
PRAGUE – GAC / BOARD OPEN SESSION

Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 16:45 to 18:15

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Hello, everyone. I think we can get started.

So welcome again to the Board.

Our usual time allocated for a session between the GAC and the Board, we have a number of items on our agenda for today.

We have identified the Registrar Accreditation Agreement negotiations, WHOIS, and compliance. And as well, the IOC/Red Cross, Red Crescent.

We have perhaps a question or two regarding the strategic plan and the international strategy for ICANN.

Also, we have ethics and conflict of interest identified, and, as well, the Board/GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group.

We know that we have dealt with some gTLD-related issues on Sunday, and we are not proposing a range of items here, but we do want to raise the issue of root zone scaling with you in today's session before we do conclude.

So, without any further delay, can I hand over to you, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Heather.

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.

It's a pleasure to be here, and certainly one of the events that we look forward to. They are always memorable.

So there's a full plate of pretty substantive and meaty issues here. We've got a little more than an hour and a half, from five minutes to 5:00 to 6:30 so we are in danger of not being able to cover them all if we spend too much time on any of them.

I think our posture is we are here to listen, we are here to serve and happy to engage in any and all of these at any depth you want. So let's just sort of manage our time and I will turn things back to Heather. Whatever order you want is fine with us.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you very much.

So the first issue we would like to raise, again, is related to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, WHOIS and compliance matters.

We have had some discussions and some exchanges with other parts of the community this week, so I think there are some questions floating around or observations that we may want to make.

I know that some attended the public session yesterday on related topics. So there are points that we may wish to make with you now in relation to that.

So I will look for a request for the floor. GAC members will raise issues based on their particular interest.

Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair. And I'd like to speak about the RAA negotiations in particular. And first of all, to welcome the progress which has been made in those negotiations and the priority that they have been accorded. It's certainly very welcome.

It appears that the draft which was released by ICANN for discussion or to inform discussion here in Prague has a number of changes over the early version of the RAA, including many which relate to the law enforcement amendments. So I do want to welcome that development.

The main thing I really wanted to focus on was really the -- I guess the process from here. I would be very interested in a sense of a project timeline, given the need to consult with a draft RAA once the negotiations have completed, and the importance of wrapping this work up, really, before the launch of new gTLDs.

I think certainly from my perspective, and I've heard it mentioned many other times, I think this is an important piece of work to have finalized before that time.

So I guess I have one specific question which is can we expect to draft a consultation by Toronto? At some stage I would be very interested to hear an answer to that.

And if the answer is yes, or even if it's no, it's sometime later than that, then while there are many issues that appear to have been addressed

and agreed between the negotiating parties, there also appear to be a number of outstanding questions.

So from the documentation which was the RAA negotiation updates which were released by ICANN, there are a number of high-level, largely judgment-related questions as I read them which have been posed for the community. Do the benefits of this outweigh the costs of that and so on.

There are also some broad questions posed to the community in the open sessions yesterday.

And many of the particular questions seem to me to relate to specific privacy and data protection legal issues. And I've heard a number of comments and seen a number of comments in writing which relate to the role of privacy commissioners, why is ICANN negotiating with law enforcement, and -- when no one is paying attention to privacy and other considerations and so on. So I really wanted to offer a reflection in my role as the GAC representative for Australia in that when I turn up to these meetings, I make sure on issues of significance that I consult with all relevant stakeholders back home.

So I don't come here as an advocate for law enforcement only. I come here with an Australian government position, and the Australian government has privacy laws. So you can be sure that from a GAC point of view or certainly from my point of view that in my positions, those two issues have been balanced.

So I'm a bit concerned, I guess, by some of the comments I hear from the community which seem to suggest that law enforcement is the only

consideration and no one is considering privacy. I can assure you that from a GAC point of view, that is not true.

To the extent that there are specific issues or questions that need to be addressed, no one is shying away from that. What I would encourage, as we are not party to these negotiations, if there are any specific questions which can best be answered by a government that they be put in writing and put to the GAC and we will get back to you as soon as possible.

I think the -- It would really help to focus discussions if those questions were clarified. Vague references to privacy or data protection and so on, I think the time is ripe to move past that to very specific questions that need to be answered, if there are those issues.

So that's my intervention, question about timing and projects and a commentary about the balancing of the various considerations.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, Australia.

Would you like to reply, Steve, or --

ROD BECKSTROM:

Would you prefer that we listen -- take all the questions? Or we can begin -- Those are three good questions we can certainly start with, if you like.

I am going to have Kurt Pritz speak since he is the lead on the negotiations in ICANN as senior vice president. Kurt, can you join us, please?

KURT PRITZ:

Yes. I'm back here.

Thank you.

So the questions as I captured them, one is timeline. There are a number of outstanding issues. The purpose of the consultation here was to get public input on two of the issues we think are the most important in the negotiation: WHOIS data verification and data retention by registrars, which is related to the privacy issue we discussed.

We think it was important to get that consultation here because the WHOIS validation steps requested by -- requested by law enforcement, if inserted into the RAA, would change substantially current practices for registering domain names and their costs, and we want to get input from the multi- -- you know, the multistakeholder model, the multiple stakeholders, on the balancing of that issue, WHOIS improvement versus the changes in the marketplace.

Once those issues are resolved, we think the rest of the issues in the RAA will shortly follow. It's a negotiation, and both sides are loathe to make concessions in some areas without resolution of this most important issue.

So given that, we think the timeline for closing, after we finish these two issues, is fairly short. We think there will be a proposed agreement posted for it before Toronto.

The issue, of course, is what if we don't get to agreement on WHOIS verification? What steps do we take next? And that will be interesting for the Board to consider. And we'd look forward -- we'd appreciate GAC input on those two specific issues and where we should lie.

Privacy issues do, to us, muddy up the discussion because it lends a degree of uncertainty as to what is the real effect of those laws in different jurisdictions. We met with law enforcement representatives today and discussed having a survey, taking a survey of different privacy laws, and we would certainly appreciate the input of the Australian government or others on what effect privacy laws would have on data retention.

And the issue there for registrars is mostly not over what data elements are retained, because there's agreement with law enforcement there, but how long they are retained for seems to be the discussion of where it might be affected by privacy laws.

But I appreciate your comment about coming to the meeting fully informed on both sides of the issue. And to the extent you or members of the Australian government can inform part of the discussion, it would be greatly appreciated.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you.

I see the EU Commission, and I see requests from Bertrand.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Can I go ahead, Madam Chair?

Can I go ahead?

HEATHER DRYDEN: EU Commission, yes.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Just to complement what Australia just said, to clarify the position of the European Commission on this matter, just like Australia and just like everybody else in the GAC, we are not part of the negotiation, which means, and this is something very important for the negotiating parties and for the whole ICANN community to understand, that unless we are asked a specific question, we are not going to get into the negotiation, tell people what they should or shouldn't write in that contract.

We do sense that there is an expectation that we would do that. The Commission will not provide an opinion on specific text unless we see that specific text and we are asked whether that specific -- we are asked for input, we are asked for an opinion.

Let me also point out again, for the benefit of everyone that neither the Commission nor, I believe, other GAC members, but I speak on behalf of the Commission here, we are not a court of justice. So do not come to us to ask for jurisprudence or interpretation on the law.

We can and we will, however, facilitate contacts with all the relevant authorities or subparts of national -- the European Union which you think you may need to talk to.

Concerning the specific point on privacy law, allow me to say I take exception with the notion that privacy law is muddying up the negotiation. Privacy law is an extremely important part of these negotiations, and just as Australia said, we do not -- we, as public authorities, we do not take sides. That is not our job.

Our job is when we are requested to ensure that we can provide the information that is needed. And on this note, I just want to make sure that we are -- that we have a common understanding with the ICANN staff, with the Board, with the registrar negotiating team.

I hear that GAC input would be appreciated. As I said, certainly on part of the Commission, I cannot speak on behalf of the whole GAC at this point in time, but certainly on the part of the Commission, this input will not arrive unless and until we see a text and we see specific questions.

So, please, please, and this is a plea to you because we have a common interest in this moving forward. I really do believe that everybody agrees that the law enforcement recommendation ensuring that the DNS system is not abused by criminals is in the common interest of everyone but please do come up to us, if you think you need them, do come to us with specific question and we will always do our best to answer them.

But do not expect unrequested input from us because we are not part of this negotiation and we have no intention, the Commission has no intention to become party to this negotiation.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, EU Commission.

Bertrand, please.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Bertrand De La Chapelle.

Two points.

As I mentioned during the interaction we had with the registrar constituency, if you look at the label of this document, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, you will immediately sense that there is a tension between the two words. An accreditation is a form of authorization; i.e., there is a sort of hierarchy between one actor and the other. But if you qualify it as an agreement, it implies a sort of level footing of the two -- of the two parties.

This is part of the tension that exists in the evolution of this document, because it is, in a certain way, rules embedded in a contract, and at the same time a form of contract that the parties have the right to negotiate.

So the first point is if the different actors understand that there is a tension in this very instrument and that one of the reasons that there is

sometimes difficulty to progress is because each side is seeing one of the two words. If there is understanding on that, there can be further progress.

The second point is related to the involvement of data protection authorities.

I think as has been said, we should make a distinction between two elements. When the GAC and individual GAC members make a contribution or an advice as the GAC has, it is, indeed, the responsibility of each state and government to balance the different positions between the different authorities, and there is no reason to doubt that each of you have.

However, once this stage has passed, as we are now witnessing, the interaction has involved concretely the law enforcement authorities, and although efforts have been made to also include the data protection authorities, it has been sometimes harder to do it.

So it is extremely important that in this current stage, without going back to the GAC, the discussions are informed by all the different actors: the data protection authorities and the law enforcement agencies. And in this respect, I would personally appreciate tremendously any help that GAC members, without providing advice or additional contribution in the substance, could give in helping outreach to data protection authorities and making sure that they have the capacity to participate as much as needed in this discussion.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Bertrand.

Are there additional -- Ah, I see United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. And I think we seem to be closely -- very, very close to an agreement here, which is always a good thing. But I think what we're trying to convey, and maybe we're not being as clear as we need to be, is a sense that we can probably facilitate better than anybody in the ICANN community exchanges between ICANN staff, the registrars, our government officials, including data protection experts (audio problem).

So we would be your easiest source. This is the message we are trying to get across. But just as an additional aside, and speaking on behalf of all of us because we have endorsed more than once the law enforcement recommendations, is sort of a sense that seems to be developing that our law enforcement colleagues routinely ignore privacy laws. And I can assure you that that is not the case.

So I think we want to put to bed -- there is a bit of a misapprehension that seems to be developing that we are going in one direction only without respecting the balancing act that occurs, in fact, every day of the week in every country.

So if you would please, again, as Australia has strongly suggested, whatever specific questions that remain could be put in writing and distributed to the GAC, and we will all do our best to facilitate further exchanges and responses to those questions.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: I think the message is pretty clear. On our side, I think that's conveyed back to staff to work on. So let me turn that over to you, and then I'm not sure that there's anything more to say at this moment other than thank you for all of that, and it is pretty well, forcefully and clearly stated.

Rod.

ROD BECKSTROM: Sure. Suzanne, thank you for that offer, and I think that we'd be interested in learning how you feel we could most effectively and efficiently do that. Would that be with some -- a few global conference calls that you could help line up different participants? Or a limited number of meetings in places? But very open to your suggestions, I think, on how to get your input into the process, which we can discuss later, as you wish.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Rod.

Okay. Can we move to the next agenda item, then?

So we have the IOC and Red Cross, Red Crescent. However, before we deal with this, I would like to add more of a bulletin about intergovernmental organizations and protections for them.

Just to note to the Board and to the community that's here that we did have a presentation earlier today from the IGOs that were signatories to

the letters that have been sent recently to ICANN about further protections. And this is a presentation that was well received and will be discussed further within the GAC. And so that's for your information that that has taken place.

So on the point about the IOC and Red Cross, Red Crescent, I believe the United States was going to raise a particular point for clarification.

United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm happy to do that.

I think this could be fairly short, but I'm hoping that we can get some guidance from you.

As you all recall, the Board very graciously accepted a part of the GAC's request back in 2001 for enhanced protections for the International Olympic Committee and the Red Cross and the Red Crescent names in June 2011, and you issued a resolution that indicated you would accept the request for enhanced protection at the top level, but that you did have an expectation that there was further work undertaken. And I think the phraseology was until the GNSO and the GAC develop policy advice based on the global public interest.

And subsequent to that resolution, the GNSO created a drafting team, and they produced a set of proposals that they shared with the GAC just prior to the Costa Rica meeting, and we discussed it with them during Costa Rica. We were very gratified that the proposals actually refined the original GAC request for protection at the top level. So we welcome

that as a further refinement, and that was quite a bit of hard work undertaken by this drafting team.

They did not reach agreement as a GNSO -- on that text as a GNSO product until subsequent to the Costa Rica meeting, but once they did reach agreement, the Council approved it and forwarded it to the Board.

It is our understanding, of course, there was a meeting in April, I believe, of this year and the Board rejected the GNSO Council recommendation.

So we in the GAC are still left with a sense of not knowing quite where we are and where we need to go next. So from our perspective, the current situation, with no clarity as to next steps, it sort of raises questions as to what part -- at what point did this exercise somehow cross a line that would cause the Board to reject it? And now, where do we go from here? Because from the GAC's perspective, our consensus position still stands. We are still seeking enhanced protections for the IOC and the Red Cross at the top and the second levels.

The drafting team apparently still exists, and they're willing, bless their hearts, to continue to work on this issue. But when we the GAC and the GNSO met, we both sort of agreed that it wasn't entirely clear to us where we stand and what the next steps sudden be.

So this raises also a timing issue, since again, timing is of the essence if we are going to reach agreement on enhanced protections at the second level.

So if I could just ask for some feedback as to, you know, how do you see this rolling out? How would you guide us or advise us as to the next steps we need to take? And we might like to follow up once we have that guidance.

It raises some questions not only about sort of the substance, which we feel pretty strongly about, but procedural question.

I guess from the GAC's perspective what the drafting team had very graciously undertaken to do was to refine our proposal which we had understood you to have accepted. So having accepted our proposal, I think we interpreted their work as implementation. And we're now sort of confused that it seems to have been interpreted on your end as policy.

So if you could clarify where the line is being drawn between implementation and policy, that would be extremely helpful for us as we undertake sort of -- we look at our options for the next step.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me ask Cherine to bring this back into view and put the Board's action in April in context here.

CHERINE CHALABY:

The Board had set the direction at the top level and said that this direction was done, per se, for the first round but asked for the direction from the GNSO for -- at the second level. I am not sure we have received this direction for the second level from the GNSO. So we

need to receive that, and I think that would be the best way to do it for the GNSO, to produce that direction to the Board for the second level.

I think putting this aside, you should know we are meeting with the Red Cross tomorrow. There's a subset of the Board together with our General Counsel meeting with the Red Cross tomorrow.

So we -- I don't want to say more than that, but this is where we are.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me make sure we're not talking past each other here.

The advice or direction that you provided was for those names at the top level.

I apologize for not being absolutely up-to-date on all of this, but my recollection is that our view was that the protections -- it's essentially how do you prevent others from grabbing those names and putting them into the top level. And I don't know whether I'm remembering or reconstructing, but there's a lot of protections built in so that if anybody were to try, there would be instantaneous ways to stop that.

So it -- I'm not sure there's more protection needed than already exists to accomplish exactly what you are asking for. And if there is a complaint that we didn't sort of cast in concrete an extra rule that accomplishes what we think is already accomplished, then sort of having a procedural discussion, not one of substance and not one for which there's any real issue on the table, it's my guess and I don't know whether we're having a serious issue.

Plus now, which is a bit later, we see the names that have been applied for, and so it feels like a moot issue, but not one at which we are really at loggerheads about.

So....

HEATHER DRYDEN: United States, you wanted to follow up?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes, I would like to, if I may. Not that I want to belabor any of these points but I do think it's important because, quite honestly, the rationale doesn't really shed a whole lot of light for us. It's very, very hard to understand exactly how or why the further refinements that the drafting team actually identified, and for which we were grateful, somehow were considered just to be either unacceptable.

And so is it a question because they went to the top level and you felt you had already taken care of that, and so you're simply waiting for additional input on the second level? If that's the case, we'll take that back and consider it. But I guess it raises a bit of an -- and we may not be able to resolve this and sort everything today, but it sort of raises a question, then, as to how we conduct some of our work. Because as you know, the GAC provided you with a request, advice of the GAC, consensus advice. You accepted it in part with a deferral of the second part.

So we saw the refinements by the drafting team as simply a way of embellishing and refining the implementation of what you had already agreed to. Extra protection at the top level.

So what I'm hearing is somehow you thought that was redundant or it was unnecessary. So that's useful to know, but if I may, that is not entirely clear to us from -- by the way, there is no staff briefing material yet posted for that particular board meeting, and I notice that the briefing material posted for the June 2011 meeting has several pages that are privileged and confidential. So it's not at all clear to us the basis upon which you made your decision since several pages are simply blank.

So that makes it awkward as well, which compels us to raise these questions here in the public exchanges.

But it is beginning to raise a question, I think, in my mind, if I may, that we may need to take up with the GAC as a whole and the GAC/Board Joint Working Group on the recommendation -- ATRT recommendations is how we do what we do. And whether sort of adopting or experimenting with some new methods is, in fact, even ever going to work or whether we will always be compelled to follow some elaborate policy development process that frankly does not belong to the GAC.

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: So I do think it raises that.

And finally, if I may, we do understand that the Red Cross has made overtures to the Board, we have been given copies of that material and we understand that the IOC has filed a request for reconsideration. So we are very interested in what you might do.

STEVE CROCKER:

As you said, there are several parts there. I want to clear away one specific piece. The June meeting had to do with the arrangements to bring the new CEO on board, and it wasn't appropriate to -- it's personnel related so it wasn't appropriate to post that until after it's available -- that information will all be available. So that's just not part of the -- I recognize the coincidence on timing, but that's just separate.

Let me turn things over to Cherine for sorting out the other elements of this.

CHERINE CHALABY:

I think Suzanne makes a good point, and I think we indeed to come back to you with answers, where we are in the process and all that, because I know that we -- the Board made a decision not to accept the -- we talk about the top level; right? I know we had a discussion at the BGC for a reconsideration request from the Red Cross, and I don't know if this has been posted or not so I can't deny that. And I know we have a meeting with the Red Cross tomorrow on the top level; okay?

So this is a stream going, and I don't want to disturb that stream.

On the second level, we're expecting a GNSO recommendation.

So if you want, we will check again on where we are on the process in more detail to what I just said and come back to you and let you know. Okay. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Cherine. Chris, you wanted to comment as well?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. This is just to help me because I know that we will be -- the Board will end up talking about this and I'd like to take the opportunity of being with you to ask you a couple of questions just for clarification.

I just want to get clear what it is that you are concerned about, Suzanne. There are two issues here; right? There's a second-level issue, which if I can just park that to one side for a minute, and there's a top-level issue.

On the top-level issue, what is it that you are expecting from us that you haven't got?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. If I may, I believe it's a better understanding of why the drafting team's enhanced or refined protections at the top level were rejected.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Because we don't really understand.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So you want to see a reasoning from us as to why that happened. Okay. I mean, I'm guessing we can do that. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be able to do that.

And on the second level, it's a concern -- your concern is that there should be enhanced protections for certain names; okay. And I confess that I'm not clear about where we are on that so I can't help, but I just -- what are you asking from us? What's the next step on that process?

Right. So Bruce says we have requested the GNSO to look at that and they haven't come back to us yet. That doesn't answer your question? Okay.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Well, it does in part, so thank you for that. But your original resolution also asked the GAC to come back to you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And you have?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Well, our original request was for protection at the second level. We explained our rationale.

We can provide the information to you again.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sure that's not necessary. I'm happy for you to do it, but I'm sure that's not necessary.

But my understanding is the current situation is that we are waiting to hear from the GNSO. Is it okay that we are wait -- I mean, is it acceptable to you that we should be waiting to hear from the GNSO?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Now, that's a very, very awkward question to ask, yes?

You have, in fact, issued a resolution asking for both. We did attempt to collaborate in a slightly different methodology using a drafting team.

If now there is a GNSO issues report that is pending that is largely focused on the intergovernmental organization question but it does raise questions in the text of that draft or -- or first issues report, there are references made to the IOC and the Red Cross.

So from the GAC's perspective -- and, again, this goes to our ATRT recommendations that pertain to the GAC -- we have proposed a certain approach for these two entities for clearly expressed reasons. And we believe we have provided a very clear basis on which the GAC consensus -- how we arrived at that. There's protection under international law as well as specific national statutes naming these entities.

So the GAC has already offered advice. What you are now appearing to say to us is that you cannot take action on that advice until you hear from the GNSO.

So now is probably not the time to get into any detail as to --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it's not.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: -- what that process is; however, I do think it's fair enough for the GAC to express a concern that if that process is to take the traditional two to three to however many years these things may take, then we think the whole request becomes moot. And that is what we would consider very troublesome.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I now understand. Thank you very much.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. Let's move to the next topic. So we have identified the ICANN strategic plan and international strategy for a discussion topic, and I'm looking to the UK to raise some points there. Thank you, UK.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Heather. Thanks very much, and thanks to the Board for providing the opportunity to just have a look at the strategic plan which was adopted in May, I think, as I recall. ICANN's international status and profile is obviously very important and we're all cognizant of that and we've heard some very important statements about that on the opening day of the ICANN meeting and very welcomed, too. And I think they recognize -- those statements recognize that the internationalization,

the global credibility of ICANN is increasingly under the harsh spotlight of other fora and particularly the upcoming ITU World Conference On International Telecommunications and the World Telecommunications Policy Forum next year and the preparatory processes for the review of the World Summit On Information Society outputs from 2005, the ten-year review of those. So the -- the international elements of the strategic plan have particular importance and they -- the plan was adopted before the outcome of the application round for new gTLDs and made clear to the Board's gTLD committees that were very alarmed really at the lack of stakeholder engagement from many developing countries in particular in Africa and Latin America, so this brings a particular resonance to the -- the undertakings in the strategic plan with regard to internationalization, and I'd be interested to hear in particular how you're now looking at what's in the strategic plan with regard to internationalizations and the undertakings in the plan to consult with the community and to develop principles of international operation, to look at the organizational structure of ICANN and so on, how you're looking at those elements of the plan in the light of recent developments and as you look ahead to a lot of debate at the highest level, right up to possibly the General Assembly and as I say beyond to ITU conferences and the WSIS review, how you're going to start really take forward those undertakings and then, as I say, I would have thought start to adjust them in the light of recent developments and what's coming up. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, UK. Who would like to respond to these questions?

ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you, UK, for sharing those observations. The strategic plan objective for 2012 internationalization was to conduct a survey and to gather data from the global community and to synthesize that and come up with priorities under the extremely broad topic of internationalization. That survey was completed, and I'm going the hand it over now to either Jamie Hedlund or Kurt Pritz that are involved in the process of that synthesis. And Jamie can also speak as a member of the vice-presidents of Global Partnerships. Within that group, incidentally, the vice president of Europe, Nigel Hickson has specific responsibility for the WCIT strategy and is very open to inputs from any of you on suggestions of how you might help us or advise us of information that we should be aware of. Jamie or Kurt?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah, sure. So as Rod stated, we did issue a survey. There was some good participation among the community. It is an input that will go into the development of a document that will be issued for comment from the community to help inform the consultation on some of the exact issues that you identified, Mark, and we hope to have that document out for comment at or before the Toronto meeting.

HEATHER DRYDEN: UK, did you want to follow up?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks so much, Jamie, for setting out how you see the work progressing. That's -- you know, obviously we will look to that report with keen interest and just urge that you allow us time ahead of the

Toronto meeting to digest that and consult back incaptals. But I -- I hope that there is ready recognition here that this is -- this is the critical part of the strategic plan. And I also actually want -- if I may while I'm at the mic -- want to touch on -- on compliance issues with regard to the WHOIS report. We didn't really touch on that on the earlier item and compliance is a -- is an important element of the strategic plan as well. I would like some reassurance that there is due recognition as set out in the WHOIS Final Report that this should be retained as a strategic priority or reestablished rather as a strategic priority and that compliance, one of the recommendations, I think recommendation 4 of the WHOIS report, is going to be looked at fully in the round with architectures for compliance examined across, you know, different types, different types of architectures, you know, in-house and external, independently-established compliance and enforcement. So I wonder if actually I could seek a comment on that. It does relate to strategic plans. I've squeezed it in on that, but I think we -- I would appreciate anyway, a comment on that. I know time is short and I've probably overdone my stay at the mic. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, UK. Did anyone want to reply at this point on that? Rod, please.

ROD BECKSTROM:

Very quick status update. On Saturday in the Board meeting we approved a resolution, simply acknowledging receipt of the completed WHOIS report and we will begin now to analyze the contents of that report before responding.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Kenya, please.

KENYA: Thank you, Heather, and thanks for that. It's good to know that there was a survey that has been, you know, sent out. I'll be curious, however, to know whether it took into consideration the very low participation of developing countries for -- from Africa and Latin America and also the current situation with new gTLDs and if it did not what are the plans to ensure that that is included. But I'll probably wait until you send the report and then we can perhaps provide comments on that once you've sent it. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Kenya. Chris, did you want to comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Very briefly. Just wanted everyone to remember that there are -- there are other aspects of internationalizing domain names apart from new gTLDs. We have IDN ccTLDs. There are more than 30 of them currently in the root and they -- they contribute significantly to the internationalization of ICANN. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Chris. Okay. So the next item we have is ethics and conflict of interest. So I invite comments from the floor on ethics and Conflicts of Interest. EU Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is unsurprising, I guess, but we would like to -- on the record to recognize the work that has been done on this topic, which is a complex topic. We know it very well. And recognize the progress that has been made. I have personally attended an open meeting, which I think took place yesterday, in which the results of the -- one of the reviews which have been commissioned by Akram had been discussed. Specifically on this meeting let me make a comment. It was -- the participation was very poor in quantity even though very high in quality and this continues to be quite surprising for us, that this topic of ethics and conflict of interest which are the foundation -- the good governance of an organization are the foundation of an organization, seem to receive so little interest from the ICANN community. I know that -- we know that now everybody seems to be focused, for a number of reasons, on the new gTLD program, but let me point out that any house without very solid foundation will fall down at the first blow or the first glitch, whatever you may want to call it.

Now, I have a few questions for the Board. I understand that the expert groups, specifically the group of international experts, was mandated to make analysis only on the Board behavior. And I would like to know if there is a reason why that group was not mandated to extend this analysis also to senior management of ICANN?

Secondly, I would like to know whether the Board has already identified priority items on which to focus their (indiscernible)work on the basis of the reports that you have received.

And thirdly, for the record, and for the benefit of everyone because I know that you have already replied during the session yesterday but as

it was poorly attended, I think it's useful to repeat it here for the record, I would like to know what is the timeline, expected timeline, for further action, noting -- and again for the record -- that we were expecting an update on the conflict of interest policy already at the Costa Rica meeting at March and then we were told there would be an update possibly at the meeting at Prague. So again, we would like to know to have some clarity on what is the expected timeline with milestones with some precise dates on this particular item. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Bruce, this is yours.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, let -- thank you for those remarks and let me first focus on the Board side of it and then I might ask the CEO Rod Beckstrom just to comment on work that's happening with respect to ethics and conflicts at the staff left.

In terms of the timeline, the report of the most recent expert group was published on -- early in June and that's in public comment until, I think -- let me get the dates right, until the 6th of July. That's the first phase of public comment and then there's a reply comment period from the 7th of July to the 28th of July.

The key recommendations of that review were essentially creating a document that summarized the -- our incorporation documents which basically say that we're a public benefit organization, summarized the bylaws including the mission and core values of ICANN and summarized our sort of key policies around conflicts and ethics. Really in a short

document that, you know, everyone can sort of keep in their back pocket and have available whenever they're thinking about ICANN decisions.

The second area was with respect to sanctions on Board members that may not be complying with our ethics and conflicts policies. Currently our sanction at the moment is the Board can vote a Board member off the Board, and those experts said that we should add an intermediate step which is that we would give a formal written reprimand which would obviously -- we would make public. And you would expect that the -- you know, the peer group pressure, the reputational damage of having a formal written reprimand from the Board to a Board Director would be significant enough that they wouldn't transgress again. And then obviously if it was sufficiently serious in what they had done, the Board would vote that Board Director off.

The third part is with respect to what happens when a Board Director leaves. And the principle that the expert group had was that a Board Director, when they leave the Board, should not take advantage of decisions in which they voted in their, you know, future actions after they leave the Board. There was no time limit put on that. In other words, that should be an ongoing commitment that you don't take direct advantage of a vote that you take while you're on the Board. Then the question is well how do you sanction that? You can't vote them off the Board if they're already off the Board, but certainly you would think that at the very least we can use the same principle that we have when they're on the Board as in a formal, you know, public reprimand from the Board and also there are laws with respect to the

incorporation of ICANN in California that apply to things that are directed down. So certainly we're bound by that legal framework.

In terms of the next steps, obviously when that public comment period is complete, we would expect to receive that public input, and assuming it's supportive, we would create the document that's been recommended and we would take steps to add the sanctions and other mechanisms in our policies.

In terms of what's been done recently, we have actually updated our conflicts and ethics policy since Costa Rica, based on the first two reports, so that was actually approved at a recent Board meeting. So we have in fact updated our conflicts and ethics policies, and then I would assume by Toronto, you know, we should be able to approve the -- you know, the next iteration. That would be my expectation. With respect to staff, if I could perhaps defer to Rod.

ROD BECKSTROM:

Sure. The members of the senior management team complete a statement of interest annually. Those are reviewed by the general counsel's office, and there are no conflicts on the senior management team from those reports.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Can you comment on any sanctions or what would -- what would the action be taken if a staff member transgressed those and what mechanisms are in place if a staff member leaves ICANN and takes some advantage of their employment at ICANN?

ROD BECKSTROM: Sure. Certainly termination is an option because our agreements with most employees and staff members are at will. But let me refer this question, if I may, to our -- it's a technical legal question. I'd like to refer it to our general counsel, John Jeffrey. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Can you hear me? Yes. So there are both policies that relate to senior management. We fill out the same statements of interest annually that the Board of Directors do, as do all of the parties involved in the organization that are at a significant policy or management level. So there's a level set by our tax code that applies conflicts and those are reported on our annual tax statements and reported in our annual report.

As it relates to sanctions for staff that would have a conflict, as Rod indicated, those are sanctions -- the sanctions available are up to and including termination. And we've had no instances of conflicts that have risen to a disciplinary level in recent time. So after they leave, there's no revolving door policy relating to staff. In fact, we've been looking at that and we've asked each of the three panels involved in the ethics review to consider that and specifically as it relates to employees of ICANN that are employed by the California entity ICANN, there are restrictions on what limitations we can place on employees of the organization.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Are there any other comments, EU Commission, please?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Madam Chair. Apologies for taking again the floor but I want to first of all thank the Board and staff of ICANN for providing this clarifications but I do need to ask for a couple more clarifications because if I understand correctly, the legal counsel of ICANN, Mr. Jeffrey, just said that you have asked the teams that have reviewed the conflict of interest policy on the revolving door -- on a possible revolving door policy for staff but yesterday the panel of international experts told us that the scope of their work was only on the Board. They were requested to examine only the activities of the Board. So I would like a clarification, because either I didn't understand correctly or there is a contradiction in here.

Concerning what the staff has told us, I thank for the additional clarification. But my question was slightly different. And my question was not what is currently happening at the senior management level but why did the board -- if this is the case, why did the board not request the international expert, the team of international experts to review the state of play of management policy? And if this means, according to the board, that the currently policy applying to senior management is fair, that's fine enough. There is no need for change for that. This was the question. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: I'm happy to respond to that as well. As you're aware, there were three levels of review. The first level of review was with out internal or our corporate council that serves ICANN, Jones Day. That level of review went to all existing documents in the organization, including a review of those that applied to staff, senior managers, and the board.

Also, the second review, which was conducted by the outside law firm that was unrelated to ICANN's day-to-day business reviewed ICANN's policies against similarly-situated organizations throughout the world and, in fact, looked at internal policies for employees as a specific focus.

The third review, the scope of it was specifically set at ICANN's global function and best practices. And I am aware of the question that you asked to the individual member that was there at the panel a few days ago.

And he responded that he did not look or they did not focus on senior managers. But we -- we're not aware of a limitation, other than a limitation they might have set themselves, on that specific review. And we will seek to clarify that point with them following up.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. So it sounds like their scope wasn't limited to that. But the response we received yesterday said they had not reviewed that. So we'll go back and ask them that question.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. The next topic we have identified is the board/GAC recommendation of the implementation working group. There are just a few key things we wanted to draw to the attention of the full board and others. So Egypt, if I could.

EGYPT: Thank you, chair.

So this is, basically, a quick brief on where we stand on the ATRT/GAC-related recommendations.

The GAC has worked intercessionally on a new format for the GAC communique with the objective of making GAC advice clearly identified from other text that is normally included in the GAC communique and also with the objective of having a format that would facilitate the job of the staff of extracting GAC advice from the communique and entering it into the GAC advice online register. The BGRI working group also agreed during its meeting on Sunday to have the GAC advice online register launched and in parallel work on ensuring the completeness, the accuracy, as well as the status of the past GAC advice that has already been entered to the GAC online register.

The work group also agreed on the process that will be followed or the cycle that is going to be followed in dealing with and interfacing through the online GAC register. Also, during our meeting on Sunday, we have looked into the differences between the GNSO and the ccNSO PDPs in terms of whether or not they are required to proactively seek GAC input on public policy issues as well as how this input is being handled within the PDP process.

We have already had members volunteering to continue this dialogue with the SOs and ACs and outreaching to them with the objective of finding the best way to include GAC input earlier than the PDP process.

Finally, the GAC very much welcomes the opportunity of having an additional meeting here in Prague with the board, specifically, on the topic of new gTLDs, which, again, goes along with the ATRT recommendations. So thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much, Egypt. So there's multiple aspects to what you asked about and what you've touched on. I'd like to reply to a portion of it. I'd like to call on Chris for a portion. And perhaps Jamie for other aspects.

One area you focused on was the GAC register. And you and I and Heather and others have had the pleasure of working closely together. And Jamie on the design and implementation of the GAC register.

For the benefit of everybody else, this is a mechanism to make sure that the advice provided by the GAC to the board -- and I think it works in the other direction as well -- is communicated with certainty so that it doesn't get lost anywhere, that it gets communicated clearly, so there's a clear understanding of what that advice is, and so that the advice is tracked and dealt with, carried all the way to conclusion. That is, whatever the response is, each piece of advice is treated separately and carried through in a workmanlike, way. Further, to make that work, we laid out a 4-phase process. The first phase is the communication handshake of having the advice, whether it's in the communicate or in other communications of whatever sort, broken down into the individual pieces of advice, each piece of advice entered into the register, and a verification step that -- so the process is that ICANN staff enters it in on behalf of the ICANN board. And then GAC looks at that register and says whether or not it's a fair representation, an accurate representation of what was intended. That's intended to be a very quick cycle as a sort of firm handshake. You can think of it as the kind of

practiced handover in a relay race where two runners have to make sure that they don't drop it in the process.

And so that's phase one, basically.

And then phase two is, again, a bounded relatively quick assessment of how much work it will take to deal with that piece of advice. Some small number of pieces of advice are probably easy enough to dispose of right there to implement or respond to. But the majority will take some amount of work. So that phase is to assess and set expectations about how long.

And then phase 3 is the substantive phase. And then phase 4 is a formal closeout and an agreement that what is claimed to be done is, in fact, done and that both sides are in agreement on that.

The -- my understanding of the state of play is that we actually are now in process and that that register is up and live and that there are elements -- pieces of advice in it.

What is not yet true is that all prior advice has been copied into that, and it's under control.

But my understanding is that we've agreed to treat this as a live operation. And the advice that's in there, move that forward and gradually pick up the older items. But everything that is current and everything in the future goes through that mechanism and that's up and running rather than trying to get it complete and sign-off that it's complete, because that will just take forever.

And that -- we shook hands and took a picture and -- got to get the picture out of my camera somewhere. But we'll have a minor ceremony on that. So I felt very good about that part.

Let me call on Chris for other elements. Or who are you -- excuse me. Okay.

Oh, bill. No, he's over there.

So, Bill, apologies for not mentioning you earlier. You played a central role in helping put all this together. And so pick it up.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thanks, Steve.

Well, I don't have a great deal to add to what Manal reported, other than to say that I think the working group is working quite well together.

One other area where we're beginning to pay attention now is how to inform GAC of the possibility of requiring advice on public policy issues that are coming up across the community. Because it's relatively clear in the bylaws that that's something the board is charged with doing. And I'm not quite sure where we've been doing that as diligently as we might have heretofore.

So that's another issue that we've begun looking at in addition to the ways that the ccNSO and the GNSO work.

I guess I could also mention that we took a preliminary look at the bylaw process that's invoked when GAC advice is not taken and the possibility

of a preconsultation. And we're hoping to work separately as the GAC and as the board members of the BGRI working group and come to some conclusion about whether those processes are, first off, adequately and, secondly, adequately documented so that, if we ever have to use them, it happens without hiccups.

But, in general, I think the group is working very well together. I think we have actually made fairly substantial progress so far in the first six months of the year, which is all that we've been working. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

Maybe that's -- is that a sufficient amount on that, or is there more pieces that we need to sort out there? Okay. So maybe that's good and we can move on to other topics.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay.

So the last main item is regarding new gTLDs. As I mentioned, we've had the meeting on Sunday. And there are consultations ongoing on those particular issues. But one that we wanted to raise today concerns root zone scaling. And I believe, Netherlands, did you want to raise this item with the board?

NETHERLANDS:

Well, just briefly. Thank you, Heather. I want to take not much time. We received the report and thanks very much for the effort and the very comprehensive explanatory report on how the system works now.

And there are a couple of mechanisms, networks, organizations working and monitoring the root zone system.

And I think one thing which still puzzles us -- we had the same discussion also in security and stability committee -- is, basically, two elements of -- which were also committed by ICANN. First of all, it's what we call the thing the early warning system; but I think we will now call it the feedback loop in order to maybe slow down the pace of introductions when there is an indication of harm to the root zone system.

And the second one is the, basically, the iteration of the first round. I think on the first thing it's very clear to read your report what's -- I think we are still grasping to understand is the -- I think you called it chain of command.

What happens, what kind of parameters, what metrics are used in order to, first of all, I think they should be defined. We've not seen definition of that. And then, if you have defined them, how is the chain of command back to ICANN or to, let's say, IANA to slow down the pace?

It's not that we want to know this in detail, but we want to have a certain comfort feeling that this will be taken up before we will have the first insertion in the root.

Because I think it will -- I understood from former exchanges that this is quite difficult. Because there are many organizations involved over different systems and given also some resilience, of course, to the root zone system. But, in the end, I think there should be some kind of

harmonized metrics used in order to get the information back to IANA or ICANN to slow down the process. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. The report that you now have is a substantial revisiting of the prior work that was done and a lot of energy has been put into that. Nonetheless, I think everyone involved is very sensitive to wanting to make sure that it meets the needs that you see. So this feedback that you've just given, actually, helps focus attention on what else is needed that isn't there.

And I recognize that much of what you've just said has been said before. But, nonetheless, it's very helpful to have this. And I -- what I'm saying here is not in any sense -- I'm listening to what I'm saying -- intended as a complaint. Because we know you just got this report, you know, a short time ago. And, if you want to expand or sharpen what you've just said, that would be perfectly in order.

So let me make sure that I've understood. I heard two things here, really. One is, with respect to the report that you have, the feedback loop and the organizational structure of that and the metrics and decision processes, to the extent that they can be defined, are not yet included in that. And that would be an important part to expand and deepen in that report.

And I think the only thing to say is, yes, we'll -- that is the next iteration to focus on.

The other thing that I heard was something about the evaluation at the end of the first round.

And I think we've said in the past, yes, we'll do that. But I don't know what more there is to say at this point because the first round isn't over yet. So we can't begin that. So maybe I could ask for what the -- what can be done now that would be helpful in or responsive to the requests that you're making.

NETHERLANDS:

I agree with you. Now is not the time to anticipate on this. The fact that this acknowledgment that it will be done I think is already enough.

Still, there is -- I think we have a different expectation than we have now about the amount of -- let's say, the scale of the new applications in the sense that, of course, we have this 1,000 a year restriction. But, again, I think 1400 is quite a lot for a one-time exercise. And it should be, I think, good not to wait for the complete iteration after the complete insertion of every -- let's say the change in the root. Because then it will begin with even the second round. So time I think is important. It should not be exactly after every insertion. But the start of this evaluation we should think about this when is the right timing. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Maybe an offline discussion to clarify that a little bit would be helpful. Not pushing back at all. But the insertion process is a continuous process. It's not a sort of all at once. And, now that we have some numbers in front of us, we're not talking about tens or hundreds of thousands, I think it's helpful to keep in mind that there are changes to the root zone that happen more or less every day at a very modest rate,

one or two or three and, you know, sort of lumpy and sometimes 10 occasionally.

And so we're talking about -- if we're talking about a thousand a year, that's a rate that is four or five a day, perhaps. So that's higher, but it's not -- you know, it's not sort of dramatically higher. That's not a reason to ignore it or have no concern. But I think we're talking about things that are, as I say, not explosive, not dramatic. And the essential function is that feedback loop and the knowledge that people are, in fact, watching and responding.

It is, in any case, a slow moving thing. It's not as if there is a sharp exponential rise in a matter of seconds or something. We're not talking about that kind of speed. It's -- the speed at which things are going here is closer to watching paint dry. But we'll watch it nonetheless.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So Norway, please.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

So just for clarification on that specific issue is what the Netherlands also said that it's just that we need just a confirmation and assurance that you will gather all these threads, all these sort of items that together should then comprise this feedback loop system.

So that is what -- and, of course, as it has been said, some of these variables are not defined yet, as such. But just an assurance that you will collect all these threads and then compile and establish this

feedback loop system with defined responsibilities who is doing what at what sort of thresholds of certain defined things. So I think that's what we are asking for. Thank you Norway.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Thomas? Ah, thank you.

THOMAS NARTEN: Yeah, thank you. This discussion has been helpful. It's reinforced some things that we've heard in the past. So I don't think this is really anything that's new here. I would just agree. I think there's more work to be done here. I think the appropriate thing to do is follow up and then iterate on that.

STEVE CROCKER: Suzanne, do you want to add something? Anything?

SUZANNE WOOLF: No, I don't think -- I don't think we need to add more. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. I'll just add very quickly that another element of all of this is that the -- this is a highly distributed system. It's not an ICANN-run sole system. And the root operators are by design an extremely effective independent set of operators. And there is an enormous strength in that independence. And so there's a -- you know sort of factual issue of how much structure to try to impose on a system that is deliberately designed to not have the kind of single point of failure modes that come

with having a highly organized structure. So there is a kind of a -- almost philosophical underpinning there that has to be taken into account that in -- a danger is that, in trying to get things organized in the way that the question could be interpreted, would be exactly inimical to providing the degree of protection that has been carefully built into the system. That's a quite sophisticated and subtle point that I know runs counter to the natural intuition of senior policy makers and legislators who have said, well, I want to know who is in charge. And I want to know who gives the orders and so forth.

But it is one of the genius elements of the design.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. I have Sweden and U.K.

SWEDEN:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And thank you so much, ICANN Board, for having another fruitful discussion. We met you in this New gTLD Committee group. It was also very good, and I appreciate all the discussion and the possibility for us having a good dialogue. That's very important.

I would just also say, echo my colleagues from Netherlands and from Norway, and thank you very much for the scalability, the root server report that we finally received the other day and now we have on our table. And one of the things that you say in this report, there will be publication of more comprehensive data for external reviews, which is planning, and I want to know when this is going to happen.

And I also want to know if this information will be, like, day-to-day based or a publication monthly or in what kind of way we will do that?

And as my colleagues also mentioned, we had a very interesting meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee earlier today, and one of the things that I picked up, which was maybe not very surprising perspective, but still, is that these new gTLDs, they might have different behavior, actually, which means that the whole environment of new gTLDs, all the changes and introductions and everything will look different when this is going to be introduced.

And of course we also understand that there obviously needs to be more work to be done. We heard ICANN Board also say that. That we need to have all these metrics and make sure they are also measured. And that's, actually, makes me come back to the question I had to the new gTLD commission, and I go also said that a couple meetings back, that we need to have those tools for being able to adjust the speed.

And one of the things that was obvious, also, after the meeting with that group is it's not about the hard number of batches that is the key issue here. It's the pace. The pace when you introduce new gTLD, and in parallel, having all the changes for the existing new gTLDs in the roots. All these things together must be able to well be measured, and these kind of things monitored, and also be able to adjust the pace. And that's another thing that I think it's very obvious from the meeting we had with the SSAC group.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: So next I have U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks, Heather.

I just wanted to come in and acknowledge the point that Steve has made, but also I think underline that within this distributed system and the feedback -- feedback from my BlackBerry, I think that was. Appropriate moment.

Within the sort of system and ensuring that the feedback loop works, you need consistent metrics. And as I understand it, we're not there yet in terms of ensuring that the metrics from the root server operators and other actors are not all harmonized. You may get -- If that's not sorted out, you'll end up with another glitch. Sorry, that was a cheap shot.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

Okay. Well, at this point I would like to conclude the agenda items we have identified, but on behalf of the GAC, I think we do need to acknowledge the departing CEO. You've had, I think, numerous

meetings with us like this. I don't know that you'll miss them necessarily, but we do need to recognize your hard work and your dedication over the years in your term as CEO. So we want to wish you all the best.

[Applause]

ROD BECKSTROM:

Thank you.

Thank you. And just very briefly, actually I will miss this. I think that the GAC is such an absolutely critical pillar for the multistakeholder model. Without your personal, deep engagement, the model would not work.

And I remember when I came to Sydney, my first meeting, and was just awe-struck by how many countries were represented at this table to advise the Board of Directors of ICANN. I couldn't believe it.

But today, that table is larger. And I know having worked in government myself how difficult your jobs are, what the broad spans of responsibility on policies across ICT and many other issues. And I can't thank you enough for all the time you put in and for the generosity of your support to me and the entire ICANN staff and organization through the work we've done around the world these past three years.

So it's been a great honor, a great pleasure. A special thanks to Esan (phonetic) who joined the going away party last night and had many kind remarks and to many of you who came and joined.

Thank you very, very much from the bottom of my heart.

Thank you.

[Applause]

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, Rod.

At this time, I can also more formally introduce the incoming CEO who I see further down the table, Fadi Chehade. So on behalf of the GAC, we look forward to working with you, and we will see you at the next meeting.

All right. Steve, did you want to say anything?

STEVE CROCKER:

No, I was just going to say when you said see him at the next meeting, I said we sure hope so. Yeah, he'll be there.

Good.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, Board. Thank you for meeting with us again today.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you.

[Applause]

[End of Transcript]