
MARRAKECH – Public Forum 1
Monday, March 07, 2016 – 17:00 to 18:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

NANCY LUPIANO: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is with great pleasure that I introduce ICANN Board Chair Dr. Stephen Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Am I on? Yes. Thank you, Nancy.

So hello. Welcome to the ICANN 55 public forum. As you know, this is basically ICANN's open microphone session where the community can speak directly and unfiltered to the Board. And not only to the Board, but more importantly perhaps to the rest of the community. We have slides up here? Yes. Okay.

So this year, this time right now, we're launching a new public forum format. This is in conjunction with the change in the whole meeting schedule of which this meeting goes by the very complicated nomenclature called our A meeting. It will be followed, you can guess, by a B meeting and a C meeting later this year. And so all of this flows out of recommendations that is came from the Meeting Strategy Working Group that worked for two years with lots of public consultation, and I make a point of saying all that because if you have complaints, we're going to

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.

say well, where were you when these were being decided. That doesn't mean we can't make adjustments, but don't just yell at us. It was a community decision.

So in this setup, we have two -- we've broken the public forum into two parts, or alternatively you can say we have two public forums. Today's will run for what was supposed to be 90 minutes and is now down to 81 minutes. And on Thursday we'll have another two and a half hours allocated to this process.

So I've told you what a public forum is. Let me tell you what it is not. It 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, please use the online system and submit them. We have a tracking system and we try to be careful and complete in the processing there. It's the only way for your comments to receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organizations, and staff members. That's not to say we ignore what happens here. We definitely pay -- try to pay attention here as well. But it's a less-organized and not as -- not well-formed kind of process.

All right. So with that, let me turn things over to Brad White, our director of communications for North America, who will give you

an overview of this specific public forum, how questions will be fielded, et cetera. Brad?

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Steve. As Steve said, this one's going to be a little bit different so we're going to start off with very brief reports, five minutes or less, from representatives of the various ACs and SOs. Then we'll open it up to floors from the question -- or excuse me, open the floor up to questions from the community. We also have remote access, so people not in the room can participate.

Like always, we prefer questions over comments, particularly so at this one. Since we're having another public forum on Thursday, part of the thinking here with the Meeting Strategy Working Group is some questions that are raised here can potentially be answered at the Thursday meeting. So while we always say questions are better than comments, it's particularly amplified at this particular meeting.

There is a microphone right here that you can queue up to. Those of you who have been to a public forum before know that we function on the rule of twos. So you'll have two minutes to ask your question, make your --- and so on. If you have follow-up questions you again have just two minutes.

That's the basic overview. This is very much something we're trying for the first time. So bear with us as we stumble through possibly a few rough production patches, although we've done our best to prevent them. And tell us afterwards what works and what doesn't. With that, Steve, I'll throw it back to you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. Page 3. I have a big part here. Thank you, Brad. So I'm going to turn things over to Erika who will run this -- this part of the session. We're going to start with reports from the AC and SO reports and then move into our Q&A portion. I see that Sebastien is ready right now, but I'm going to turn things over to Erika, so it's up to you.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you so much, Steve. Sebastien, do we have time that we can hear first the reports or is it just something you want to say ahead of the reports? Ahead of the report? Okay. Go on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

This is Sebastien Bachollet. I am an ALAC member and Internet - European Internet user representative and I'm a former representative for the committee which defined the meeting strategy.

I believe it is important to insist at the very beginning of a meeting like this, it is important to take into account that people speaking in languages different from English are necessary. That's it. I mean, you have to speak in your own native languages. You have -- we have marvelous interpreters so you can speak in your own languages. And I believe that there are many people reading the transcription in English. So please, use your headphones, use the live interpretation services so that you can listen to the audio system. That's why we have all these tools available for the community.

Now, secondly, questions that you would like to ask, please do not ask only those questions to the Board but please, ask those questions to other participants. The thought of being able to have two public forum sessions makes it possible to make questions today in order to answer those questions in the following days and for these questions to be discussed in the ACs and SOs. And these questions might be discussed by the Board and by the supporting organizations and advisory committees. This is what I wanted to say. And sorry for interrupting you before the report. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Sebastien. And thank you very much for the -- you were absolutely at the core of the meeting strategy work, and I

thank you for all of that. I know you've been a strong proponent of providing support in many ways for -- linguistic support everywhere.

There's a big difference between a plan and what actually happens, and so I was very eager to listen to you in realtime as opposed to having to read the transcription. Let me hold up three dead -- my phones here, none of the batteries seem to be working in this thing. So we have a little bit of execution that we have to fix up here.

ERIKA MANN:

Yeah, but thank you so much, Sebastien. It was good to mention this because it's often forgotten how many languages we actually have available and the great work the translators are doing all the time. So let us give them a big clap. I don't know where they're sitting. They're sitting all in the back.

[Applause]

It is hard work and not very visible, but we all profit from it.

So what we want to do, Steve mentioned already, it's a new format. We want to try something new again. And we have two cycles of presentations right now coming up. So the first is the -- are the ACs and then afterwards the SO. And I will start with Alan Greenberg from ALAC. Would you be so kind to come up

here and do the presentation? We do this one by one, about five minutes each, and then we will do -- hopefully we will have enough (indiscernible) then for a debate and lively discussion afterwards. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There's a little red light -- ah, now they're working. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I will comment, there's a minor problem in that the slides I'm supposed to be looking at are covered by someone's head, but I have my own copy here.

The At-Large community and the ALAC are in ICANN representing the interests of Internet end users. Now, that's a rather interesting challenge. The organization that was created in late 2002 is a relatively complex one. It's a hierarchical structure. The physical embodiment of At-Large in ALAC -- in ICANN is the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee. There are five regional At-Large organizations for each of the five ICANN regions. And then within each RALO we have groups which have the very imaginative name At-Large structures. Many of the RALOs also have end users.

Currently we have 198 ALSs with 2 on the -- in the process of being certified, so another week or so, I could have said 200.

And we'll have 90 countries, plus individual members. So it's a -- it's a large structure. It's complex. It's multi-level.

The design was one thing -- as Steve said, theory is one thing, implementation is something else altogether. The -- there are, I won't say problems, but clearly there are difficulties in how we make this kind of structure work. There's lots of interests in the world in the Internet. Less interest, perhaps, in what ICANN does. If you take someone who's English speaking, well-educated, technology-based even, and try to tell them what some of the things we do are, you'll get people's eyes rolling. If you then take in the fact that English is not the first language for the vast majority of our people and add in that English is a non-language for a very large part of our overall community, we have some interesting problems. And we're doing a number of things to address those, and that's -- this is one of our major activities that we have going on at the moment.

We are first of all reviewing and revising the membership rules. We want to make sure that if we a -- if an ALS applies, that indeed there's an intersection between what they're interested and what At-Large is doing and what ICANN is doing, rather. We want to enhance the ability for individual members, so people who have an interest in working with ICANN and working with At-Large can do it without any real impediments.

We have a real challenge to get information out to these groups in languages they can understand, both in terms of the jargon and in terms of the actual language they're using. Obviously if we're talking to organizations that have hundreds of people, we're not talking directly to them, we're talking through yet another intermediary, their management. And we're working hard to make sure we can engage with the actual workers and to maintain regular contact with them.

So we're very optimistic that within the next little while we'll have processes in place which can really engage the people on the ground in these countries. And that's going to be exciting.

One of the major activities we have been working on, no surprise, is the IANA transition and accountability. The ALAC representatives, the formal members on the CWG and CCWG plus other participants, to be -- to say they were very active is sort of an understatement. I think we've been annoyingly active, from some people's perspective. But certainly, we have been very, very active. We have our own support group to make sure that what we're talking about was not just the five members in each group but was the -- was the considered opinion of a much larger group. We overall had almost 80 meetings in consulting with the community, and about 2,000 person hours involvement. And that's over and above the various briefings we did to both ALAC directly and At-Large.

As is on record, on the 25th of June we approved the CWG accountability, and I'm delighted to say yesterday around 3:30 in the afternoon we approved the CCWG accountability -- I'm sorry, the first one was the stewardship and the accountability yesterday. And we have a strong commitment from our -- from the ALAC and the larger community to be active and participate in the follow-on work in Work Stream 2.

The other thing that continues to take a lot of our time and has for the last several years are things related -- issues related to gTLDs and where users are affected. We're continuing to work on an issue related to Public Interest Commitments and the GAC advice from the Beijing meeting on restrict -- on controlled TLDs. And we still believe that there needs to be work, and certainly as we go into a potential second round and the CCT review we need to focus on the issues that were raised at that point and understand whether there is a problem and to what extent that problem needs to be addressed as we go forward.

We have been quite active in the whole issue -- whole range of meeting -- of reviews and working groups on what used to be called WHOIS, now is the registration data services, RDS, and, of course, the proxy services that go along with it. And lastly, we are very strong supporters of IDN, Internationalized Domain Names. As mentioned before, a long percentage of the community that we represent doesn't speak English. They don't

use the Latin script, and the availability of IDNs at all levels within the domain name structure has been exceedingly crucial and important to us, and we continue to focus on that.

And that -- oops, I'm now going into RSSAC. And that's it. Thank you.

[Applause]

I hope I made my five minutes.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you so much, Alan. Obviously impressive to see the number of meetings and the people involved and it gives us a little bit of insight how complex actually our organization is in total.

Next presentation is from the GAC, Gema Campillos, who is the vice chair, please.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Good afternoon, everyone. It's a pleasure to me to be here. I'm going to speak in Spanish, if you don't mind.

This is Gema Campillos speaking.

I would like to highlight the presence of Thomas Schneider and excuse him for not being here because he's now meeting with

the Minister of Trade and Digital Economy of the Kingdom of Morocco who is now presiding the high-level meeting at the GAC.

In this meeting, the GAC comes with a representation of 162 members and 35 observers. This is a show of the interest of GAC for ICANN activities and the internal diversity it has achieved.

The agenda of the Governmental Advisory Committee in Marrakech is set by two main topics.

One of them is the final adoption by our committee of the proposal to reform ICANN in terms of self-control, and the other topic is the celebration of the high-level meeting I have mentioned before.

The GAC today is part of the inter-sectorial committee for ICANN reform and must issue its opinion about the proposal that has been presented for the achievement of the goals that were set, and this should be done before the end of the Marrakech meeting.

The decision will not be easy since there are certain discomfort. There are some countries -- or certain countries have certain discomfort in terms of some topics of the final proposal.

The advisory -- Governmental Advisory Committee is expecting to finish its discussion and adopt this -- adopting a decision tomorrow.

Taking into account these priorities, the GAC still wants to deal with other topics that are really important for governments and international organizations such as the review of the new gTLD programs, the kickoff of this -- of the committee to evaluate or assess the benefits of the new gTLD program in relation to consumers and consumers choice, and we will also discuss some other internal topics.

On Wednesday, we will have our usual joint meeting with the ICANN board of directors.

In the high-level meeting, which is the second hallmark here in our meeting in Marrakech, it takes place every two years and this is the third time we celebrate such a meeting on this occasion. This is presided by the -- by Mr. Elalamy, the minister of Morocco, and we have the presence of many important politicians from the African continent.

These governmental representatives have discussed different aspects related to the transition, the IANA transition, and the oversight of the IANA functions, and during the afternoon they are discussing issues related to government engagement from developing countries in the industry of domain names and within ICANN.

Finally, the meeting -- the GAC meeting room is placed in the room called Palmeraie Palace and they are -- all the sessions will

be held for the drafting of the GAC communique, and this is a document which is separate from the declaration that we'll be issuing in terms of ICANN reform.

All these sessions, but for those -- that session, all the other sessions are open and you are kindly invited to attend those sessions.

Thank you very much for your attention.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you so much, Gema.

Next on the list is Brad Verd from SSAC [sic], the co-chair.

BRAD VERD:

Just a quick correction. That was RSSAC.

My name is Brad Verd. I am the co-chair of RSSAC. I have one slide, and hopefully I'll get through this as quickly and accurately as possible.

Real quick, RSSAC, we advise on matters related to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the root server system. This is a very narrow scope but very critical to the DNS ecosystem.

The formal RSSAC committee is comprised of representatives from each of the root server operators, the root zone management partners, and liaisons from the committee. I'm sorry. From the community. And in addition to the formal committee, we have the caucus, which is made up of roughly over 70 subject matter experts, and as you can see, a large portion of them are not directly related to root server operations.

The caucus is responsible for delivering the output of RSSAC. The actual work gets done with the caucus.

I want to cover the publications that we've done since Dublin. The first one, RSSAC 001, this one defines server expectations for root server -- service expectations for root server operators. This document has been on the shelf for a bit. It's been done for a while and there's been a bit of administration and timing to get this published as we worked with the IAB to publish its counterpart, which there's a document that the IAB has worked through their system and published which defines the protocols for root server operators and then RSSAC 001 is the other half of it that defines the service expectations around those protocols that the operators perform.

RSSAC 002 is a document that defines a number of measurements and metrics that each of the root server

operators collect and publish for consumption by the community. And Version 2 was a minor update to some fields and measurements that, based upon operational experience, needed to be modified.

In addition, we had two public statements, one on the CCWG proposal and one was a workshop report. The workshop was the first of its kind for RSSAC. We took the formal committee, locked them in a room for a number of days, and we talked about root server system topics and we provided a report on that.

Current work. We have a root server system naming scheme work party. This group is looking at how we actually name root server operators and if we are -- if we need to modify it. Given the evolution of the DNS ecosystem and the root zone, we thought it prudent to ask the question, "Is there anything that we need to change about things that have been in place for a long period of time?"

Again, you see RSSAC 002. This is the metrics document. Part of this document is to be reviewed every -- it's called out in the document that it should be reviewed every year. This will be Version 3 that the work party is working on, and I -- there will be some substantial changes to RSSAC 002, modifying the current metrics and adding a number -- quite a few more to it.

And lastly, but certainly not least, is this -- as we've been working through these documents and public statements and working in the community, it became very apparent to us in RSSAC that there was no document that memorialized the history of the root server system, so we thought no better place than RSSAC to start this, and we worked in collaboration with the root server operators, both past and present, and a number of experts who have been involved in the root server system going back to its beginning to document its history.

I can say it's a fantastic read. It's really, really interesting. I learned a number of things from it and I look forward to providing this to the community for your consumption.

The current work, all three of those documents, we expect to have complete before ICANN 56, and with that, thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you.

Next is Patrik Faltstrom from SSAC.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I'm Patrik Faltstrom. I'm chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and I will bring you

up-to-date on two specific issues that we are working with at the moment.

The first one is related to the two reports by SSAC numbered 63 and 73. They're related to a so-called key rollover for the root zone, and that is something that implies that we are changing the key material that is used for the trust of DNSSEC which we all use to ensure that the responses we get from the DNS servers in the world are correct, given that we are using validation.

SSAC have had and do have the view that this key rollover process should start as soon as possible. It is an operational procedure which, of course, should not start too soon, but it is a process that takes some time. And in SAC63 from 2013, we pointed out to ICANN and the community how important we felt that this process actually start.

Because we didn't see, from our perspective, enough things happening, we also sent a letter to the ICANN board in the form of SAC73 where we pointed out that the community and people using DNS started to ask, "What is happening?"

We are aware of a design team that have been working on a report and that is planning how this actual key rollover process is going to work. Several members of SSAC has also been members of that design team. The design team have presented to SSAC and the community at various places the process laid

out, and so far we have not heard anyone that is objecting to any of the steps in the process, although there might be external things that blocks certain steps in the process.

The important thing, once again, is that this start.

So our hope is that we can start the process of rolling keys for the root zone and would like to make the community aware of this change that it will happen. We encourage ICANN to start a communication program to actually explain to parties what this involves. It is -- we have done these kind of key rollovers for the trust anchors before, specifically in ccTLDs like .SE before the root was signed, so we have done it before. We've also done other changes to the root zone, like adding IPv6 Glue. We added -- we started signing it and we added new gTLDs and we are still here and we can still use the Internet. So operationally it's not a big thing, but it's still the case that it has never been done before to this scale and that's why it's important to plan correctly.

The second thing I wanted to mention is SAC77. We commented on the gTLD marketplace KPI proposal, and our comments is that we don't really believe in the -- how -- the quality of what is described in the proposed document. We do understand that the idea with the document was to trigger feedback, which we now provide from SSAC, and we think that important -- the most important thing and the reason why I bring it up here, and not

only send some sort of public -- in the public comment process, is that we think it's really, really important that when someone is developing a KPI, they have to start thinking about what you actually want to measure. What is the actual end result?

And when you know that, then, and first then, you should look at what data you need to be able to come to those conclusions.

After we presented this to a number of the SO and ACs so far during the weekend, we have got feedback and other documents where people in other places in ICANN also are developing KPIs, and it seems to be where people ask for SSAC's help.

So it seems to be the case that this is a sort of generic call to everyone to, if it is the case that you want to draw certain conclusions, start by thinking about what you want to measure and then look at the data. Don't go blind looking at what data you have and then try to find what conclusions you can draw from it.

So that's basically SAC77. It is specifically -- a specific comment on one specific document, but we hope that it is written in a way so that the general methodology that we described can be used in other places.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Patrik. We now turn to the supporting organizations and we have first the ASO and the chair from the number -- number -- help me --

(Off microphone.)

ERIKA MANN: Resource -- exactly -- organization.

So please, Oscar.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you.

Good afternoon, everybody. The Number Resource Organization, the NRO, is a coordination body for the five regional Internet registries, the RIRs, that manage the distribution of Internet number resources, including IP addresses and autonomous system numbers.

Each RIR consists of the Internet community in its region. Together, the RIRs serve more than 30,000 members worldwide.

The RIRs predate ICANN, but we are part of the ICANN system and we have supported from the start. In particular, under the

understanding that ICANN would eventually gain independence from the U.S. government.

We have publicly supported the progressive steps to reduce U.S. government oversight over the years and increase ICANN's independence. We played a leading role in producing the Montevideo statement of 2013 which, basically, calls for accelerating the globalization of ICANN IANA functions and predated the U.S. government announcement on IANA transitions.

We have been committed to the IANA transition, and the communities have worked hard to produce a workable plan. Our plan supports ICANN as the IANA operator and improved accountability mechanisms through contractual measures. That is an agreement which has been under discussion since May 2015.

The agreement, the SLA, is a critical part of our plan as much as the CCWG proposal is critical to the names plan, the CWG. Therefore, we expect the SLA will be given the same priority. We have supported the CCWG plan, and we continue to support the transition. And we ask for support for the SLA as an equally critical part of the transition process.

We urge the community to continue to support the transition process this week. And we urge the ICANN board to proceed with approval of the ICG and CCWG plans by the end of the week.

We ask the ICANN board also to approve the SLA and commit that it will be signed at the same time frame as ICANN bylaws are updated.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank and appreciate the tremendous work our different communities and volunteers devoted the last 24 months into this process. Thank you for your hard work. And thank you for your attention.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Could I ask somebody from the technical team be so kind to come to me. The Internet connection is disrupted all the time.

Next from the ccNSO and the chair Byron Holland.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Hi, good afternoon. I'm Byron Holland, chair of the ccNSO, Country Code Names Supporting Organization, and also president and CEO of CIRA, the Canadian country code manager.

What is the ccNSO? Effectively, we are a membership organization of almost 160 country code managers and operators. Many, if not most, of us, in fact, predate ICANN. And there's a very significant diversity within our membership.

Often the ccNSO is viewed as a relatively homogenous environment. But, in fact, there is remarkable diversity within our environment, within our business models. Some are operated by government departments. Some are operated through educational institutions and academia. Many of us are private not-for-profit corporations or organizations of some stripe. And a few of us even are for-profit companies.

Almost none of us have any sort of contractual relationship with ICANN. We try to make it a collegial and consensual relationship that we have with ICANN which on most days actually works.

The ccNSO fundamentally is a supporting organization within the ICANN ecosystem that the issues of country code operators around the world is taken up, is discussed and debated.

But unlike our sister supporting organizations, the ccNSO does not necessarily represent its members. And, typically, we do not make decisions that are binding on behalf of our members. And that is a very important distinction. And that's what will help anybody understand the nature of the ccNSO.

And fundamentally the reason that we do that is because we represent the countries that we're from or the domain name holders within our respective CCs. We are, first and foremost, bound by our jurisdictional environments, our legislative environments, our country's legal environments. And, therefore, it would be very difficult to create binding policy across that wide range of legal, legislative, and political jurisdictions.

So the ccNSO exists primarily as a forum for members to exchange ideas, best practices, and understand the challenges of CC operators and try to mitigate those by sharing information and expertise as best we can.

So what are we focused on in the coming months, in the coming year? We do engage in substantive policy discussions within the ICANN ecosystem and ICANN's direction is, of course, very important to us because issues that are raised in ICANN do impact us. For example, the retirement delegation or transfer of ccTLDs, as you can imagine, is something very near and dear to our heart and something that does get discussed and policy developed within the ICANN ecosystem.

The IANA transition and the CCWG accountability are both issues where we were chartering members, where our CC members have been very, very involved. And we have spent an

enormous amount of time, like many of those in this -- in the ICANN ecosystem, wrestling with these challenging issues.

CC operators as registries are direct customers of IANA. What happens to IANA, how it's operated, how it's managed, how it's overseen as essentially our critical supplier is of paramount importance to us. And we have paid very, very close attention to this transition as a result, both the stewardship transition and the associated accountability changes.

The ccNSO later this week, in fact, Wednesday afternoon, will be putting this decision to a vote within the ccNSO Council. So we still have a fair amount of work and discussion ahead of us on this important transition. But it will be absolutely critical to us that our community is comfortable with what's happened. We believe also that we need to pay very close attention to how the CSC, or the customer standing committee, will be organized and operated. And, of course, the new PTI will be of critical importance to us. How it is structured will be critical to its success. That it is consistent with the CWG stewardship proposal will be absolutely paramount in its success and support within our community.

I'm going to take this moment, this is my last ICANN meeting as chair of the ccNSO. When I look at my colleagues to my right, I think I might be the oldest, or longest-serving at least, one. And

it has been a very, very interesting journey over the past number of years. Since my tenure began, using a little bit of poetic license given Goran is not officially the new CEO, but I've worked with three ICANN CEOs. And I think if we all look back to only a few years ago, one of the common refrains was how slow everything was here. Nothing got done. Everything happened at a very slow pace.

I think many people here would share with me the notion that that has changed rather dramatically. Things here happen at a blistering pace. The common refrain now is volunteer fatigue. It has been a dramatic change.

And during that time, the work of -- the two key threads, the CWG stewardship and CCWG accountability, have really put to the test the notion of cross-community working groups. And from my perspective, having worked with them, having worked on cross-community working groups prior to them, I am very confident in saying that the collateral benefit of these exercises has been we have truly engaged as a community in working with each other, understanding each other in a way that arguably we never did or never really had to before. We had to listen to each other. We've had to work with each other.

I finally understand how the GNSO's organized and how they vote. And I am finally starting to understand why there's so

many I.P. lawyers in bars around the world where ICANN meetings are held.

But above all I think that it has proven that the multistakeholder process can work. It's not always pretty. It's definitely messy. We all gave up something that was important to us to get this deal done, assuming we all get it done in the end. It was complex. It is complex. But in the end, we have taken something very difficult and as a community put our nose to the grindstone and transformed the future of the Internet for the benefit of all of our domain name holders, for all of the Internet, I truly believe.

So on that note, good luck to all of us in the coming week. And thank you very much. It's been a wonderful journey.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Byron, thank you so much. It's hard to imagine that this will be your last ICANN event. I hope you will be seen in the future.

Give me just a second, James.

I would love -- because James is doing the last presentation. So if you would want to participate in the question and answers

which are upcoming and you would love to make comments, please be so kind and queue. The mic is in the center.

I think we have one mic today. Yeah, one mic in the center.

Thank you so much.

So last presentation comes from the GNSO, the chair James Bladel. Please.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Erika. And good afternoon. Last on the agenda, hopefully first in your hearts.

[Laughter]

I'm James Bladel. I'm the chair of the GNSO, the Generic Names Supporting Organization. And part of the new leadership team of the GNSO which includes our co-chairs Heather Forest from the non-contracted party house and Donna Austin from the contracted party house.

The GNSO is responsible for developing generic top-level domain policy. It is a very large, diverse, and complex organization consisting of stakeholders ranging from registries and registrars to intellectual property, business users, commercial users, ISPs, and noncommercial users as well.

We're organized in terms of a GNSO Council, which is responsible for managing that policy development. And the council is divided into two separate houses, a contracted party house and a non-contracted party house. We also have three NomCom appointees as if that weren't complicated enough.

The policy development process at the GNSO is open. So just because I described all of these categories, perhaps some of you might be mentally picturing which of those buckets you might fall into, but the fact is that we are open to participation and volunteers from all members of the community regardless of whether or not you are actively engaged in any of the GNSO stakeholders or constituencies.

What happened to my slide?

I lost everything.

Am I supposed to hit the green button? Okay.

Something's happening.

James, we were not given any slide deck. Would you like me to come up and take some from you?

JAMES BLADEL:

Ouch.

[Applause]

This is the part where I wish Marika were at the podium. Oh, no.

Okay. So I just wanted to point out -- or highlight some of the activities that you would have seen up on the screen at this time. So right now we've launched recently three new policy development processes, or PDPs as we call them.

The first one is a next generation registry data services, RDS. Many of you may have heard with great fondness the term "WHOIS," and this generally is discussing and examining how we should replace the WHOIS system and, in fact, if we should at all.

There is also a PDP underway to address the questions and issues surrounding a new round of new gTLDs. There is a PDP that's scheduled to be -- we actually voted to initiate a PDP at our last meeting on a review of rights protection mechanisms in new gTLDs including a review of the UDRP. That's expected to be finalized and launched at our meeting here in Marrakech.

And, finally, we have some internal housekeeping issues as well. For example, we are examining some review recommendations as we look into our own internal structures and processes to improve GNSO operations.

And, of course, like most other SOs and ACs here in the community, we have spent a lot of time relative to the IANA transition and the associated accountability work. This was a

significant portion of our work over the weekend sessions. We are scheduled to review the accountability report on -- at our public meeting on Wednesday. And I think that some parts of our community are ready to go. Other parts of our community still would like to discuss and examine some of the issues. So I'm hopeful that we will come to the meeting on Wednesday ready to make a decision.

And then finally, when all of this is complete and we move into the post-IANA transition and into the implementation phase, both for accountability Work Stream 1, start to examine Work Stream 2, and then focus on what ICANN looks like after the IANA transition. We are expecting and, in fact, anticipating that members for the GNSO will be actively engaged all of those efforts. We are both direct and indirect stakeholders and customers of the IANA functions. And I expect that we'll be heavily involved in those efforts as well.

So thank you for your time, and if you have an interest in any of those issues, and how could you not really, it's WHOIS, it's new gTLDs, it's IANA transitions, please come to one of our sessions and ask some of the folks there about how you can get involved and get engaged in these topics. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, James. So would you be so kind when you raise your question, keep it under two minutes, please? And I'm not sure how we want to make it because this is now a debate, of course, with the ACs and the SOs as well. You are sitting there quite far away from the mics, in case a question which is addressed to you. Do we --

BRAD WHITE: Erika, if you want to throw a question to one of the AC/SO reps, I'll go with my mic, sure.

ERIKA MANN: You have the mic. Wonderful. Please. Please be so kind to introduce you as well.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you very much. My name is Seun Ojedeji. ALAC member, but I'm speaking on my personal behalf. Just for clarification, I presume this particular question period is just for the SO and ACs, right? Not for the Board yet? Correct. Okay.

So my -- my question to the SOs and ACs is that in light of the report of the CCWG and on the premise that the community would be significantly empowered compared to what we have now, irrespective of when WS2, that's Work Stream 2 of the

CCWG commences, I expect that each leader of SO and AC considers critical the need to initiate processes that attempts to review their respective Internet processes in a manner that ensures adequate accountability to the community they represent or to the objectives they stand for.

Now my question is, is there any leader of the SO or AC that disagrees with such expectation? Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Do we have somebody who would love to answer from you?
Was it hard to --

SEUN OJEDEJI: Actually anybody disagrees? Is anybody answering disagrees?

ERIKA MANN: Nobody will disagree, I'm pretty sure.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: At all. Patrik, thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I'm not disagreeing. I'm completely agreeing with what you're saying, that we're moving into a new world where we have to sort of -- all of us need to work differently according to what now the consensus in the community is.

What we have to remember, though, is that we have both the accountability Work Stream 2 issues and then we have the normal review we have inside ICANN. So, for example, what is related to SSAC is not only the SSAC review that we are coming in to review soon because we were the first SO and AC that had a normal organizational review and we are moving into that now. We also have the -- for SSAC we also have relationship with the normal ICANN SSR review team and the review that is going on, and then we expect both final implementation of the ATRT2 and potentially ATRT3. So we have multiple of these reviews that we have to look at, and we also had to make sure in the community that we are keeping them in sync and ***from each other and not trying to do sort of double work or confusing all of us by trying to come -- or even risk coming with different conclusions in the different reviews that are going on.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. Jimmy. Please introduce yourself.

JIMMY SCHULZ: Jimmy Schulz. I'm a member of the ALAC At-Large Advisory Committee. I'm from Germany, and I don't have the pleasure to speak in my mother tongue here.

Yes -- well, we've heard a lot about the transition and accountability process and you already heard that the ALAC yesterday already voted on it with a tremendous vote from the community from the Internet users. And all the other groups are voting this week, most of them on Wednesday. And I would really, please -- well, back -- no. Ask them to reconsider those who have still problems with it, that this is a one-time chance. We have to do it now. And we have to vote for it because we don't know -- we don't know what's going to happen in November in the U.S. Maybe this is the last chance we have. So please, if you have any problems, considerations, talk, reconsider that. It is a good compromise. It's a compromise, yes. It's a good compromise and it's better than what we have. And we will make that. I am -- I'm in a good mood, but this will change the ICANN, this will change the Internet to the good. So please, reconsider that, and give that a chance. And yeah, thanks.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Jimmy. Next, please.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: Constantine from .MUSIC. Over ten globally-recognized organizations filed a reconsideration request to overturn the grossly negligent .MUSIC CPU report which, when examined against the AGB and passing CPU results, demonstrates clear procedural errors. Our community definition, an organized, logical alliance of music communities, was omitted. The community name, the music community, was ignored, too. Despite unprecedented support from organizations with members representing over 95% of global music consumed, the majority criterion was never assessed. The findings were silent and conclusory. The International Federation for the Phonographic Industry, the IFPI, which administers ISO 3901 standard of codes for uniquely identifying music globally was also disregarded as a recognized music community organization, despite its status with the United Nations and WIPO. Had the same fair standards been applied as the other prevailing CPEs .MUSIC would have passed.

In a letter to the Board the IFPI objected to the CPE findings, noting serious misgivings about transparency, consistency, and accountability of the CPE process. Music's regulated sector was disregarded, too. The CPE report deemed the music community has no cohesion. How does copyright work without cohesion? It is a disservice to Internet users and the public interest that

ICANN agreed that all these illegitimate and inconsistent findings were compelling and defensible.

We remind the Board it accepted GAC category 1 advice that all of the music community operates in a cohesive, regulated sector.

The result, based on a contravening, established processes proceeded with implementation and reliance on factual misrepresentations materially harms the music community and Internet users with respect to consumer trust, safety, and protection.

We still believe in the process, and as such request the Board to accept the reconsideration request.

[Timer sounds.]

Any delay in delegating .MUSIC to the music community harms the music community and the Internet.

We're available for a hearing to answer any of your questions. Will this be possible? Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. This topic is under reconsideration, but Chris, please, you want to respond, briefly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Erika. Constantine, just to say, as you know, that reconsideration request has been filed, and there's a process to go through. But I want you to know that we -- we have listened to you and heard you and have no doubt you'll continue to tell us what you -- what you think and believe.

So I can't comment. Obviously you understand, it wouldn't be appropriate. But thank you for coming to the microphone.

ERIKA MANN: Yes, please.

PAUL FOODY: Good afternoon. Paul Foody, speaking on my behalf. I've got a number of questions. I'll just ask the questions, and if you can answer them after or on Thursday, that would be great.

First of all, can ICANN please encourage buses coming to and from supporting hotels to run as close to time as possible? I was waiting 35 minutes with people yesterday, and I feel sorry for them.

Has ICANN deliberately removed links to past meeting transcripts from its meetings Web page? Will ICANN be replacing those links anytime soon?

A third question. Bill Gates famously predicted the Internet tidal wave back in 1995 at which time he said that any business not online will be going out of business. How long do you think it is before ICANN becomes more powerful than any government on the planet?

Another question. At the high-level GAC meeting today, Akram Atallah described the demand for second round .BRANDS as a success of the new gTLD program. He's predicting a serious demand for .BRANDS in the future. ICANN has said it will never permit more than a thousand top-level domains to be incorporated into the roots in any one year. If only 10,000 .BRAND applications are received, how will ICANN justify to waitlisted .BRAND wannabes that they have to wait up to ten years whilst current .BRAND competitors make hay?

A second part to that question, Harald Alvestrand said that a root with a million names would be a terrible idea. How many TLDs can now join the root before it becomes a terrible idea?

Finally, because I'm sure you've had enough of me and I think that the clock is wrong --

[Laughter]

Does ICANN still seriously believe the future does not involve dotless domains? Thank you very much. You can answer now or Thursday, it's your call.

And thank you very much, Fadi, for everything you've done. I really appreciate --

ERIKA MANN:

Can I do it -- can I do it in the order? So I will not go -- I don't think we will respond to all of your questions, but one, the buses, we will clarify, we will take this off here and do this afterwards.

The links to web pages, I doubt that staff will respond because probably that's simple mistakes. We will look into this. If you could send us the links which are missing so then it's much easier to --

PAUL FOODY:

There's no link to the previous meetings anymore.

ERIKA MANN:

To the previous meetings. Gotcha. Then I misunderstood. This Gates is not really a question.

The .BRAND, I'm not sure, you want to put this up, Fadi, or whatever you want to say. Or Akram. Somebody? Akram? No. Okay, fine. No? Yes?

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: No. All I was going to say is that I will miss you.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

PAUL FOODY: I'm not aware I'm going anywhere.

FADI CHEHADE: I am.

PAUL FOODY: You don't say. Thank you very much. Well, I prefer a considered response to the -- the bigger issues, please.

ERIKA MANN: Certainly. Thank you.

Brad, you want to come in with the video question first?

BRAD WHITE: Thank you. We've got a question from our video hub in Calabar, Nigeria. Mr. Okong Peter. Mr. Peter? Mr. Peter, if you can hear me, we don't have any audio. We're going to take a commercial break and we'll get back to you in just a few minutes.

[Laughter]

BRAD WHITE: Why don't we take a couple in the queue here in the room and we'll see what we can do.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. We have to sort this out with the commercial break.
Please, next.

FIONA ASONGA: Fiona Asonga, for the record.
I'd like to start by just thanking Fadi for how far you have brought us in the time that you have been with us, and to pose a question to the different ACs and SOs about the last couple of years.

The one thing that the ICANN has been working on is the issue of diversity, and I believe that that still has a long way to go to be achieved.

Some of the issues that we are looking at as we go through the transition process is the question of diversity, which again is going to be addressed, I believe, in Work Stream 2.

However, in the meantime, I think it is important for us to have a way in which our respective ACs and SOs are making an effort to address the issue of diversity, and not just when you come to a region such as ours, but you focus on trying to reach to the different potential members of your respective ACs and SOs.

I would like to challenge you, now that you're in Africa, I know that I'm helping a number of groups to reach out to potential members within the community who would -- within the African region who would fit into our respective ACs and SOs. I would like to challenge you to retain them, because it's good that you're here and they're attending, but what do you do to support their continual participation?

It's not just enough for you to come and see us in the room when you come to our region, but we need be able to continue engaging through other ICANN processes and activities, and that begins with plugging into the ACs and SOs and being guided,

mentored through, so that we can appropriately engage and participate.

Because the only ACs and SOs that seem to accommodate global diversity are the GAC, the ALAC, the ASO and a few others within the rest of the different groups -- some groups in the GNSO but would like to equally be engaged and participate like our counterparts in Europe and North America.

Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Do you want to make a comment? I think it's probably --

Mike?

MIKE SILBER:

I just wanted to make a suggestion. If you go to the meetings Web page and if you click on "Calendar and Archives," you'll find the full archive of all of the meetings. If you go into each of them individually, you'll find all of the sessions with all of the transcripts, all of the sessions.

Now, I haven't tested each and every one individually, but just a random sample that I've done in the room shows that they're all there and they all work.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Mike. This was with regard to the question of the missing links, yes.

And with regard to the last question about gender diversity?

I think this is -- it's a point we all have to work on. It's not just the ACs and the SOs. We all have to do more and be more engaged altogether.

Please.

GREGORY SHATAN: Hi. Greg Shatan, president of the intellectual property constituency and member of the commercial stakeholder group, so I guess it's appropriate I'm coming during the commercial break.

In any event, I'll be speaking in my personal capacity, and to an extent as a member or participant in the CWG.

This morning in the IANA transition implementation meeting, we saw or learned that it appears that the -- and this is a question for the AC and SO leaders, so to just make sure they know where this is being directed.

This morning we saw or learned in the IANA stewardship transition meeting that it appears that the implementation, at

least in the eyes of ICANN staff, would be subcontracted back to ICANN staff.

In my view, this was not consistent with the CWG's view or activities, and I think we saw kind of an instance of it already where the proposed structure for PTI, or implementation of PTI, seemed to be at odds with at least my understanding as a constant member of the CWG of the structure that was intended for PTI.

So I'm wondering if any of the AC or SO leaders, also as chartering organizations and as customers, have any comments on this. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Certainly as chartering members and being personally very involved in the CWG stewardship myself and knowing the discussions that happened there, it is certainly my expectation and interpretation that there would be separate staff and budget for the PTI.

As many of us here will recall, there was long and to some degree acrimonious debate around separability and the compromises that had to be made around that, and one is that PTI would have separate budget and its own staff. And certainly from our perspective that is our expectation. I think it's in the

letter of the document, and if not clear, it was certainly in the spirit of the document. So it would be my expectation that there would be PTI-specific staff and not just simply contracted back into ICANN.

GREGORY SHATAN: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Erika, if I may interject.

ERIKA MANN: Sorry?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Sorry. Erika, I'm over here.

Just now Fiona asked a question to the SO/AC leaders that I thought was quite relevant to Africa and quite important to enhance ICANN's diversity, and I was wondering if some of the SO/AC leaders can address that question, where she posed, what can you do, can you think of ways to retain the participation of the African community that's participating in this meeting in the future, and that applies to other regions as well when we go to ICANN meetings.

ERIKA MANN: Brad, would you be so kind to give --

Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Thank you for the question.

We in the GAC attach a lot of importance to participation of countries for different regions of the world. As I said, we have reached 162 members in the GAC. I think most of African countries belong to the GAC already, but it's never enough. We are very fortunate again with the help of ICANN and I will mention two instances.

The first one is the travel support program that benefits 30 countries each time, and I think also five slots are allotted to international organizations.

They are completely composed or made of countries belonging to underserved regions.

We also have been working with the global engagement team of ICANN to try to attract more countries and international -- regional organizations to ICANN, and there is a working group dedicated only to look at issues that are of interest for developing countries. There has been a presentation today in the high-level governmental meeting about their work.

And we also make extensive use of translation and interpretation services and we -- you know, our conference calls and email exchanges try to be as inclusive as possible. But we are very grateful to receive new ideas, new ways to incorporate more people into our work.

[Timer sounds]

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan Greenberg for ALAC. I'm going to address both questions.

In terms of the PTI subcontracting, there was always an intent that we subcontract things like human resources and finance and not necessarily have our own people. There certainly wasn't a belief or understanding within the group that the major functions would be subcontracted. In fact, there was very specific talk about the staff being transferred. You know, perhaps transferred under full contract, but transferred nonetheless.

In terms of maintaining contact from some of the people who are participating in this meeting, I can only speak on behalf of ALAC. We're doing several different things.

Number one, we've taken the person that I believe is the most experienced person in at-large and is mentoring two people from Africa. That will be continuing for the rest of the year. And when that mentor mentors people, they don't disappear afterwards. It's not allowed.

We've also brought in groups of a number of -- large number of students and a number of NGOs from Africa. We are spending a large amount of time and resources to make sure they understand the environment and we are very optimistic that we'll see a significant number of them staying around.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Patrik Faltstrom from SSAC. Regarding the question about the PTI, we in SSAC, we developed for the CCWG and CWG our redlines regarding the implementation guidelines and we are not surprised that there will be interpretation discussions around the -- whatever we now have -- the text that we have agreed upon that we need to talk about during the implementation phase.

So let me just start by saying that I'm not surprised that we will have more of these discussions. We just saw the beginning now. But let's move into the implementation phase so we can deal with all of these issues.

Regarding diversity, we in SSAC do focus specifically on skill diversity, and that is something to not forget in this environment, and I'm very happy that we don't only have technical people on SSAC, but also lawyers and people with other kind of background.

Regarding outreach and connection with people that are, for example, from Africa, we are working very hard, in general, with the fellowship program. We are reaching out and working with them. And regarding outreach of our activities, we're working with ALAC and they helped us quite a lot regarding spreading our material. And, yeah, what else are we doing.

Yes, we also work with the communication team, just like ALAC said, to be able to be better on staying in touch.

Finally, one thing that is really important for us in SSAC is that we only conclude and make our decisions via email. We do not do it face-to-face. And that is just because everyone must be able to participate, even though you only have the ability to access to email under very low bandwidth, and every time we

make a decision, everyone have at least 48 hours, if not a week, to respond to that email.

No decisions are made face-to-face. And we think that is really important for us. Thank you.

[Applause]

BRAD VERD:

Real quick on the diversity question, Brad with RSSAC. Maybe this is a shameless plug, but the caucus, the RSSAC caucus, we're always looking for new members and that's a great opportunity for you to get engaged and stay engaged with us in the RSSAC, and I'm happy to provide that afterwards if -- if you need that.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Just a few comments on both questions.

On diversity, the NRO, number resource organization, has a diverse executive committee, one from each region. The ASO, the address supporting organization, address council has also a diverse group. Three from each region.

We also have additional committees or liaisons. For example, in the CCWG we had the group diversity as well but we only had

four persons. Anyway, we managed to have from different regions as well.

The thing is that it is difficult to have a good level of participation. One of the persons from these liaisons is from Cuba and he had restrictions to use some of the tools that were required to have communication with the CCWG and the rest of the IANA transition.

So even if we -- he will be able to make those calls, the required bandwidth is not regular in some of the countries, and so we have to pay attention to that as well.

And second -- and the PTI, as you know, the numbers proposal is independent from whether there is a PTI or not, but we -- we have provision in our text, in our contract, that that could happen, and we are okay with that.

The thing is that from my personal view and as a manager, I think that this is a beautiful opportunity to actually separate costs on -- costs that some of the supporting organizations are asking for.

In my previous life as a ccNSO member, I recall that we've been asking for that split of costs and I think that this is a good opportunity to have that separated cost, and now the numbers

community are asking for that as well and I think that ICANN staff should take that opportunity to have that split of costs.

ERIKA MANN: You want to say, Brad, that the queue is closed? BRAD WHITE: Yeah, we have closed the queue at this point.

Erika, we have an online question. Do you want me to take that one right now?

BRAD WHITE: It is not the video hub, but it is a question that came in online specifically for James Bladel of the GNSO from Mr. William Cunningham who is asking about the rationale for replacing WHOIS.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thank you. And thanks for the question. I think the answer is that it's probably premature to conclude that we will be replacing WHOIS. This is part of a long process. And actually it's both at the end of a long process and the beginning of a new long process that was initiated by the board and before that an expert working group and a WHOIS review team. And now the PDP has begun.

This effort is going to look at a number of issues associated with WHOIS, the use cases, the needs, issues like privacy and other concerns that probably were not a factor when WHOIS was created almost 40 years ago. Obviously, it needs to be looked at from top to bottom. One of the options or possible outcomes of this work would be to change the existing system. One.

Of the options might be to replace it, and one of the options might be to do nothing. We don't want to presume the outcome because this work is just beginning. But I think the rationale for changing it is one of the discussion topics that's on the table.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you. The queue is closed, just so that is well understood. Please.

No, not -- you are fine, the two ladies there now. I don't want somebody else to queue. Yeah, fine.

HAJER ABDELKEFI:

I am Hajer Abdelkefi, a member of the Bar Association in Tunis.

So, I was saying that I am Hajer Abdelkefi, a member of National Bar Association in Tunis and Association (indiscernible).

I was invited by you, and I am thankful for that to attend this 55th meeting of ICANN. I thank you for that.

On occasion of having Nobel Prize, I'm not qualified because these are technical matters. Especially it is first time for me.

But I have some primary impressions about that as a law militant and an association and civil society militant.

What I notice is first the absence of the aspect -- or at least the absence or shortcoming in the legal aspects in ICANN. This is for one.

Second, you focus more on internal aspects, be it technically or organizationally, without handling the ICANN relationship with outside world. Especially today in Africa, there are major challenges. Africa is first time for ICANN. And I think -- Excuse me?

I think that ICANN today, it is in its interest to establish extensive relationships with institutions, be it professional or governmental or non-governmental in African countries.

The third comment, and my last comment, the African and Arabic presence is almost most absent. Thank you.

[Applause]

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you for attending the ICANN meeting. It's a privilege to have you here and wish you good luck on the Nobel Prize. I have

many friends which have tried many times. So it's wonderful that you are here.

Somebody would love to say? Asha, you were looking excited. Would you like to make a comment?

[Laughter]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Not excited. I am excited that we got that wonderful lady to speak. I just wanted to agree with the comments you made, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Okay, thank you.

I have to smile a little bit on your first comment about the legal side. I think there would be many in the room here would say we have too many lawyers here.

But I'm sure it's your first meeting, so we will look forward to having more discussion with you about this topic.

Steve, it's your turn.

She closed the queue.

STEVE CROCKER: So how was this for everybody?

BRAD WHITE: Steve, can I interrupt for one second? We've established -- in fairness to Mr. Peter in Nigeria, if we have time, I would love to be able to take this gentleman. He has been waiting for some time. We finally got that video hub back up, if we could do that.

STEVE CROCKER: Excellent, let's do it.

BRAD WHITE: Mr. Peter in Calabar, Nigeria.

REMOTE HUB: Can you hear me now?

BRAD WHITE: Yes, sir, we can.

[Applause]

REMOTE HUB: (indiscernible). And are there any way of how can subnational levels and --- be involved in process? What is the --- of the

consumer? What is the possibility of assigning digital numbers to mobile --- ?

BRAD WHITE:

Mr. Peter, unless somebody had better luck than me, you were broken. Your audio was broken, and it was very hard to understand. Was that only me or did anybody -- if you could send that question to us online, Mr. Peter, we'll be happy to deal with that. I'm sorry. The audio problems are persisting. You are just sort of inaudible. But shoot that to us online and we'll address it.

Steve, we have one more online question. Can we take that before we close?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yes. But let me thank you for the prior question and apologize for the audio. But do send it, and we'll answer it very carefully.

[Applause]

Thank you. All right, one more.

BRAD WHITE:

Yes, sir. This is an online question from Mr. Belittle Aru (phonetic). I want to get your thoughts on the VOIP ban in

Morocco. If possible, the ANRT president can give us an explanation for the ban since his agency is behind this ban.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, that's outside the scope of what we can handle here, I'm afraid.

Yeah, I think -- I'm sorry. That's not a question which we're going to deal with here.

All right. That brings to an end this part of the public forum. And the next one will be in the afternoon on Thursday, three days from now right now, same time -- I mean, same room.

We'll see you then. There's various activities scheduled this evening including the AFRALO celebration. And then several days of work in front of us. See you all. Thanks.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]