
BUENOS AIRES – Board with ccNSO
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 10:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We're about to start the meeting. Please take your seats. I'm talking on behalf of Byron Holland, chair of the ccNSO, so do as you're told.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the meeting of the board and the ccNSO. I am a somewhat familiar face but occupying a different role.

My name is Byron Holland and I am the just recently elected -- newly elected chair of the ccNSO, and looking forward to a good discussion here.

We have a very full agenda and I know you -- the board folks have a very hard stop, so we will work towards getting it all in but look forward to a good exchange.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you all. This is an opportunity that we -- that we on the board look forward to. The format some time ago had been more social and we shifted to this sort of engagement for the express purpose of putting substance into the interaction.

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.

This is a time for direct messages. I'm sure none of you are actually very bashful, but I guess the other side of that is, we're fully prepared, and when necessary, we'll be fully responsive.

So with that, let's just plunge right in. This is really your meeting. We want to do as much as we can of your agenda.

As Byron said, all of this runs on a tight schedule and no matter when we've started, we're going to stop at the appointed time.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Thanks, Steve.

First up on the agenda is some comment on the key work that the ccNSO is engaged in right now. I'm going to speak briefly about where the finance working group is at, as well as the framework of interpretation working group, and then Paul Szyndler is going to speak a little bit to the country and territory names study group.

So I will kick it off and change hats, because I'm also the chair of the finance working group and hopefully the soon-to-be former chair of the finance working group because I'm happy to say that we are coming to a conclusion on that.

For those who haven't been watching the last two and a half years of the finance working group, we've been having a fulsome discussion with ICANN on the -- what would be an appropriate compensation for ICANN for the efforts expended on behalf of the ccNSO community, and in fact, just before we got here, we had what I believe will be the final finance working group update to the ccNSO and had broad consensus on the

path forward and the framework that we're going to -- that we're going to recommend to the council.

So I think it's been a long journey, a couple of speed bumps along the way, but we are at the one yard line, just in front of the goal, and I believe that we will be successful when it comes to the council later tomorrow.

So that's where the finance working group is at.

I'd now like to turn it over to Keith to provide an update on the FOI.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you. My name is Keith Davidson. I'm the chair of the framework of interpretation working group. "The framework of interpretation" was a name that was coined coming out of some earlier work that the ccNSO completed on delegations and redelegations of country code top-level domains, and the framework was a concept of providing some color and depth to the existing policies and guidelines relating to delegations and redelegations, primarily looking at RFC-1591 from 1994 and the GAC principles of 2005.

There were three main chapters of the framework and we've just concluded our work within the working group on the third and most controversial topic, which is the topic of revocation. This is a term that was coined in RFC-1591 where a ccTLD may be revoked, and exactly what that meant and whether that meant a deletion of that top-level domain from the IANA root and so on.

So we've struggled our way through, but after probably 18 months on this particular topic, we have achieved a unanimous position within the working group and are now going through a public consultation on the topic of revocation.

I think what is important for the board, going forwards, though, is after we've completed this chapter, which is the end of the framework, we will be working on a glossary and working with IANA staff on an implementation process, but most importantly, we'll be working with the GAC and other constituencies in ICANN so that we hope to bring to the board, somewhere around Singapore or London, a completed framework for the board's verification.

So thank you. Cheers.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Are there any questions or comments for Keith?

Bertrand and then Mike and then Steve.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

Thank you.

Well, first of all, deep congrats for the work that has been done in this working group. These are thorny issues, threading the line very, very delicately on -- between the independence of CCs and the relationship with their own governments and the international responsibility of ICANN as a steward of the process.

One question I wanted to ask is: How do you anticipate the interaction with the GAC moving forward? Do you expect that there will be full endorsement? I know that they were participating in this thing, but maybe not all GAC members have followed those topics as accurately as they could have, so how do you see that?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I think -- good question. Thanks, Bertrand.

And I -- the GAC have had some distractions on their plate over the last recent months, or year or two, but we are seeing a reengagement of the two GAC representatives on our working group.

While they can't speak for the GAC, I think they are carrying messages back to the GAC on these more controversial issues and we are looking at a way to work with them to ensure there's not a large gap between the GAC and the working group, and we're certainly hinging our final result on GAC support for the document.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Byron. Just to go beyond what Bertrand was saying, I think this is a deeply impressive piece of work. There's been an enormous amount of work and effort that's been put into this, and kudos to all those involved: Keith, Bart, Bernie, the whole team. I think they've done a fantastic job.

That being said, I think that because it's CC related, very few people other than the CCs look at it, and to me it's a potential blueprint when

we have so many additional names going into the root, some of which may fail.

And I think it's a very interesting piece of work in terms of what happens with TLDs in a less certain TLD environment. I don't think that it's unique or specific to ccTLDs. So anybody who's not a ccTLD manager who hasn't read it, I would really encourage you to find the time. It, to me, has proved very useful in terms of refining my thinking on some non-CC issues. It's not just a specific little ccTLD document with no relevance to the rest of the organization.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mike. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

I, too, am very, very pleased with this work and have been waiting for it for a good while, watching, hoping for it.

Let me give a perspective about, from a process perspective, what things look like at the board level when we're given an action to take with respect to CC either delegation or redelegation.

I don't recall -- I guess there are a couple of instances where there's been an outright revocation of a delegation without a corresponding redelegation, but much more often we're faced with redelegation requests, and then of course with delegation requests.

There are some knotty, difficult little problems. Not so little sometimes.

RFC-1591 talks about community support, puts some rules down about the key operators or key points of contact have to be in the country involved, with the deliberate intent that they be subject to the laws of the country. And perhaps I'm forgetting some other things, but we, at the board level, are often presented with a package and then have to deal with sometimes the discrepancy between what the RFC-1591 rules are and what the facts of the current transaction are.

The board does not want to be -- and I'll emphasize it again. The board does not want to be in the position of making primary decisions on these matters. The board is, in its best mode, overseeing that the process was followed, that the results are complete and sensible, and that the competent and relevant parties have done their work.

We have, of course, quite a bit of competence on the board, so it's not unknown for us to slip into the mode of getting into a debate about the specific facts, but that's not what the board should be doing, not what the board wants to be doing, and so to the extent that we can create processes that represent the community and that are controlled by the community to do these things, we are in much better shape.

So as I said, I'm extremely pleased to see this, been waiting for it for a good long time, and then the next steps will be to put it into practice and see how well it actually holds up against the not-very-frequent but nonetheless semi-constant stream of transactions that come before the board.

And so I'm not sure this will be the end of the process, but it is a very important step forward and goes critically toward a maturation process

that we're all looking forward to where this becomes self-sufficient and everybody agrees on what the process is.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Steve. Keith, did you have a comment?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Byron.

Just to follow up on some of Steve's comments, there have been some instances in the past where the board has made decisions that appear to be outside of the policies and guidelines laid down within RFC-1591 and the GAC principles, including retirement of ccTLDs.

There is no policy, there is no guideline for retirement.

That, in fact, is a separate topic that the framework of interpretation working group hasn't been able to look at because, in the complete absence of policy, a PDP must be gone through.

So we can't provide color and depth to something that doesn't exist.

Although it's fair to say that there's only been a couple of cases of retirement, so it is an unusual thing, but there is still a tranche of work to be done in that regard.

Steve, you pointed out on the local Internet community or significantly interested parties. That is one of the chapters of the framework, and I think we do have a matrix of tests to see that there is real consent from

the community to accept, and we hope the board does take that seriously as a matrix of measurement along that way.

And, yes, our aim is to provide a framework that the board will be able to -- or that we will all be able to have predictable, usable, rational decisions coming out of.

So thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

For the benefit of people who haven't been following all of this so closely, just two comments.

One of the things discovered in the very small number of cases where there was outright revocation -- and my recollection is that CS, which was originally assigned for Czechoslovakia and then withdrawn when Czechoslovakia was separated into the Czech Republic and the country of Slovakia and was then assigned a few years later to one of the countries that resulted from the dissolution of Yugoslavia, and that was awkward because even though I think about five years had transpired, there was still a very long tail of hanging references to the prior use of dot CS.

And so I think that's resulted, if my memory serves, in an understanding that once something is taken out of service, if there's no continuity, that it needs to be taken out of service for a very long time, and I think the figure is now 50 years instead of five years, in consultation with the ISO maintenance organization for 3166.

The other thorny problem that we've been faced with more than once is a de facto redelegation presented to us after the fact where there's been a change of management and everything's been done except interacting with ICANN and IANA and then putting a package together that is deficient in the formal sense but extremely compelling in the sense of "This is the way things actually are, and it's only our records that are out of date."

So it's that sort of thing that is full to smooth out in some way.

Were you raising your hand or putting on your coat? Yeah.

Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Chris. Thank you, Byron.

I just actually want to add a little -- a small wrinkle, Steve, to what you just said, which is that we also have, in fact, circumstances where there has been a de facto redelegation where the processes have not been followed in the background, where the local Internet community has not been involved, where the de facto redelegation is done and we have been -- we have been given effectively a fait accompli and said, "You must deal with this." And those -- that sort of problem is something that we are going to need at some point to tackle, because it amounts to going behind the process, and sadly and unfortunately, it is often governments that are the ones who are responsible for that, and I don't know what the answer is but we are going to have to find a way of dealing with that.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. If I can interject, while Chris is entirely correct, sometimes those de facto redelegations are incredibly useful –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. I agree.

MIKE SILBER: -- because they're smooth –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

MIKE SILBER: -- there's no bump in the road, there's no issue around the transition plan. The transition plan has already -- or the transition has already taken place.

So it's one of the things that we've been looking at to try and say, "Well, how do we deal with these?" Because it may actually be a good thing. Or it -- sorry. It may not be a bad thing, is I think the better way of phrasing it.

And so I think that we need to interact further on those issues.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Mike.

As you can see, one very quickly gets into the deep end of the pool here, as soon as you start examining this issue.

But on that, given there are other items on the agenda, I think we'll have to move on.

The next update is around the work done on the country and territory names study group, and Paul Szyndler is going to provide an update for us.

Paul?

PAUL SZYNDLER:

Thank you, Byron. My name is Paul Szyndler. I'm from auDA, the dot AU CC manager, and for my sins, for the last two years I've been chair of the country and territory names study group.

The group was established with three functions, which were to look at the way in which country and territory names are used across the ICANN community, to assess whether there's any inconsistencies in these processes, and, if necessary, make a recommendation for further work.

The study group has done precisely that. We concluded our work in September and provided recommendations to the ccNSO council.

The council has since adopted those recommendations and passed relevant resolutions.

I won't go into the detail of the study group's work, but it is worth highlighting the three recommendations that it made because this is where we're at currently and those recommendations are the best indicator of where our subsequent work will go.

The key point was that the group recommended the establishment of a cross-community working group that will look at these issues in greater depth.

The group would, in the first instance, continue the study aspect of the study group's work. This is a moving feat. The environment is always changing and it's worthwhile to continue the study.

But the second recommendation -- and this is where it gets serious -- was to provide advice -- that this working group, rather, would provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across all respective SOs and ACs.

Please note here that there is no presupposition on the part of the study group nor the ccNSO council that such a framework is necessarily feasible nor desirable nor will be implemented in the end, but we will assess its feasibility.

And should the framework be deemed feasible, the study group would then provide detailed advice as to its content, what it would look like.

This is precisely where we're at at the moment. We intend to invite the GNSO, ALAC, and GAC to participate in this working group.

Staff is currently developing a straw man which will both be developed into a charter for the working group and form the basis of the approach upon which we make to the other SOs and ACs.

Of particular interest to the board will be the final part of the recommendation of the study group which is now adopted by a resolution of the council, and that is -- and I will read it out, just for the

purposes of accuracy -- "In the light of the further need for work on the treatment of country and territory names, the complexity of the issue at hand, and the aforementioned inconsistencies between various ICANN policies, it is also recommended that the ccNSO council request that the ICANN board extend the current rule in the new gTLD applicant guidebook regarding the exclusion of all country and territory names in all languages for consecutive rounds of new gTLD applications."

This is a rather long-winded way of saying we would not want anything to happen that would preempt the work of the working group. This advice wouldn't be provided to the board until we've made some more progress with the formation of the working group. And that's my update -- thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Paul. Are there any questions or comments on this subject?
Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Jay Daley from dot nz. All of this work that Keith and Bernie and others have done showing these inconsistent policy decisions, to me, is pretty conclusive evidence of something. And, yet, I haven't seen the potential strength of reaction to that from the ICANN board that I might have hoped for in terms of accepting what that means for how historically ICANN has handled certain things.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Jay.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'm not sure I understand, Jay. The framework of interpretation working group is in a report. That's the work Byron -- sorry, that Bart and Bernie and Keith have done. Paul was just talking about the working group on country names and top-level domains, an issue that has been running for some considerable time and is currently dealt with them not being allowed. And you're recommending that they shouldn't be. So I'm not sure what it's evidence of because I'm unclear about what you mean.

JAY DALEY:

Sorry. It is a more general point that there have been a number of work items that have come through the ccNSO that have looked at the way that the board has operated in relation to CCs, has identified inconsistencies there. And we -- what I want to know is what will be the plan to ensure that we don't get those in the future.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I don't know what you -- can you give me an example?

JAY DALEY:

No, not without going back to the reports.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Maybe we can take the question offline and talk about it because I don't know of an example where there have been inconsistencies in dealing

with the ccTLDs specifically where advice has been given from the Cs to the board. So let's talk about that offline.

BYRON HOLLAND: I do have a comment from Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Can I volunteer that we take this back to New Zealand, and I will work with Jay and we'll pose a question at the Singapore meeting on the topic.

MIKE SILBER: By all means, pose the question beforehand and we can hopefully answer it in Singapore. Even better.

STEVE CROCKER: Great.

BYRON HOLLAND: If I could just summarize that, Jay, your concern is that through the work of the various working groups in the ccNSO, we continue to unearth policy inconsistencies that then we have to wrestle with and try to find some resolution a la the FOI or the study group. And is the board not worried that we continue to uncover inconsistencies? Is the board worried? Is the board going to do something? Would that be reframing your question?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So that I can respond to.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No offense, Jay. No offense.

BYRON HOLLAND: In Singapore or here?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. I can respond to it. Examples would be useful. But if you're characterizing the work -- inconsistencies discovered in the work of the framework of interpretation working group should worry the board because of some systemic issue, I disagree because the FOI working group is working on 1591, one RFC that has been in existence for I forget how long now but is very precious to this community.

And given how much change has occurred since it was written, it would be extraordinary if there weren't inconsistencies. I would argue the exact opposite, that it is evidence of everything working extremely well, one that the ccNSO is capable of doing this work, recognizes the issue, and does the work and comes up with possible solutions. And, secondly, the board is sitting here saying, "Wow, that's fantastic. Thank you very much."

MIKE SILBER: If I can add to that. I think inconsistencies are a reality of organic growth. And if they're pointed out, there are a couple of options with inconsistencies. One of them is we manage around them. And if that's appropriate, then so be it.

One is that we simply accept them and move on.

The third is that there's change that needs to be made.

What I don't think, Jay -- and this is a nuance that I was getting from your question, with apologies to Bertrand who tells me that "nuance" is not a French word.

If the inconsistency identified requires action from the board, then advise us and we can look at taking action. It doesn't mean because there is an inconsistency, you have to deal with it and we can't -- you can't push it back to us and say, "Guys, this is untenable to us. We can't find a work-around. Why don't you do something about it" because sometimes it would be in our court. So I think it needs a bit more dialogue around that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mike and Jay.

MIKE SILBER: It doesn't worry me, and I don't think it causes anyone else on the board to have sleepless nights.

STEVE CROCKER: Let's get some facts on the table. I think some of us at least are at a bit of a disadvantage to understand what it is we're talking about. So I don't know if we're worried, but you got your attention.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Jay.

With that, Item Number 1 on the agenda behind me is roughly complete.

[Laughter]

BYRON HOLLAND: Good news is we engaged in some dialogue. Bad news is we're on Agenda Item Number 1 of 4. That said, I would be remiss if I didn't take time to say thank you to ICANN staff and in particular Xavier and the members of the finance working group for all the heavy lifting that was done over the past 2 1/2 years. So I just wanted to recognize those tough conversations and the resolution that has come from them through the finance working group.

So with that, we're going to go to Item Number 2 where Roelof, Roelof Meijer, from SIDN, dot nl operator, and chair of the ccNSO SOP working group is going to make some comments.

Thank you, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Okay. Thank you, Byron. This is Roelof Meijer, indeed.

Sometime after having seen the reaction of ICANN on the input we provided to the draft financial plan for 2014, and we needed some time -- I say "some time" because we needed some time to recover. We wrote a letter to the board and ICANN CEO in which we primarily expressed our concern and our frustration about the lack or the absence of a truly responsive and structured financial and strategic planning process.

And what truly is lacking is a proper response to input provided, also proper action on input provided, deadlines that are actually met by ICANN, and a process that is predictable also in the way it is structured.

Over the years, we've been seeing deadlines moving. We've seen the process being changed, always with the objective to improve but very often failing to obtain that improvement.

We had Xavier Calvez, ICANN CFO, in our working group session last Sunday. And we received a response from ICANN CEO Fadi Chehade. And I have to say that both in discussion with Fadi and Denise Michel and the letter with Xavier and Denise Michel and the letter from Fadi Chehade are quite reassuring. And they promise us the creation of a process that is well-structured and truly responsive.

However -- and I don't want to be negative about this. But we have received that kind of a reassurance before. And as a working group, and I think also probably as the ccNSO community, what we seek from the board is some additional reassurances or maybe some extra reassurances. The first being confirmation to the question: Is this issue,

the subject of the creation of a truly responsive planning process for the strategic plan and for budget and other financial plans, is it receiving the highest priority at the coming time? Because what we notice is that the board and the CEO are quite busy with the new gTLD process and Internet governance and we would like to get some confirmation that this is your -- one of your top priorities.

And the second thing is we would like to get some confirmation on the fact that this time the process will be truly responsive in the sense that anybody who submits comments will get a response and the board of ICANN will have the time to take that input into consideration before the strategic plan, financial plan are being approved.

That said, I can tell you that we will -- we will follow the process closely, but we also are willing -- and very happy to contribute to improving it.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Roelof.

Chris, did you have a comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Byron. Thank you, Roelof.

Having sat and said much the same thing that you have just said to the board in years gone past, I understand the frustration.

So a couple of points. First of all, I'm on the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee's doing a fair amount of work in respect to the

processes from the budget side of it. But, of course, because it is all linked into the strategic plan, that's relevant, too.

And we have -- this year coming is yet another transition year in the sense that we are transitioning to a new strategic plan. And so, therefore, there are some tweaks that will need to happen to the budget timing process to make it work. But there is a plan in place. I think you may have discussed it with Xavier, but I'm not sure.

There is a plan in place, however. And the goal of that plan is to do what you have asked to be done which is to ensure that there is enough time for questions to be answered. I can also tell you that the accuracy of answers or the depth of answers to questions, or the lack thereof, is on the board's mind. We have talked about it. We have discussed it, and we are clear, certainly in the Finance Committee we are clear, that the quality of the answers needs -- line formats are not acceptable. Proper answers are what we need.

So from a reassurance point of view, I can tell you that we are looking also for reassurance that all of this is going to happen. And I am getting comfortable, if not completely comfortable, that it will happen and everything will work smoothly this year -- this coming year with one caveat, which is that because of it, we're transitioning to a new strategic plan. The timing issues are slightly more complicated than they might otherwise be.

But in respect to future years, we are already working on the timing once we're out of transition to the new strategic plan.

So it is top of mind. It is top priority. And it's not something that gets overshadowed by the new gTLDs. It is about operational excellence which came up from the strategic planning session yesterday, and that's very important. And your comment to lift focus area 4 on operational excellence to be focus area Number 1 was well-taken.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you Roelof -- or thank you, Chris.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. Let me just add, the short -- the short version of Chris' answer is we are taking it all very seriously and working hard on it. Let me go a step further and close the loop. If you're not happy, we're not happy. The points that you raised are very important. We know that you have been working, you and the working group, have been working on this very assiduously for a period of time.

I have been impressed with the depth of analysis that you and Lesley and Byron have been able to do on our budget. Sometimes I think you guys know our budget better than we know our budget.

And so Chris went on at length about the effort that's going into it. I want to tie that together with no matter how much effort goes into it, if it doesn't result in a satisfactory process, then we're not done, and we're going to keep at it until we do get to the point that we need to be because the points that you raise are inescapable. They are absolutely essential.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Steve and Chris. This is good to hear because I have the distinct impression that Xavier needs -- in order to be able to improve this, he needs the capacity within the ICANN organization to do so. And that means it has to be high on the mind of the board and the CEO.

MIKE SILBER: Roelof –

BYRON HOLLAND: Cherine and then Mike.

MIKE SILBER: I will give a cynical view. So you carry on, Cherine, with the positive.

CHERINE CHALABY: So we're talking about three things here: The strategic planning, the operational planning and the budget. Right?

MIKE SILBER: Yep.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. I'm not sure your comments were more directed to the budget side or the strategic planning side or the operating planning side. But in terms of the budgeting, which I think is something at the heart of everybody's mind over the last few years or so, we do understand there are some issues in terms of the quality of the response and the

timeliness of the responses. So that's something that we -- definitely are at the top of our minds.

We're also concerned there might be a perception that we are taking a backwards step that there's not going to be enough consultation with the community and so on and so forth. So you will see with some process we're going to announce, there will be quite a few consultation points with the community at various stages this year.

So we take the comments very seriously, and I'm sure that we're going to get this right eventually.

This is a big year because also the strategic plan is this is the first time a full proper strategic plan is going to be converted into also a five-year financial plan. And, also, we are going to start producing not just expense reporting but quarterly balance sheet, P&L cash flows and so on and so forth. There's going to be a lot of work here interacting with the community to get this right because we want to move this organization from the last 15 years of doing nothing but expense planning, frankly -- we never had proper financial planning -- to move to another level and that is proper financial planning and financial reporting, which we're going to do. And you are going to start seeing quarterly reports actually coming out very soon, in the next week or so, if they have not been out already.

So we take the points very seriously. But I want to raise the level of the discussion away from expense budgeting to another high level as well and that's important.

BYRON HOLLAND: Since we have other topics, Roelof, I'm going to ask you to make a Twitter-size response and then we're going to move on to Item Number 3 briefly.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. Our main -- our main concern is ICANN's operational excellence, accountability and transparency. And that means also that you -- well, it starts with the clear strategy and a strategic plan which has metrics in it. From that, ICANN should derive an annual plan with metrics in it; and from the annual plan, there should be a budget. That is the line.

So our comments are mainly about at the high level how to achieve operational excellence, transparency and accountability. But in addition to that, we see that nothing is being done with the input we provide, both on the strategic plan, the procedure, and the operational plan and budget. That's why we wrote that letter.

But the main concern are operational excellence, transparency and accountability.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Roelof.

In the interest of time, we have a little more than five minutes before we have to conclude this meeting, I'm going to move to Item Number 3. Unfortunately we're simply not going to have time to move to Item Number 4.

But, Keith, very briefly, could you make comment and/or ask any question around the issue of Internet governance and the Montevideo statement in particular.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thanks, Byron. I'm not sure how brief we can be without speaking in shorthand. But the topic of Internet governance is, of course, one of the key themes of this ICANN meeting, and there's been a lot of activity recently. Just in terms of background, the ccTLD community has been a great endorser of the Internet governance forum process. ccTLDs have been actively catalyzing in country, in subregional, regional, and in the global IGF since been behind in supporting the Internet governance process. By there are some -- there are some confusing threads of debate, particularly arising post-Montevideo or the Montevideo statement. And so just to make some points, and perhaps not expecting an answer here today, but some points for clarification for the board to consider, we'd really like some clarity about what ICANN would see as the expectation on ccTLDs and our community in terms of Internet governance. Can we also comment that we see commentary from ICANN saying ISTAR is the representative group for the -- for the Internet ecosystem and ISTAR is not inclusive of the ccTLD community, so we are hoping that ICANN is not venturing to speak on behalf of the ccTLD community at all as we have our reserved right under our bylaws to be the authoritative voice for the ccNSO.

And then we come to a specific question from Young Eum Lee, one of the ccNSO councillors so I'll read it, it's, "What are the board's expectations about ICANN's relationships with other international

organizations with regard to the Montevideo statement and the upcoming meeting in Brazil?"

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Keith. Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thanks, Byron. I don't want to speak to this directly, but you did mention about closing the meeting. I would appreciate it if there are some actions that should be coming out of this meeting if they could be restated so that the notetakers can have those to bring forward. I would appreciate it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Ray. Olga.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: Yes. Thank you. In the interest of time, there's -- there's really quite a bit that we will be talking about on this topic and working with you on, but I will address concretely your questions of expectations, both inward expectations within the ICANN community and outward expectations, Expectations that the board might have vis-a-vis other international organizations. In terms of inward expectations, our expectations, or better put our hope, is that we work more closely together from now forward in the greatest coordinated manner possible to work on the ideas that are on the table, to flesh them out, to

give them more depth and concrete actions, especially in the manner that the ccTLDs are in a position to discussion with nationally within their national governments.

In terms of outward expectations, expectations that the board might have regarding the reaction to all of this and the relationship with other international organizations, I would hope that that would be to see improved relations with international organizations as they observe what's going on and note that things are changing, viewpoints are opening up, there is a willingness to dialogue and think about new ideas. So I'm sure that many around the world would find that welcoming, even the Geneva institutions.

Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. Two quick comments, and then we really have to wrap this up.

Gonzalo.

GONZALO NAVARRO:

Okay, Gonzalo Navarro from the board. I'm going to be really brief. It's sad to me that we don't have more time to talk about this issue. It's important. You ask about how the ccNSO or the ccTLD community can be engaged in this efforts towards Brazil. My suggestion to our VIPs in the region is to collect information and to meet you guys in the time from here to Brazil and to try to elaborate a common understanding about what's -- about the meeting, what's going to happen.

In the past the ccTLD community, especially in the Latin American region, were -- was a true ambassador to our governments. So you were playing a very important role in that regard, and I hope that you can reply that effort in this meeting and multiply this effort in the different regions with different -- our different VIPs.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Bertrand, last comment. Very short, please.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Just very briefly, although the meeting has started more than ten minutes late so we wouldn't want to shorten that. Just one quick point, picking on what you, Byron, said actually, I think, three meetings ago, regarding the very important role that the CCs are playing at the national level in fostering forums at the national level, multistakeholder discussions on Internet governance. In the present context, the Brazil meeting is not a beginning and an end. It's just a part of a long process. Anything that can foster multistakeholder discussions at the national level to feed in, get feedback of any sort, will be welcome, and I'm absolutely convinced that the CCs have a very, very strong role to play in that regard. And I'm not meaning financial support. I'm meaning interaction and facilitation.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Bertrand. Steve, do you have a final comment?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm pleased that we got into some substantive topics. I sort of regret that we haven't been able to get to all of the questions on the list. As I said at the beginning, we look forward to these interactions and look forward to having them be frank and candid, as they say in diplomatic circles. And I think we achieved that without much doubt.

There's a bunch of things to follow up on, and don't be -- don't be bashful, don't be hesitant to keep pressing.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you all, and for the CC community members, now we must return to -- from where we came.

Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]