We are developing a program that will enable Africa to contribute to the digital economy and to contribute resources that will stem from the delegation of .AFRICA.

All of my distinguished colleagues requested a speedy delegation of this domain. So I would like to add my voice to the

voices of these distinguished colleagues so that this delegation is carried out as soon as possible.

And I have three concerns: First of all, I see an overall issue generated or stemming from .AFRICA, particularly in terms of applicable legislation. That is, we are facing a situation -- a specific situation. And we should be mindful of the fact that this is specific to Africa. Then we have the IRP. Well, this is a process in which we would have liked to be present to avoid certain situations. It is important to bring this to the attention of the Board. Africa became a case study. And the entire ICANN structure and the entire ICANN ecosystem should take this on board to avoid the repetition of similar situations in the future.

Further, before I conclude, I would like to thank everyone who contributed to the progress of this situation.

First of all, the ICANN board who made a brave decision some days ago. Then the team that is working very hard together with us to resolve these issues.

So my deepest appreciation and my deepest appreciation to the legal team and to everyone who spoke on our behalf regarding .AFRICA.

Special thanks to Mr. Cherine Chalaby, who was very brave in remaining as the chair of the new gTLD committee and who took

into consideration not only ICANN's interests but also Africa's interests.

Special thanks to Mike who supported us in the .AFRICA issue.

And special thanks to Africa -- sorry -- to Fadi. Fadi, please listen to me. I'm addressing you. Fadi, I thank you so much for everything. There are two important things in our lives. We write history in life. But we also make history. We make history. You made history. You have been making history since -- from Dakar to Marrakech going through Singapore, Beijing, everywhere. You took Africa's strategy on board and took it to a level that today enables Africa to engage in the discussion of so many topics. As an African citizen, you made this possible. Thank you so much. And all the best.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: I believe that Cherine would like to take the floor. Cherine, go ahead, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you for the kind words to myself and my colleagues on the board. And I reassure you that the Board is doing everything possible to accelerate the process and do it in a fair and consistent manner. So thank you very much.

I wanted to go back and comment on the two points of the timing and the suggestion from EU about creating a working group.

In terms of timing of a future round, I think the Board is very much aligned with the GAC view; that it's very difficult to go forward without learning all the lessons that we took from the past. And, frankly, on a personal level, I have to say I am very thankful for all the GAC advice that was given to us during the last, I would say, two or three years, have put us under pressure but made us think a lot, and it was in the right spirit and we really appreciated all the effort that was made by the GAC in that regard.

There are many, many initiative going now, as you can see, and you are well aware of them. It's important to make sure that they are coordinated together and that the work is not duplicated everywhere. So that's a very important thing.

And then hopefully the next round, when it's kicked off -- we don't know when this will be -- should be on a sounder base than the previous round, including all the lessons that we've learned.

So the comment here is our views are aligned with the GAC views on that regard.

In terms of the safeguard, we are aware that the GAC is not satisfied with the manner with which some of these safeguards, and we're also aware the ALAC is thinking the same way. So we hear that. And we hear it for a while. It's not the first time that you raise this issue.

And if you recall, last year we tried to, in an informal manner, bring together facilitated meetings for the community. And we held two meetings -- one I think was in Singapore, another one later on in April -- where we brought in the GAC, the ALAC, the registries and the registrars to talk about this particular issue. In particular, any potential harm to consumers and also the enforcement of PICs.

Unfortunately, it was difficult to correct the past because so many contracts have been signed. And trying to change the PICs or a unilateral action by the Board to force all the contracted parties to change the PICs, that was not a practical thing to do.

But going forward, there is now a suggestion possibly to form a new working group to consider the PICs issue. That would require, obviously, commitment from the GAC to provide volunteers and people to contribute to this. It will require the ALAC to do the same thing, and it will require also the GNSO to do the same thing. You have to bring the three parties together.

We are -- We talked to the -- I talked to Thomas about it, talked to Alan Greenberg, talked to James Bladel about it, and while the idea is a good one, and we must consider it seriously, the question is there are two other initiatives currently taking place. One is through the GNSO PDP, which will look specifically into the PICs issue, and the Board will make sure that these issues are being considered as part of the PDP. There is also the AoC consumer trust review which have a specific mandate to look into the PICs issue.

So by creating a third one, are we creating sort of a volunteer fatigue or another group that looks at the same issues or can we bring them together and mix them together?

So we need to look at that and make sure there is no duplication between the three. But the idea is a good idea and we should consider it very seriously.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Cherine.

We have a few more interventions from the GAC and also some from the board. There are about six, so please make your points as brief as you can.

I have Pakistan, Belgium, U.K., Spain, Erika, and then Norway.

Thank you very much.

PAKISTAN:

Thank you, Chair and ICANN Board.

In the last ICANN round of new gTLD applications, developing countries, including Pakistan, has minimal applications for the new gTLDs. We observe that this is due to lack of awareness about ICANN new gTLD programs, particularly in the developing countries, and high fee for the new gTLD application evaluation.

In this regard our suggestions are ICANN through its relevant committees will review and formulate new requisite policies for adequate measures to mitigate these impediments and avoid emergence of global monopolies in this space and (indiscernible) the issues faced in the last round of new gTLD applications.

I also request ICANN to give more focus on the awareness of a new gTLD program in the developing countries for next round of gTLD as and when will be launched.

Thank you very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you Pakistan.

Belgium.

BELGIUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. My colleague from the African Union and myself, we are not perfect so I am also going to speak in French.

Pakistan has just raised a point that I wanted to make here. The first gTLD round showed that there was some imbalance among applications because most of the applications came from the U.S. and Europe and only a few came from developing countries in Asia, Africa, or America.

I would like to know whether the Board took into account that this could happen. Did they consider that this would be a normal process to guarantee a greater geographical representation?

As Pakistan said, the fees were quite high, and also whether they considered the issue of domain delegation.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. We take note of this point so that the Board can react to this.

UNITED KINGDOM:

...anyway, Fade's presence here, and also Goran. Thanks very much for joining us here today.

Well, it's already been commented that the next gTLD round seems to be now looming large and we have a real challenge, as one of the communities in ICANN, to ensure that the full roster of public-policy issues are reviewed in the light of the experience of the first round. And some of these initiatives are accelerating fast in terms of preparation. There's a PDP already under way. The GAC has got to engage with that, and we have to work out the modalities of that. But that is just one.

So it's a real challenge for us to scope out the work that we have to do and ensure that the full range of public-policy issues are taken into account. And there are lots of problems, as we are all well aware. And I just wanted to recount two particular issues that became center stage for us in the GAC in terms of public-policy interest. And this intersects with what we were talking about in terms of the global public interest. And I was very interested to hear what's going on with regard to the work on that and how the GAC can interact with the work on global public-policy interest.

I hope at the next meeting we will have a real opportunity to talk with Tarek's team and get a real sense of how we can contribute effectively and as efficiently as possible to the work, to that very important work.

To come back to the two issues, I just wanted to highlight the concerns of many community-based applicants in the first round. The number of successful community-based applications was very low. Most of them experienced real challenges and barriers in terms of the evaluation processes for community applications, and there were many apparent failures and certainly perceptions of deficiency in process in how their evaluations were assessed. And some who failed in the community evaluation process have ended up in contention, and they're not very well resourced to be able to fight it out in contention.

So it's a very unhappy experience. The experience is a very, very negative one, which is obviously very disappointing. Communities can often ensure that linguistic and cultural diverse tease manifest in the Domain Name System.

So I just want to underline that as a particular area of concern. And it's an ongoing issue, of course, for applicants in the current round. But we have to look forward now to the next round and the lessons and how the procedures and processes can be much more effective and serve the best interests of communities.

That was the first one I wanted to raise. And the second one is the experience of the Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal movement in terms of ensuring that their names and

designations, which have protection under public international law, are truly taken into account; that their concerns about ensuring adequate protection, which costs an enormous amount of money to combat in the Internet world, how we can ensure those protections given are permanent.

It's taken us a long time to get traction on this issue, unfortunately. So that's a lesson. And here we're talking about designations and names which are protected under public international law. So I just draw your attention to that. But I say I do welcome the current work that's been going on during this meeting with ICANN staff, with the GNSO chair and our chair following my raising of this issue with the GNSO earlier in this meeting. I appreciate very much the work that's being done on that, and we look forward to a decision which will accelerate permanent protection.

And finally with my Commonwealth hat on, I endorse the comments made by my colleague from Pakistan and others about the importance of outreach to communities in developing countries and small island developing states. We, within our Commonwealth set up, with the help of the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth telecoms organization, look forward to working with you on how we can ensure that awareness is maximized and there opportunities for communities, again, with very meager resources to be able to advantage of the expansion

of the Domain Name System in many of these countries who were left out in the current round.

Thank you very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K.

I have Spain Norway, and China, and then we'll close the list, thank you, for the GAC members.

SPAIN: Thank you very much, Chair. I will try to be as brief as possible.

On the substantive issues, I would like to recall just to complete the scene, the sensitivity that the use of geographic names, still this causes among at least some GAC members. So I ask that you pay attention to this issue in the review of the current new gTLD round and eventually in the next round.

I would like to pay attention, then, to procedures, procedures alone as the rights of the community to have their opportunity to make our voice be heard. And I think procedures have failed in the current round of gTLDs.

You continue to delegate gTLDs that at that affected highly regulated sector. Although they were only 30 or 40 of them, there were not big numbers, you gave us misleading messages

sometimes when you said that you accepted their advice, and, in fact, implementation was not consistent with it.

We did have informal conversations, but unfortunately they didn't lead to any good result. So we need to improve for the future our engagement and try to understand each other.

I notice that you prefer to have the communities, the GNSO, the GAC, the ALAC, to come to an agreement among themselves, and that's the ideal situation, and we would like to agree on the controversial issues without your help, but in the end, you have to fulfill your responsibilities. You have to be true to the spirit of ICANN and, as Fadi Chehade highlighted in the opening ceremony, it's your responsibility to manage the DNS for the benefit of the world community. And it's very important that you always have this in mind.

Thank you very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Spain.

Norway.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone. And thank you for the board to be here and discuss these matters with us.

It is just a brief comment on the future gTLD rounds and the timing.

So my comment is actually just to that. It is reassuring to hear that also the Board shares our views that we need to -- not to rush this and to take into account all the lessons learned from the first round. So I thank you for that it comment.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I understand that Goran has to leave, so let me just use a few seconds of your time to, again, make the point that we are very happy to have you here, and we are very much looking forward to working with you.

And just a quick reaction on your announcement that the number one language in ICANN will be Swenglish in the future. I made some recollections there are a few things I know about Swedish, like nimbil, dimbil (phonetic) which is the thing that my kids, when they were two years old, on our vacations in Sweden

were fighting with the Swedish about cars. Or (saying city name), or however you pronounce it, where the EuroDIG took place. And something that I would invite you to feed into the public interest discussion is -- I think you call it (non-English word or phrase) or something, this concept of you don't need to have a law on anything. It's actually common sense that you use as a basis for reflections.

So I think we will adopt this. I will ask my Swenglish -- "Swenglish" -- my Swedish friends for giving me some more nice words and I will ask my Finnish friends for giving me the nasty words in Swedish so we can have that conversation.

Thank you very much. We're looking forward to working with you.

[Applause]

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your kind words, Thomas, and I am really looking forward to, in the future, to work very closely with you. I have a great respect for the team sitting in this room as I actually come from the government. I know what you did last night and I know what happened, and I have to admit that this is one of the most -- this is really -- when governments comes together and does something like this

shows that diplomacy can work in a very good way. And I'm very, very thankful for it.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: In the name of the GAC, thank you, too.

[Applause]

Next on the list we have Norway and then China.

NORWAY: I had my comment. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Sorry. China.

CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks the Board for coming. I know we are approaching the end. And so I just have a quick question. And, first of all, I have a short comment.

My comment related to the GAC advice and the gTLD safeguards. We think the GAC advice regarding the gTLD safeguards in the first round of new gTLD program are important. Those, otherwise, are valuable. So we're waiting to see those advice can be considered and factor into the next round of new gTLD program.

So my question is not on the list of the agenda topics.

But I'm wondering whether the Board can share with us your consideration on the ongoing discussion on the IANA transition and accountability proposals within ICANN community right now. And, when you receive feedback from each AC and SOs, especially on the issue of accountability proposals, maybe through the CCWG, what is your next step in the next few days? Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Bruce?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll take it. Thank you, China, for the comment you made. As you know, the CCWG has submitted its final proposal to the chartering organizations. And, as far as we can tell, all of the chartering organizations have reviewed it. And so far I think six out of the seven -- or five out of the seven have already said that they are either supportive or have no objection of transmitting the proposal to the Board. If the two others will say the same thing, then, frankly, the Board will be very happy with the outcome and will transmit the proposal immediately as-is to the NTIA without any further comment or questions on that proposal. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think Erika wanted also to have a word. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: I just would love to make a comment in relation to the upcoming review. Because we will have a very detailed review about the gTLD program. So there will be sufficient time to evaluate all the questions raised today and probably even more.

I would love to put us one more on the agenda during the review, because I think there's one tendency we all have that we often overlook the importance of the economic impact this domain name ecosystem has on our economies. And I understand that there's the need to intensify our effort in developing countries.

But I would argue, if we have a better understanding about the ecosystem and the economic positive impact the domain name world has, it will give us better insight in, you know, where policies are needed in the future and where we may have to maybe let the market evolve as well and give it some time to develop in the right way. So I would love us to do a bit more intensive work on the economic side.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Kavouss, one last intervention. And the EU Commission.

IRAN: One last intervention. I think, when you made your assessment, you referred to the serious assessment and review. Would you make the result of that assessment available for some feedback before you're going further? That is very important that you share that result of assessment to us or with us -- I mean, I'm not talking of GAC -- in order to have feedback. Then you proceed. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. I think we have to conclude. I just wanted to also say that probably the biggest challenge, if not failure, of the first round that needs to be remedied is the unbalanced opportunities across the world. I think this is something -- it was, actually, my first intervention ever in the GAC when I raised this. And I think this is something that we have to do all we can. It's not -- it's easy said. It's not easy done. There are different factors to it. But we have to take this very seriously and jointly find a way that the numbers are differently distributed in the second round. With this, I'd like to conclude and thank you all.

And, before Fadi starts thanking people, I think I should say something about him. Because this is the last meeting that we have in this framework with Fadi. And it's a personal -- a few personal thoughts.

When you came, you were talking about the new season at ICANN. And I remember your slides with the nice fields and the trees and whatever. And, actually, I think it was true. There was a new season at ICANN in the sense that you had a vision, a vision that I shared, about bringing people together, not dividing people. Bringing people together. You go and talk to everyone. Whether people like it or not, you cannot be stopped talking to people, which, in the essence, is a good thing. It's a useful thing. I think we should never stop talking to each other. Because the alternatives are worse if we stop talking to each other. I would like to thank you for the courage as well to do things that may be -- you have taken some risks. You have taken some decisions. Maybe not everything was 100% perfect. But you always took the courage to try and do something and take that risk and stand up for what worked, for what maybe did not work so well. I think we need people like this. Because, if you always wait for others to do things, maybe that won't go in a direction that you would want it. So I'm really happy to have experienced that, actually, you can move things and people. Of course, you need to help others to follow. And, if you do, they will follow. They

will understand and also influence you. And I think this is really something that is extraordinary in you that you have the courage to actually talk to people. Try to move things on.

And with regard to us in the GAC, I think the attitude towards the GAC changed with you.

It was much more a listening mode, a positive mode than from at least what I have perceived in the times before. And I think it has had an influence on the atmosphere of how governments work together with ICANN, how ICANN is perceived. I think you had a very, very strong influence on this which cannot be overestimated. And I think this is a good step.

I think Goran will be able to build on that on the ground that you laid. It was also amazing that, when I became chair, but even before, whenever there was a problem, the only thing that Fadi said is, "What can I do to help you?" And I want to thank you for that.

[Applause]

FADI CHEHADE:

I have the deepest respect for how much governments can be a force for good and how much governments could also be not so much a force for good.

You have enormous ability to shape the future of people. And I started engaging with you with that understanding that, if governments are not full partners in the ICANN journey, the journey will get us nowhere. I understood that from day one.

And, when I arrived to Prague and I attended my first meeting with GAC, I really did not understand your language. I don't come, like my successor, from your world. And that may have served me well. It also caused me to make many mistakes. Because I did not know your world. I did not know how you work, how you talk, how you function. But I put my heart into it.

And the result is, I think, good. This GAC has almost doubled in size since I started at ICANN. We're at 161 countries today.

And that's a great thing because there's only a few left. And we will get them. We will get them with the leadership of Tarek Kamel, to my left, who not only heads governance relations for ICANN, but he's really been the person that guided me to understand to speak your language, which he knows very well. And his moderate, thoughtful wisdom has guided me and got me out of a lot of trouble that I walked into because I did not know you.

I thank you very, very much for the partnership we built. And I leave you with just three thoughts. The first: You are a key anchor for ICANN staying focused on the public interest. Please

help us stay there. Because, if we lose that anchor, we have problems.

Some people in the multistakeholder sphere say that governments are not the sole owners of the public interest. We all are. And I agree. But we need you to be part of that anchoring us in the public interest. Lest we lose this. And, if we lose this, we lose a lot.

Secondly, I'd like to please ask you to not bring to this body and to ICANN many of the Internet governance matters that are not in ICANN's remit. That weakens ICANN. That weakens us as an organization. And I understand that this is an unparalleled body in the sphere of Internet governance. So, as experts as you are, you bring issues because they need to be addressed. But please, please save ICANN from losing its wonderful way by adding too many things on our plate that are not in our remit. And the graphic that I shared with you many times with the three layers, anything above our layer in the blue layer needs to be addressed and is urgently needing to be addressed. And many of you know that's where I'm going to spend my time when I leave ICANN. But not here. Not here. Let us not burden ICANN with that.

That does not mean -- and I now address my board colleagues -- that ICANN does not -- can walk away from its responsibility to do its part in solving issues above its layer. Because some issues

above our space may need our participation. We cannot walk away from that, as I wrote very clearly in my farewell letter to the Board.

And, finally, I just urge you to please participate in ICANN, not just in the GAC where you have a very specific voice and an advisory role that is very important. But there are many parts of ICANN where you have other roles. And your statement last night affirms your other roles, your new decisional roles as well. Take them to heart. Participate. ICANN is different from the vertical world you live in and the government you live in.

But, please, think of it as an innovation in governance space. You are participating in a beautiful -- I call it -- some people may not -- magical place of innovating and governance that I think will serve humanity well this century.

So, please, do participate. Do innovate. Come out of your comfort zone. Come out of your box, as I think you know our chairman does so well. Our chairman here, the chairman of the GAC, and our chairman Steve Crocker. If they sat in their boxes when Steve did what he did to help us build the Internet and when Thomas came to change the -- and bring the GAC into the fullness of ICANN, we would not be here. It takes innovation. It takes courage.

And, finally, I just want to thank all of you for the gift you gave the world last night. Thank you.

[Applause]

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. The part of that gift that personally is important to me was that you did it with consensus, that all of us came together at the end from all sides of the debate here in this body and you gave us a go ahead, with reservations. Understood. Which are respected.

But the general sense of this room to move forward with this transition which started here, I thank you for that personally. And I treasure it. And all the best to all of you. And I hope I meet you in other fora and other places as we continue the big journey of Internet governance together. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

This is the coffee break. We may stand up for Fadi and also for the coffee. Thank you very much.

[Coffee break]