
HYDERABAD – Public Forum 2
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 11:00 to 13:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

BRAD WHITE: Ladies and Gentlemen, if you would please take your seat, we'll begin the public forum in just a few moments.

STEVE CROCKER: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the second part of our public forum. Those of you who were in the first part on Saturday basically know the drill for this session. In this revised format, which we started at ICANN 55 in Marrakech, based on recommendations from the meetings -- the format is based on the recommendations from the community's Meeting Strategy Working Group. This session will last two hours. As we have always emphasized, this is not a replacement for the public comments process when ICANN is seeking comments on various issues and policies. If you want to comment or weigh in on a specific issue that is up for public comment, we invite you to use the online system for that purpose. That's the only way in which your comments will receive the proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members.

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.

I want to turn to our ombudsman, Herb Waye, who will explain the expected standards of behavior governing this session and, of course, all others at this or any other ICANN meeting. Herb?

HERB WAYE:

Mr. Chair, thank you for your introduction and the opportunity to stand before the community and present the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Hello, my name is Herb Waye, and I have been with ICANN for about ten years. Prior to my appointment as ombuds, I served as adjunct in the office of the ombudsman and have a solid institutional knowledge, enabling me to hit the ground running.

Community is all about relationships, and in this vibrant, diverse system we call ICANN, to enable progress and productive, inevitably there will be conflict. It is usually positive and results in change. But sometimes the conflict results in inappropriate behavior that can damage the relationships and undermine the process. In much the same way when people in a community come from such diverse backgrounds and cultures, the community members must be conscious of differences and embrace them as being the strength of the community. Inappropriate behavior is never acceptable. And now ICANN has rules, a set of guidelines or principles, if you wish, to remind the community of the importance of respect. I would invite every

one of you to take a moment to read the expected standards of behavior. There is a link in the Adobe room that will take you to them. And then to think about them. Ask yourselves if you are living, really living, those behaviors. Because by living them, you become a role model, and an example of good behavior for the newcomers and the youth in the community. You become a leader, and you make this whole system a better, safer place for all.

I would like to invite everyone to drop into my office here in Hyderabad for a quick visit, and I wish everyone a productive ICANN 57, taking place in a safe, harassment free, respectful environment. Thank you, and I will now pass the mic to Ron da Silva to explain the rules of the public forum.

RON da SILVA:

Thank you, Herb. I have the distinct privilege of walking through our process for this morning, and similar to what we did on Saturday for the public forum 1, I will take a few minutes to describe the flow and some of the rules for engagement. But first, I wanted to talk about the comments from Saturday, the first public forum. Those are going to be published online within the next couple of weeks. So rather than take time -- I think we mentioned then that we would spend a little time reflecting on some of those today, we're going to instead put them on the

website to enable more time on the floor today to talk about new topics.

Also, there were a number of emails that have come in, and those likewise you should get some responses, too. And I don't know definitive whether those will also be on the website, but I will ask that they be included or summarized in some way so everybody can see what questions came in, either through email or from the forum on Saturday.

Now, the structure for today, we're going to have 15-minute blocks of open mic. And the very first one will be focused on this new meeting format. So definitely welcome, if you have questions or comments or input or some -- some type of feedback with regards to this meeting structure, you can begin queuing up now. This is our first format of the annual general meeting as described in the Meeting Strategy Working Group, and while people queue, if anybody queues, and it's actually okay if you don't want to talk about meeting structure, I'll talk about the rest of the agenda for this morning.

We will have -- after the specific discussion on the meeting format, we will have two 15-minute blocks for any topic of interest. We will have a slight break and talk about ICANN 58, followed by three more blocks of whatever topics you would like to bring up and discuss.

Remote participants, or for that matter participants here in the room who maybe are intimidating at coming to the mic, you have another option, you can send email to engagement@icann.org. Again, that's engagement@icann.org. Fairly straightforward. And we'll -- like we did on Saturday, we'll intermix remote participant questions into the queue.

Now as a reminder when you're at the microphone, speak slowly, speak clearly, so we know what you're saying, and please begin by stating your name and who you represent. There will be a limit, just like we had on Saturday, of two minutes for you to raise your topic or raise your question. It's interesting. I think I had six minutes to describe all this but I didn't get the timer. And then someone on the board will respond and likewise limit the response to two minutes. If there's additional clarity needed, we will allow for an additional two minutes of clarification or response and then similarly, another two minutes for the board to respond.

So with that, like we did on Saturday, we're going to tag team this up here at the front and have someone from the board take each of those blocks. So specifically on the meeting format, I will hand it over to Chris Disspain. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Ron. Good morning, everybody. This is Chris Disspain. This is the session on -- on meeting, the structure of this meeting C. I can see already a queue, so I will be quiet. First -- the first question, please.

FIONA ASONGA: Good morning, everyone. Fiona Asonga, for the record. I'm CEO of the Technology Service Providers Association of Kenya. Now, my comments on the structure of the current meeting that we are still in is that I think that high interest level topics have been very many but the way they have been organized has been difficult for us to be able to effectively participate in the different discussions because they all get scheduled like at the same time. And at the same time it means one human being can be in only one meeting at any one time. And so being able to comment on the different high interest topics that are important to us becomes difficult. I would like to propose that in future we consider having them in a sequence so that then we have one interest topic coming after another and that allows those who are following the high interest topics to be able to participate in the key discussions. Because sometimes you may find you have got four areas you want to participate in that are high interest topics but you've got all at the same time, then you are extremely limited in terms of providing input and being able to engage. That's just my feedback moving forward. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Fiona, for an excellent suggestion. Before I take the next question, Sally, would you just like to -- wherever you are -- just like to comment about the survey?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Chris. Can you hear me? Yes. Thank you, Fiona. Yes. We will conduct -- we being the meeting's team, we will conduct a community-wide survey towards the end of this calendar year to review the first year of the new meeting strategy working program. It's now run a full cycle. And we are very interested in getting input from anyone who would like to share with us things that they would like us to look at, topics they would like us to survey. Specifically we will look at the degree to which the new meetings met the objectives stated in the policy and the proposals. So if anybody would like to contact me or Nick with any subjects they'd like us to look at, and then, you know, we'll come back later in terms of the process on the schedules and how we progress that. But there will be a survey and it will be community-wide, and we'll do it at the end of this year.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Sally. That's not intended to put people off making comments at the microphone now, but simply to say that we're

going to take the things that everybody says today and encourage you that when the survey's launched that you actually repeat those comments into the survey. Next, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bonjour. Sebastien Bachollet. Hello, my name is Sebastien Bachollet. I'm going to speak French in order to seize the services that are provided which enables us to speak in different languages within the room. So I suggest you grab your headphones and put them on. Because other people might also wish to speak in different languages. I know you can very well read what's written in English, but when you do that, there's two intermediaries between what I say, what's translated and then what's transcribed. So if you wish to have a real version of what I'm saying, you should better get rid of one of the intermediaries.

As concerns meetings and the meeting strategy, I'm not going to comment on what's been done because I led that working group, but I would like to underscore a number of things. Firstly, the implementation of our strategy was not agreed upon within the working group so it was the staff who implemented our strategy. I think it is then important to see what was done, how it was done, why it was done the way it was implemented, and what the results of that are. But then in terms of what was

suggested, we should also see what was implemented effectively because there are some differences at that level.

I'm very glad to see the staff organizing a survey, and I think it would be interesting to have a small working group led by the community to work with the staff on that matter.

And given that I didn't follow your instructions, I'm going to introduce myself now. I'm Sebastien Bachollet, ALAC member, former president or chair of the strategy working group, and I speak in my personal capacity. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Sebastien. Any comments? Okay. We'll take that as a -- as a comment.

Next, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Hello. Jordyn Buchanan with Google but speaking in my capacity as a participant in this process and an individual, as opposed to in a corporate role.

Two quick comments.

First is to heartily echo the first speaker's point that there did seem to be a large amount of conflicts in the schedule, which I found particularly surprising given the length of this meeting. I

feel like we've been here a really long time and I would have thought that the extension of the schedule would have made it possible to decrease the number of conflicts, but it -- instead, there seemed to be as many as ever, and possibly more. So it's - - it may be that we just need to make hard choices as a community to schedule topics as we did in Helsinki, where I found a lot less of this and it made it much easier to focus. And that focus, I think, is really important. We have a really limited amount of time, and so I think the fact that we are here for so long ought to be an opportunity to be -- to bring the community together and get a lot of work done, and that's just not possible when our attention is spread as thin as it has been this week, I think.

And in fact, in addition to duplication in terms of conflicts and sessions, I saw a lot of duplication of the same point -- the same content being reviewed over and over again. Poor -- I'm on the CCT review. Poor Jonathan, who chairs the session, I think probably gave the exact same update to about eight different groups, and that just doesn't seem very effective or productive. You know, I know that there's several other chairs who were running around doing the same thing. So we need to find ways to consolidate some of those updates so they don't have to be repetitive and create the sort of conflicts we're talking about.

Last point is just about this public forum format. I'm a little confused as to why we bothered splitting it up into two sessions if we're actually not going to reflect on the previous session in the second one. I don't really care one way or the other, but why don't we just make it a big block of four hours, if we're just going to take comments. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Jordyn, thank you.

Just before you go, I'm going to -- two things. One thing I just want to take issue with is you said it feels like we've been here for a very long time. We have actually been here for a very long time.

Can I ask Sally to make a couple of comments, please?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Jordyn, for your comments.

This is one of the reasons why we want to do the survey, because the proposal had too many requirements for the meeting, this meeting. Two particularly relevant are that we add another day to compensate for the shorter meeting in the summer, and this was indeed designed to try to help the community to extend the time and to reduce the conflicts. So we'll need to look at why

that perhaps hasn't worked. You may have noticed there are virtually no sessions scheduled on the last seventh day, so that's something we need to have a look at.

And the second point is that the middle meeting, the summer meeting, was not just shorter but has a dramatically reduced scope, in terms of actual content that's being presented, and that's one of the reasons why the conflict. It felt much less conflicted. And that may sound obvious, but some of the comments made to me between then and now would suggest that that's not actually clear to lots of people.

So another thing that we'll look at in terms of what worked, what didn't work, and what do we want to do moving forward.

Thank you for your comment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you very much.

Anyone else from the board want to comment? Okay. Moving on. Next person, please.

CHING CHIAO:

Thank you, Chris.

Good morning. My name is Ching Chiao and I'm from Brandma. We are a corporate registrar based in China and we serve large

brands from China. This is my 40th ICANN meeting, so thank you. And my son just went to college, so I have more free time being here.

[Applause]

But as a corporate registrar, I would like to share some mixed feedback from my customers about the price for new gTLD sunrises and reserve/premium names. We're talking about the --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. May I ask -- this session is about the meeting.

CHING CHIAO: Oh.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I ask you to go back and come back at the next session?

CHING CHIAO: Oh, I see.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Otherwise, we're going to -- you're going to suck up all of the time that people want to talk about the meetings. Is that okay?

CHING CHIAO: That's perfectly fine.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Super.

CHING CHIAO: I thought we could talk about --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it's not a problem. So come back -- come back in a little while.

CHING CHIAO: Great.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We've got five or six minutes of this session left so I'm going to close the queue after Alan.

Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Thank you. Tony Holmes, and I've come to the mic to repeat, on behalf of the ISPCP constituency, what we said when we met with the board. ICANN 57, we found this the most difficult

meeting ever to arrange, which was really a surprise to us because it was the longer of the meetings on the new schedule.

And maybe we expected a little bit more correlation with the way we had ICANN meetings of this length before, but that didn't happen, and we had the block schedule.

Within my constituency, we wanted to meet with a number of other groups, not only within the GNSO, but with the contracted parties house, with the ALAC. We wanted to try and get some time with the CEO, and we had a block schedule.

The problem was that everyone was working on that block schedule and whenever you tried to have interactions with other groups, it concatenated the problems. It just moved all the bits around.

When we actually arrived here in Hyderabad, some of those bits were still moving. The schedule wasn't set. And that became a real issue.

We feel that the focus for ICANN meetings should initially be on the core issues that ICANN needs to deal with, and most of the high-interest topics are of interest to everyone and are really important. They should fit around the other parts of the program.

So we would like to see in future some of the core meetings that take place when we get together hard-coded into the meeting schedule at an early date, so that we have something to work around, and we would also propose that there should be a single point of contact from all of the SOs, ACs, and constituencies to work with the meetings team and the scheduling team to make sure that we all are aware of what's happening and we can coordinate at an early stage and get to a set schedule. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you very much.

Sally, did you want to comment?

[Applause]

SALLY COSTERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Tony, very much indeed. And I -- I welcome on behalf of the staff team your request that there should be a point person or a group of point people from the community that you select to work with us at the staff side, at the -- on an ongoing basis, starting, if it works for you, before, in fact, we leave Hyderabad.

We've obviously been aware of these issues and we would like to provide the SO/AC group, in whatever combination you choose, with a block schedule, a very first day block schedule for Copenhagen before -- even before we leave here, that we work in -- absolutely hand in glove with that SO/AC coordination group to do as you suggest. Both to coordinate about what sessions should be blocked, hard-coded, for intercommunity hot topics or high topics or topics the community wants to discuss together, and then at the stage after that, how do you then spend the time to develop the key meetings that the different SO/AC structures need to have with themselves, as it were, and with the other SO/AC structures.

So we are very, very committed to doing that and really appreciate your energy to help us to get that moving.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

TONY HOLMES: That's appreciated. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Sally. Thank you, Tony.

When we've taken the last question on this from Alan, I'm going to pass this along to one of my other colleagues on the board, so if you have questions on any open topic at all, you can now start to queue up behind -- behind Alan, if you want to come to the microphone to talk about anything at all.

Greg?

GREGORY SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan, president of the intellectual property constituency.

First, I'd like to echo all of what Tony said. Both of us struggled mightily, being in charge of scheduling for our respective constituencies, with the scheduling of this meeting and the lack of coordination and what seemed like surprises, such as the high-interest topics metastasizing to eight and a process for choosing them that seemed rather ad hoc. The -- Sally noted, as I have repeatedly, the fact that the promise of Day 7 was essentially broken and that all that Day 7 is is the old Friday, which is the day after, so just renumbering that as Day 7 does not give you a longer meeting. It does -- and we really could have avoided some of the conflicts if we had used Day 7 fruitfully and not merely renumbered the day after as Day 7.

I think that there were a number of -- there are always conflicts, of course, but the types of conflicts I saw at this meeting were more of the worst kinds, conflicts directly in terms of subject matter and interest.

What I'd encourage the team to do is to use the concept of user journeys and think about the type of people who come here and perhaps look at the attempts at user journeys that people like myself planned for their days. And think about you have policy people, you have technical people, you have various different people, and for some people they're in one room most of the time. That's easy. For the rest of us, we're finding -- picking our way through the schedule.

So I think if you take a variety of user journeys, Fiona's journey may be different than mine and different than others, but there are defined types, and I think a real Day 7, if we're going to do it, would alleviate a lot of that, but we need to see how people use these. The color coding in the schedule --

[Timer sounds]

-- does not really represent proper user journeys. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Greg.

[Applause]

Thank you.

I think so we have time to carry on, we'll take that as a comment. Understood. And I'm sure Sally has taken notes, and I have no doubt you are prepared as much as Tony is to help fix that issue. So thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Absolutely.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you very much. This is Seun Ojedeji. I work for Federal University Oye-Ekiti. I'm speaking on my personal behalf.

I just would like to mention that any meeting that cannot start on Sunday and end on a Saturday will ultimately require a two weeks' leave for somebody like me. I had to apply for two weeks' leave for this one, and I think it's a waste of my leave days.

I think it should be good that the meeting is scheduled to start on the weekend and end on the weekend so I can at least save some of the days instead of using a day to travel.

The other point is I think -- I'm told that one of the intent of this long meeting was that some people will be able to come for this topic of interest and leave. We didn't -- before the end of the meeting. But when I looked at the schedule, I couldn't find a day that I could actually take off because everything seems to be required for me as ALAC member until -- tomorrow -- I still have an agenda item tomorrow.

So I think the schedule needs to be streamlined. If it is going to be long meeting days like this, it should be good that it's scheduled in a way that we get our business done and we can leave before the end of the entire meeting. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you very much.

Before we go to -- and thank you for the comments. Notes have been taken.

Before we go to Alan. Ram.

Oh, you want to go after? Okay. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess the advantages and disadvantages of being at the end of the queue is many things have been said, and I support almost everything that has been said until now.

But a couple of specifics. I'm the chair of the ALAC. I'm speaking in my own capacity but with a number of different hats, including a very active participant in GNSO activities and the chair of the ALAC.

This is on paper as someone has said the longest meeting we've ever had but not really. We used to have GNSO PDP discussions, and they were scheduled the day before the formal meeting started. And there was a hard-fought battle to get funding for that. Now we have been told it has to be on the first day of the meeting, so we have funding but we are not allowed to use it.

We, like the GNSO, have started doing development days on the last day. And, again, we were told that the last day which was

advertised as a meeting day wasn't really a meeting day, it was for development.

So from my perspective, there were five days, not seven, and because of the constraints put on even how we use those days, this was by far the most difficult meeting we have ever had to schedule.

I appreciate the concept of saying we'll have a block schedule before we leave Hyderabad. But creating that block schedule prior to doing the survey and finding out what we want I'm not sure is the wisest path. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Alan, can I -- may I ask you a question just for clarity. Sorry, I have a mint in my mouth.

Are you saying that you're not -- you haven't been given the opportunity to use Thursday for things that you want to use it for?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, yes and no. We wanted to do a professional development and group -- and community building group with the new ALAC. And we decided -- the GNSO started that several years ago. We started last year. It's very effective to take a new group of

people who have never worked with each other and actually have them talk to each other before they disappear.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, could you --

ALAN GREENBERG: In our normal -- Sorry. In our normal world, the new group convenes on the last day of the meeting and then disappears. So we tried to get the group to work -- the new ALAC to work together as a group for a day. Last -- in Dublin, we did it the day after the meeting. This time we were told we have to do it on the 9th.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But why is that a problem if nothing else is happening on the 9th?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if we hadn't been constrained to that, other things would be happening on the 9th. It was advertised as a regular meeting day for the innocent attendee. They are here with nothing to do.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much.

Ram?

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you very much, Chris.

I wanted to share a little bit of my own experience from this meeting from the perspective of a board liaison. It's been a long meeting for me as well, especially keeping a focus on multiple topics at the same time and keeping up with the preparatory material for board sessions, for the SSAC sessions, and other sessions. It's just been a crushing load.

The week prior to coming to this meeting was for me personally was devoted primarily to just preparing for the sessions here.

One observation is that a longer amount of time clearly means that we have more topics to cover. And I can share with you in the community that the board itself is struggling with that in its own internal workshop sessions where the number of topics far exceeds available time.

And I personally look forward to find ways where board members can continue to mingle inside of the various sessions and listen to what the community is saying. I think that's incredibly important.

On the other hand, I wanted to point out several incredibly positive things that I have noticed here, and I wanted to give a shout-out to that. At this meeting -- prior to the start of this meeting was the Indian School of Internet Governance, the first-ever time that happened. That's phenomenal. It was done at the university nearby, and there was an international audience and a curriculum that got started. I think that's a great start and a terrific initiative.

I also want to give a shout-out to the first ICANN hackathon. The energy there was amazing. The business engagement with Indian businesses, I saw lots of participation from local industry. And that's something that we should continue to do. That's not new but that's refreshing to see.

And I loved the Women in Internet session --

[Timer sounds]

-- that happened with the international participation and the role models for leadership that is being shown. I think that's a great thing that we ought to continue going forward.

So personally I find it refreshing to see these new initiatives come. In addition to discussion about policy and other things, to see these new initiatives as part of the ICANN meeting, even though it meant that I came here a couple days earlier, it was

very refreshing. So thank you for all of you who came up with these ideas and have increased the vitality of this whole ICANN structure.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Ram.

That's the close of this session. I now pass the microphone across to Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Chris.

My name is Asha Hemrajani. Now we invite questions and comments on any subjects of community interest, including some left-over questions on the meeting structure.

Please.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Asha. This is Ching again. So apologize for not actually following the topic previously, even at my 40th meeting; so still lots to learn.

Once again, as a corporate registrar in China, we have mixed feedback on -- from our customers regarding the price for the new TLD sunrises and also with the reserve or premium names.

We are talking about the registry offering from, you know, basically two questions here: A, so inconsistent pricing and, B, predatory pricing.

I believe these two issues have been so readily brought up by other members of the community, especially from BC. I'm here to tell everyone that it does not seem to stop. We're talking about usually four to six digits of USD for sunrise or actually for premium names and not only for the new TLD but for the legacy price of -- you know, for the legacy TLD like .COM at the secondary market, the price also inflated. So usually we are talking about few thousands or even millions when short and memorable names change hand.

So how do we and what can we do about it? How can ICANN board do it without -- while promoting competition and consumer choice of TLDs?

I think one good solution is to open up another round.

And the other thing is just to really look at the current process. Especially when my clients read about .WEB auction, the worries are much greater than excitement. I believe many in the room believe the same. I won't repeat what happened and what's been said in the past few weeks and months.

[Timer sounds]

At the higher level to me and to my clients, it's all again about ICANN's -- I mean, the reputation and also the accountability, so -- which I would hope that with your decision, especially in this ICANN board, will help drive the price lower and the cost lower for the clients. Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Ching.

Chris, would you like to comment on that, please?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Only because -- only because .WEB was mentioned. I think -- I'd just like to say that I think everybody and I hope that everybody understands that we won't enter into any discussion about .WEB today. It's not an appropriate thing for us to do. We're happy to listen, but I just wanted to plant that flag in the ground right now.

Ram, did you actually want to say something about .WEB, about your position here on the board? You want to -- Okay. So just for -- that's fine.

So just, everybody, to be clear, we know that -- everyone knows that Afilias is involved in the .WEB thing. Ram is sitting here on the board.

Ram has been scrupulous in recusing himself from all of the discussions and anything that's been said about this topic. And I just want everybody to know that just because he's sitting here as part of this session, there's absolutely no communication with him at all about this and he's completely recused, okay?

CHING CHIAO: Can I just add one more thing?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Please.

CHING CHIAO: So I think the process, pretty much we respect the board's process. But to many of us here and many of the brand owners, especially from China, it seems like it's in the black box. So we would hope that more disclosure of the process and making sure that ICANN, especially the board, sends a strong message, everything is okay moving forward. We will drive innovation and competition. And it all leads to, you know, customer taking the names but without really adding the cost. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Ching.

Xie xie the comment.

I think we have an only question.

Brad, could you read that, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from Beran Dondoh. ICANN should take into account the different religions when setting dates of meetings. I understand it is difficult working around international calendars, but it is important that ICANN takes this into consideration.

From a personal point of view, I have tried -- I have had to miss ICANN56 in Helsinki and may miss ICANN59 in Johannesburg during the holy month of Ramadan, the Muslim fasting month.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Nick, may I ask you to address this please? Do you want to come up here and use my mic?

NICK TOMASSO: My apologies for that delay.

When scheduling ICANN meetings, we do take into account major religious and national holidays. We also have to be

cognizant of the fact that there needs to be some distance between ICANN meetings. So we're pretty much -- use a March/June/October schedule.

The other thing that we need to look at is the other conferences that happen in this space like IETF, IGF, RIPE, and a myriad number of others. And we always like to place a week between those meetings and the ICANN meeting or vice versa.

So when you do all of that, it's inevitable that we will be holding some meetings over some major religious and national holidays.

And I -- we do our best to avoid them, acknowledge them when they do happen. But I cannot develop a schedule on an annual basis or a multiyear basis that avoids them completely.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Nick.

PAT KANE: Good morning. Pat Kane with VeriSign.

At the open forum on Saturday afternoon, Jonathan Robinson came to the mic and on behalf of Afiliat leadership wanted to talk about the .WEB allocation. Jonathan's comments were a summarized statement based upon a blog that he had produced

earlier and a two-page document being circulated here at ICANN57 entitled ".WEB, ICANN's first test of accountability."

The leadership of Afilias does a disservice to this board and the community by making this issue a referendum on the community, on the board, on ICANN, and the empowered -- and the people that made that happen to include Jonathan's award-recognized efforts.

Afilias -- while Afilias frames its false allegations against Nu Dot Co and VeriSign as a test of ICANN's new role as an independent manager of the Internet's addressing system. It is nothing more than a tactic to attempt to overturn legitimate auction results and be awarded the right to operate a public asset at less than market value or worse, pushing ICANN auction proceeds now earmarked for the public benefit into their own pockets or the other applicants through a new private auction.

We are all self-interested businesses, Nu Dot Co, VeriSign, Donuts, Afilias, and the other applicants for .WEB. We've all taken different approaches. And from what I can tell, we believe that we have followed the guidelines set forth in the applicant guidebook.

But this is not a test for the board. This issue is not a test for the newly empowered community. It is a test of our ability to utilize

the processes and the tools that we've developed over the past 20 years for dispute resolution.

The facts are the facts, and the validity of those facts will be determined by courts of law and through IRPs.

What I ask you, the board and the community, is to allow the processes that we have in place to work through to their natural conclusion without undue lobbying or interference from any self-interested party. Thank you.

[Timer sounds]

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you for your comment. As Chris mentioned, we are unable to comment on the .WEB matter at this time. Thank you.

Sir?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Good morning. My name is Jimson Olufuye. I'm the CEO of Kontemporary Konsulting, based in Abuja, member of the Africa ICT Alliance, consisting of ICT association companies from 27 countries in Africa. We are a member of the business constituency.

And I want to use this opportunity to congratulate everyone, particularly NTIA, the board, the community, and, of course, the business constituency for the success of the transition.

When you just won a major battle, that is when we need to be very, very vigilant. In fact, I'm saying this from AfICTA perspective. We need to engage more. We appreciate the engagement office that is in Nairobi, but it needs to be better resourced. We need to provide more resources to this engagement office to engage African governments and the private sector. We are concerned with issues of compliance and abuse, cybercrimes, cybersecurity, child online safety, many things.

I also understand that ICANN will have a framework for capacity-building for training. But we need to reach out. In person you need to come to us, we need to provide resources to reach out. So I want to use this opportunity to also appreciate Tarek, Pierre Dandjinou, Patrick Jones, my fellows in the BC for all we do in the region.

I happen to be one of the five global business members of the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation, and I know we have recorded a lot of progress with the transition that we just witnessed. So we see progress with the government of India engaging in this space, the government of Iran.

So we need to do more and get more government and be more proactive. Thank you.

[Timer sounds]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Jimson. I would like to ask Sally to comment on that, please.

SALLY COSTERTON: Hello? Oh. Thank you, Jimson. Thank you for your comments. And I'm very pleased that you have been involved with many with of our other colleagues in the Africa community in setting up the center in Nairobi. It is absolutely the role of the center to become a focal point for engagement, increasing engagement, with all stakeholders in Africa. And we hope to do that primarily through hosting capacity-building activities that will extend and develop the skills of the African community members to work with the staff, with the board, with the whole community to increase the amount of dialogue, the amount of understanding that we have with African governments but also with all other stakeholder groups, technical training, civil society groups, and the business community obviously as you're part of that.

There is a -- there are a set of KPIs and a scorecard which has been helped developed by the community members with the

staff on how we will measure the success of the Africa engagement center, which is a really great initiative being piloted by that group.

And I would very much hope that as we progress over the next few months, please give your input into how we do that, when we may want to make changes as time goes on. Thank you very much for your contribution. Much appreciated.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Sally.

(Pronouncing name), please, your comment or question.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Excellent pronunciation again. My name is Young Eum Lee representing .KR in the ccNSO Council but speaking on my own behalf.

It was encouraging to observe during the historical meeting of the new independent ICANN that the various stakeholder groups were engaged in productive activities to fortify the ICANN structure. I share the sincere gratitude that most of us have toward the numerous volunteers and for the countless number of hours and the many sleep-deprived nights they have spent to achieve this.

I would, however, like to stress one aspect that I hope will not be lost during the formation of the several new committees and the structures. And that is regional diversity.

While I recognize that there is conscious effort within ICANN to ensure diversity in the spirit of multistakeholderism, regional diversity is one factor that does not have mechanisms ensuring it. Thus, when we look at the composition of the initial committees in the new ICANN structure, we see that certain regions are represented more heavily than others, specifically the North America and the Europe regions.

Cultural and language factors may have been the factors that have produced those results. But, I would like to stress that the global nature of ICANN can only be strengthened by appropriate regional representation. And I would like to make this plea not only to the board but also to the various SOs and the ACs that are responsible for the selection of the representatives in the future. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you very much.

Kamsa hamida.

The board also feels very strongly about regional diversity, and we are very supportive of what you have suggested. So thank you.

And with that, I would like to pass this on to my colleague, Maemura-san. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much, Asha. My name is Akinori Maemura. My name is displayed as the last name first, then the first name second. That's my preferred way. But just call me Akinori, my first name. Just easy. Thank you.

Next gentleman, please.

MITCH STOLTZ:

Hi. I'm Mitch Stoltz. I'm with the Electronic Frontier Foundation. I want to thank the board for their ongoing commitment to the principles set out in the bylaws that ICANN does not regulate the content of websites and services.

And over the course of this meeting, I've heard from many of the contracted parties, many visitors from various constituencies and, of course, from my friends in the noncommercial users constituency about the importance of that principle and more

broadly the importance of freedom of expression, the one human right which guarantees and strengthens all of the others.

But risks and challenges remain. I ask that the board and this entire community guard against the imposition of new and broadening controls and regulations on Web content which is, in essence, speech through misuse of the contractual compliance process, through new and broader public interest commitments.

And on the issue of private agreements between contracted parties and other stakeholders for the regulation of content, they will happen. ICANN as an institution should not condone them, should not give them forum, and should not make them part of the multistakeholder process when they are not. The risk is a loss of confidence in this institution, commercial harm to the contracted parties. Much as harm was caused to important --

[Timer sounds]

-- businesses and institutions from similar controversies about the restriction of content -- I'm thinking about the Stop Online Piracy Act in the United States, the anti-counterfeiting trade agreement in Europe, and the controversy over Facebook free basics here in India. I hope this body guards against repeating those mistakes. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

Anyone takes this question to answer? Becky.

BECKY BURR: I just want to say that the board understands very clearly that ICANN doesn't have a role in content regulation. That's in the bylaws. I understand the other points you're making, but that is a very clear foundational principle for us.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Becky.

Next please. Thank you.

PHILIP CORWIN: Good morning. Philip Corwin. I wear many hats within ICANN world. One of them is as a councillor representing the business constituency on the GNSO Council. Another is I'm co-chair of two working groups including the one reviewing all RPMs and all gTLDs. But the hat I'm wearing for this statement is that of counsel to the Internet Commerce Association.

You all will recall that last year Global Domain Division staff negotiated renewals of the .CAT, .PRO, and .TRAVEL registry agreements, all of which included so-called voluntarily adoption of uniform rapid suspension.

ICA protested that as did many others, saying that it was making policy through contract negotiations. We filed a reconsideration request as did the BC and the NCSG jointly. And that doesn't happen very often.

And I want to note here that my BC colleagues favor adoption of URS as consensus policy but took a very principled stand against getting to that result through this manner.

But GDD and the board in that process said that, of course, it would be wrong to force URS on applicants -- on registry operators through negotiations but that these was all voluntary and, therefore, okay.

Now, on October 12th, ICANN published for public comment a renewal agreement for .XXX in which they too agreed for URS in exchange for a 87% reduction in their registry fees. One has to wonder what a registry operator wouldn't agree to in exchange for that type of reduction.

So I'll end with this question. I don't know what the RPM working group is going to recommend on URS becoming consensus policy. My own mind is completely open on this point, depending on what our work finds and what changes might be made in it.

But if we were to recommend that URS should not be consensus policy --

[Timer sounds]

Can I just finish this?

-- would GDD staff continue this practice in negotiations? If the answer is no, then I maintain it's inappropriate for them to do it now. And if the answer is that they're going to keep doing it, even if we come out against it being consensus policy, then doesn't that render that part of our charter work a somewhat irrelevant exercise in futility? Thank you very much.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Anyone takes? No?

CHERINE CHALABY: Akram, do you want to make a comment on that, please?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Sure, thank you. So basically the negotiations are -- the registries come and ask for something, and we tell them please adopt the new gTLD contract. And if they push back on it and

they say they don't want something, we can't force them to take it. It's a negotiation between two parties. And I think it's within the remit of the corporation to negotiate its contracts.

If the policy comes back and says that the URS is not something that we want to have as a policy, of course, we would support that. Thank you.

PHILIP CORWIN: I appreciate the last part of your statement, Akram. Thank you very much.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Before going to the next -- for the time keeping-wise, the queue is now being closed. Then if you had any specific question, then you can send us the email to the engagement@icann.org. Thank you very much.

Next lady, please.

LIMEI LIEU: Thank you for the opportunity, and good morning. I'm Limei from China Organizational Name Administration Center, CONAC (indiscernible).

I have a question regarding the registrar data escrow service. And right now, ICANN accredit seven data escrow service providers, and only one, Air Mountain, is paid by ICANN.

And so my question is if ICANN has any plan that give other six registrars, other data escrow service provider, the equal status, because other registrar data escrow providers, they do not charge registrar as well.

So they do -- but they do have some cost to cover. So my question is the equal status.

Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much.

Akram, you may answer or someone else?

Cyrus. Thank you, Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much. This is Cyrus Namazi from Global Domains Division.

So the question before the Board and to the community is about data escrow services that registrars are required to use. ICANN does subsidize the full cost of one service through Iron Mountain

but we also have other approved data escrow providers in different parts of the world in case a registrar chooses not to use the ICANN-provided service.

At the moment, we have no reason to or haven't really contemplated the budgets for actually subsidizing other services in other parts of the world. We haven't really seen the business need for it. But if you see the need for it and there is a reasonable justification for it, we'll always be happy to consider it.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you.

Next gentleman, please.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Dear board members, my name is Raoul Plommer and I'm from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. I participated in my first ICANN this year, and I'm spending most of my time to understand some of the fundamentals about structures, processes and procedures that creates are our extremely complex environment here at ICANN.

In this meeting I've learned a perplexing fact I'd like you to enlighten me about. Why is it that within NomCom, which has

great power in selecting our leaders of this multistakeholder community, has appropriated six seats for entities that are motivated by profit and just one for the noncommercial interests?

In other words, the balance is badly tilted towards interests who are making money at the expense of us who feel that human rights deserve more representation than one (indiscernible). This is also against the principles of fostering diversity within ICANN. Specifically, why does the Commercial Stakeholder Group have four seats and other SGs within the GNSO have only one each?

I would like to point out that the other user constituency within the NCSG, NPOC, has no seats on NomCom, and I've also learned that academia used to have a seat on the NomCom seven years ago, but it was taken away, leaving the NCSG with only one. I've also heard that if this situation isn't rectified soon, the NomCom will stay this way for many years to come.

I suggest that our fresh board take charge of this unfair situation and puts it at the top of their earliest of priorities. The matter is urgent, and I find the current situation completely unacceptable.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

Anyone?

Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you, Akinori.

And thank you for your feedback.

There is a process that is just kicking off, actually, which is a formal review of the Nominating Committee, and so the process there will be that ICANN will be appointing an independent reviewer, and that appointment will happen early next year. And certainly I expect that that will be one of the topics, is do we have the right composition of the Nominating Committee.

So, yeah, I do encourage you to participate in that review process once it starts next year.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much.

Before going to the next one on the queue, I think we have the online question.

Brad.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: I have a question from Marilyn Cade: I regret missing the meeting in person. I was shocked to see other meetings scheduled at the same time as the public forum. The public forum used to be a full day. It has continually been diminished in time. Let us not accept any other sessions at the same time as the public forum. The board and staff need to be able to listen attentively to the broad community; that means we need to all be in the same room, even when virtually so.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Who takes it?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I ask a question? I'm not clear. Are there other sessions going on right now?

Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: All right. Thank you very much.

Then this concludes my part, and I am now -- we are now having Markus Kummer to handling the part of the ICANN 58 presentation.

Markus, please.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you.

Maybe the people standing in the queue, if they wish to sit down, please do so. We briefly introduce now the Danish presentation for the next ICANN meeting, ICANN 58.

But before doing so, allow me to say a few words about Hyderabad and our host. It has been a great pleasure for us to enjoy Indian hospitality. And those of you who were here in 2008 for the IGF, I'm sure they will agree with me to see the tremendous transformation the city has been undergoing.

This conference center was more or less stand-alone in an area. There was little buildings and now it's built up with glitzy, high-tech buildings. It's really truly amazing to see this transformation. That's really development in action.

But now allow me to call on our -- the host of our next meeting, Finn Petersen, director for ICT, the Danish business development, to present the host country presentation for ICANN 58.

Please, Finn.

FINN PETERSEN:

Thank you, Markus.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be here in Hyderabad and to be able to welcome you all to Copenhagen for the next ICANN meeting. It will be the first ICANN meeting in Denmark, and we are eager to see you all in Copenhagen March next year.

The meeting will take place at the Bella Center, which is located between the Copenhagen airport and Copenhagen downtown, only five kilometers to each place. So let us see a video and see what are awaiting us in Copenhagen.

Please.

(Video playing)

VIDEO:

Copenhagen is a vibrant metropolis, a gateway to Scandinavia and one of the safest and cleanest cities in the world. The city is repeatedly ranked the most livable city and the Danes the happiest people in the world.

Copenhagen is a compact waterfront city. It is easy to navigate in and has one of the world's best infrastructures. Easy to get to from anywhere, the transfer from the airport to the city center takes only 13 minutes by metro, which is faster than in any other European capital city.

Situated by the water, it has a temperate climate with mild winters and lovely summers.

Copenhagen is globally known as one of the most environmentally friendly cities, with a harbor so clean you can swim in it. The city has an ambition to become the world's first carbon neutral capital by 2025.

Congestion is low in this bike friendly city where more than 50% of Copenhageners commute by bike on a daily basis. For visitors, there are plenty of opportunities to rent a bicycle and join them.

Copenhagen dates back a thousand years, and it is home to the world's oldest monarchy. Trends and traditions go hand in hand with exciting museums, beautiful sights, vibrant night life, and shopping opportunities.

Danish design is also globally renown for its innovative architecture, furniture and fashion.

With a focus on new Nordic cuisine, Copenhagen has become synonymous with world-class gastronomy and the city offers a wealth of dining opportunities from Michelin starred restaurants to the more traditional Danish cuisine.

Your Congress will be held at Bella Center Copenhagen, just nine minutes from the city center by metro, and only a few minutes from the airport by metro, train, or free shuttle service.

Bella Center Copenhagen, has a long-proven record of hosting both large and small conventions. It has ample meeting space and is a versatile venue that could be modified to suit every type of event.

Bella Center Copenhagen also offers two hotels, Bella Sky, right next to the Bella Center, with 812 beautifully appointed designer rooms and unique facilities and features, and Crowne Plaza Copenhagen Towers, one of the world's most sustainable hotels, only a few minutes from Bella Center Copenhagen with a shuttle service.

With more than 20,000 hotel rooms in Copenhagen, there is plenty of city center accommodation to choose from, ranging from five-star hotels to the very affordable designer hostels.

We are certain that you and your colleagues will have a wonderful time in one of the safest and most livable cities in the world, and we sincerely hope we will be welcoming you all to Copenhagen.

(Video ends)

[Applause]

FINN PETERSEN:

As you saw, Copenhagen is beautiful in the summer. The meeting will be in the very early days of spring, so you may consider not to book your written ticket but stay a couple of months more in Copenhagen.

And I will provide with you some more facts and what you can expect.

We have always been a heavy user of domain names. Our ccTLDs have issued more domain names per inhabitant compared with most other ccTLDs.

We have one of the highest broadband penetration in the world, and our public sector is highly digitized.

For many years we are, and we are still, on the top of the transparency index according to the ranking of Transparency International. We are heavily taxed, but as you heard, we are at the same time one of the happiest people in the world according to the U.N. Happiness Report 2016. We have a Danish word which is not used in most other languages. I will try to translate it into English. It says happiness at work.

So with this word, I hope to see you all in Copenhagen and hope that you will experience the happiness of work at the ICANN meeting. And when you relax in Copenhagen, have a coffee or

beer and a Danish open sandwich and look on all the happy people surrounding you.

Or you might go to the castle of (saying name) just north of Copenhagen where Shakespeare's Hamlet took place and where Hamlet said the famous words, "There's something rotten in the state of Denmark."

[Laughter]

It was many years ago, and things have changed. In which direction, you will find out when you come to ICANN 58.

See you soon in one of the safest country in the world according to global Peace Index 2016.

See you all in Copenhagen.

[Applause]

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Finn. And for those who are really interested to see whether there is anything rotten in the state of Denmark, I would warmly recommend the Danish TV show Borgen known as the Danish West Wing. Gives a fantastic in-view into how the Danes live.

And another recommendation is the concept of hygge, which is very Danish. Everybody agrees it is difficult to translate. It's

something between pleasant and cozy, but it is very Danish and you will see it when you go to Denmark.

So (saying phrase in Danish), or in other words, we look forward to going to Denmark.

Thank you, Finn.

[Applause]

MARKUS KUMMER:

And with that, my apologies to those who have patiently been queuing up, and I toss over to Lousewies who will moderate the next section of our open forum.

Please, Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much, Markus.

Let's go straight to the next speakers, and the shorter we can keep the questions and the shorter we can keep the answers, the more people will have a chance to speak today.

VEERENDHAR BORRA REDDY: Thank you, Board, for giving me an opportunity to stand before you to give some comments and analyze my two queries.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Sir, would you please say your name?

VEERENDHAR BORRA REDDY: My name Veerendhar Borra Reddy, from India, Hyderabad -- on the academic side.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you.

VEERENDHAR BORRA REDDY: -- on the academic side.

And I thank you, the Board, for giving me an opportunity to be a new entrant participant for this 57th AGM in Hyderabad of ICANN, and also the one (indiscernible) individually, officially and professionally are very good to me. The (indiscernible) put in papers, I wish her all the best in her life.

My query to you, to be discussed accordingly within Internet and (indiscernible) ICANN Board, across the board, across the divisions, across the sections in the ICANN fraternity, there are the one, the laws, and the legal laws and the violation of the human rights.

And, above all, to see the one to discuss the very serious matter in the Nigerian fraud in this existing in the Internet community.

Thank you. And at last, I wish all the board members well in advance happy and merry Christmas and a happy and a prosperous new year.

Thank you.

[Applause]

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you. Thank you very much for that. I think there's a couple of things that are relevant to your question, sir. First is that within the Work Stream 2, there is actually a subgroup working on human rights which of course is open for anyone to participate in. And then my neighbor Ram was just whispering it's the SSR which is working on questions of fraud and of abuse. So we look forward to your participation.

Thank you. Next question, please.

VICTOR ZHANG: Thank you, everybody. I come from China, Hangzhou, and from MNG.CN. My name is Victor Zhang. Although I can speak English, but I think ICANN is more Chinese (indiscernible) so I ask question is Chinese.

First of all, I would like to ask a question, this time to attend ICANN 57. I have a suggestion. Yesterday, I attended Chris Mondini's meeting and also Grace meeting. It's a meeting about RSG. It's a luncheon. It's an informal meeting.

So my suggestion is ICANN Board can host more events like this, although we have very short time, because we have very few people we can talk about specific questions in a deepened away. So I suggest that we can have more events like this. This is my first comment.

Second, about new gTLD program. From last year till now, in China we have about 50% of new gTLD of the total amount of the world. So my suggestion is ICANN can invest more into the Chinese market. Yesterday I also shared my comments in the APAC events. We have a lot of strings. Now we have more than 1,000 strings. In the future, we'll have more. What if -- what if some of the strings disappear or stopped working? Does ICANN have any measures in facing this kind of situation?

And also, we have so many strings coming to the market, and it is also a burden for some of the corporations. How can we do? Do you have any measures in this area?

For instance, can you reduce the cost for the domain name arbitration? And finally, I have something else to say. I would

like to say thank you to Goran Marby, our CEO, for taking a photo with the Chinese community.

Thank you so much.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

I'm going to pass you over to Asha. Go ahead.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you very much for taking -- raising the question. And you have three aspects. First, thank you for your recommendation, which is a very good one.

In India, we have a lot of engagement with businesses. And last time we had similar activities.

And the question could be responded by my colleague, Akram, or my other colleague

AKRAM ATALLAH:

So, basically, there is a process to -- for TLDs to exit the root. We have that. We have not -- we have exercised one of those.

There is a community working group on the next round. And I think that any policy issue that you would like to discuss for the next round should be by participating in the community process. And I think that these issues are already contemplated in there. Thank you.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much. Let's go to the next question, please.

ELAINE PRUIS:

I'm Elaine Pruis from Donuts. And first I'd like to say thank you for selecting Copenhagen for the next meeting. It's a fabulous city, and I can't wait to be there.

Next I would like to state that in August nearly all of the applicants for dot home, corp, and mail TLDs sent an letter to the ICANN board with a constructive suggestion about next steps for these three TLDs. We have yet to get a reply from you.

At home, corp, and mail are in purgatory over name inclusion concerns.

More than two years ago, ICANN referred the matter to the IETF promising that ICANN will collaborate with the technical and security community to identify the best ways to handle these strings. The IETF did not recommend a way forward after

reviewing the matter. And, to our knowledge, a consultation with ICANN either did not occur or it bore no fruit.

So two years have passed since then. And those two years represent valuable time that ICANN could have used to collect important data on potential name collision occurrence as well as to consider possible mitigation measures.

The Board should not continue to allow this idleness to stand.

In lieu of continued inaction, we're not suggesting that these TLDs move to contention resolution phase. Rather, we've made the very simple suggestion that we study the data that's currently available, gather collision data that may be occurring right now.

One idea is to delegate home, corp, and mail to ICANN or to a third party simply as a transparent exercise in gathering this data about name collision risks. And perhaps that exercise could result in a plan to mitigate risks with those three TLDs and produce a possible path forward. We see no down side for doing a transparent study. That's all we're asking for at this point. We feel ICANN owes the applicants of home, corp, and mail and the public at least that. And a reply to our letter would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you, Elaine. I'm going to give it to Steve for a reply.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much for the question. And I appreciate that there's a lot of interest in those strings and comparable interest, perhaps, in some other strings.

For the benefit of everyone who hasn't been following this area very closely, one of the important pieces of background is that these strings, as well as some others, have been used informally or not through the ICANN processes. And there is a fair amount of background traffic that comes to the root zone that isn't intended to be there. That's one of the strong considerations.

I don't want to take a position or show -- say exactly how this is going to be resolved. The interaction with the IETF is based on the fact that the IETF is where, at least in the past, the original thinking about how to allocate the name space and create the name space has taken place and where the -- a lot of the technical thinking is.

So one of the challenges in this situation is working out the right way to coordinate between our colleagues in the IETF and whatever processes we need to build.

With respect to looking at data, we should, obviously, do that. I would add a caution that one also has to look at the underlying

forces at work. And so a particular measurement as to fit into a broader model, it's just a generic statement about the proper role of measurements versus the kind of questions that are asked.

We'll take your comment seriously and try to be responsible in responding to it.

And, at the same time, of course, security and stability and lack of user confusability are absolute paramount and not exactly comparable to commercial interest. Thank you.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much. Next question, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hi. Jordyn Buchanan again and continuing to speak in my personal capacity.

I will just note, regarding the previous topic, I believe the IETF just adopted a document on special use names that may eventually provide some clarity in this area.

But, to move on to the topic I intended to discuss, I guess we'll do some more ICANN archaeology and refer back to some history, which is in February of 2012, the Board adopted a resolution reaffirming its commitment to a second round of new

gTLD expansion as well as directing the CEO to create a project plan relating to that second round.

I mentioned this because that resolution also included -- called out two particular milestones that needed to be achieved in that project plan relating to GAC advice. The first was a review related to RPMs, and the second was review related to root scaling and stability related to the program.

I note, with the publication of the CDAR report recently, both of those milestones have now been achieved. And, in addition, I know the Board recently requested input from the GNSO regarding what issues the GNSO viewed as being relevant to new gTLD expansion.

So I guess I'm here to wonder, with that additional information now in hand, what's the status of that project plan and -- yeah, that's it. That's my question.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: I'm wondering if that would be someone from -- well, obviously, from the organization, Goran's team who would like to reply. Okay. Akram is back. Very good.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Hello. So, basically, there was this original project plan. But also the Board has sent the GNSO a question to the GNSO on what they feel needs to be done before we actually consider the next round.

And, until we hear back from the community on this, in particular, the reviews that are going on as well as a PDP that's going on, that's a clarity we're lacking.

Once we have that, I think we can sit down and present to the Board what our alternatives are. I hope that answered the question, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, Akram, just to clarify, does that mean you're saying we're waiting for those things to complete before we draw up a project plan? And, if that's the case, does that match the Board's understanding of what was intended by that resolution?

AKRAM ATALLAH: I think we're waiting for the GNSO to tell us their opinion on what they view as needed before the next round. And then we will get all of this information together and present it to the Board.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, as I understand it, the GNSO just provided that feedback back to the Board, so that might be good to incorporate? But, unfortunately, I think you'll see their response is indeterminate. So you guys may have to work through a lack of certainty from the community on this one.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much for that.

Bruce, you want to come in on that?

BRUCE TONKIN: Jordyn, one comment I would make -- I know you're a member of the competition and consumer trust review team. I think, at the very minimum, we have a commitment we've made to the U.S. government under our Affirmation of Commitments to carry out that review.

As you know, there are three parts to that. One part is looking at what I call the general marketplace and another part is looking at consumer trust. And I think recommendations that you come in those areas no doubt would help policy development work into the future.

But the third part of that review is actually review of how the evaluation process went.

So I think, at the bare minimum, we need to receive that. Because that then helps us look at what changes need to be made in the application evaluation process.

And the other piece of data I think we have, which the GNSO could consider, is the reconsideration requests and the independent review tribunals. There's been numerous cases related to parts of the new gTLD program, particularly related to the community priority evaluation and, to some degree, to string similarity.

So, just at face value, that would seem to be an area that GNSO might want to consider providing advice to the Board or policy recommendations in those specific areas.

But -- so I hope that sort of gives a bit of a lead is that first we need to get the output from your group. And then there's some obvious things that the GNSO might want to consider just based on evaluating the last round.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Since we have 30 seconds left, I'll just say that the CCT is actually looking specifically at reconsideration requests as one of the factors in the evaluation process. So it may be that your two items are actually merged.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much. And for the next question I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Lito, who, like me, is celebrating his one-year anniversary on the Board.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Lousewies. Yes, we're no longer the newbies. May I apologize to the persons in line? Because I think we have a long queue. Remote participation, please, Brad.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a comment from Michael Palage of Pharos Global. This is a class of TLD that I have personally championed since ICANN's first round of new gTLDs back in 2000. Unfortunately, there are some in the ICANN community, particularly large TLD portfolio companies, that do not share my enthusiasm and would not shed a tear if community TLDs were to become extinct.

I was encouraged by the report by the Council of Europe that highlights the importance of community TLDs and the changes that need to be made in future rounds to ensure that ICANN fulfills its important public interest obligations. This report was raised during the end of the GAC session with the Board.

I would strongly reiterate the comments of Mark Carvell urging the Board to read this document.

This reason I think this is so important is because I have a number of community applicants, community registry operators that feel frustrated by apparent desperate treatment that they have received in connection with the recent interactions with ICANN staff.

And there are two specific incidents I would like to bring to the Board's attention.

The first is a community registry that had their proposed registry agreement amendments rejected because on ICANN staff's position that the Applicant Guidebook prohibited such changes. Now, what is frustrating is ICANN's apparent strict interpretation of the Applicant Guidebook in denying their request. But the liberal interpretation of the Applicant Guidebook by ICANN in connection with other contested auctions of last resort.

I have another community applicant that is awaiting another applicant to exhaust their accountability mechanisms provided for the ICANN bylaws before moving forward.

As I raised this issue in yesterday's session with John Jeffrey and Chris Disspain, that client is puzzled that another TLD has been able to move forward with contract signing, delegation, and launch despite a still pending accountability mechanism that appears active on the ICANN Web site in connection with that string. This is why I really encourage you to look at the Council

of Europe report on community TLDs and figure out how it directly intersects with ICANN's public interest obligations in allocating critical Internet resources.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. Anyone want to comment on that? Okay. We just -- Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is Chris. Only really just on the CPE again to say that, as I said earlier, that we are -- the BGC is looking at a number of issues in respect to the CPE, but, obviously, not in respect to that specific thing but Akram is at the microphone.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes. Thank you, Michael. If you would like to discuss this specific cases with us, we will do that later on. And I don't want to discuss specific issues here. Okay? Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Akram. We'll make another remote, since it's a long line. Brad?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We're still cueing that up, so you can go to the people in the room.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Brad. Go ahead, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Keith Drazek. I work for VeriSign. Before I say a very brief comment, I just want to be clear that I'm not seeking a response or action from the Board. But I would like to provide a very brief follow-up to the previous remarks made by my colleague Pat Kane.

It's clear that the .WEB auction has become a topic of interest this week largely as a result of lobbying and attempted influence by Afiliis, one of the losers of the .WEB contention set public auction.

I'm quite sure you'll hear from them again before this session is complete.

[Laughter]

I just want to say, for anyone interested in this topic and the facts, I encourage you to read the blog post, the joint blog

posted this morning by VeriSign and Nu Dot Co on CircleID.
Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Keith. Next, please.

KANUMURI RAJU: First of all, I want to congratulate all global Internet ICANN communities last 20 years. What you've done is an evolution. The future is the evolution. And I represent the civil society all over the world.

And three areas I want to address Internet governance. Second is the multistakeholdership. And third one is the multiple strings on TLD. Open governance of the future evolution of Internet should be the human application service layer should be taken care. And the human connectivity layer should be taken care. And the human security layer should be taken care. And human economic growth should be taken care all over the world as true Internet governance.

Coming to the multistakeholdership, last 70 years -- what you've seen are global societies and economies, still 70% of the people are still in them whether they are living in poverty or not. No, the future of the Internet revolution should go in such a way the people should come into the domain layer. Coming to this in

TLDs and all. And every English world in the global language service is reckless. If this is the case, we should have a .CORRUPTION as a string, .GENOCIDE as a string, (indiscernible) as a string, and as well as the -- what we call as the how we should move forward.

Looking at this point, we should connect next 3.4 billion people.

And one more thing "free basics" is a ridiculous word used by the global monopolistic nature. If this is the case, I want free TLDs and a thousand TLDs which should reach all the have-nots and the poor people of the world.

And I want to thank you. And for a thousand years India has given hospitality for global civilizations. And we want all the civilizations to be part of the next Indian revolution, and we want to be part of our Indian growth. Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, sir. Sir.

(Applause.)

Sorry. Can you state your name, please.

KANUMURI S. RAJU:

My name is Kanumuri S. Raju. And I'm one of the Civil Society members, also one of the oldest ICANN members. Our mission is

promoting globally the next 3.4 billion people. Not only people. Ecological system also is important, and ecosystem is destroyed. And we the human nature are killing the Mother Earth. And we should stay with the Mother Earth also, and let us out of this future for the next thousand years. Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you for your comments. Very good comments. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Good morning, afternoon, Lito, Steve, members of the ICANN board, and the broader ICANN community.

I'm Jonathan Robinson speaking on behalf of Afiliats. And I'd remind you that I'd like to tell you that we are committed to a single objective, and that is the introduction and operation of .WEB and to bringing true competition and choice to this market.

This morning we heard VeriSign listed alongside the other applicants in the .WEB contention set. I remind you that we've been committed to this since we openly and transparently applied for .WEB back in 2012. There's a convoluted and legalistic narrative that's appeared on a blog this morning about our motivations, and it's not consistent with the facts.

Afilias is an organization that was born out of the founding principle of ICANN to introduce competition in domain names. We're committed to fair competition. And we are a deeply committed, active, and ethical member of this community.

We are heartened by community concerns relating to the potential breaches of the letter and spirit of the Applicant Guidebook, related to particularly transparency and accountability issues.

We simply want to ensure the integrity of the public auction such that an applicant that appears to have so clearly breached the letter or spirit of the Applicant Guidebook does not benefit from this breach. Afilias originally sought to resolve these contentions via private auction or private settlement. This is entirely consistent with the last resort wording of the Applicant Guidebook.

That said, we have absolutely no issue with the money derived from the public auction finding its way back to the community.

However, we firmly believe that ICANN has an overarching responsibility to enforce the letter and spirit bylaws and core values. Moreover, the powerful entrenched and well-funded interests are not able to subvert ICANN's integrity, accountability and commitment to competition. This is not simply an Afilias issue. This is a matter of serious substantial

and overarching concerns to the entire community. It's encouraging to see broad recognition of this. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Jonathan, for your comments.

[Applause]

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Lito. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. We go to another remote participation, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from Edra Saleem Malik (phonetic). Does ICANN have any policy regulating the volatile pricing of the new gTLDs by the registries and registrars? If so, why is the price of new gTLDs very high, for example, .WEB, et cetera.

LITO IBARRA: Do we want to comment on that? Okay. Okay. Robin, please.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you very much. My name is Robin Gross with IP Justice and the non-commercial users. A serious concern about Internet

access in Kashmir has been brought to our attention. I realize this is not directly an ICANN issue per se, however, ICANN participants should be aware and take this concern with them back to their home countries with a new awareness that we still have work to do to ensure a free and open Internet, even in democracies. The Internet has been blocked in Kashmir since July 10 and is not yet restored. A Facebook page called Kashmiris Overseas has been taken down and the Facebook accounts of several activists who speak on the Kashmir human rights issue have had their accounts in India suspended. Newspapers, online media, Internet access, and even telephone has been suspended for most of the time in the last four months, and this situation continues to be as such. Since many members of this community care about Internet openness and Internet freedom, we should be mindful of the enormous challenges faced by many in this world to use the Internet to engage in free speech and Democratic processes. Thank you.

[Applause]

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Robin, for your comment. Go ahead, please.

K.S. RAJU: My dear friends all over the world, humanities, and civil societies, as a security adviser, a national security adviser to the Indian government, et al, what happened -- what the lady is giving in Kashmiris, the Kashmiri issue started as a genocide, worldwide we noted, and the (indiscernible) issue was there. And we stopped --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sir. Sir. Sir. Thank you, sir. If we could return to the topic, that would be good.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: My name is Sivasubramanian. I'm from Nameshop. I'm the proprietor of Nameshop. Nameshop from India is the new gTLD applicant with a change request for the string .INTERNET which fully conformed to all criteria. The request to change the string to .INTERNET was received, published, and revealed. ICANN promised to evaluate the requested change the string to .INTERNET, but the change request was denied without reasons or rationale. Nameshop experienced hurdles not only in the evaluation process but in every bylaw mandate review and reconsideration process. The board reconsideration process, the ombudsman process, and the Cooperative Engagement Process, one after another stonewalled string .INTERNET. The Cooperative Engagement Process has been uncooperative and

was unilaterally closed in evasiveness. The ombudsman did not look into the unfairness of all of this. The CEO and board have not responded in a manner satisfactory in form and content to several Nameshop communications, especially the most recent one sent ten days ago on obstructions to justice. I appeal to you to pay attention to the gaps and hurdles in evaluation and reconsideration of the string .INTERNET which is enormous and significant Public Interest Commitment. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA:

Anyone taking this? Okay, we'll take that. Okay, go ahead, please. We will -- we're about to close the queue. Go ahead, please.

ALI HADJI:

Merci. Thank you, my name is Ali Hadji. I'm from Comoros. And so I think in order to benefit from the fact that we have French services we should use them because they are very good in their service. They provide a good service.

During the Q&A session with the board and the ccNSO I asked a question because I intended to know what would happen regarding conflicts, and the first answer that was given to me made me think of a case we all know and went back to a number of decisions that weren't well-taken. I was a bit surprised when

they replied to my answer -- to my question because, of course, we're a family but we're a diverse family. We have different languages, different cultures here. We're a big family. So that led me to reconsider the situation and to go back to one of the strengths of the past board and the ccNSO and the former board Fadi, the former CEO.

So they said ICANN should go to the members, that we should act for the community. The results are clear because we now have regional offices in every region to defend the action plan, and I would like to seize this opportunity to congratulate and thank Pierre Dandjinou for everything he's done for Africa.

We have a new board of administrators today, and there's also a new CEO in ICANN.

[Timer sounds]

So I would like to know, other than the post-transition measures to be taken, what is the general view to be taken home from now, from this moment. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA:

... one. Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much for asking us this question. Be sure this board and the new CEO will go on working for our members and going towards you and not the other way around. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Cherine. We'll take another one.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you. My name is Jimson Olufuye. I decided to come up again to respond to the statement made earlier by one of the public commentators talking about Nigerian fraud. Well, I want to put it on record that there's fraud everywhere in the world. Cyber fraud, I see a lot of footprint outside Africa attacking African infrastructure, so it's wrong and disrespectful for publicly talking about Nigerian, you know, fraud. And I just want to make it clear that we need to change this language. It is not helpful. And it's quite disrespectful. Thank you.

[Applause]

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Jimson. Now, I hand over to Becky Burr.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. Go right ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hi. Jonathan Zuck from The App Association. I'm also the chair of the CCT review team. And those of you that have had the opportunity to spend some time with me know that I from time to time bring up the importance of data and metrics in an organization such as this. And our experience with the CCT review has been that getting the kind of data that we need to perform the review has been more challenging than it really ought to be. And if you look back at the recommendations at the end of almost every study that gets commissioned about ICANN, it ends with a recommendation of getting more data and making more data available, et cetera. And so while our official recommendations won't come out for some time, it seemed like right now would be a time to say that ICANN needs to get in the data business. I think that ICANN needs to have a dedicated staff associated with data, a data scientist, and start to build a repository for data to be made available for the Policy Development Processes and the reviews that are always constantly going on within the organization.

Part of the reason I bring this up now is in the context of the efforts around the DNS health index project that is a little bit of a remnant of another way of thinking about these issues and is unfortunately a little bit politically charged, both in the way that it's worded and structured. And so I guess I'd like to recommend

thinking in terms of some kind of a pilot around an open data initiative rather than the notion of this health index that's two amorphous and I think fraught with bad optics. So I'd like to just ask the board to consider thinking about an open data pilot in the very near term because I think it's something this organization really needs and the organization needs to really get serious about being a repository for data so that we can make quantitative and evidence-based policy in reviews going forward. Thanks.

[Applause]

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Jonathan. Any takers? David.

DAVID CONRAD: Hi. David Conrad, ICANN CTO. Actually just yesterday we posted a blog on an open data initiative pilot. I would recommend you take a look at that blog.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. Go ahead.

NASRAT KHALID: I'm Nasrat Khalid, I'm a new fellow from Afghanistan. My question, and this will add to our knowledge of many fellows

and others, the question is, there's a gap on the growth of Internet. The few "I" organizations that I have known and a few of us have been engaged with have very specific rules on the growth of Internet and there are basically supporting one, making sure the Internet is protected and two, standards and policies are in place. However, there's pretty much nobody that's working on the in-ground growth of the Internet and not enough investment is being done that will expedite the physical connectivity of the Internet and the unconnected countries.

I have a little experience with the U.N. organization so the U.N. doesn't have an institution that's working on the Internet. The ICANN is working on names and numbers and there's the forum and then the ITU is working on frequencies and stuff, but there is really nobody who is -- who has the responsibility to go to the ground and really connect people. And if we expect the governments and civil societies to -- to be doing that, all the private sectors to be doing that, then that will be really slow. The urgency of connecting people is -- we do -- we do all talk about it as if it's really urgent connecting the next billion and all of that, but in action are we doing enough to really set that as a priority and for us to think it's -- it's as urgent as we talk and think about it. So enough actions.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. I think we all agree that connecting the remaining millions, billions of people in the world on the Internet is a priority. Unfortunately -- or fortunately probably for us, physical infrastructure is not part of ICANN's mission. So what we have to do is make sure that the DNS is there to support the physical infrastructure when it comes.

NASRAT KHALID: My question is more that it's nobody's task right now. So how are we working as the part of DNS that we work with to sort of go and really work with somebody. There's no organization doing that. And somebody must take it because even though if we do DNS, then we do say we want to contribute but how do we raise the voice, who do we raise the voice to, and what do we do?

RON da SILVA: Becky. I can take that. There's -- with respect to the next billion and getting infrastructure in place, there's an initiative underway with ISOC in promoting how do we, in fact, close that? How do we get infrastructure in places where today it's just not there and we've got this huge gap of the population that has no access to Internet. I would encourage you to go participate in your local chapter. I know there's also, as part of the IGF coming up, there's a lot of discussion on this topic as well. How do we address this underlying infrastructure issue, whether it's

wireless, whether it's fiber, whether it's copper? There's a lot of different ways to close that gap, but, you know, there need to be very specific investments and a plan around how do we encourage those investments across the world.

NASRAT KHALID:

Just last one comment and I'm going to go. I am the board member for ISOC Afghanistan, and I understand what ISOC is doing. But it is not the amount of investment that my country needs to get Internet connected. So I'm not going to get an answer right now and I've been doing the research on this, but the question would be that you, the bigger people in the board, go ahead and talk and really put investment and talk to other people who can put investment so we can really expedite that and maybe an organization who just works on infrastructure which we all can agree upon will be the back pillar of connecting the next billions of people in the world. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

[Applause]

PAUL MUCHENE: My name is Paul. I'm an ICANN fellow. My question is concerning a public comment on the renewal of the .COM Registry Agreement with VeriSign. I know the community responded to this public comments in August and there's quite a lot of opposition on the cost -- on the cost of the .COM domain.

So can the board assure the community that in their renewal and also revision of the agreement with VeriSign they'll not increase the price of .COM? Thank you.

BECKY BURR: J.J.? Does anybody have a comment on that? Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Akram, can you, because you dealt with the .COM renewal.
Thank you.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, Cherine.
So the .COM contract and extension is posted on the website and it actually has a -- actually has explicit language about pricing that it remains the same. So if you look at that, you'll see it there. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

VEERENDHAR BORRA REDDY: Thank you, Chair. I'm very sorry that I took the mic for the second time for the slight mistakes that I made before the one. Before the board, I request, my query, the initial one. There are the two queries about the one, the frauds on the Internet, but the slight mistake that I've been sorry for, that I tendering my apology before the board, unintentionally I made Nigerian frauds on the Internet, but keep as the frauds on the Internet. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much.

Jay?

JAY DALEY: Hello. I'm Jay Daley from .NZ.

I love ICANN in many ways, but on this idea of open data and data scientists and the like, I'm afraid that I see you as the -- the cousin from the countryside who's only just got into the city, relatively unsophisticated. So I would echo what Jonathan said,

that a huge step change is necessary in terms of skills and a vision about what you can do with data. Okay?

BECKY BURR:

Thank you.

So I'm going to turn to Bruce Tonkin, and one of the issues that we've been discussing here related to International Governmental Organization names, some ideas that we've tossed around and come up with, and Red Cross, but that's -- yeah.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you, Becky. One of the things that I said, I think, in our first public forum is that the board attends meetings with different parts of the community. We had meetings with the GNSO Council, for example, and meetings with the Governmental Advisory Committee this week. And a common topic came up, which was around how to handle the situation where we have inconsistent information or recommendations or advice that's been sent to the board.

So on two topics, one is around the protection of Red Cross names, we have inconsistency between the policy recommendations from the GNSO and advice from the GAC, and on the topic of intergovernmental organizations, or IGOs,

likewise, we've had policy recommendations that don't seem consistent with the advice we've received from the Government Advisory Committee.

In those meetings, we heard -- I think it was Donna Austin in the GNSO -- saying that, you know, she would really like to take advantage of sessions that could be facilitated to really thresh out and try and reconcile differences between different parties, and then I think it might have been Kavouss in the session at the GAC that had sort of similar recommendations.

The board met yesterday and we had a discussion about, you know, how best to move this forward, and we haven't made any resolution at this meeting because we want to talk to the different parties, but the gist of our suggestion is that we like the idea of some sort of facilitated discussion between the GNSO and GAC. We think it's important that in doing such a discussion, that there's a clear set of shared information and briefing documents that are available for all the parties in that discussion.

So if I took Red Cross as an example, a briefing document might explain how the topic of Red Cross relates to ICANN's mission. It might relate to how it meets our commitment to operate in conformity with relevant principles of international law --

[Timer sounds]

-- and international conventions and applicable local law. We might identify the relevant international conventions in that topic area, identify national laws that might apply to that topic, and also talk about -- then once you've got that information, help define what the problem is in the context of our mission and bylaws, and then have a facilitated discussion to try and reach some sort of shared viewpoint.

At this stage we're really open to you, at your request. If the GNSO and the GAC wishes to pursue that further, the board is certainly open to directing the CEO to provide some resources to help organize such an event and potentially provide a facilitator, at your choice. So just an idea out there.

You know, I've spoken to some members of the community following the meetings yesterday, but just wanted to put that on the table and, you know, offer it as a suggestion for moving forward.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks very much and I'm sure there will be more discussion on this point afterwards.

We're coming to the top of the hour and the close of the public forum, so I'll hand this back to Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Becky, and thank you, everybody. As you've seen, we shared the load for facilitating the session here. We have an extraordinary collection of talent on the board and operate as a team, so it's been a real pleasure. Sometimes in the past I did all the talking and they had to sit quietly, and we've tried to fix that problem.

This brings the public forum to a close. We very much want to get your feedback on this session, so please go to meetingapp.icann.org. That's meeting -- m-e-e-t-i-n-g-a-p-p.icann.org and give us your feedback.

Immediately following this session -- well, except for a brief break -- there will be a community recognition session for all of the many people who have been very active, as we've been saying, and there will be a reception this evening at 6:30 to thank the community for its work in achieving successful IANA stewardship transition. It will be next door on the lawn at the adjoining Novatel. We look forward to seeing you there. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]