BUENOS AIRES – SO/AC Led High-Interest Topic
Monday, November 18, 2013 – 10:30 to 12:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

So once again, if you'd please take your seats, we'd like to get this very important meeting started and I'd like to introduce Director, Global Media, Brad White.

BRAD WHITE: Welcome, everyone. We think this is going to be a fairly unusual session. There's a lot of experimentation that's going on in this session. Most of you are familiar with the public forum, where we have a lot of interactivity, where it's the community's chance to address the board.

This is going to be a sort of laid-back public forum. We want this to be as interactive as possible. We want you guys to be able to engage these folks, the ACs and the SOs.

The very concept of this panel is to avoid stove piping. Each advisory committee, each supporting organization, meets with its community. This is a chance to bring everybody together to talk about a common issue.

They've decided that the issue that they want to pursue is Internet governance. Specifically, the title of this session,

"Evolution of Internet Governance, Montevideo Statement and ICANN'S Post-Bali, Pre-Brazil Activities, Methods and Objectives."

Clearly, they weren't going for a short word count.

But that's what this session is, and these folks will -- they've also agreed to give you very brief responses.

We don't want to be superficial here. We want to get into the meat of the issues, but we want to do so as conversationally as possible.

Again, no timers like in the public forum on either the questions or the responses. Very casual.

Over here at this table, Natalie, raise your hand. Our remote participation in this particular session is going to be by Twitter, and what is our hashtag, Natalie? It's 48SOAC. Natalie will get some tweets, she'll signal me, she'll read some of those tweets, and that's the way we're going to do remote participation.

Think Twitter when you're asking your question. We're not going to be counting your characters so you don't have to worry about that 140 number but think short. Again, interactivity is the name of the game here.

You'll notice that we have some colored pieces of paper that are being handed out. They exist on some chairs.

This was part of an experiment that was tried in '09 at the Sydney meeting where people could express, in a nonverbal sense, their reaction to what's going on.

If you approve of what's going on, raise the green paper.

If you disapprove, raise the red paper.

And if you want to speak -- we have some roving microphones -- raise the yellow paper.

And if you're colorblind, we really don't care what the hell you think.

The other thing, when the meeting is done, we want to collect these papers. We're trying to be ecological. So please give these back, or if you want to take the red ones and you go to the airport, you can guide in airplanes when they're coming into the gate.

So there is a use for these things.

With that, let me introduce the panel. And again, we have -- these are really the people that lead the community. This is the community, representatives of the community, right here.

We're going to start off on the far left over here -- and if I mangle some of your names, I apologize in advance. I've tried to talk with

each of you and get that right but I'm sure I'll mess up there a little bit.

On the far left, Carlton Samuels, ALAC, the Latin American/Caribbean islands.

Next to Carlton, Evan Leibovitch. Again, ALAC, North American regional.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond. How did I do, Olivier? Is that close? I worked on that one.

[Laughter]

European regional ALAC.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Close? Okay.

[Laughter]

I'm sorry. Tijani Ben Jemaa. Yeah?

[Laughter]

So I'm not doing really well right off the top, right?

Paul Wilson.

[Laughter and Applause]

Byron Holland, with the ccNSO.

Heather Dryden, who is the chair of the GAC. I was saying beforehand when we were meeting, you could usually tell Heather, not that she's often a target for criticisms but a lot of times you'll see a little red sniper's laser beam going across her chest.

[Laughter]

If we see that, I'll be jumping in front of Heather and trying to take the shot.

Keith Drazek with GNSO.

Marilyn Cade, GNSO.

Michele Neylon, GNSO.

Robin Gross, GNSO.

Patrik Faltstrom, SSAC.

Robert Guerra. He's forgiving. Look at the look on his face. "Yeah, that was good, Brad."

So let's jump right to it.

I want to throw a question at these folks.

Now, not everybody is going to address every issue. That said, when they do want to speak, they're going to kind of follow your

pattern. They're going to raise up the yellow piece of paper and we'll call on them or I'll point to them. You'll see their names appear. I realize with this many people on the stage, it's hard to remember who is who, so we'll have the names up here. They may mess up a couple of times and get the name wrong, but, you know, it's an experiment. We're playing it loose here.

So Internet governance has been obviously -- we just kicked off with the opening session. Internet governance was a central theme for Fadi when he was addressing the opening session.

What exactly do you guys think, or your communities think, is the primary role of ICANN, moving forward, in the Internet governance realm?

Anybody? Who wants to kick it off?

Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: So now that I have the microphone, can I keep it?

[Laughter]

Let me speak as a business community member. We did talk about this in the CSG, the commercial stakeholder group.

I think generally the business community believes that ICANN should be a participant in the broader Internet governance ecosystem work that goes on. It's going on in a large number of places. In many of those places, just historically, they may not include all stakeholders. That's true both in the meetings that go on that are purely the technical community as well as the meetings that go on that are purely government.

Multistakeholder participation from different groups is really in its early stages, let's say. Maybe in the terrible two's stage.

But I would say as business, we do think ICANN needs to be involved as a participant, in a collaborative way. But I'm going to say one other thing, because I might miss the opportunity later.

We think it is the community of stakeholders at ICANN that needs to be involved. Not led by the board. Not led by the CEO. Not led by the staff. But supported by all of those, so that the full engagement of the broadest set of stakeholders from ICANN works outside in other fora as well as working inside.

BRAD WHITE: Let me ask some of the ALAC folks. We've got some ALAC representatives here.

In your communities, your respective ALAC communities, do the communities view ICANN -- view a proper ICANN role as helping to drive this sort of move toward adoptance of a wider Internet governance sphere? Is there that sentiment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. My name is very easy to tell. It is Tijani. Okay?

So my name is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

How ICANN can play an important role in Internet governance. And it should.

Some people say that "We are about names and numbers, we don't have to go through this kind of discussion in the Internet fora about human rights, about diversity, et cetera."

This is wrong, because we are part. Internet governance is also about names and numbers.

When we implemented the IDNs, it is a way to promote the diversity, the linguistic diversity and the cultural diversity.

So that's the role of ICANN in Internet governance.

I think that ICANN used to participate in those fora before, but it was by the CEO and the board members and the chair of the board going there and making beautiful and nice speeches about

our best model, we are the best, we have the best model, et cetera, and we are organizing always a forum, ICANN forum, which is not well attended, and that's all.

I think it was the very wrong way to participate. We are -- what we have to sell, we have to sell the multistakeholder model. And this can be shown to the people only by the participation of the community in those fora, and the participation -- not participation in the ICANN forum, but participation in the substance and the -- to discuss the subjects of those fora.

We have to be present but present in another way. We have to be real participants, not represent -- going there to represent ICANN. We have to represent ICANN by our inputs in the substance.

And this begins to be done starting from Baku and I hope that it will continue in the future. We don't have only the Internet Governance Forum, we have also something very important, the WSIS forum, and we will have in Sharm El Sheikh WSIS plus 10. Those are key dates that we have to keep and that we have to prepare very well.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm Carlton Samuels. I believe that ICANN has a role to play in a wider sense. Let me tell you why.

If you think of the Internet as networks of networks and you think of the Internet as having interfaces between networks, those of us in that business understand that where interface management is concerned, there are protocols. There's a set of rules that we all agree to. And sometimes networks don't work very well. The protocols break down and you have to fix them.   And that includes engagement.

Think of that now in terms of people involved in the space. Issues converge, and sometimes when issues converge there is friction, and if we take the position that it's only my part that I'm supposed to respond to, we are going to get burned.

So engagement is required to make the Internet governance model work.

ICANN has to understand that for it to work seamlessly, it's not just about names and numbers management, names and numbers policy, it has also to do with interfaces with other parts of the network, and so engagement is required. And that's what I think we have to get to.

We have to get to the point where we understand that in the ecosystem, where there are many parts engaged towards each other, convergence happens, sometimes there's friction in the interface, and therefore it requires us to move in and fix it, which

is why I totally support this idea that ICANN take a role in making sure that the entire ecosystem performs. And we must go a little beyond where we are now, outside of our comfort space, to make that happen.

BRAD WHITE: Let's talk about timing for just one second, if we may.

I think it's fair to say that the Snowden/NSA revelations have kind of increased the push on Internet governance. I know as the guy at ICANN who receives journalists' questions, I'm getting a lot of journalists from around the world who are calling me up and saying -- asking about the whole issue of Internet governance.

Is it fair to say that the Snowden/NSA revelations has sort of brought this to the forefront? And if that's true, are we making a mistake by using this as an opportunity for engagement on this issue or is that simply not the case; that we were ready to go there anyway?

ROBERT GUERRA: So my name is Robert Guerra. I speak, I guess, in my capacity with the SSAC but also from the Citizen Lab that's done a lot of work actually on the very issue that you've talked about, which is surveillance and measuring the openness of the Internet.

I think for those that say that Snowden is the one factor have not been paying attention to what's been happening in the ecosystem governance for some time, have been trying to assert more control in many parts of the world.

And I think those who have been paying attention have been saying "Some structures need to change. We need to be aware of the facts and make sure that there's a balance."

So that's -- you know, so I think the way I see it now is there's a moment in time. Moments in time come for a variety of different reasons and there's an opportunity.

And it really depends on -- there are governments that are pushing to close the Internet, to restrict the Internet, in many parts of the world. The ISTAR organizations -- ICANN and others -- are saying that, "No, this is something that is being used by the world and we need to keep and evolve the multistakeholder model."

But in doing so, we also, I think -- so that's one thing. And so I think it's just what we do over the next six months to a year, recognizing that each actor will push in a particular direction, is important. I think something that's equally important is that not all the actors are the same, so governments will push with a

certain amount of resources, and private sector and NGOs as well, so we're not equal sectors.

And so one thing that ICANN can provide is a space where some of these issues -- like here -- can be discussed, where we're all equals and talking about it. So I think that's key.

Getting back to your question in terms of ICANN roles and linking it to the time is that ICANN, this year, is very helpful in making sure the IGF takes place, and so ICANN is one of the -- of several key coordinating bodies where uncertain issues get here that can set an example.

BRAD WHITE: In other words, ICANN is in a place where it can drive this, so it should? Is that an oversimplification?

ROBERT GUERRA: It shouldn't drive it by itself. There have been a lot of criticisms pushed at ICANN. This is an opportunity to basically reset, start anew, get some fresh perspectives from experts around the world, and hopefully, going forward, how it should be done learning from that I think -- you know, that if it wants to be a neutral steward or wants to work with others, it has to show that by building trust in the community.

And so I think it's -- it can help push the conversation, but it can't do so alone.

BRAD WHITE: I'm interested, just by show of papers: Is ICANN seizing the moment -- is that a good moment to move this dialogue forward, to push the whole issue of Internet governance, or should it stick closer to its remit as a coordinated technical body?

I'm just curious. Give me a sense of things.

Okay. That worked really well.

[Laughter]

Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah. I was just, you know, listening to the way people are talking about this and the questions that we're being asked to address. I mean, I think we have to be very careful about the choice of language. I get very, very nervous when I hear about, you know, "ICANN is going to do this," "ICANN is going to do that." That's expanding ICANN's remit in a very, very dangerous way.

I would see ICANN as being potentially a facilitator, a place where different interest groups can come together, but it shouldn't be driven by this fear, uncertainty, and --

BRAD WHITE: It should be a facilitator.

MICHELE NEYLON: A facilitator. But it's like you bring people together, you put them in a room, and you get out of the way. You let them talk, you let them engage.

Now, I mean, the thing about Snowden and all this, it's -- we all know a lot of this stuff has been going on for years, but the difference is -- and if you look around the room, you ask anybody here, I mean, how many of you have had conversations over the last six to nine months where members of your family or friends were totally technically inept? I mean, okay, I included in there a lot of my relatives.

[Laughter]

You know, and they're actually concerned about these things. There -- it's being raised up as something that they are worried about. And that means that, you know, we're having dialogues, we're having conversations with people about some of these

things that have been going on for years but people weren't really talking about openly.

I mean, from the more technical side, you're seeing people on the IETF working groups talking about, you know, privacy and DNS. Within the EWG, one of the things we've been looking at across all our work is bringing this -- the concept of privacy and putting it in there, because ICANN has done a really, really poor job.

Privacy is something, it's not an extra. It's a fundamental right for a lot of people. It doesn't mean you have a right to anonymity, but you have a right to certain degree of privacy. And, unfortunately, ICANN as an American organization has done a really bad job in that space. And it has coming back to bite ICANN on the ass.

I mean, for me, I'm a European. I mean I'm speaking here as me, not speaking as chair of the registrars.

I have just seen a lot of this stuff where it's, oh, we must do something because government has this big bad bogeyman who is going to come along and take it all away. I don't think that's true. It think it is an exaggeration. It is an excuse to spend lots of money, set up all these different panels and things. And they're going to cost more money and probably aren't going to do anything. I'm not saying that government isn't going to do but

that somewhere in the middle is the reality not this big, bad bogeyman and big government suddenly taking an interest in stuff they don't really understand.

BRAD WHITE: Heather, let me throw a question at you. And just the grin on her face was priceless. I hope you caught there.

Governments typically -- it has been my experience that governments are used to a very much top-down. Governments are used to basically having that regulatory function to control what's going on.

As the chair of the GAC, give me a sense of your stakeholder group. How -- how do they feel about this dialogue opening up right now about the future of governance? What's coming at you?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for the question. I knew it was going to land on me at some point.

But, first of all, as far as the GAC view on this, there isn't one. And there are reasons for that. We do have a wide range of views in the GAC among governments about what should happen and what they think about the ICANN approach in the (indiscernible)

more broadly. We tend to stay focused on what is for most of the time a clearly defined role. So it is to be provided by (indiscernible) the public policy issues arising from the coordination of the names and numbers for the Internet. What is less clear, I think, is what it really means for governments to participate first in this model, in the ICANN model.

And this is continually being tested and evolving and so on. So it's very difficult certainly from a GAC point of view to give you a direct answer to that question.

However, there's a lot of interest, and I think governments will want to know more and more about how ICANN sees its role and what's planned by the leadership of ICANN and understanding 1net and these concepts in order to be able to influence those. And it's really not that -- I think GAC members and governments will be interested in.

At the same time, ICANN has a really important function to play. And in my view, it really is important to see to running ICANN and running ICANN well, first and foremost. And that's probably the best message that we can communicate elsewhere.

And at the same time, I do believe governments have a responsibility to really understand this model and to help explain it to others because it is different.

And I think in some cases, some governments have wanted to treat the GAC as though it's just the same as other intergovernmental settings where they go. And it just can't work that way. So...

BRAD WHITE: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So, effectively, I wanted to answer the question that you asked earlier with regards to whether ICANN should be basically dealing with these issues. And the view in our community, having spoken to quite a few of our members and tapped what their feeling was, was, Hell yes, this is something which ICANN should be dealing with.

Now, should it lead it? I don't think so. And I don't think that anyone is actually suggesting that ICANN should lead it. Should it contribute? Should it participate? Yes. Are these orphan issues? I think that is a silly term to make use of. They are definitely not orphan issues. Many other organizations have actually been dealing with this thing, have been in the trenches for many, many years.

So ICANN being a newcomer in this is welcomed in our community because many of our members have actually been in the trenches and have already been fighting in order to promote the multistakeholder model.

The Snowden revelations, well, you know, was it new really for everyone? Ultimately, I think it was sort of a known secret from absolutely everybody. And it is kind of a case of "Oh, yeah, now we can make use of it for political reasons."

BRAD WHITE: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I wanted to get back to your question about the timing. And the issue of Snowden, I think, was simply something that brought it into the eyes of a lot of people in the general public. It was very high profile.

But within the ICANN bubble, we've known about this kind of thing brewing for a long time. Okay. There was the IANA contract renewal. Ah, we dodged another bullet.

There was the Rockefeller hearings.   Ah, we dodged another bullet.

There was the GAC scorecard. Ah, we bruise off that. We dodged another bullet. And we keep going from dodging bullet to dodging bullet to dodging bullet.

To me, this is just one more point on the continuum. Okay, we can't dodge it anymore; we have got to confront it. I'm happy to see this happening where Fadi is taking this head on, where the community is taking this head on. But the signs have been there for a long time. It is just a matter of, Okay, we can't deflect it anymore. Now we have to deal with it.

BRAD WHITE: Okay. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Easy name from APNIC. We were one of the organizations that was involved with this meeting in Montevideo that produced the statement. That meeting was actually a fairly regular one. It happened a few times over a few years. The difference with that meeting was the fact that we did for the first time see the need for a statement.

And that statement, in my mind, was triggered by a few things but in part it was triggered by the Snowden situation.

And I think maybe the question that was asked was whether the results we saw out of WCIT last year would have been a different result had Snowden preceded that. And that was an interesting question, and one that led us to say, Well, we kind of do need to say something here. It's important. It is an important time, even if I think everyone knows what was revealed is not necessarily new news.

But we thought it was necessary to say that what had happened was eroding trust in the Internet, something that we are all concerned to maintain, trust in service providers, in standards, in technologies, in governments, one government in particular possibly.

And it also -- the response to that eroded trust could be a kind of fragmentation which is something that we also work very hard to avoid, both at the technical kind of infrastructural level which can be threatened by fears of -- well, by interventions at the technical level and also at the policy level where sort of fragmentation policies around the globe should be threatened (indiscernible), the integrity of the net as well. That reference to trust and fragmentation I think were very important.

The role of ICANN, again, I think, is -- I mean, ICANN's got a very technical and specific mission. And it was really good, I think, to hear Fadi talk this morning about this issue of mission creep which

is a bit of the elephant in the room. It was good for him to bring it out because I think ICANN has got challenges as we all do. And it doesn't represent mission creep for any of us to get our head out of our own work and look around at the environment we're working in and what we actually need to do to make sure that the environment is safe for us to continue doing our work. So I don't buy for a minute that there's mission creep going on at ICANN through things like the 1net initiative and the other work that's going on at the moment. I think ICANN is a really important catalyst, and I think Fadi and ICANN's behavior these days is giving a lot of confidence that that is what ICANN sees itself as -- it is the role that ICANN sees itself playing, one as a catalyst. It is working closely with other organizations as peers, which is in some ways a new thing for ICANN and it's a really refreshing change at ICANN these days, to have that sense of real peer relationships.

So on to 1net, I hope we're going to be -- I'm talking about that here because I think that 1net is kind of the latest focus for work that ICANN is doing as a member of a community. And I think it's a really important thing, a small and early step, right now, but it is a very important thing as an alliance or a dialogue to foster the multistakeholder model.

And I think that's something that's much bigger than any one of our organizations. And I really hope we'll talk more about that today. Thanks.

BRAD WHITE: Great. Byron, I think you wanted to say something.

Natalie, we've got a tweet. Let's take a tweet first.

NATALIE: Okay. We have a tweet from @McTim. He wants to ask: Should ICANN be going forward with this?

BRAD WHITE: I'm sorry. I didn't hear it. Should ICANN be going forward with this? I'm assuming they are talking about the facilitation role and the whole Internet governance debate, but that's an interpretation.

>> Yes -- Sorry.

MARILYN CADE: I just quickly want to say two things. I opened this by saying ICANN should participate but not lead. Someone else used the word "facilitate." I think there is a big difference between "participate" and "facilitate." So I just want to point out speaking

again from the business community that I was saying "participate" and that it is the community that should participate.

So my answer to McTim's tweet would -- if I were designing that phrasing, then I would say, yes, ICANN should be participating. It should be contributing. The full community should be participating.

I will say one other thing quickly. ICANN is an operational, bottom-up organization. And Internet governance is not our full-time job. In fact, doing our own job with excellence is our full-time job. And we also need to participate in Internet governance. So my answer to the tweet would be modified in that way.

BRAD WHITE: And, Byron, forgive me. I forgot about you waiting patiently.

BYRON HOLLAND: No, I just want to try to maybe weave a thread through the two questions, one about timing and then the prior one about strategy.

I think Snowden is a catalyst and has been a helpful catalyst in spurring the debate. But really the timing issue to me is more about other events that play out throughout the course of this year, which the Snowden event has really highlighted and

surfaced, and that's a WTDC in the spring and then the plenipot in the fall.

Those are very hard milestones which have potential to have serious impact on the Internet governance space. And I think it is important that when we talk about timing, we talk about Snowden, that we also think about those key milestones and what we have to get done in order to be active and meaningful participants in those environments.

And then back to strategy, if you look at a how an organization is run -- And this is not about Fadi. And I think too many people have talked too much about Fadi. I think we just have to talk about ICANN and the CEO and the leadership there.

If you're in an organization that's facing dramatic environmental change around you, it behooves you to act, particularly when nobody else really seems to be acting. And I say that recognizing that the ISTAR community actually has been one of the key catalytic commentators here, so ICANN and that community.

But part of the issue is in the multistakeholder environment with many different actors, at some point somebody has to step up and foster and catalyze the debate. And I think as a leader, Fadi has done what we would expect leaders to do: Step into the void,

act as a catalyst, survey the environment around him and act. That's not unreasonable.

What he has to do, and what I heard this morning -- and I'm sure the ICANN board, et cetera, have been hearing is, "Hey, you are a bit too far out in front. Get the community in behind you." And my sense is that is what is happening. And he has been listening, I believe.

BRAD WHITE: So what I'm hearing is you're basically saying ICANN is ideally situated to facilitate this and now is the time?

BYRON HOLLAND: That's right. They're one of the actors in the space. Clearly, they're an important and a main actor. And it's not unreasonable that at a point in time they take a leadership role recognizing that then the rest of the community has to fill in and pull its weight in these discussions.

BRAD WHITE: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Brad. Keith Drazek, GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group but speaking in my own capacity. The registries group has not had a chance to really discuss these issues in any level of detail and certainly have not reached any sort of a position, so just to make that clear.

Just a couple of the questions that have been asked, I'd like to respond to, first, is ICANN -- should ICANN be involved in this discussion, in this debate, and moving things forward? I think the answer is absolutely yes.

The ICANN community and ICANN -- all of us here, what we do on a daily basis is one of the best examples of the bottoms-up multistakeholder model in action. And to the extent that we can lead by example and committing to what we do every day, and being committed to the bottoms-up multistakeholder process, I think that is one of the most important things we can do as we engage in other areas on the international stage with other organizations and governments.

I feel like we, the community, the ICANN community, have been led to this point by the board and by the CEO. And we can debate whether that was appropriate or not appropriate. But that's in the past.

I think the key right now is that the ICANN community must step up and contribute and engage and take back that leadership opportunity and that leadership responsibility. Thanks.

BRAD WHITE: Patrik?

We'll take Patrik's question and then we'll take yours -- or answer. Excuse me.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

I think what has happened the last 30 years is that we moved from a situation where all communication in the world has been run and controlled by well-defined bodies that took care of the problem for us.

Today, all of us are bringing a piece in the puzzle to the table regardless of whether you are owning a fiber, whether you write software, or whether you create content, or whether you run a service. And we are collecting all of those pieces of the puzzles together, and together we are, because of that, responsible for the piece that we are bringing to the table.

To get that puzzle to actually work together, we need to communicate with each other. And to be able to do that, we do

that by participating in various fora which we call multistakeholder processes or multistakeholder forums like ICANN but the others as well. And that's one of the main reasons for me why it's so important that not only these organizations, like ICANN being one of them, communicate with each other but that's also why the process within the organizations must ensure that the ultimate goal is for each one of us being responsible for the small piece that we're bringing to the table do work together.

KHALED FATTAL: Can you hear me? Yes. Khaled Fattal. I'm group chairman, the Multilingual Internet Group.

I'm actually very pleased to see this debate taking place. If you all remember, I sort of kicked off this need for a public debate on the Snowden effect and how this is a cancer scare to the ICANN model, to the multistakeholder model. And I actually virtually -- I mean, everybody's making the right comment within what they think is necessary or should not be dwelled on within ICANN.

But here are some angles I think that need to go into the ethos of the debate I haven't heard taking place and perhaps I can help redirect. The challenge of the Snowden revelations to ICANN and the multistakeholder model is in the trust in the system and the

perception around the world of what ICANN and multistakeholders stand for. This is the key.

Now, something else that's at the heart of it is -- and I believe to a logic, perhaps ICANN is very limited in what it can do but ICANN has its -- is authority in what it does in its remit stemming from the U.S. government. And the NSA is a part of the U.S. government. So the perception that we can actually deal with it, whether it's led by ICANN or led by the community, this is detail. Whether it is -- we'll be able to actually deal with the issues of the surveillance and serve the global public interest, that's another issue. But at the heart of it, the NSA was caught with their hands in the cookie jar. It is a reflection of a government, my government, the U.S. government. It actually has a trademark on freedom, has a trademark of freedom online.

Democracy, we are all students of recent history of how this has been trampled upon. So what ICANN needs to do -- and this definitely needs the involvement with the community, ICANN and its community need to step up and say, We want to adhere to the ethos of multistakeholderism in its purest sense and deliver on that. And if that actually causes change that is good for serving global public interest, then we've done our part.

BRAD WHITE: So what I'm hearing, this is an opportunity for ICANN to flaunt the multistakeholder model. We can put it out. Let's not talk about community. We can put it out to the broader world, the world that may not know about our model and the success of our model and what it's brought in the past 15 years.

KHALED FATTAL: What you're saying is correct, provided it is deployed correctly.

As it stands now, it has been dealt a cancer scare when it comes to credibility, when it comes to transparency.

If the perception around the world is that multistakeholderism is a subset of democracy and freedom online that the U.S. government pushes on, complicit with big U.S. business, to spy on the world, then you have a problem, and ICANN has a problem.

Until this is fixed, we will always be suffering from what I would call the cancer scare.

So it is an opportunity, but it's how to leverage that opportunity.

BRAD WHITE: Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Some of you have seen the scary Marilyn Cade travel schedule, which started long before Snowden and PRISM.

I think actually some of my fellow panelists have made reference to this.

We began the awareness about the challenges to the multistakeholder model in a very different way, I think. And that is the rapid growth of the uses of the Internet and the capabilities of the Internet. And I used to say if the Internet is so important, why isn't the U.N. in charge?

And I think, actually, the challenges to the multistakeholder model are the rapid growth of users, the rapid change in the uses, and the fact that it's very hard to keep up with the -- the ability to answer the questions that governments rightfully have about how are my citizens being protected from fraud or risk or scams, child online, et cetera.

Those debates have been going on very actively over the past several years, and from now to 2015, not from now until the ITU plenipot, but from now to 2015 there are a range of meetings where the role of governments and the role of stakeholders are being debated.

The surveillance topic is -- it's on the table but it is not the only topic on the table. And the multistakeholder work that I think we

need to focus on is about answering the rest of those tough questions, and answering the legitimate questions governments have.

Here's one: Where do I go to get help in how to build a CCERT? Where do I go to get help on how to deal with spam? Those aren't orphan issues, but we probably have to be realistic that work has to go on someplace. I don't think it belongs here, but we do need to figure out part of the questions we need to work on. But I don't think surveillance is the cancer scare. I think that there are lots of other issues that are the cancer scare.

BRAD WHITE: Michele, Can you pass that to Robin?

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you. Yes, I just wanted to say it is true that surveillance has been one of the reasons why this has been put into the forefront recently, but I also think this is a wake-up call for all of us that people expect to have human rights on the Internet and people expect that the kinds of rights they have in the traditional space will also apply on the Internet.

And so this is our chance as a community to really try to build that, to put that into the system. And if we can bring in -- if we

can recognize that many of the people in this room have been doing multistakeholderism for 15 years, there's enormous experience on what's worked and what hasn't worked. And we can learn from that. And we really should take that into this meeting and use this as an opportunity to improve our own multistakeholder model, at the same time trying not to engage in mission creep because I do have concerns about that as well. But I think we need to go back to more democratic principles, reminding others that we have to be accountable and transparent in whatever model that we're using.

And so there are things that ICANN has done well, and there are things that ICANN can improve upon. And this is a chance to do that. And the people in this room and our stakeholders, our communities back home, really should be the ones now who are engaged in this. It really shouldn't come from the staff, but it needs to come from the actual community members who have been engaging in these processes for so many years, because we actually do have a lot that we can bring to the table and try to improve the situation with respect to human rights and privacy and freedom of expression.

And so I hope that this is really an opportunity to build those kinds of concerns into our own model here as well as whatever comes out of Brazil.

BRAD WHITE: Great. Thank you.

So let's take a comment from Robert from the SSAC, and then I think some questions back here. Let's hear Robert and then we'll take some questions in the back here.

ROBERT GUERRA: Let me say two things. Let me call this a watershed moment and other than the revelations and all the things that happened in the last few months. There's also an important demographic shift that's happened with most of the developed countries connected, most of the growth on the Internet, the next 2, 3 billion will come from countries and parts of the world that have a very different set of values. Governance is very different and a lot of them are fragile states.

So now is our moment to actually set what's important for us going forward, because if we don't do that, we'll no longer have influence.

BRAD WHITE: And this is the time.

ROBERT GUERRA: This is the time, but it's not something that's happened in the last six months. It's been happening over the last couple of years.

Some have been talking about it. People haven't been paying attention. So we're all -- The alarm's gone off. We have a sense. I wouldn't say it's a cancer, because cancer -- but I think now is our moment to act through our actions of how we -- what we do and in what fashion, in a democratic fashion.

BRAD WHITE: So the dialogue is not new but the spotlight is on the issue now.

ROBERT GUERRA: The spotlight is new, and, maybe a little bit of promo, we at the Citizen Lab, again, have been working on this a lot, and we have a video at our cyberdialogue.ca that actually talks about this a bit more.

I think in terms of something that -- what ICANN should and shouldn't do, which I think is equally important, because we're putting a lot of different things, is ICANN has a very specific remit on what it should do. And people want to talk about other aspects of it, what this has also done is it's catalyzed a variety of different spaces.

And if people want to talk about other aspects of it, what this has also done is it's catalyzed a variety of different spaces, ICANN being one, us in Toronto at the cyber dialogue being others and

many other organizations to talk about the different issues. And I think what ICANN should do in the other organizations is coordinate so there's a thread among all the different things. And so that's maybe something ICANN and others can do. And we need to make sure that that conversation takes place. For ICANN to do it all, it's not too much but, you know, there are other initiatives that also have taken place so it should not be alone.

BRAD WHITE: Great. And we have a question back here from somebody who has been waiting.

NIGEL HICKSON: Is it me? All right.

BRAD WHITE: Oh, it's Nigel. Never mind.

No.

[Laughter]

Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Nigel Hickson, ICANN.

I just wonder if we've asked the right question. I'm pretty simple because I used to work for the U.K. government, so I think in simplistic terms. And it seems to me that the panel have done well in identifying the problem. We know what the problem is. We know that the views of some governments could lead to the end of the multistakeholder approach, to a multilateral approach. That's the problem.

There's a sequence of events leading up to a decision on that, as Marilyn has eloquently outlined. And what do we want to do about the problem?

And it seems to me that the question of what we want to do about the problem is not for ICANN. It's not for ISOC. It's not for the RIRs. It's not for one individual. It's for the community as a whole. It's for society.

I recall in the U.K. when the government introduced the poll tax, and I'm old enough to remember these things. This is a sort of tax on citizens which many of us thought it was undemocratic and unjust. First of all, politicians opposed it, then the media opposed it. The government took no notice at all. Hah! It's just people talking. You know, Margaret Thatcher at the time said, you know, this is just, I'm doing it.

So we had to go on the streets. We had to protest. We had to put out our placards. You can tell it did my career a lot of good.

And, therefore, we took the argument to the streets.

And it seems to me we're in this same situation.

So the question of what we do is to all of us. The question is, to the ICANN community, it's beyond the ICANN community, and as I think many of you said, it's a question that we all have to take up our role in.

So it's not whether ICANN should appear in an individual meeting. It's not whether we should do something specific. It's the general approach we all have to take.

BRAD WHITE: And we have a question or comment here.

NARESH AJWANI: Naresh Ajwani, vice-chairman address council, president of CCAOI, civil society, and managing director of VNL manufacturers of GSM equipment.

I'm speaking my mind.

Biting bullet and trivializing the Snowden effect is a lip service to multistakeholderism. I agree with Kate. PRISM and other issues are just one of the many but very important issues.

On one hand, we have ICANN with the perception of business domination despite other stakeholders' engagement and on the other, a model is being proposed with United Nations led body limited to government as the only stakeholder. I think what we need is a middle path.

Here, we are touching the issues but not knocking at them. We are referring to cancer but we are not talking about at which stage this cancer is. We are talking about the fear of people coming to streets but we are not realizing as to who are those people who would come to the streets. I think the opportunity is also being used for flexing muscles by other bodies related to ICANN. Therefore, it's time we need to find a middle path or a body, which may not be ICANN and also, not the United Nations. I think that's where this multistakeholderism would emerge from. In a true manner, the emerging economies who are now contributing to Internet have taken the suffering of doings of the emerged economies for long. They should be given the opportunity out here, not within this limited membership but expanding to other stakeholders who are not even known to this body.

I think it's high time we stop dribbling. We should knock very hard at this stage on the doors since if this situation is not handled boldly this time, it may sweep Internet away.

Thank you.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you very much.

Erika has got a question here, if we can get her a mic. Then we'll -- just one sec. Let's just hear Erika. She's been waiting a while, and then I'll take you two.

ERIKA MANN: It is actually more a comment but maybe a question as well. So what I think is important, because I hear this quite frequently, that because of the present situation we tend to criticize our connectedness to the U.S. government. And I think we should see it in a different way. It's part of our history. It's part of the way we operate, to some degree. Now, we may have a different future ahead of us, but I think it's important to keep a common spirit about it, about our history, as well as the future and work on the future together. Because otherwise I think you get some bitterness. And I don't think this is helping neither ICANN nor is it helping develop the multistakeholder model nor is this helping

the U.N. It's not helping Internet governance. It's helping nobody.

It's a common path we are searching for and we want to find, and that's what we should work on.

So I'm not sure. And I like very much many comments here, but I think Marilyn made a valid point that we have to look into 2015.

BRAD WHITE: So it's that search for commonality.

ERIKA MANN: It's the search for commonality we should have in mind and be all together. Not just ICANN, the whole Internet as a whole, the ecosystem.

BRAD WHITE: Great. Thank you.

And our two ALAC represents have something.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Brad. My name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I am from the Asia-Pacific region and I like some of the questions and comments that have come from the floor and also from the panel.

The Snowden revelations is considered as a revelation for some but not for others. And I just want to say the size of the community that did not know about the revelations is much larger than the ones who did know. And that's what shaping public perception and pressure for action. And I think that Fadi did a great thing in getting this Brazil meeting off the ground because that is a focusing event that is absolutely necessary for us on moving forward and finding this middle path that the gentleman over there had just mentioned.

And the thing is that we're not starting from scratch. There are great models of multistakeholderism outside of the Internet ecosystem itself. And we need to start looking at those and to tease out what is it that makes them good, applicable, and try to adopt some of that.

Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. So everything is about trust. Everything is about confidence. We have to build trust and confidence.

(indiscernible). We do have to do this effort. And we cannot build trust without participation, without contribution, and the Internet governance ecosystem, especially the international

events. So participation, contribution, this is the way how we can build interest.

BRAD WHITE: Paul, I wanted to direct a question at you primarily because your stakeholder group, I think, is largely defined by a very technical bunch of people. It's very technical. And, yet, you were talking about the Montevideo statement. And you were talking about trust in the Internet. And, I guess, if there was a group that I could think of that would say, "Whoa, slow down, wait a second, ICANN is a technical coordination body. Do we want to go here" -- and what you said about losing trust in the Internet, kind of resonated with me. Can you speak to that a little bit more?

PAUL WILSON: I think the question of trust is something that we had trouble agreeing on in terms of the industry, the standards process, which has been called into question to some extent. The implementation of standards, the integrity of ISPs and so on, all of that was called into question by the details of what Snowden was apparently reporting.

I think we had no difficulty and if you are asking whether we thought it was a set of -- a case of mission creep, I don't think it came up at all that we shouldn't be all of us concerned. If trust in

the products of the work that we collectively produce is eroded over time, it wasn't something I think that raised any questions. So I may have missed something in what you're asking me to comment on.

BRAD WHITE: No, I think you hit it on the head. I think Dr. Paul Twomey -- Paul, you realize you are no longer CEO, right?

PAUL TWOMEY: Thank God.

So my name is Paul Twomey, and I was the CEO of ICANN for about seven years.   And before that, I was the chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee for four. I helped found the organization.

I spent 20 years trying to promote multistakeholder models, first in my native Australia and then through the ICANN process.

A couple observations and then a really testing question. My first observation is this, when we first helped form ICANN, there was a whole body of people out there who thought ICANN was supposed to be the world government.

We took thousands and tens of thousands of emails from people who thought somehow international democracy through the

Internet was what ICANN was about. And we unleashed all sorts of desires which were clearly just not feasible.

I suspect we are in a little space at the moment as well partly because of Snowden's disclosure. There is a whole lot of new desires people have which again I think we have got to be careful to say what is actually feasible.

The second thing I would put -- I think we should think very, very carefully about, the question I think is: What is it that's actually -- where do you coordinate that? How can you coordinate using multistakeholder models?

We have the transit layer of the Internet. We have the protocol layer of the Internet which gives us the scale we have. And we have the content layer.

The transit layer is basically government regulated through teleco licenses. The transit layer what we are talking a lot about here.

But when we talk about the content stuff, I really would test this and ask us to think: Is the question new? Or is it just a question that's an existing question that the Internet has made largely because of scale.

Let's take pedophilia. It is not new. The Internet may well have made it bigger, but where do you normally coordinate these

things? You do it through INTERPOL. Maybe there needs to be more helpful learning for us, but that doesn't necessarily mean you have mission creep.

And so I think having seen the pattern of this sort of discussion before in the last 20 years, I would just pose to people to keep thinking in the next several days about Internet governance if it is a content issue that's really coming up, is there somewhere else that already does this? Or is this something that really is new because of the Internet?

BRAD WHITE: Let's hear from Evan, and then this gentleman here has a question.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Brad, I want to go back to your issue of trust because it is very important. Within ALAC, it has been an extremely important topic and has pervaded a lot of things.

One of the things I notice is that in the ICANN sphere, when you hear "trust," it is part of a silo. I never hear the word "trust" unless it is wrapped up with "consumer choice, competition, and trust." It is always tacked on to something, and it is always given its own silo It doesn't pervade everything to do with ICANN. It's

like this little corner. Okay, we'll do all these other things. And then we'll figure out how to work trust in. That can't persist. That has to be something that pervades all of ICANN. Trust is not a subject matter. Trust has to be part of something of everything that goes on here. And I think that's a big part of how ICANN needs to evolve in order to become part of the grand participant in this effort that we're talking about right now.

Trust is absolutely key to this. Without that trust, ICANN is wide open to the kind of things that everybody fears.

By building that trust, ICANN has a way to establish, if not leadership, its position at the table and its legitimacy to be there and to be, you know, a steward of the model.

But trust has to be there and it's not totally there yet. It has to be baked in, as opposed to tacked on, on a silo --

BRAD WHITE: Does the facilitation of this dialogue help advance us towards that trust element?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Absolutely.

BRAD WHITE: Can you wait one second? All right.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: This is Mikey O'Connor, but if you're responding to Paul, by all means, please go first.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mikey. Yeah, I actually did want to pick up on Paul's point because I think it raises a very important point --

BRAD WHITE: Good, good, good.

BYRON HOLLAND: -- and one of the challenges we have is we live in a digital world that's still governed by analog rules, and that comes up over and over and over again, that the laws we often have right now are not scalable in a network effect or suitable to the digital world. And often what comes, I find, into my little microcosm in Canada, leading the registry in Canada, which is also a multistakeholder kind of environment, is we're constantly asked to do things that are really just a question about "Why isn't my analog law scaling into my digital world?"

And that is not our remit, most definitely. But what it gets to is trust in the system, to pick up on some of the points that have been made here.

And back to Snowden and the NSA, that was just a catalyst. It's not the NSA per se. I mean, what are we going to do? Really?

BRAD WHITE: Right.

BYRON HOLLAND: States will always believe in spying. If -- what are we going to do? Move IANA to Canada? Well, we just caught with our hand in the cookie jar in Brazil and Brazil was just stopped spying on our aerospace industry. I mean, where do we go with that, honestly?

But back to the journey, the next several waypoints along this journey this year, we need to be very, very careful that we robustly defend what I truly believe is the best and most appropriate model to govern the Internet, which is the multistakeholder model, and if ICANN steps out in front for a moment to lead, that's fine. ISOC probably should too at some point.

And others reinforce the strength and power of this model so when we get to those next tour stops, we're in a strong position and the rest of the world can see the benefit of it and start to regain some of the trust that's clearly been lost.

BRAD WHITE: And Byron, you raise an interesting point. What I seem to be hearing, the theme -- and maybe you could just use your pieces of paper to tell me whether or not I've got it right -- the general theme -- and this is vastly oversimplified -- is, this is a prime opportunity to strut the multistakeholder model, to show what we've got, to expose it to the rest of the world.

Is that fair? Okay. Okay.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: Hi. It's Mikey O'Connor again, and actually I'm really glad I let you go first because I think that's a great segue into the point that I want to make, which is: Just as we are trying to build trust in the global stakeholder community, we also have a little bit of a trust issue with the way that Fadi moved a bit ahead of the community on this. And I think that it's safe to say that we've put that to bed. It made a lot of us pretty cranky. Certainly made me cranky. We certainly weren't shy about voicing that. Some of us less shy than others. And for any of you who got cranky with the way I voiced my crankiness, I apologize.

I think now is the moment on this road to say, "Look, let's also take some lessons learned out of the last two or three months and try not to do it quite that way again."

This whole business of secret board resolutions that were sort of documented after the fact and so on, this is not -- this is not the multistakeholder model that I live at the bottom of with great pride. I love the bottom.

[Applause]

MIKEY O'CONNOR: And so when I live there --

And thanks for the applause. I like that too.

[Laughter]

MIKEY O'CONNOR: I live down at the bottom, and it's exquisite. I get up into these upper layers that are less consensus based, more voting, more traditional, and it makes me comfortable, and so I don't perform well at this level.

But the lesson learned, part of it, I think, may be one of the bigger gifts that this whole rumpus gave the organization. There's no real question in there. Sorry.

BRAD WHITE: Heather?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Just one observation to get me started, and that is that I hear so many of the comments --

[Two people on the microphone]

-- forward-looking perspective, and that we're getting past some of the questions about how we organize ourselves or who should lead and so on and so forth. And what I like about that is it's inviting us to find some common ground within this community and with others in order to -- to move forward, and in some -- in some cases, it might be easy, in fact, to forget the successes that we have had, that things fundamentally do work.

And, you know, speaking from the point of view of the Governmental Advisory Committee, there's really a lot that -- that the GAC has accomplished and contributed to ICANN and to some of the decisions. The gTLD program, getting in place the IDN fast track, the country codes, these are significant developments (indiscernible) to the Internet, and it is my view that the GAC has made a major contribution to that.

And so it's -- it's a matter of reestablishing some confidence and governments are a part of this and need to know that their credibility has been impacted. But at the same time, as I say, we

need to continue to be forward-looking and build on the successes and keep framing it that way.

I mean, it's -- it's not going to help us to think that we need to discard it all and start again. That's really not where we are.

BRAD WHITE: (Speaker is off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: When I look at multistakeholder process, I very much look at collaboration and I think we have to remember in ICANN that it's not -- and other similar organizations that it's not only the process development process that we are running and make decisions together, we also learn from each other because each one of us have (indiscernible) at home in the businesses, in governments and whatever, and that claim that we -- the primary focus is not to ask each other to make decisions on others' behalf. Each one of us is still making our own decisions and we accept that. But we have to learn -- learn from each other, and by doing that, we can make more consent-based decisions in our existing decision-making processes that we already have.

And that's why discussions in fora like ICANN must be made in the open. Because without knowing what's happening, we cannot

adjust the decisions that we are making within our own decision-making processes, and that is, I claim, much more important, to some degree, than the decisions that we're making together.

BRAD WHITE: Okay. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Brad. Chris Disspain.

I just wanted to respond very quickly to Mikey.

Mikey, I acknowledge completely and get your disconcertion about, as you call it, secret resolutions, but I have to respond to one other thing because it's gone into the transcript and these things have a tendency to become fact.

You said that it was sort of cobbled together after the event, or something along those lines. The resolution was written at the time and it wasn't drafted afterwards. It was written at the time.

So the issue is not that the resolution was drafted after the event, but that you wanted to see it. I think it's -- I just wanted to make that point that it was written at the time.

CARLTON SAMUELS: So I want to go back to this issue of trust and how the Snowden revelations come into play.

So if you look at the Snowden revelations, it could be seen as a handle or a wedge, and for those of us who believe in the multistakeholder model, we see it as a handle, because what is at stake is that ICANN's reputational risk was tarnished. And so what -- the way we respond to it is first to reach out to everybody else in this space that can help us navigate it and to create a more -- a better model for ourselves.

I totally believe that it would be dereliction of duty if Fadi did not move to do what he did. I totally believe that. Because that's what leadership is about.

You can't go on believing, knowing what's in the space, what has been swirling around, and the troubles it brings to the risk -- to the reputation, and not do something about it.

BRAD WHITE: But not away from it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. You have to lead into it. That's the first thing.

Now, the response has to be that we ensure that our way of looking at the world, looking at the Internet governance space, we

believe we have a model that works well and there's some -- there are issues with it.

And so it is, again, an opportunity handle to make that better, and that's what I think was necessary and that was what he did. Thanks.

BRAD WHITE: Phil?

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you, Brad. Good morning. Philip Corwin and speaking solely in a personal capacity.

Trust needs to be earned, and trust in a large part depends on taking responsibility, and I'm not going to talk about what's happened in the last two months. I've written about it. There's no need to go over it. We can't reboot and go back to September. I will say when I read the resolution, I don't understand why the board felt a need to keep that from the community, because I don't -- I think it was -- I think the community would have been fine. I think it would have been much better if the community had been involved at that point.

But I will say the one -- most of us here are volunteers. Even if we're here because it's our business or our job, we're involved

with the Internet and many of us have been involved for years because we care about the Internet and we believe the Internet is amazing technology and is making the world a much better place and improving lives everywhere and spreading knowledge.

So what disturbs me is that this weekend, we hear Brazil is happening because ICANN requested it of the president of Brazil. The community -- it is not an idea that came from the community. And then we hear this weekend from management and board, "We're done. Now it's up to you, the community, to shape it."

I don't think that's correct. I think the board and management can say that, but if Brazil -- and I'm concerned that Brazil may not turn out well. Perhaps I'm wrong. I hope I'm wrong. But in a sense, the community has been drafted into Brazil. They haven't volunteered. It's not an idea that came from them. And if Brazil does go badly, it will reflect poorly on ICANN and on the trust in ICANN because it came as a request from ICANN. So I don't think -- I'm not sure what the right way is for the community to work with board and management going forward, but I think if the board and management believes they can just say, "We're done and now it's on you," they're not done because this is going to reflect on all of us in the way it turns out.

So I think we all need to think about that and talk to each other in the course of this week and figure out, now that we're here,

maybe we don't want to be here, some of us, maybe we don't like the way we got here, but we need to go forward together and no -- no part of the organization can say, "We're done, we're stepping back, it's on you." We have to be together.

BRAD WHITE: Okay.

[Applause]

Olivier and then we'll take -- Khaled, you had a comment?

Let's take Olivier first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Brad.

So I think that saying that this community was not on board or was not looking at this before the recent events is somehow not totally true.

Some parts of the community were already involved with the WCIT process, with the IGF, with things that were happening outside of these doors.

I think that what has happened, though, is that the revelations and the actions which were taken by the board have served to effectively gel the community into starting to think about this.

A significant segment of our community here was solely focused on new gTLDs whilst the whole ship was just about to approach a storm, and I think it's very good that there has been suddenly this waking up call for us to actually be here and be able to discuss these issues openly.

Now, some might have questions about the way that it was done, whether it was done behind closed doors, et cetera. I'm not going to be able to comment on this because ultimately I think that what had to be done had to be done. There are times when things have to be done and you just have to bite the bullet.

Whether it was a temporary thing and -- I think that now it will be much more open. I think that we are all for it and we'd like to basically see this move forward and stop starting to think, "Well, did they do well? Did they not? Was it transparent? Was it not transparent?"

The fact is, we do have a storm coming up ahead of us. No matter whether we've got new gTLDs or no new gTLDs or whatever it is we're doing, we're going to hit that storm, and it might totally change our business, it might change our community, it might change the way that everyone else on the planet uses the Internet and is able to make use of it, and I think that's something that we need, as a community, to be awake and to -- to wake up to. Sorry.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Olivier. I've just been informed that we can -- because we started late, we can go for about another 15 minutes. Are you guys cool with that? Do you want to do that?

[Applause]

Good dialogue?

Anybody alive?

Khaled, if you could wait one second, let's hear from Robert and then we'll go to you.

ROBERT GUERRA: All right. I just wanted to maybe pick up on a couple things. We've been all making statements so I just want to say that I am, you know, very supportive, particularly of my -- the comments my fellow Canadians have mentioned here, that it's about the journey, it's about updating and looking if our analog traditional laws also (indiscernible) a specific moment.

There's also a couple different things I've seen in terms of a specific meeting that's coming up where someone makes a comment and there's like a flurry of reaction to it. Let's not get caught on the small things. It's the journey over a couple different things.

There will be people that have a difference of opinion. That's okay. There will be people and others that are going to react. That's okay. But let's not just jump to conclusions. Let's just have that conversation. I think that's particularly important.

I must say I was distressed when there was a comment made by someone in the audience about something that they felt and there's -- and it kind of bypassed a conversation that we were having. I felt quite uneasy about that and I'll make that public, as I just did on Twitter.

Let's not have the small things worry us. Let's hear the different views.

So I think this conversation, I think, is particularly good, but what I -- what I would be interested in -- and this is kind of my comment -- is, with everything that's being said, I'd be very keen to hear from the folks online that are tweeting very actively and those out in the audience: What next? We've got like 10, 15 minutes, so if there's like two concrete things that we can do, either at this meeting or within the next six months in this space and in others, let's hear them. And I want to hear a variety of views, because if someone says something that I like, or someone else, let's try to support them. I think that's what's important, and not our differences of opinion.

BRAD WHITE: Khaled?

KHALED FATTAL: Thank you. Let me start my comment with something on a very, very positive note.

I am very pleased -- I'm actually very proud -- to see the debate and the quality of the debate we are seeing.

When I challenged ICANN and challenged Fadi that this debate needs to be put in the public, not only are we seeing it at the highest level of the public, it became center-stage at IGF in Bali, and that is exceptionally positive. So that's a good start.

But just going back to the issues that there seems to be a consensus on, which is the issue of trust, I've heard comments from some of my friends on the panel saying that this perhaps is not a cancer scare, maybe it's something else. At least we'll agree that it's a serious illness.

From a western perspective -- U.S., Canada -- please carry on championing the causes you have on spam, on security. These don't stop. But on the -- on the issues that are center-stage to today, which is the Snowden effect and the revelations and the repercussions of the key trust, let me just add this other

component. This is not about sensitivities. The Internet today is still governed by the United States Treasury office and the STM. This goes to the heart of Internet governance, so if we're going to go and take this conversation to the rest of the world, be mindful you're not talking to fellow citizens who live in the west. You're talking to emerging markets. And the next two, three billion Internet users who are coming in the door (indiscernible) because they're not on the Internet need to know how do I become a believer in this multistakeholder model.

So we need to make this crystal clear that the way they're going to be governed is not subject to one government, or at least we're going to provide a solution that can actually be more encompassing to their involvement, beyond just what I would call the paint of the wall.

And something else. It may not necessarily be the case that everybody knows about what's on in the world. We all walk into our houses and the first thing we do is switch the light on.

We switch the light on. We don't really look at who's bringing in the electricity, what plant is providing it --

BRAD WHITE: We just want it to work.

KHALED FATTAL: Absolutely. Same thing with the Internet.

                       Thank you.

BRAD WHITE: Let's go here and then we'll go in the back.

                       Also, before you ask your question, I've been informed that there's a very healthy dialogue going on in the chat room. So you folks joining us remotely, please weigh in. This will be part of the record. We want it. Twitter, keep the comments coming. We're all going to make that part of it. We want to hear what you have to say.

                       Sir.

LOUIE LEE: Hi. Louie Lee, chair of the ASO Address Council.

                       I want to support what Olivier had been saying. We do have our leaders leading us, seeing a storm is coming.

                       What Fadi was doing was executing on a mandate that the Board had given us. The mandate was documented in the last couple of days, but that's to show you that it was done back in September.

                       So -- And thank you very much to the Board for having that shown to us, what that was and the reasons behind it.

It is true that Brazil can go very wrong, but would it be worse or better if ICANN were to lead the conclusion of that panel? Does it give more legitimacy or less? Think about that.

But I think Fadi has started with the right person. While she has the ear of the world, the president of Brazil can help us do this multistakeholder model, bring others on board. And there's one other thing I can't remember right now but I will pass on to somebody else.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you very much.

In the back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good morning Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology. I don't want to beat a dead horse about how things went down, but Gandhi said be the change you want to see. And so I think the very best defense of the multistakeholder model so any deviation from the model is to continually engage in it. And so any deviation from that I think is very dangerous.

But in answer to your question, Paul, about the future, I think one of the thing that's interesting about the Internet is how (indiscernible) has survived on sort of philosophy of serendipity.

I think the notion that it's all about a journey is something that we need to be very cautious of at this point with the stakes as high as they are.

I think in order for us to have success going forward in these endeavors, we actually need to define what success means. We actually need to set some objectives for the outcomes of these meetings, and what we would like to see happen, you know, as the outcome instead of trying to justify later how things weren't as bad as we thought they could have been, et cetera, which has been the perpetual sort of disease that we -- that has increased over time.

So we need to set the serendipity down at least for a while and really define some metrics for success. They don't have to be numbers but we have to define what it is that we want and all come together as community to get there. And I think absent that, we will be trying to justify our actions after the fact rather than moving toward the common goal.

Thanks.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade, and I want to pick up on something, since we're coming to a close, and that is the actionable items that I take out of this.

My community is meeting in something called constituency day tomorrow, and that's actually a very important time when different community groups come together and talk about what the priorities should be.

And all of us go and meet with the Board in groups as well.

But one of the things that is happening is that we are considering a revised mission as an organization. ICANN is considering a revised mission. They're considering the strat plan for the next several years.

And what I take away from this -- I guess I spend so much of my time in these other meetings talking with governments and with other organizers and working on a variety of challenges, I see the chair of the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, Peter Major from Hungary here, there's a huge number much very challenging sessions. I would urge you not to just focus on what ICANN should be doing as a participant or a facilitator in a single event. Because decisions are being taken right now that are going to affect the multistakeholder model. And we need to be thinking and talking in our community groups about what we think we are

going to do or what do we think ICANN is going to do or should do in some of those other events as well.

And it seems to me, Brad, that I will just call attention myself to the strat plan and the fact that that's a very important place for us to quickly pay attention, since we're going to be asked in the community. And this kind of activity is actually touched on in the strat plan, as I understand.

BRAD WHITE: Okay. Keith.

Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: It would be important for us if we could actually see what the hell people are saying on Twitter, I mean, what the input is because it's all fine that you're hearing from all of us, because you hear from us all the time. You know, what are the people in the world thinking? What's their reaction?

There's no point just getting my reaction or Marilyn's. No offense, Marilyn. See, she's offended.

But I agree with (indiscernible).

But it would be good to sort of just get the audience to speak, because there's no point in us speaking. We've all heard us before.

BRAD WHITE: It's in the questions. We're taking them.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes, but you've got tweets and other things I can pick on my mobile. Others can't see and hear.

BRAD WHITE: Point taken. Point taken.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle from Nominet. I'd actually like to echo Jonathan's point just a few moments ago. What we've got to start doing is thinking about what it is we want from this organization, but, in particular, I think we've got to look in that very much wider perspective of all the organizations that are involved in shaping the Internet. We've also a much greater interest outside, and part of that interest I think is going to be we have got to go out and help people to get engaged, to help people understand the issues, and to help people support -- help support people in resolving the very concerns that they've got.

If we do it as we are ICANN, we're not going to get there. We can do it as part of the very much wider community. And I think we've got to stop thinking ourselves entirely as an island but what we can build, what we can bring into that wider -- that wider framework, that wider environment.

Thank you.

BRAD WHITE: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's a green sheet. I'm agreeing.

BRAD WHITE: Oh, sorry. Forgive me. I forgot our color coding system for a second.

We've basically got to wrap this up. We're running out of time. I'm getting these signals.

I wanted to point out that this issue, the Internet governance issue, is going to be not just this session. There are several -- there's one at 1:30 today. There's a couple of others scattered throughout the week where they're going to be touching on this.

This is obviously a nerve that's hit the community. We've tried to be responsive to that in structuring some of these panels. So this is only the first, but there's other opportunities to make your voice heard and to get out there.

And we want to hear what you want to say.

Can we thank all these folks? I think this was great. It was a great dialogue.

[Applause]

Thank you very much.

Thanks again. We appreciate it.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]