STEVE CROCKER:	Good afternoon. Welcome. Please take your seats. Stop all of this useful interaction.
	[Laughter]
	We have business to do.
	[Laughter]
	This is a meeting of the registry stakeholders meeting with the ICANN board. I'm Steve Crocker, chair of the board. Probably you guys all know that by now.
	I'm told that David Maher is chairing the meeting here with us.
	Our role here is -- although this is intended as a dialogue, I really want it to be a very unbalanced dialogue, with most of you doing the talking and most of us listening, but we can see where the flow is.
	We have quite a few board members here, mostly on the front row and a few in the second row across here.
	Let's see. Who -- just wondering -- and Rod Beckstrom and I from the board are up here. I was just looking to see if there were any other board members who ought to be up here.
	Bruce, we're going to call on you anyway. You're welcome to join us if you want.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER:	That would be great. Bruce Tonkin, vice chair and chair of the Board Governance Committee.

And I guess the other piece of business is there was an exchange of topics, topics suggested from the registry stakeholder group, cross-ownership, conflict of interest, and EBERO. What is that?

DAVID MAHER: Emergency back-end registry operator.

STEVE CROCKER: Emergency back-end registry operator. Developing economies, support program, DESP, which looks like the beginning of "desperate" --

DAVID MAHER: That's JAS.

STEVE CROCKER: -- single-character IDNs and questions from and to new board members. Suggested topics from the board, CEO search, what qualities do you think we ought to be seeking, ethics guidelines, what are your top three concerns and proposals to address them. Particularly what are your proposals to address them. What is the view of registries with respect to the registry role versus registrar or reseller role in taking down domain names being used for illegal purposes.

Update on discussions between registry and law enforcement, what are the barriers to improving collaboration. Feedback on the JAS final report.

We want to put the CEO search discussion at the end, and Rod would like to be excused from inhibiting our discussion or being assaulted with it or whatever the case may be. And so he'll excuse himself at that point.

And so with that, I'll turn things over to David.

DAVID MAHER:

Thank you. The -- among the first topics that we've put on our list are the -- the first topics that we put on our list are the new gTLD contract issues, which includes, in particular, cross-ownership, the EBERO, and the continuing operations instrument.

In very brief summary, the reason we're especially concerned about these issues is what we perceive as a possible handicap, a lack of fairness, to the registries who might be interested in applying for new gTLDs.

We're still not certain about the impact of cross-ownership. In particular, the impact of any anticompetitive regulations, whether it's antitrust law in the United States or competition authorities elsewhere.

If we don't have certainty on the application of these rules as quickly as possible, that that handicaps our process. The same holds true for the continuing operations instrument. The current proposal which requires very significant amounts of money to be put in escrow or part of a letter of credit, covered by a letter of credit, again, we see as a handicap to the application process, and this one is not so much a handicap to the registries themselves as it is to the -- some of the new applicants who are faced with a very serious financial burden.

Now, we know that both of these topics are under consideration. I'm not sure that the board wants to comment on them. The continuing operations instrument, in particular, will be the subject of a meeting Thursday morning.

The JAS proposal is of concern. We're worried that the money being paid in for applications might be diverted to subsidizing other competitive applications, although I understand that at least one of the current proposals is that ICANN will be a facilitator and not take money out of the budget.

Our vice chair of the GNSO is here, Jeff Neuman. Jeff, do you want to expand on those or --

JEFF NEUMAN: Which -- sorry. Which one? You mentioned -- just about JAS or the --

DAVID MAHER: Well, any or all.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, so on the cross-ownership issue, we had a really good discussion this morning with John and Dan and Kurt and other members of ICANN staff, and I think they understand our concerns. We understand that you've been in dialogue, or the staff has been in dialogue, with competition authorities in the United States and in Europe, and just to emphasize the point that, you know, until such time as we get -- "we" being the existing registries -- get the go-ahead to actually register names or act as a registrar in our own TLDs, we're going to be at a competitive disadvantage to those registrars now that are applying for new TLDs in the future.

We've had this discussion before. It took a little while, between the Singapore meeting and this meeting, to get more information.

We understand ICANN staff is going to publish a notice in the next day or two, or couple days, about the status of the discussions with the competition authorities.

One of the things we raised this morning, which we'd like to raise with you, is that we believe the response that you're going to get is not going to be a clear-cut, definitive yes or no. I doubt any competition authority would say, "Yes, all existing registry operators can be registrars." It's usually going to be a case-by-case basis determination, I'm sure.

But that said, the question we asked is: What kind of guidance is the board looking for in order to issue the go-ahead to existing registries and registrars? And hoping that it's not a yes or a no for the competition authorities.

So that's on the cross-ownership. Do we just want to take one topic?

EN

DAVID MAHER: Do you want to address the COI, the continuing operations?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So on the continued operations instrument, the discussion today centered around whether there was enough time between the -- when -- sorry. Let me take a step back.

There's an RFI out right now for emergency back-end operators and that's due at the end of November. The question is whether the information will be enough, and ICANN stuff will have enough time, between when applications -- or sorry, responses are due and when the application window opens up less than 40 days later, or 42 days later. Whether that's enough time to provide guidance to applicants as to how much to put aside in the continued operations instrument.

Because that is -- just to let you all know, as someone who is a back-end operator, we've been asked that question I can't even tell you the number of times. It is the single most asked question that we get, and I don't know if the other operators would say the same, but I've heard it's similar. You know, how much money do we put aside? And all that money that you put aside is money that you cannot be using to market your TLD or, worse yet, use to actually fund the security and stability of your TLD.

So on the one hand, you have a COI whose purpose is, if you fail, to have an emergency back end so that the security and stability of the TLD stays up. But on the other hand, you're putting so much money aside, you may not have enough to actually build up your infrastructure to make it secure in the first place.

So you kind of have those diametrically opposed philosophies there.

STEVE CROCKER: I just want to make sure I understand the connectivity between the pieces.

EN

You're suggesting that all this money put into the COI fund will increase the probability of failure?

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm saying if it's high enough that, yes, that's the case.

STEVE CROCKER: Which would mean that we would get the system tested. This sounds like a good thing to me.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think there are better ways to test the system, but I guess that's another way to look at it.

[Laughter]

DAVID MAHER: Well, all right. Moving along, unless any of the board members have questions or comments on that, the -- the next topic I have on the list that I believe Steve read is the ethics question.

This is not an area where the stakeholder group as a whole has had an opportunity to develop a position, although I think -- I sense a general feeling that ICANN should adopt clearer ethics rules, modeled along the lines of various governmental and administrative agency rules that are intended to prevent the revolving door.

This is something that we'll be working on very shortly, but at least I'd like to register the -- what I think is the generally held position.

Bruce, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, David.

Oops, I'm really loud now.

EN

On the conflict of interest and ethics discussions, I think the first thing to realize is we do actually have existing policies. We have a policy which is a conflicts of interest policy, and we also have a document which is a code of conduct.

Now, both of these are probably hard to find, so one of the improvements is obviously to make them easier to find. But just to give you an idea, the code of conduct actually has in it today each director and liaison is expected to adhere to a high standard of ethical conduct and to act in accordance with ICANN's missions and values. The good name of ICANN depends upon the way board members and staff members conduct business and the way the public perceives that conduct. Unethical actions or the appearance of unethical actions are not acceptable. Board members are to be guided by the following principles in carrying out these responsibilities, and then the code goes on and summarizes those.

So we're not starting from nothing, so I just want to make that clear.

Having said that, you know, as ICANN is getting more and more responsibility, you know, we obviously realize that it's -- it's timely to review both the conflict policy as well as the code of conduct or ethics policy, and to do that, we're actually getting some external consultants to advise us. And they are looking at, you know, the different ethics and conflicts policies in place in other organizations that you've mentioned, and in fact, I also asked the ccTLDs yesterday -- earlier today, you know, how many of those have those policies in place, and it seemed to be about 10 of them did, and, you know, suggested that they forward examples of those to be considered.

But the process would be that we'd propose some updates to our policies, taking in both the public input and the expert advice, and then they would go out for comment and be approved.

So that's kind of the process side of it.

We do have a dedicated session on Thursday from I think 2:00 to 3:30 p.m., and, you know, the staff will be able to give you an update on who we're seeking advice from and, you know, what we've learned so far.

And my expectation is, in the next few months, you know, we'd be posting a revised policy or policies for public review. And then ultimate approval.

DAVID MAHER: Well, thank you. We look forward to participating in that proceeding.

Yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry. This is Keith Drazek, alternate chair of the registry stakeholder group. I just wanted to let you know that Ken Stubbs is on the phone and would like to be recognized to talk about -- going back to the COI question, and also to discuss the JAS working group final report.

DAVID MAHER: Okay. Ken, go ahead. I'm -- well, we can't hear.

KEN STUBBS: Can you hear me now?

DAVID MAHER: Now. Go ahead.

KEN STUBBS: Yeah. Thanks. Thanks so much. I have a couple of issues I'd like to go back to.

First of all, on the COI, as it relates to the JAS -- and I know we're moving into the JAS, but -- I spent a significant amount of time, even though I'm remote, listening to the session, and it seems to me that the assumption by the working group is that the proceeds from the auctions of

contested strings are going to be made available to the candidates, as they call them.

I'm very concerned about that, because going back to the initial board discussions regarding proceeds of the auction, the principal function of those proceeds was the -- to be used to enhance ICANN's core mission, which was security and stability.

And I am afraid that money that should be used for education, for DNSSEC, and for issues like that, enhancing security and stability, as the Internet grows and the number of names and resolutions increases, may get derailed and used for other purposes.

Also, the other thing I'm very concerned about is the request there that the requirements for the COI be waived for these applicants.

My argument there would be that there's a much higher probability that these people may, in fact, have problems as they move forward, and this could impair the fund, Number one. And number two, it could in effect, represent some sort of a transfer of the burden for replenishing that fund onto future applicants. I don't think that that's an equitable approach to taking it.

And I do honestly feel that we need more direction from the board on how they plan to manage the significant amount of money that they may be getting from the auctions. The last three meetings that ICANN has had, when they've discussed budget and so forth, I've specifically asked that question, and still have not had an answer.

Thank you.

DAVID MAHER: Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Hi. Good afternoon. This is Bertrand de la Chapelle speaking.

I want to come back just briefly to the notion of conflict of interest and policies.

There's a strong distinction that I won't delve into the details, but between the conflict of interest and the question of revolving door during the tenure on the board and after the tenure on the board.

One of the key challenges that we all know is as long as we have people who are on the board who are active in the community and legitimately so, it is a very strange situation if, when they leave the board, they were supposed to not go back to the activities that they had when they were on the board.

So the revolving door policy is a tricky and a delicate thing.

The second thing is -- and we're studying that closely.

The second thing is, going to what David was mentioning, what are the reference points in terms of conflicts of interest policies and I'm very happy because that's a point that I raised within the board and that has been fully taken into account. Very happy that you mentioned also reference to administrative entities or agencies and regulators of various sorts, because there are probably significant lessons to take from that.

Which leads to the final point, and I want to just share a question as I did with other constituencies.

Given the quasi-regulatory nature of some of the activities that ICANN has -- and I'm very cautious about using the expression because I know the weight of the term "regulatory" -- but given that, and this growing dimension in the context of the new gTLD program, should we or should we not push the logic to the extreme of placing above all the independence of board members and considering that board members would be completely independent during their tenure, like the people in the college of various agencies or regulators, and therefore, not be part anymore of the entities that they were designated by or they worked with before, with a corresponding revolving door policies afterwards.

It is a very strong question. It is pushing the logic to one stream, but it is also an important question regarding the evolution of the multistakeholder model and to which extent the situation where we may have problems of quorum on some decisions on the board or problems of testing the independence in one position or the other is going to grow.

So in a nutshell, the question I want to share is: Should we take into account in this discussion the extreme or quasi-extreme model, which is a completely independent board with people designated who make a career choice to move away for a while just like you do when you go into public administration, for instance.

DAVID MAHER: Well, I -- as I said, the registry stakeholder group is not in a position to give a fully-thought-out position on this subject, but it seems to me that the extreme of isolation of board members simply wouldn't work.

ICANN is a unique institution, but it is also quasi-regulatory, and I think there are adequate models just from my own personal experience with administrative agency law. Please.

CHERINE CHALABY: I agree with David's position on that.

Also, I think as I mentioned before in other meetings, the nature of boards like ICANN with their international structure and diversity is people come and people go. Frankly, what matters is the conduct during the board in three aspects.

One is when participating in decisions and discussions, every board member must not be conflicted, number one.

In their conduct, they must follow ethical standards and never be beyond reproach.

Three, in terms of confidentiality, they must ensure that they remain confidential, and when they leave the board, they keep everything that

don't belong to them, in terms of intellectual property and confidential information, back where it is.

The fact that after that, if they conducted themself properly during the board period, term, what they do afterwards I don't think it's something that concern -- personally -- I'm not talking on behalf of the board -- is something that we should be terrible concerned about. The problem lies when they don't behave -- someone does not adhere to these things during their term, and then goes through a revolving door, if you see what I mean. This is where the problems lie.

So we need to fix the period they're on the board and not worry about what's happening after that. That's a personal view.

DAVID MAHER: Thank you. I think Jonathan Robinson had a comment.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. It's really -- I guess it's a couple of supplementary points.

First of all, on cross-ownership, one of the things that came up in our meeting this morning was that time is of the essence here, so I think it's important to recognize that the resolution of this matter, a sort of year down the track, is not -- is potentially, from a commercial perspective, rather unhelpful.

The reason being, these are matters of a strategic nature for the businesses involved. They need to plan. They need to organize. And they need to think carefully about their position in the market, both with respect to new TLDs, future new TLDs, and the existing TLDs they operate.

So I'd encourage you to absorb that as effectively as you can, and respond within the constraints of all of the -- the issues which is clearly dealing with competition authorities around the world in whatever way you have, but recognize from our point of view, as operators of existing TLDs, it is important to get this resolved quickly.

So that's the first point on cross-ownership, David.

Second, on the continuing operations instrument, this is an interesting one, because as I understand it, my understanding of the current structure -- and I realize this is due to be discussed in more detail later this week, but the current one is very much an impact on the working capital of those businesses that are about to -- that are about to emerge on the operation of a new gTLD, whereas the alternate proposal is much less of a drain on the working capital, and therefore, the effective operating function, which is really, I think, the point that was being made here earlier.

So if you take it in pure business terms, this is a working capital impact that could jeopardize the effective functioning of that business.

And in fact, there is a link to JAS here because within JAS there is a proposal to reduce the continuing operations instrument for JAS applicants. At least that's one element of what's on the table. And frankly, in my view, I'm not sure that all the dots are joined in this respect, but should the current proposal be adopted in one way or another, in many ways that addresses the problem, because one isn't currently reducing the requirement for JAS applicants. They would build up into a fund, like everyone else would, and so -- because clearly the concern with JAS applicants having their COI reduced is that they are potentially the more vulnerable registry operators or registry entities, and so reducing their COI is not necessarily the most constructive in a security and stability context.

Thank you very much.

DAVID MAHER: Thank you. I think because we do have a limited time, it's probably a good idea to move along to the knotty questions of takedowns and registry/registrar relationships with law enforcement.

I'd like to open the discussion by saying that the registries as a whole, on principle, cooperate with law enforcement agencies. There's no question of a combative attitude or antagonism between the two.

We realize, as much as anyone, the extreme importance of maintaining a secure Internet.

The last thing any of us need is more viruses, more fraud, and so on.

I -- a number of the registries have participated in meetings with law enforcement. One of the principles, I think, that comes out is that in many instances the first line of defense against fraud and phishing and malware are the registrars. And we work with the registrars on that.

However, we think that the distinction is worth remembering, because the registries have the ultimate responsibility for maintaining the domain name system, through their registries.

In -- yesterday, I was very fortunate to listen to the fascinating discussion of domain name abuse chaired by Nii Quaynor, and one of the -- another very important point to bring out is that some of the proposals, legislative proposals, and in particular I'm thinking of one in the United States, is almost certainly going to be not only ineffective but dangerous.

It strikes at the technical heart of the domain name system. I hasten to say I'm not an engineer and I won't go into the technicalities, but a well-regarded technical group, including Paul Vixie and a number of other people, have prepared a paper pointing out the dangers of blocking domain names through action against service providers.

This topic was framed by the board, as I understand it, to ask about our relationships, and as I said, I think they're very good. I know on behalf of my own registry, the PIR relationships are good, and I believe that's true of all the others. I'd be interested if there are any questions from the board.

STEVE CROCKER: Not a question but just in the interest of full disclosure, you mentioned a paper by Paul Vixie and others against the blocking of access to content through the DNS. I'm one of those others.

DAVID MAHER: Sorry. I forgot to give credit where credit is due.

STEVE CROCKER: It is not a credit issue, just transparency.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: This is Bertrand de La Chapelle again.   The session was extremely important yesterday.   And in that session on DNS abuse, I raised a question that we're all now being faced with, which is the following: In the current system if a citizen of country A is conducting a perfectly valid business in country A with the server based in country A and according to the laws of country A but bought its domain name from a registrar that based in country B where this activity for one reason or another is deemed not legal or inappropriate, the legislation of country B according to a few recent cases is used to take this domain name. And if I push the reasoning even further, this could apply to a registry, as you know, so ultimately anything that is in dot com or dot org to take those, or dot net, by the very fact that those registries are based in the United States could theoretically mean that any activity on a domain name that is registered at the second level should be submitted to the law of the United States.

How does the registry community feel about this evolution which is going to sort of fractalization and extension of sovereignty of one country versus others?

DAVID MAHER: That is an excellent question.   And speaking as an American lawyer familiar with that case, I wish I had an answer.   It is under -- it's in litigation in the United States.   It's at least conceivable that American courts will decide as a matter of the principle of freedom of expression that law enforcement agencies in the U.S. went too far in that case. Personally, I favor that outcome, but there are no guarantees.

Anyone else want to speak to that?

JEFF NEUMAN: This is Jeff Neuman. You're asking how we feel. I'm not sure it matters how we feel.   The reality is we are subject to the laws of our own jurisdiction. And whether I like it or not, if I get an order from a court in the United States or a law enforcement agency, I have to comply at this point. So, I mean, we could debate it. But at this point, there is nothing really we can do about it unless we're found in contempt of court. I suppose we could do that. And there actually have been some cases now with law enforcement. There have been some decisions. Without going into detail, there were some decisions by U.S. courts that I know NeuStar on behalf of dot biz has gone into court and we saw an order that was completely, fundamentally unfair to a registrant. We went in. It was a default judgment. But the judgment -- the court went in our view beyond what it was -- it had the authority to do.

And in that case, we went to court and we won and we got the remedy to be commensurate with what the activity was.

But I did want to just entertain something also that David had said. He had said -- he started out that the relationship is primarily with the registrar. And I think that's correct, but I will offer a couple caveats on that. Number one is registries are in a unique position because we have a brand to protect. And registrars aren't always -- they don't always have the same incentives to protect our brand as we do. Registrars often view our TLDs as completely exchangeable or, you know, they don't care what TLD they sell. If they sell a com, a biz, a net, an org, it doesn't matter to them. It is generally the same amount of money, and it is a domain name.

For us, for NeuStar, we started a domain name takedown program in 2006 primarily because dot biz was on a list of most dangerous TLDs at the time. You may say, Why does that matter? It mattered because ISPs used that list to block legitimate traffic. And when that happened, our brand equity went completely down. Sales went down. We were just viewed as a joke.

We made the decision at that point in time that we were going to implement a program to take down names that were used for phishing, pharming, malware, et cetera. We also set up a laboratory environment within our registry to verify complaints we received and to proactively go out there and find bad activity.

When we found it, we instituted a policy where we gave registrars 12 hours to take down the name. If they didn't, we did. And in a lot of cases, they didn't, because, like I said, they don't always have the same incentives we had. We took down those names. We continue to take down names. When we can show definitively that it is being used for one of those purposes, we've taken down more than 100,000 names between biz and dot US. Not only have we never had a lawsuit, we've never had a letter claiming that we were wrong.

So I know there is a lot of discussion out there on VeriSign's proposal that they made. I want to state for the record, VeriSign's proposal is exactly what we do, not the malware piece -- I'm sorry, not the -- there was a virus scanning piece. But the piece on reserving the right to take down names used -- for names used for these purposes. I know they're VeriSign and COM and NET and it is a much larger registry and, therefore, garnered a lot more attention. But done the right way -- and I know VeriSign would do it the right way. Done the right way, the program actually is a better protection for registrants than the alternative.

DAVID MAHER: Thank you, Jeff.

Any other questions about takedown policy, relationships with law enforcement? I hope if you have had concerns that underlay that question, I hope we've put it all to bed.

BRUCE TONKIN: I think, Bertrand, one of the things to be conscious of, just talking very specifically more or less security issues. So we're talking about malware, phishing, and things like that. It is quite different than sort of

issues like NeuStar is not looking at this and saying this is criticizing our President, we'll close it down or something. They are not making content decisions here. That's really the distinction.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just to add, there are a couple very limited circumstances of content we will take down. If there is an allegation of child pornography, we will send that to -- in the United States to the national center for missing and exploited children. If they come back and say, yes, in fact, there is child pornography, we will take it down. And there are more cases now with illegal pharmaceuticals that we're starting to get more involved in and may do some takedowns in that circumstance.

And we've certainly had orders from agencies like the Food and Drug Administration and others to take down names that are used with the distribution of illegal pharmaceuticals.

Other than those extreme examples, you are absolutely right. Content issues -- if someone makes an allegation of infringement or slander, libel, you name it, whatever it is, we generally do not get into the content issues.

DAVID MAHER: Moving along on our agenda, I believe we've come to the CEO question. Unless you have something else, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: No. This is good. And the timing is also very good because we've got a hard stop at 2:00.

So, we -- let's just jump right in. As I think you've heard, we've run -- tried to run an open process of soliciting inputs on criteria as well as what the process should be. We had a substantial session yesterday -- this is just Tuesday, right?

[Laughter]

I'm in a time warp here. George Sadowsky is chairing the board's very vigorous and heavily involved subgroup of board members who are overseeing the process. We're quite determined that we'll run a vigorous process and we will also try to make it as visible and as transparent as possible. Even within the board, we want all the board members to be -- to have access to the major events and understand the process.

George, do you want to say anything further? Microphone is coming.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah, thank you, Steve. You've encapsulated it well. Just a couple of things. First of all, we would really like to hear from you about what you think we should be looking for in a new CEO. And we have opened a mailing list: Ceosearch2012@icann.org. If you send anything there, it will go to the entire search committee, which consists of eight of the board members -- eight of the board voting members. It won't go anywhere else.

So if you are in this room or in the meeting or any of the ISTAR organizations, if you have an opinion, you want it to be heard, that's where you should send it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, George. This is again Keith Drazek, VeriSign, alternate chair of the registries stakeholder group. I would just like to say I was in the meeting yesterday, the session, the public session. I thought it was an excellent session. I think a lot of the voices that we heard from the crowd, from the community, were very positive statements. And I would just -- I'd like to say that as the process continues, as you take steps forward and start to narrow the search, I think more of those types of sessions would be very welcome by the community. I thought it was a great session, and I look forward to having more of that type of engagement.

EN

RAY PLZAK: Ray Plzak for the record. I just want to enhance a little bit what George just said. He said we're looking for inputs. We are looking for inputs. We're not looking for questions. So if you have a question about something in regards to a CEO or something like that, we would prefer that you actually give us your opinion because that's what we're really seeking. We've had several instances so far since the initial session yesterday where people have not given us their opinion and their input. They've actually asked us questions.

And so very, naturally, the first question I'm going to ask you, for example, is: What do you think? So please remove that one step? Thank you.

DAVID MAHER: This is now the opportunity for input. Don't all speak at once.

Well, at the risk of standing out in front of the crowd here, I'll say that we hope that the next CEO is someone with business skills and manager whose main function is a stable and reliable kind of management which may not have been totally evident in the past.

I've lived through, I think, all the CEOs of ICANN from its very beginning. Had some very interesting experiences, both good and bad.

I remember at the inception of ICANN, there was a CEO who assumed that ICANN had global powers over everything including Country Code Top Level Domains. I think that set back the organization for some time.

Perhaps one corollary to this is it would be best to have someone who is thoroughly familiar with the history of ICANN. There are still some of us around. And someone who has had the experience of the uniqueness of ICANN, managing this -- I think you can honestly say -- quasi-governmental agency, quasi international governmental agency. None of these phrases are really accurate, but you get the idea. The governance of the technical administration of the Internet has to be done globally. And I hope you find someone who understands the seriousness of that and knows something of the history.

You asked for some ideas. I hope that's helpful.

Chuck.

STEVE CROCKER: Those are useful thoughts. Thank you.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I don't think too much can be said about having a leader who not only understands the bottom-up multistakeholder model but believes in it and will support it throughout the organization and throughout the community. That is such a critical issue for all of us as Internet governance is being considered in the environment that we're in today, the international, global discussions that are going on.

So, to me, one of the primary criteria needs to be not only verbal commitment to the multistakeholder bottom-up policy development process but someone who really believes in it and supports it.

DAVID MAHER: Go ahead, Ken.

KEN STUBBS: Yeah, thank you. I am very concerned about the timing of the transition. Correct me if I'm wrong, please, Steve. But my understanding is that at this point in time, Rod is scheduled to exit in the middle of 2012, which is going to be right in the middle of an incredibly arduous process. And I am concerned that it's not going to be fair to a new CEO to be injected at that point in time without the opportunity of working his way up the front end of that learning curve.

So I'm hoping that ICANN in its approach to hiring a new CEO can develop some sort of a transition period where possibly the new CEO would have the opportunity of becoming more educated and possibly

being able to get up to speed so that at the point in time that Rod exits, you don't have this vacuum there.

I also believe that it's extremely important to have a CEO who has a strong administrative set of skills. I do not think that outreach to the world is the principle value that a CEO will bring to ICANN in the next three to five years. I think organizational administrative skills are going to be what is needed the most. Thank you.

DAVID MAHER: Thanks, Ken.

Anyone?

CHERINE CHALABY: I just want to ask a question to the last speaker and say, Why does he believe that administrative skills would be more important than the outreach skills? Really interested in that as an input.

KEN STUBBS: I will be happy to answer that question. It would seem to me -- And I know it's very difficult. I know Rod has left the room. This is not a reflection on him but rather the process he got injected into when he first came aboard. That, first of all, I've seen a situation where the CEO of a company is not as involved on the day-to-day operation that, I believe, a CEO needs to be involved in. I don't think you can run a company with the CEO hundreds of miles away. You know, face to face is an extremely important value in administering organizations. And I think that's been lacking.

Also, I feel that the CEO's been given the responsibility of managing the outreach for the new gTLD process at a time when, in my own personal opinion, he was probably as valuable onsite available to deal with a lot of the transitional issues that ICANN is going through right now to get it up to the point where you can move forward.

I honestly believe that some of the staff, especially the senior administrative staff, has just been buried. And I really think they need to be able to get immediate decisions. And that is damn difficult when you got somebody 12-hour time zones away from you. Just my own personal perspective.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Ken.

Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, just wanted to pick up, I guess, on a couple of things you said there, Ken, that you're concerned about the timing and what I'll call staff stability or organizational stability, in that the potential for the CEO to leave, say, 1st of June-- or 1st of July next year which is in the middle of, I guess, the evaluation stage of the new gTLD program. I think one point to say is the board has definitely discussed with the CEO the concept of maintaining the continuity of critical staff.

There's also a degree of separation of roles that may not be as obvious in these sort of forums. But you obviously see Kurt Pritz, for example, is very visible in any of the sessions related to new gTLDs. And so that may create the impression that nobody else is heavily involved. But there is a separation that Kurt has been focusing more on the development of the policy, development of the application guidebook and so on. But we also have a chief operating officer in Akram, and the chief operating officer has been focusing on the task of how do you actually process all these applications, how do you manage the efficiency? How do you manage the records, et cetera? So we're not dependent on Rod, nor are we dependent on any one single person. So I think I just want to get that message across, that there is a team of people involved, and they do have different roles. So we're not expecting some abrupt change in the management team when the CEO transitions.

DAVID MAHER: Please.

JUDITH VAZQUEZ: My question to the community is: Who should be the face of ICANN in the international world?   Should it be the chairman of the board or should it be the CEO? I ask this because in Asia, and even in the United States, Fortune 500, the chairman of the board does not hide behind the CEO. And I think you're a pretty good looking face, Dr. Crocker. You just have to travel more.

                           [Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: Judith and I are still working out our moves here.

                           [Laughter]

DAVID MAHER: Oh, Chuck, go ahead.

CHUCK GOMES: Good question.

DAVID MAHER: I think this will be the last question.

CHUCK GOMES: Let me respond to that question very briefly. I think it might depend on the skill sets of the two positions that you have, and I don't know that it has to be one or the other, as long as the person doing each set of skills has the right skill sets for that.

DAVID MAHER: Thanks, Chuck.

I believe we've come to the end of the hour, and again, this is always one of the highlights of the ICANN meetings. We very much appreciate the board taking the time to meet with us, listen to us, tell us things, and generally help to make it all work smoothly.

So thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me add: Thanks on behalf of the board. We've been trying to organize these sessions so that we get right to the heart of key issues, have substantive discussion, and I think we've had that today. I think that's very helpful and I hope we continue that.

Thank you.

[End of audio]