ABU DHABI – Public Forum 1
Monday, October 30, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

STEVE CROCKER:	Good afternoon, everybody. I've got these lights shining directly in my eyes.
	Welcome to the first session of the public forum. For newcomers, this is an open mic session where all of you as well as those monitoring the online system can ask questions of the board. Public forum is intended as your opportunity to interact in a very unfiltered way directly with the board. In future times, we'll just shift to Twitter.
	Today's session will run about 90 minutes, and then we will have another one on Thursday which will run about twice as long, about three hours. So there's a lot of time for you to ask your questions and give us your comments.
	We want your questions and comments, but let me tell you some things that we do not want. We don't want you to think that the comments made here are a replacement for the public comments that ICANN seeks on various issues and policies. We have an organized process for that. If you want to weigh in on a

specific issue that is up for public comment, please use the online system. It's the only way that the comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members.

Let me explain how we select the board facilitators for each block of time during this public forum and the second one on Thursday. It's an approximate system and somewhat informal. We basically factor in several elements. We try to select board members from the region we're in and those who speak the predominant language in our meeting location, which in today's case, of course, is Arabic.

We also try to assure gender diversity, and we try to make certain that you hear from directors who are leaving the board at the end of the week.

Let me also comment that beginning with this session here, we have adjusted a practice that we've been evolving over the years as how to bring new board members up to speed thoroughly and as quickly as possible. We've had all of the incoming board members participate in our internal workshop sessions and retreat. And now we have, in this session and the ones that we will have throughout the week, invited them to sit with us; and they are seated primarily at the ends. Avri, Sarah. Who else is hiding back there? Leon. And on the other end next to the end is

Matthew. And in short order they will be here and some of us, like myself, will not be.

One of the departing board members is my colleague to the right, Markus Kummer, who will not give you an overview of the public forum format and the rules for participation. Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Steve. There will be slides up that show you how it works. And as Steve said, this is the first of two public forums. We have the total of four hours where you can give your comments.

And if you don't get an answer today, then you may get the answer on Thursday when we have the second public forum. Or if there are too many people in front of you queuing, you have another chance on Thursday.

We will start with a brief report from Chris Disspain about the board's priorities for the week.

After Chris' remarks, we will use the remainder of the session to take your questions and comments. And we accept, of course both, questions and comments. But, in essence, we would prefer to have your questions. If you ask difficult questions, then maybe we have time to prepare an answer for Thursday.

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

Are the slides up? I can't see any, but I'm told there should be slides with the rules.

And the next slide should be the expecting standards of behavior, that the ICANN community is familiar with that. And the bottom line -- oh, here they are, yes -- we ask you to be respectful to all the speakers during the sessions. And as you can see, we have as usual a microphone in the middle of the room where you can queue up to ask your questions.

The next slide would refer to remote participation. It gives you the address where you can send emails to. And our producer for the public forum, Brad White, is sitting there right in front. He will read your question. And remote questions are treated equally regardless of whether you're in the room or ask your questions remotely. And the board facilitator will decide who might best be able to answer your question.

And, as I said, before, if we can't answer the question right away, we will try to get you a response as soon as possible.

Now to the next slide, the rules governing the session. These are very simple rules. Three things: Speak slowly and clearly, state your name, and give your affiliation. And, obviously, we've set a time limit. Your first comment will be limited to two minutes with the usual count-down timer. And you are allowed to ask a follow-up question, and then you have another two minutes.

And the same goes for the board. Also, the board responses should adhere to the two-minute time line.

With that, I think we have done the basic rules. And now let's hand it over to Chris who will give us the board's priorities for the week.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Markus.

Good afternoon, everybody.

The board's overarching priorities for the next 12 months were set out in a blog that Cherine published the other day. So I hope everybody's had an opportunity to look at that. In respect to us for this week, well, of course, our first priority is to meet with members of the community and to -- and to listen. And, indeed, we have been doing that in various sessions today and will continue to do so. It's Constituency Day tomorrow where we get to sit with each individual one. And, in fact, that now runs over into Wednesday as well.

But the board itself has actually already met this week. We met for three days, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. And I just wanted

to run through a few of the things that we've done because that will give you an idea of what our priorities have been.

So we held an open board meeting on Sunday morning. And at that board meeting, we passed a number of resolutions. We passed a resolution in respect to .AMAZON asking the GAC to provide some additional input. We passed a resolution in respect to IDNs, accepting the -- and I'm going to use the shorthand term "compromise" between the ccNSO and the SSAC in respect to some IDN-ccTLD issues.

And we passed a resolution in respect to thick WHOIS, basically suspending contractual compliance enforcement for 180 days, which Goran informs me is six months.

We held an open session on Internet governance. We did some work on long-term financial planning. And many of the board committees met and discussed obviously the issues that they deal with.

I chaired my last meeting of the Board Governance Committee. The next meeting of the BGC will be chaired by the new chair.

And one of the things I wanted to say just to finish off is that it's great that we now managed to split the accountability mechanisms work into the BAMC, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. And that means the BGC can now

concentrate far more closely on matters of board governance. And as an illustration of that, the BGC at its meeting here looked at the screening process for board members and noted that this is not -- not a uniform practice across all SOs and ACs and agreed that we should engage the community in a dialogue on that matter, on the matter of standardization of both the processes and the criteria for that.

So those are just some examples of what the board's been doing this week. For the rest of this week, apart from our open board meeting -- or board meetings, rather, on Thursday, we'll be engaging in your sessions, listening to you, and holding joint sessions with you. Thank you very much.

And now I'm going to pass the microphone to Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Thank you. All right. Could we please have people line up at the microphones, please? Both of them. And we'll take turns between microphones.

Sir, go ahead.

RICHARD HILL: My name is Richard Hill. And I have been following very closely the work of the Independent Review Panel-Implementation

Oversight Team that is looking at the implementation of the new IRP.

I would like to commend the work of that group. They have been very assiduous in order to develop the procedures that need to be put into place for that new IRP.

I also commend the work of the ICANN staff that is supporting that team.

But I'd like to encourage the board to provide whatever support is needed so that the call for candidatures for the new standing panel can be issued fairly soon.

I'd like to thank Steve Crocker and Cherine Chalaby for your excellent recent posts about the board activities and priorities. I notice that there was no mention of the new IRP or for the need to appoint the standing panel in the priorities. But actually I took that as a positive sign. I took that as a sign that this is a planned, necessary activity that's going to happen anyway so you didn't need any particular focus on it at the board. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you.

Becky, would you like to comment on that?

BECKY BURR: Yes. As you know, this is something that's near and dear to my heart. The Implementation Oversight Team has been working very steadily through the rules. I think they've made a lot of progress. I know that there is a draft of the call for expressions of interest, and we certainly are looking forward to getting that out quickly.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Becky.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Good afternoon. Thank you very much for this first round of the forum. My question is a simple one relating to the resolutions that you have passed this Sunday relating to Amazon which indirectly involve all of the GAC people.

I think that irrespective of the very numerous paragraphs or preambles, in fact, the resolution does not have so-called Resolved part. it has some action but it is not Resolved part. That is not the question I have.

My question is that this resolution's content is very heavy, a lot of legal issue in that resolutions, so-called resolutions. And I

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

don't think that you expect any immediate reply from GAC. Nevertheless, at least as a GAC member of Iran, we favor to almost as much as possible reply to you but we have to read the resolution, we have to digest the resolution, and we have to properly understand it.

What at least I am worried about is that this resolution should not be seen as you asking GAC to revise its previous advice. We understood that you're asking additional information. But the way you put it, it seems that implicitly asking revision to say that in order to support the ideas of the advice that you have given, that you want more reason for advice.

Maybe you were guided by the report of the panel that there was no rationale for the advice. In fact, at that time there was no rationale as mandatory. It was voluntary.

[Timer sounds.]

But we think this should not be seen as a reply to -- revision because it would put a very dangerous precedent that many, many advice already given may be subject to this and people taking back and coming back and asking revision which may not help us to go ahead. Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Kavouss.   The resolution did ask for additional information, but I will let Chris answer that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Asha.

Hi, Kavouss.   The resolution doesn't ask the GAC to revisit its advice.   The resolution requests the GAC -- asks the GAC if it has any public policy rationale for providing its advice previously and whether it has any other information at all it would like the board to consider when the board considers the -- next looks at the IRP finding.

So, absolutely, we're not asking the GAC to reconsider its decision or rather its advice.   But we are asking the GAC if it has anything further it would like us to know when we next look at the IRP finding.   So that's -- that's the sum of the resolution. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Chris.

Please, can I have more people line up at both of the microphones.   And if you would like to submit your questions online, remote participants, you can submit to the email address

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

engagement@icann.com -- .org. Sorry, sorry. I'm already thinking I'm out of here.

[Laughter]

Steve.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you, Steve DelBianco with the business constituency within ICANN.

And the BBC is among the groups that recruits volunteers and contributes a lot of content to the reviews, the individual specific reviews that are done by the community.

I also dedicated 2 1/2 years of my life of bringing the Affirmation of Commitments reviews into the ICANN bylaws. So when I did that, I know that the verb "assigned to the board's responsibility for community reviews" is to cause reviews to occur. The scope of a review and the how it's done is all dictated in the bylaws similar to the AoC.

So I was troubled this week when the board under that mandate decided to pause one of the reviews, the SSR2 review. And Rinalia today explained that in your obligation to cause a review, you certainly would want to hit pause if you had any reason to

believe the review wouldn't happen according to the bylaws. And I appreciate a heads-up, if that's the case.

But my question for you is: Having hit pause, does the community need to come back to the board to hit the play button, to hit the resume button again? Or can we exercise the authority I think the bylaws give us to pay attention to your heads-up, your alert, but it's up to us to resolve any considerations with respect to the scope, composition, or structure and it's up to us in the ACs and SOs to determine we're going to go ahead and resume or hit the play button after you hit the pause button? So I'd love to hear your answer on that so we can get past this and move on. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Steve.

Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Steve, thank you very much for the question.

The answer is very simple. It's really the board is back into the community's hand and it's up to you to resume when you want to resume. It's not for the board to tell you when. All we did is we fulfilled our fiduciary responsibility. We saw something

wasn't working well. We raised it to you. We asked for a pause. And you then -- it's up to you to decide when you want to resume and how you want to resume. Does this answer your question?

STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Kavouss, before I go to you, may I beg your indulgence, patience. We have a question online. Brad.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Asha, we have a question in French. My colleague Alexander Dans will read the question.

My name is Christina from Burkina Faso, western Africa. What can ICANN do to improve the consensus problems within the groups and subgroups and the various instances at ICANN?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Cherine, would you like to give it a shot? Or Steve?

CHERINE CHALABY: Certainly I will give it a shot.

                        I think the way the -- our governance model works --

ASHA HEMRAJANI: En Francais?

CHERINE CHALABY: I will answer in French afterwards.

                        -- which stakeholder group are almost self-governing and they have their own method, their own way of finding consensus. And I think the board cannot interfere with that.

                        We find our own consensus within the board, and I think every stakeholder group and every group must find their own consensus and their own way of doing it. And I know that differs from one stakeholder to another. It's not always perfect, but it is not for the board to interfere with that process.

                        Have I answered your question?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I would like to add to the answer. Within the community in the past few years, there's also been discussion in terms of how do we enhance the effectiveness of group work. And facilitation has

been something that has been discussed, also enhancing the ability of chairs to actually manage more effectively which can help to better chances of consensus building. And I think those are actually effective tools if they can be done properly. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I apologize coming again for the follow-up actions.

I think the answer, Asha, you have given me worried me more than I should be.

Because you referred that you're putting in question that GAC advice was not based on public policy. And that seems to be a little bit doubtful that you're asking.

I think the bylaw clearly mentioned that. Most of the activities or all of the activities of GAC advisory committee is based on public policy. So you expressed doubt that our advice are not based on public policy, that is why you want some evidence of that. I think that was not -- I hope if you feel have not been the

intention of that. Because decision of public policy remains within the governments.

I don't think that any other questions should be raised that does or is your advice based on public policy? Perhaps you should kindly, if possible, allow the GAC to continue to do that based on the activities and based on the bylaw and based on the duties of the GAC and not putting in question that their advice were not based on public policy. And public policy is exclusive issue only should be discussed by GAC. And that is the GAC whether that is an issue, is public policy or is not. It not externally related. Thank you very much for giving me the second time the opportunity to express my views. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Kavouss? Kavouss? If I could just clarify for you in case there's any doubt, we have no doubt that the GAC acts based on public policy. What we are asking you is whether or not you would like to provide us with some detail of what the public policy is that you acted on in giving us the advice in respect to .AMAZON. Whether you choose to respond is a matter for the GAC. But there is no suggestion whatsoever that the GAC is not providing public policy advice. We're merely giving you an opportunity to provide further detail should you wish to do so.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:	Brad, no questions, right, online?

BRAD WHITE:	No questions online at this point.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:	Okay. The gentleman on my left.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE:	I'm Chokri Ben Romdhane from Tunisia, and I'm engaged with the Middle East work group, strategic work group.

So my question is about SSAC and the RSSAC membership. Why we don't adapt the same model that's used by ALAC in order to have the members of these two advisory committees since it would be -- it will -- we would have with this model a balance between the civil region in the community of the Internet? Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:	Thank you. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	I can give that answer for the RSSAC part, and I'll refer to Ram for the SSAC part. I'm the liaison from RSSAC to the board.

So RSSAC is focused on root server operations, basically. And we have a caucus. And the caucus is, basically, open to any DNS expert. There's a simple application process all online. You can submit your application. And it will be reviewed and most likely will be accepted, if you have technical background in DNS stuff. Because RSSAC work is basically technical.

I will pass to Ram for SSAC.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Chokri, for the question. It's a very good question. I'm the liaison for the SSAC to the Board.

The fundamental charter and the purpose of SSAC is to focus on technical matters that deal with the security and stability of the domain name system. And, as a result of that, the overarching goal of membership inside of the SSAC is about gathering the right set of experts who can help the SSAC to carry out its charter and its mission. So that's the prime leading principle.

Now, the SSAC is very open to membership from all parts of the world with all kinds of backgrounds. And it's actively looking for that.

But the SSAC does not look, for example, for geographic distribution as the primary way of having representation inside of the SSAC. It looks for distribution of expertise in the major

areas that the SSAC is focused upon. Now, having said that, there's an open process for application into the SSAC. If you go to the ssac.icann.org Web site, you will find details of how to get into that. Every year there's a year-long membership committee in the SSAC that evaluates these applications as they come in. So the SSAC is open to participation from technical experts from all over the world of whatever diversity that they have. But the primary focus is on technical expertise.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Steve, would you like to add something?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes, I would. Thank you, Asha. You heard specific responses from Kaveh with respect to the RSSAC, from Ram with respect to SSAC.

Let me make a more general comment about our overall structure.

We have -- as everyone fully understands, we have three supporting organizations and four advisory committees. I've been around for a long time. And I've been watching the dynamics of all this, including from the time before we had the structure in the earlier days of ICANN.

The framework, the template of advisory committee and supporting organization is an approximate one that does not have 100% of accuracy with respect to what the underlying issues might be.

So we have this kind of one size fits all assumption built in that, if you have an advisory committee, therefore, several things follow.

In my observation, the advisory committees are actually more unlike each other than they are like each other.

And they serve very particular purposes. We do, of course, ascribe to the basic principles of transparency and accountability and diversity, et cetera.

But each of the advisory committees serves, as I said, a unique and distinct purpose. And, in the case of SSAC, the focus is really on technical excellence, ability to penetrate into issues and be analytic. It is much more of a probing kind of activity than it is simply one of brokering constituencies or different geographic or other kinds of balances. Because, in the search for truth, that won't necessarily bring it to you.

It's clearly an important consideration in finding people. And wherever possible it's a consideration, but it is not the hallmark.

The hallmark is are we getting the right people focused on the right issues. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Steve.

Gentleman on my right, please.

DAVID McAULEY: Thank you very much. My name is David McAuley. I'm with VeriSign, and I'm a member of the IRP Implementation Oversight Team that Richard Hill mentioned earlier. And I just want to underscore his comment and appreciate the fact that he made that comment to the Board. I would like to broaden that comment just a bit, if I might, and mention to other people in the room that are in the leadership of the supporting organizations and the advisory committees and in those groups that there is important work coming their way with respect to the creation of the standing panel. Important work and involved work.

And it's all under bylaw 4.3, and I would like for them to be aware. Underscore the message to them there's assistance coming from ICANN staff and also from the IRP IOT team itself. Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, David.

Becky, did you want to add something? Or shall we move on?

BECKY BURR: No. I just wanted to thank David and the implementation oversight team for all of the very hard work that they've been doing.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Sir, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, Asha. Ron Andruff, unaffiliated and a member of the community for about 20 years.

In the opening session Chris brought up a comment about screening. And I'm grateful that he did. Because it's come to the attention of a number of members of the community that our board of directors are operating on a double standard, which is that 12 members of the board have been screened via background checks. Some several times, as in the case of returned appointees such as our incoming chair. Cherine has been screened three times. While four voting members, two of which have served on the Board for multiple terms, have not once received a similar screening.

To be clear, I'm saying that all NonCom, both ASO, ALAC appointees, and the CEO have been screened. But, for unknown reasons, two board members appointed by the GNSO and two members coming from the ccNSO do not or have not undergone background checks.

Along with the NomCom appointees, these appointees represent all of the voting directors.

As we know, our board of directors have a fiduciary duty of care to the institution of ICANN, the absence of which is negligence. In ICANN 2.0, we must hold to the highest standards. And our board is charged to do everything in its power to mitigate risk. Hence, we have a board governance committee, risk committee, and audit committee.

As this is our annual general meeting and, as I understand it, on Thursday the new board and officers will take their seats by acclamation.

To mitigate the risk and perception of lack of adherence to accepted, customary board background screenings, the community -- I'm sorry -- on behalf of the community, my concrete recommendation to the Board is to immediately take all steps to correct this oversight.

We have time. We have the resources to do four background screens between now and Thursday. No one expects any issues to surface. But this simple act will ensure that the institution is properly protected. Thank you.

[Applause]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Ron. So there's two or three points in there that I want to address. First of all, I agree with you that this is an important point. And I appreciate you bringing it up. We have actually had substantial discussions within the Board. We've taken some advice from counsel. We've reviewed all of this. It's been a current topic. It's not quite as simple as saying, gee, this is important and, therefore, all of the following will take place. Let me lay out a couple of dimensions.

The very important part, which I know you and everyone else holds very dear, is that the selection process is distributed across multiple organizations. NomCom, each of the SOs, ALAC for the voting members, and then we might as well throw in the liaisons as well.

At last count, I think I said there were 10 distinct appointing bodies, although I may be off by one. It's been quite a topic of concern. There's a delicate question and one that underlies a lot of issues that are in front of us not only here on this one but on other topics as to exactly where the Board's prerogatives are versus the community's prerogatives. It's not exactly entirely within the Board's prerogative to say that we have decided that the following must happen; therefore, it will happen. Because it would be intertwined with, if not viewed as outright interfering or treading into the territory.

So there is the discussion that has to take place. So that's one part of why -- you know. And I share, frankly, your desire that these processes be put in place rapidly and firmly and so forth. But there is some important sense that we have to proceed deliberately.

To your last comment about making things happen within a certain number of days, the background screenings that we already do take a substantial amount of time.   There are different levels of background screening. Now we're getting into the technical aspects and what the criteria are.

It's one thing to do a very quick check online and for various things. It's another thing to do a much more in-depth --

Part of that discussion is not only whether everyone ought to be subjected to it, but what level of screening, what the criteria ought to be, how thorough it ought to be. And that's another part of the discussion.

So I welcome your comment. And I truly do. And I hope that it does, in fact, facilitate the community's involvement in that discussion and that there is a development of some sort of consensus.

It could also be that each group makes a decision independently but based upon the results of this kind of discussion.

And just to add yet one more piece of complexity, after one does a screening, you get back information. You don't get an back answer that says yes or no. Then it becomes a judgment as to, well, is that important? I have a speeding ticket. Will that disqualify me? Somebody else was -- just to make up something -- shoplifting as a 13-year-old. What do you want to do with that information? We get into some delicate kinds of things. I think these things need to be worked out over time. And I do believe and do agree with you that it's important to bring this up to surface because the overriding principle, the one that you have started with, is that you, the community, has to have trust and confidence in the board. And that is not only based upon

behavior but also reputation. And I think we hold that dear as much as you do.

RON ANDRUFF: If I may respond. May I respond?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Sure.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you. Steve, I really appreciate your sincere statements. But I think we have to be quite clear. Yes, everything you said is true. But the fact of the matter is the ASO and ALAC all used the screening process the NomCom uses. So that process is there. So we have the resource.

And, more importantly, we're talking about risk. We're talking about making sure that we do not put our institution that we've worked so hard to put into ICANN 2.0 in a place where we have four people that might have something or not.

And, quite frankly, I don't expect we're going to find anything. I just want to make sure that we've checked that box. Because there's a number of scenarios that have played out. The deputy chair of the -- in Australia happened to have two citizenships.

Nobody knew because they hadn't done a check. And now the country is embarrassed because nobody knew it.

All I'm saying is we're in a very precarious situation. We've achieved a good platform through a lot of hard work and the risk factor of not running forward quickly.

I'm just saying we should fast track it. Do as best we can. And that's why I'm suggesting that we don't sit people by acclamation unless we know they all are free and clear of real issues.

STEVE CROCKER: This is a real conversation. So let me take your point and play back against what I was saying.

You're speaking as if talking to us as the board is the way to make that happen. But the change that you're looking for, to be specific, is for the ccNSO and for the GNSO to adopt that practice as part of their selection process, as the other bodies have adopted. It's not that they've been imposed upon. ICANN organization makes that process available. It is used by the NomCom. It is used by ALAC. It is used by ASO, I guess.

But there's that very important line there about -- between making that process available and choosing to use it. So in your heartfelt desire to have that adopted right away, turn your

attention just slightly one degree or another and be speaking to the ccNSO and to the GNSO. And, if you can get them to say, yes, absolutely, we must make that happen right this week, I will be astonished and delighted.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Ron.   Jonathan, could you wait just a second, because we have a question on line?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from Jamie Baxter, V.P. of Marketing for dotGAY, LLC.

"Over one year ago the Board requested that an investigation be launched into the CPE process that produced results that were long since questioned by applicants, IRPs, community members associated with the applicants, independent researcher and academic experts, and many others who have looked deep into the evaluation process and inconsistency of the CPE results. Following ICANN58 in Copenhagen, it was announced that an investigation had been initiated. Throughout the summer it was suggested that the EIU had not been cooperating with the

request for information, delaying the investigation beyond the already extended time it took to begin to carry it out. It has now been two months since the last update on the CPE investigation, despite an update being provided to the BAMC back in October 11th. Given the concerning and unexplained delays created by the EIU and the lengthy amount of time that applicants and affected communities have already been required to wait, is there any further update that can be shared at this time? And is there any further detail on the process ICANN or the ICANN board will follow once FTI has been delivered" -- excuse me -- "once FTI has delivered their investigation findings, including whether the FTI findings will also be published for public review in their complete and original state. I will note and appreciate that the Board has included this matter in its FY18 priorities."

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. J.J., are you here? Would you like to take that, please? Or -- yeah, I see you there.

BRAD WHITE: Asha, why don't you let J.J. digest the question? And you can take one more person at the mic.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. We'll come back to that.

Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, hello. Thank you. Jonathan Zuck from the Innovator's Network.

And first, Steve, I just want to express my shock that you have a speeding ticket. I've made note of that.

But I want to -- I guess express general support for Ron's position. I think it was Machiavelli who said that the wise man does immediately what the fool does eventually. So whether it's the Board's responsibility, given these people are now making decisions that affect the entire community and not just their constituency, it might make sense to try to fast track this as he suggests.

The broader issue that I wanted to bring up, though, was following on Steve DelBianco's comment. I guess I fear that he let the Board off the hook maybe a little too easily in his presentation. And I really want to bring to the surface the notion that the optics of how this all went down with the SSR2 are not good.

I mean, those of us that put in years of effort to put in an accountability framework, fought tooth and nail with the American government, et cetera, to make sure that the

transition happened, et cetera, I think having a fundamental accountability mechanism sort of unilaterally put on hold is something that we should be concerned about in terms of process. I know that there's -- I've heard a lot of the rationale behind it. I guess I'm not convinced that it was the only way to proceed and that, from a precedential standpoint, it's not best way to proceed. So I just want to make that statement.

I don't know what my question is necessarily about it. But I have to believe that there were other ways to try and bring about resolution to concerns about scope, et cetera, other than intervening in such a dramatic fashion into the workings of an accountability mechanism that is now built into the bylaws.

STEVE CROCKER: Jonathan, thanks. Let me -- let me cover this in kind of two different aspects. First a general issue that you raised about process and so forth and then the specifics. This actually fits into a broader pattern where a fairly substantial set of new machinery has been laid on top of the way we operate, and the consequences of that are being worked out piece by piece. So, for example, we proposed a change to the structure of the Board Governance Committee, splitting off a part of it, and that because the Board Governance Committee was part of a fundamental bylaw or specified as a fundamental bylaw we had

to go through the elaborate process of changing a fundamental bylaw. That -- that happened, and it happened moderately smoothly, at least viewed from a distance. Viewed more closely, each and every one of the organizations involved had to say oh, now what do we do? We have this decision in front of us. What is our process for doing that. So there is, in the vernacular, a lot of implementation details.

This is another example in particular case where previously the structure, formation, and oversight of the reviews under the Affirmation of Commitments was carried out in the case of the -- all but the ATRT reviews, the selections were made by the CEO and the chair of the GAC and in the case of ATRT by the chair of the board and the -- and the chair of the GAC.

Under the new system, all of the selections are made independently and as it has turned out, although it's not a requirement, independently without coordination, and that's just one element of the process. And now we're stuck in a situation that arose. And I'll come back to some of those specifics, even though the time is expired.

We're in fresh territory in the details of how do you deal with issues that come up. We're not in fresh territory in having to do, having to have some sort of management level oversight. My view of the action that we've taken is twofold. First of all, there

was quite a bit of communication. It apparently didn't get to everybody in a uniform way. But the -- the issues that we were observing had been building for a long time. This was not -- it sort of came to a head and we took action, but in my view probably should have come to a head much earlier.

Second of all, here's a very key point. We work for you. The board is executing and serving the -- on behalf of the community. So it's not an adversarial operation, although just like anybody who works for you, sometimes they do things that you didn't expect them to do or they didn't know about, but nonetheless, the overall framework is that we're being responsive to your needs.

The current situation is that the issues have been identified, we can spend time here if we want to go into it a little bit more. We wrote a letter a couple of hours ago laying out more background and so forth. That's intended to be the beginning of a consultation process that the supporting organizations and advisory committees are intended to partake in. The board does not like -- I can absolutely assure you that we took no relish in this. We don't view it as a comfortable situation. And we absolutely are not trying to either stop it or control it in detail. And we have no stake for ourselves, for sure, in any of the issues, and we're not particularly trying to protect the organization. But we do care a lot about the use of the resources, we do care a

lot about whether there is a sensible, organized process and that the internal dynamics are effective. So I'll stop there, unless you want to press further.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thanks, Steve. Can I have Rinalia say a few words on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Asha. So I just wanted to emphasize a point, that we're all still learning how to function under the new bylaws, right? The board is learning; the community is learning. And so when the SSAC has concerns, it didn't go laterally to the other SO/AC chairs for action, it came to the board because it's an advisory committee. And so that's the function -- that's a pathway that they're used to. So we have to learn how to figure out how to solve problems that emerge from the new things that are embedded in the bylaws, and I hope that we can be cooperative in solving that. I think that the board did what's responsible, which is to sound the alarm. We know there's a problem. Let's work together to solve it. Okay, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I guess I just want to encourage the exploration -- and I apologize for taking extra time -- the exploration of alternatives to this tactic for sounding the alarm in the future. Whether it's redirecting SSAC's complaints to the supporting organizations or something like that. I think a lot of what came up during the conversations about accountability that we went through over the past several years was, in fact, putting a Klieg light back on the community for having laid too much at the feet of the board to decide. And that if anything, the board should have pushed more decisions back to the community. And that it wasn't always the question of the board being roque or something, but the community not being willing enough to solve its own problems and then expecting you to solve them like Solomon or something like that. And I think it's that dynamic that we need to work together to break. And that if it doesn't appear as though it's the best role for the board, to pause your own action and see if there's another avenue to engage the community to bring something about. It's not as though these review teams are ripping through their work at a high burn rate or something like that that it -- that it was a crisis of that level, that money was spilling out the doors or something like that. So I'm just again encouraging in this environment of renewed introspection about accountability that the board taking this kind of unilateral action is probably not the best step forward.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Kaveh, you wanted to add something?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Jonathan, thank you for the comment. In addition to what was said, a bit more about logistics because actually, the options the board had was limited. And I personally think the timeline was laid out very well because at the start of the meeting, basically on Friday, there was a meeting with SO/AC leaders informing them about -- about the decision and if there is any objection, and that's basically -- because the question was asked before. If -- during the week, if the AC and SO leaders decide, and AC/SOs basically decide, that no, no adjustments are needed and we can move forward, that can be done. So we thought actually it's a very good timing. And as Steve mentioned, all of our interests are aligned. There is no -- anything look at that -- look at this situation from that glass, that looking glass, it's basically we just wanted to give a pause and it's only a pause. The decision is now with ACs and SOs. And if they really think there is no need for that pause, we are more than happy to resume. Again, please also consider the timeline.

Also, one thing that you mentioned that the board just took the action, there is a stream of letters. So board sent three official letters. They're listed on the correspondence page and on the

(indiscernible). So yeah, so it wasn't sudden action. It was continuation of our letter from July, early October, and then basically end of October. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't want to take up more time, but thank you very much for the discussion.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Just now we had an online question, and for that J.J. needs a bit of time to digest the question. So J.J. will come back to us at the Thursday public forum. And at this point I'm going to now hand it over to my colleague Khaled. Khaled, please.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Asha. And we will continue with the questions for the next 30 minutes. Please, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I am the CEO of a micro enterprise business that has been involved in ICANN, as many of

you know, since before ICANN existed. I was initially intrigued and then strongly disappointed and shocked to learn that we have board members who have accepted accountability to ensure that ICANN can survive some of the challenges that it faces and have not themselves taken up the issue of agreeing to the background checks. I understand that you may think it's about you. And Steve, I disagree with something that you said. I don't think it's being subjected to. Serving on the board is, of course, being accountability to the community. But we as ICANN are also accountable to the general public who can be confused, disappointed, or dismayed and take negative action against ICANN because we do not adhere to the highest standards of integrity and do all that we can to demonstrate that we are fully committed to fulfilling our obligations.

I understand it may not be possible to achieve the agreement within the GNSO or the ccNSO by the end of the week, but it is possible for those four board members to voluntarily agree to accept that and then to make that commitment on Thursday and then the background checks can proceed. And that is what I ask you to consider doing.

Now, I intended to come to the microphone to talk about something else, and so I'm going to just introduce it because I'm running out of time, and I'll come back in the two minutes. I intended to come and talk about the fact that we the

community need to up our game on adhering to the use and the currency of the statements of interest

[Timer sounds]

There is much to say about that and that is on us so I'll come back to that.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Marilyn. I guess there is Becky who would like to answer.

BECKY BURR: Yes. I just want to repeat what Steve said. In fact, the board does agree that this is best practice and we did raise it, as the minutes of our meeting show. And I doubt that anybody who is on the board and has not been subjected to a background screen would object to that. What we can't do is impose it as a condition on the SOs who non -- who send people up. But I sense from the discussion and from the unanimous feeling across the board that this is a practice that is -- is highly recommended in best practices, that there's not an objection by anyone on the board to being screened.

KHALED KOUBAA: Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: So I agree with Becky, but we're also going to take an action very soon. We are preparing a paper and a communication that is going to go out to the SOs and ACs very shortly recommending and asking them to consider the uniform integrity screening for all of the board members. And hopefully they've listened to what you have to say and we hope that the response is positive.

We will see how it goes, but we will act on that and move quickly.

MIKE SILBER: If I can just add one thing, and that is certain of us by virtue of our positions in committees of the Board have been screened.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Can we move to the gentleman on the right, please.

MARILYN CADE: I think I have two more minutes?

KHALED KOUBAA: Those were the two minutes of the answer, I guess.

MARILYN CADE: And I'll speak when my clock restarts.

KHALED KOUBAA: Please.

Can we just start the two minute, please.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. So I will say again, my name is Marilyn Cade, and I wish to continue the conversation about the SOIs because this is a conversation I am presenting to the Board but really presenting to the community in front of the Board.

We agreed in the community to establish the use of statements of interest as a way to ensure that there was transparency on our part when we accepted elected offices or we accepted positions in working committees.

Due to an error on my part, every time I signed up for a committee recently I ticked the box that I had an SOI, and suddenly to my shock, amazement, and disappointment in myself, I saw it was two years out of date. Now, nothing had changed, but it was two years out of date.

That led me to go online and look at a random number of SOIs. And so here's the problem, and my challenge is to us of the

community. I think each of us needs to go to look at our SOI and actually make sure that it is not only current but give details. I could, for instance, say, "My name is Marilyn Cade," and answer that I work for MCade LLC, and that is all I have to say. But that's not enough for my colleagues on committees or for the community to understand what my interests are.

So what I am looking at is the need for the community to collaborate on raising the bar for how we disclose what our interests are, because that will also help to enhance the transparency and accountability and trust in ICANN overall.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Marilyn. I absolutely agree with you, and I would like to up the ante. I actually also think that there needs to be a convergence between our code of conduct, ethics policy and our conflict-of-interest policy so that everything is aligned.

I also believe the Statement of Interest practice is not working as a tool to promote ethical behavior.

So I support you. Continue pushing for it, and we'll do our part.

Thank you very much.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. Gentleman, please.

RAUL PLOMMER: Dear board members, my name is -- My name is Raul Plommer. I'm from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

I've learned a perplexing fact that I'd like you to enlighten me about.

Why is it that within NomCom, which has great power in selecting our leaders of this stakeholder 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 interest in making money at the expense of us who feel that human rights deserve more representation than one against six.

This is also against the principle of fostering diversity within ICANN. Specifically, why does the Commercial Stakeholder Group have four seats and other stakeholder groups within the GNSO only have one each?

I'd like to point out that the other user constituencies within the NCSG, NPOC, has no seats on the NomCom, and I have 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 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 takes charge of this unfair situation and puts it right at the top of their list of priorities. The matter is urgent and I find the current situation completely unacceptable.

Now, for those of you who don't remember, I'll admit that I made this almost exact same comment one year ago in Hyderabad, but now that the NomCom review is ongoing, I feel that it's more relevant than ever.

Last time it was answered along the lines of wait for the review.

For the sake of not sounding like a completely broken record I think good critique should always be accompanied with solution to the problem. My suggestion is that within the GNSO, all the stakeholder groups should have two seats in the NomCom, which would bring the total number of GNSO seats to eight instead of seven. That, in turn, can be defended with much higher load of work than in previous years --

[Timer sounds]

 -- when the NomCom was last reviewed.

In addition, I would like to invite the registry and registrar stakeholder groups to support this balancing act, so please come and discuss how we can make GNSO more equal regarding the composition of NomCom. Somehow I doubt that the CSG is not going to help us.

I'm not saying Carthago should be destroyed but that our constituency should have its seat at the NomCom. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. George, would you please answer?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes. Thank you very much for the comment.

The current distribution of seats in the NomCom really reflects the structure of ICANN after the 2003 reorg, and it hasn't changed since. This is of concern to a number of us. I was the NomCom chair in 2005, '6 and '7, and it was fairly apparent that a rebalancing of some sort seemed appropriate to recognize all of the SO and AC and other activities.

In 2012, the Board started a discussion through a committee, a working group of which I was chair, to rewrite the NomCom rules. We abandoned it given that the NomCom -- the NomCom review was coming up, and we decided to give our partially

completed report to that review -- to the review process. And unfortunately, the review processes with respect to the NomCom seem to have been delayed in both of the last two reviews. We now have a review in process, and I think that rebalancing is likely to be on their slate. I don't know the extent to which they have -- they have considered it, but I think we'll get a report for public comment fairly shortly and I think that your comment is quite valid.

Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, George.

Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Khaled, thank you. My name is Jonathan Robinson. And, Steve, good afternoon.

I'm responding, really, I think to the issue of the day, this issue of statements of interest and screening checks. So to that extent, I'm speaking in my personal capacity.

I guess my first reaction is it seems like common sense. It seems like something that seems like a perfectly reasonable point and

to the extent that it gets dealt with as soon as possible by whatever mechanism that, too, makes sense to me.

Second, I thought it would be useful to give you a piece of information. As you, members of the Board and the broader community, may or may not know, I am the community appointed director on the -- on the PTI. You know, your -- in common parlance, your subsidiary which is the, you know, IANA affiliate, and in fact, chair of that Board currently as well. And to that extent, I was subjected to a full background screening check, no different, I believe, to that which NomCom appointees to the ICANN Board are subjected to. And of course as you can imagine, I raised no objection to that and went through that process. I mean, frankly, I thought it was unduly onerous for a subsidiary, but to the extent that I'm not sure who determined that, actually, -- frankly, that's an interesting question. Who decided that me as an appointee to the PTI should be subject to that level of scrutiny, but nevertheless I willingly subjected myself to it and thankfully passed it.

So I think that's perhaps a useful piece of information to have in sort of the dialogue and understanding of what's going on.

And I guess third, while the clock hasn't run out, there's one other point. It struck me as Marilyn spoke on SOIs, why don't we let the statements of interest at least expire? We could consider

-- even if they don't delete or expire, we could consider a statement of interest --

[Timer Sounds]

-- that is over 12 months old to be, in effect, invalid. And so that could be something we could think about as a community. So that's just a very practical third point and suggestion.

Thanks very much for your attention.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you so much. And I would like to say again like my colleague Rinalia, I myself am very in line with your thinking and her thinking. And we -- we will be acknowledging that issue. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Khaled. Thank you for your attention.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Mike Palage with Pharos Global.

In 2012, ICANN processed over 1900 applications in connection with new gTLDs. One of the requirements of the new gTLD process was each of those applicants to potentially undergo background checks.

So my question here, what was ICANN done with those background checks? And this is kind of dovetailing into a GDPR compliance issue. Is ICANN still in possession of those background checks? If not, what have they done? How have they been processed and handled?

KHALED KOUBAA: George -- Goran?

GORAN MARBY: I have to admit I don't know the answer to that question. I was not working for the organization, so I definitely am looking either to my legal advisor or Mr. Akram Atallah, who probably knows everything.

Akram? I can see you there. Don't run.

[Laughter]

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, Mike, for the question. I am not aware of what we've done with the data after we did the background check, but we will commit to give you an answer on that as soon as we get back in the office next week.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Can I add to it?

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. I will probably go to Brad because we have an online question, please. And J.J., please.

JOHN JEFFREY: I just wanted to add an additional note. We're also will going through a complete review of all such databases inside ICANN as part of our data privacy review. As you're aware, recently we appointed a chief data privacy officer, Dan Halloran, and he's conducting a survey across the organization for databases in places where we have information like that to make sure we're fully compliant.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, John.

                        Please, Brad.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have an online question from Nitin Walia:

                        My question to the Board is that when IPv6 was introduced, there were directions to all to shift and adapt and become more compatible to IPv6. Why is there nothing similar for IDNs since

the adoption of IDNs on the world's best and even top sites like Twitter, Facebook, et cetera, no one is allowed to make an account using IDN domains even after three years?

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much. Really important matter, really important question.

There are a couple of components to this. You know, universal acceptance is really at the heart of making sure that all domain names, email addresses, and not just in ASCII or in Latin script but in your own local languages, works everywhere. So I think that's a fundamental and important thing.

Now, having said that, unlike with IPv6 or with DNSSEC, which were both requirements in the previous round of new gTLDs, I think it would have been quite a much more difficult matter to have mandated that every registry must also provide IDNs because, after all, IDNs are a very large topic with languages all around the world that have to be distributed.

So the Board at that time made the call that it's -- it's a policy decision and a business decision left up to the registries to offer IDNs. Now, I will note that many of the registries have that actually gone live are supporting IDNs, and on top of it, ICANN has a robust and fully funded program on Internationalized Domain Names and internationalized email addresses for many years with a great deal of energy and focus devoted to both the technical pieces of getting IDNs to work well as well as to the universal acceptance component of making sure that once IDNs are actually available in registries, that those IDNs can actually be accepted and used in browsers and by email clients all over the world.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Ram.

Please. I would like to say that the queue is now closed, and we will follow up with you, please.

PADMA VENKATARAMAN: Good evening, everyone. My name is Padma, and I am a next-gen (indiscernible). I am from India. I have two questions with regard to the settling of the jurisdiction question by the subgroup that no change in U.S. jurisdiction will be debated upon from now on.

So in light of the political atmosphere in the U.S., do you think any concerns arise and are justified with regard to stability and future access to the Internet, especially for minority communities and developing countries, given what seems like permanent U.S. jurisdiction for ICANN?

That's my first question.

And my second question is with regard to clarification of procedure in the CCWG charter. So from a reading of the CCWG charter, it appears that the subgroup is required to submit a report to the supporting organizations highlighting contentious issues that it can't move past before the CCWG co-chairs can get involved.

So in the settling of the jurisdiction question, the co-chair had issued a statement saying that his -- this was not in subversion of the subgroup chair's authority but was in support of his authority.

So according to the charter, can the CCWG co-chairs get involved in decision-making processes at the subgroup level without the submission of this report to the supporting organizations?

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you for your question.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR: Yes, the CCWGs are charged with -- chartered by the supporting organizations and advisory committees that make them up. They prepare a charter. They determine what the rules are. There is not a universal rule on what the role of chairs are. That's decided by the CCWG itself.

PADMA VENKATARAMAN: Thank you so much for answering my second question. I still had -- My other question was whether there -- do you think it's good, there are any concerns arising with regard to what seems like permanent U.S. jurisdiction for ICANN, especially for minority communities and developing countries, especially since we can't raise it within the jurisdiction subgroup anymore?

BECKY BURR: Sorry. I think the Board will be receiving and reviewing the jurisdiction subgroup's report, as we will all of the reports that we got. And we take all of those issues very seriously.

PADMA VENKATARAMAN: Thank you so much for your time.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Please.

ZHAOHAN LI: Thank you. Hello, everyone. Zhaohan. I'm from China, and I'm a fellow this time.

Firstly, many thanks to ICANN, to the AP region, and (indiscernible), also to my coach. And through the Fellowship Program, I really got a better understanding of how ICANN works, and it really helps me a lot.

And as for me, I'm a research assistant now and I work for the China Academy of ICT. Actually, my team has done a lot of supporting work to the China Internet community. Usually after every ICANN conference we will hold write-up session, all the multistakeholders of China. They will get together and share the information and experience to those who can't attend the ICANN meeting in person, and they will also discuss common concerns locally.

Besides participating in my local community, I'd like to make more contributions to the ICANN community in the future. And additionally, the Fellowship Program is really a good opportunity for me to make friends with young people from all over the world. And perhaps you -- you may -- you can't imagine

that there are almost 300 million young people, Internet users in China who are under 25 years old. That is about 40% of the total amount of the Internet users of China. And more and more Chinese young people, they are getting to know the Internet governance and they are getting to know ICANN. But I think the Internet governance is really complicated to follow and to understand how will ICANN do in the future to attract more young people to participate in it. And just as young people, I think we need more programs just like fellowships and the next gens in the future.

Thank you.

[Timer Sounds]

[Applause]

KHALED KOUBAA: First of all, let me thank her, because I think it's unbelievable the diversity that the Fellowship Program is bringing to our community. And thank you as a person to stand up in the mic and share with us your experience. This is an important element of our work, and we will be more than pleased to see this continue and (indiscernible).

Asha, would you like to comment as well?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:	Yeah, thank you, Khaled. Well said, Khaled. (Non-English word or phrase).

I'll speak in English because there's a lot of things you spoke about that I wanted to cover.

First of all, I'm very, very proud of you that you came to the microphone. You deserve a big hand for that.

[Applause]

But, secondly, I'm even more proud of you that you have taken advantage of this golden opportunity you have been given and you are not just keeping that with yourself. You are sharing whatever you have learned when you go back home to China. That is really good.

I really believe in passing it forward. You are a shining example of that. Well done.

I also wanted to address your last point about young people -- getting more young people and getting Asians and getting more Asian people involved. Nothing would make me happier, to see more Asians attending ICANN meetings, more Asians on the board of directors, more Asians in every part of ICANN and contributing to Internet governance in every way.

And as far as young people are concerned, definitely, you are the ones that keep us young. So please keep coming, and please keep coming to the microphone. And well done again.

Gong xi ni.

Congratulations.

[Applause]

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Asha. Thank you, everyone, for your question. And I will pass the mic to Steve, please.

STEVE CROCKER: We really have no one queued up on line or at the mic?

Perfect.

[Laughter]

Sebastien. Sebastien, I can hardly tell you how happy I am to see you.

[Laughter]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Steve. As it was not 6:30, I thought I could come to the mic and since there weren't any people. Thank you for giving me the floor.

I'm always surprised to see that at the beginning of these meetings, we do not have a systematic explanation to the participants that they can speak in seven different languages ICANN makes available to all participants the language services. This is a tool they can use to speak in any of the seven languages that are available here. I know that we all make the effort of speaking in English, of speaking the same language. But this is so support of diversity.

I wanted to take the floor to say that I was about to complete a study on the formation of the board since its creation. And let me share with you some figures. There were 107 different people who participated on the board. There were -- let me check my notes so as not to make mistakes. Just bear with me for a minute, please.

I wasn't prepared to speak.

There were 22 women and 85 men. Who were selected by the NomCom, 11 women and 24 men and 20 people selected by NomCom that came from the community and who were already participating in the community and 15 who were not

participating. Four presidents, three men. Six vice presidents and six general directors that were just men.

I think it is the moment to act. I think that we need to do something to enhance diversity and to truly strike a balance between men and women. We need to come up with a plan so that -- [Timer sounds] -- in three years the board will have as many women as men. Thank you.

[Applause]

KHALED KOUBAA: I will answer in French, if you don't mind. Sebastien is right. We shouldn't forget diversity also has to do with cultural diversity, with regional diversity. There is diversity in other constituencies in ICANN, and we also need to work on that.

And now I'm giving the floor to the chair of the board to make some closing remarks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a couple of more minutes.

I think that it is almost an insult to say that. Of course, all types of diversities are essential. That is why I work so hard with my working group on the second accountability track on Work

Stream 2. But I can speak about region, language, universities, diversities in all those areas and results would be striking.

Of course, all these elements need to be there, but I'm sure of something and that is that we need to have as many women as men as we can on the board. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: I'm going to give the floor now to Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: On this last point, I have to say I agree with Sebastien, that the opening remarks should have included clarity about the ability to accept comments in several languages and to be specific about what they are.

I accept full responsibility for that. We have a script that is intended to make sure we don't forget any of the points that we want to get across, and this was missing from the script. It's certainly a piece of process and mechanics that we can do better on.

I promise not to make that mistake in the future.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

And I am sure that my successor will have this completely under control, Cherine.

But it is a very fair point, and it's an easy one to fix and we will fix it.

And on that note, I think we've been responsive to most of the questions that have come up. But as a matter of form, let me say that we will try to respond on Thursday to any of the points that are hanging out that are within our ability to follow up on within this time. And if not, then follow up at another time.

There will be a gala tonight at the Emirates Palace Hotel. Buses will begin picking people up at 7:00 p.m. in all languages.

[Laughter]

And with that, I think we are adjourned. And thank you very much. It's been certainly an invigorating session.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]