

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
GNSO Discussion ICANN CEO
Saturday 22 March 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Man: We'll restart the recording now and then restart for the next session. For which it give me great pleasure to welcome our ICANN CEO, Fadi Chehade. Fadi welcome the GNSO weekend sessions.

Prominently, seated - although exclusively at the table is the GNSO counsel, but these are our GNSO weekend sessions which are substantive discussion about the work of the GNSO.

And I'm encouraged and I'm sure you will be to see it's a wonderfully full room with an active group of participants. We've been anticipating your arrival and had some discussion amongst ourselves and would very much appreciate if you would be prepared to work with us in a, sort of, Q and A type format.

And it would be great if we could work along those lines. And I think that that's the sense of how we'd like to take it - if that's okay with you.

So you may want to make a couple of remarks but a warm welcome from all of us - and over to you for a moment.

Fadi Chehade: Well good afternoon - good to be here. I think the big remark is obviously all of us with anticipation of the beginning of the post United States Government era.

It's going to be quite a bit of work in the months ahead. I think right now the community is just racing for what that means and what we need to do. And I think tomorrow - Monday, we will start working together to figure out where we go from here.

As I will note on Monday morning when I speak that one of the interesting interviews I had was with the economist. They run - I think ran a story today - in today's issue.

And the reporter - three times - was trying to push me to admit that the reason the U.S. Government made this decision is due to the Snowden Revelations. And I finished by telling him a story. I said, listen my wife is a gardener.

And if I dared tell her that the good fruits and vegetables in her garden are due the rain that happened two days ago, she'd be very upset with me. Because she spent at least the last six months tilling the ground, composting and trimming and doing a million things for this fruit to come out this way.

It didn't happen because it rained two days ago. So to accuse or to attach the decision of the U.S. Government to an event or a certain time is not fair.

So I want to commend all of us who for the last 15 years have done what we had to do to deserve - as (Larry) himself told me - "You deserve this in spades." You - - all of us - - we deserve this in spades.

Our community has shown the world how we work together - how we can build consensus decisions together - and how we, frankly, enabled a multi-trillion dollar market - not just the DNS market but the Internet as we know it.

So we should be - frankly, even though we are a bit in shock - all of us a little bit in shock with this decision and we need to deal with it. But we should be, frankly, congratulating each other.

And for those who are not with us today - who labored for this for years - to also give them the credit for this moment. It's a very important moment. And I think the world will be watching us on Monday.

Man: Thanks Fadi and you put your finger very, very firmly on the pulse here. And that's one of the themes that's come up in the last while. This is massive and not wholly digested information.

And so shock is maybe one word - undigested is another. But this something we are processing. And my sense is that it's something we need to process and work on together.

So you hit the nail very firmly on the head there. I think it's appropriate now - since that was what was requested and desired is that we simply turn this over to some questions - - Q and A.

And they may or may not be wholly focused on this primary and significant issue. But of course there's much else that preoccupies all of our minds.

So let me open it up to see if we can take a hand and someone who's prepared to lead into this. I've got - well I've got John and then Mikey and then Maria.

John Berard: Fadi, thank you for joining us John Berard from the Business Constituency. Because I'm the nice guy on the counsel, I was tasked with asking the initial softball but then my colleagues would then drive behind.

But I was just curious - I hope you weren't too hard on the reporter from the Economist. Because the political calculus is pretty hard to undo when you look at the timing of the Snowden announcements, the comments of the President of Brazil, the Montevideo statement the political calculus that attaches U.S. surveillance program to the Department of Commerce Management of the IANA contracts.

So I hope you weren't too hard on the reporter because it's a fairly easy sequence to understand - especially, if you haven't been involved even casually with ICANN over the years.

And I hope that he or she was not too hard on you - thinking perhaps you might be trying to mislead him or her in some fashion.

The question though - - the softball question - - that my hard charging colleagues will drive behind is in the time that you have been the CEO, what is the best advice that you have been given.

And the corollary to that - in that same time frame - is what is the greatest misconception that you have been forced to confront about ICANN?

Fadi Chohade: So the greatest misconception - I'll start with that - that I have to deal with is that we are entirely controlled by some people in Washington because it's not true. But it's a misconception.

Only two weeks ago, I was in London meeting with all the ICT ministers of the commonwealth countries - all 50 some of them. And the Uganda minister stood up and he said, "Mr. Chohade, don't you have a contract to perform your core activities with the U.S. Government" - which, of course, I could only answer, "Yes."

And he said, "So you are an agent of the U.S. Government." Well not exactly. And then how fast can one sort out all the details of what we really do under IANA? So yes, that's the biggest misconception.

It's painful because it's so untrue. But it's stuck on us. And there are so many people that spread it over the years to put us in a box. So that's the biggest one.

And I think your first question was the best advice. It depends from whom. The best advice I got was from my wife. She forwarded it to me - something that was written about Dag Hammarskjold who was the second Secretary General of the UN.

And he had something quite impressive that I really liked. And it was that it's very, very important when we engage in roles like mine here to not be attached to the results but rather to be attached to the process.

And I come from the world of results. You know, I'm a CEO. I come from a background where I deliver. And I know how to do that - to execute. But that advice was very helpful for me, you know, to hear it from someone that I respect.

I actually got married in the building named after him in New York City. So I've always looked up to what Dag Hammarskjold had done. And indeed, he's right.

If I proceed with my work and if I enter into a room like this and I already have a very preconceived set of things I want to make happen - rather than learn from the process.

I think I can't continue in this job easily. This is a job that requires me to value the process as much as I value the result. That was the best advice I got -

indirectly, a little bit. But (Sue) sent me that article. And I save it on my iPad. I really like it.

I think it was written by Archbishop of Canterbury. He wrote the article Dag Hammarskjold when - thank you for the softball. I need one of these once in a while.

Man: So now Fadi comes the hardball. And it's up to me to deliver it.

Fadi Chehade: Yes okay.

Man: You were in London two weeks ago and you didn't meet with me.

Fadi Chehade: It's true. I was in London very briefly for a few reasons. But yes I apologize for that.

Man: All right next in line is Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi it's great to see you - Mikey O'Connor. I'm a counselor from the ISP constituency and the segue is perfect. I'm the process guy. I'm the working group's guy.

Clearly, one way to view this is a huge opportunity. So I'm going to frame this in terms of one of your prior jobs where you were a Senior Executive at IBM and delivered many projects - had many people getting ready to deliver projects.

It seems to me that one way to look at this that the NTIA has turned to ICANN - just as customers turn to your organization and said, we think you're the best organization to do this. Here's the project.

You're the CEO. We are the people that deliver those kinds of projects. How can we work together to get a really good charter put together or a really good statement of work - if I translate it into your own terms?

How can we make sure that the scope is right - that the stakeholder engagement is right - that we've got all the right people involved and that we've got the right deliverables? We've got the right resources in place.

The thing that - at least I want to make sure we do - is we work well together. That this is one of the vocal points of the organization that delivers lots of projects in form of working groups - which is our term.

How can we do this together? Because you're going to hear lots of concerns about top down, disconnect, blah, blah, blah. I think those are valid. On this one, the stakes are so high. And it's so important. We have to get this right. How can we do that?

Fadi Chehade: The first thing I did today - and this is news - so it's not a resolution that's signed yet by the board. But it will be signed shortly. I have dissolved the advisory group on IANA globalization. Because we don't need an advisory group now that we're going to start a public consultation and build a working group.

I hope or we'll find the best means to do it bottom up. So the board - I think our GC's writing the resolution now to dissolve that. I have also asked the board to dissolve the advisory group on the accountability of ICANN - the affirmation of commitments because also on Monday, we should start a bottom up public consultation on how to do that together.

So I'm dissolving any groups that I thought I needed to just energize us to work together. I removed them so we can start working bottom up together on Monday - on these two.

And furthermore, since I'm here - I'll tell you, the other three groups that the board had set with me because of the amount of work. And you and I talked about this Mikey - how much there is on our plate - all of us.

I have asked the board to just, you know, defer them for later. Let's just focus on these two - building these two bottom up working groups together. I am committed to this. It appears that things happen top down because there is so much happening and it's so fast.

But I think we've talked about this before. And you know that I am committed to working with you. In fact, I need you. I mean we cannot get there without this community - especially, this room - this community really coming together to solve this.

And there's a lot happening. There are many, many tracks that are filled with work. So we took some decisions today to actually slow down some tracks or at least defer them.

They're important. But they're - we cannot do everything. And the tracks where the community will take over on Monday, we will dissolve the groups that were supposed to energize the community to them because there's no need anymore. Did this help answer your question a little bit?

Mikey O'Connor: That was terrific - this is Mikey, again, thanks. I'm the process guy. So I'm going to grind down another layer. I think - and now I am speaking entirely on my own - just to my constituency members.

The thing I don't want to see - I personally, don't want to see is a giant room full of people confronted with a very complicated problem to solve - the way we did it the last time.

That did not go well. And I think that one of the things we need to do - and now I'm purposefully aiming you back into some of your earlier roles.

Because my earlier role is a project management role - is we really need to get the chartering right.

And a charter cannot be written by 500 people. So we need to figure out a way - between the community and the administration - to collaborate on developing a really good charter.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you Mikey. And I concur with you that it'll be even more than 500 people when you add the many, many people online that will be trying to get into this discussion.

So Theresa Swinehart our Executive in charge of the area of reviews will be asked to specifically put together the management of that session and what happens beyond that.

So please - first of all, I encourage you to please find her and chat a little bit. Because she now shared with me how she will manage the flow of the session in order to come to some conclusions.

But I attempted to talk (Larry) into doing what you said because (Larry) is essentially the party waiting for us to come back to him with something. And he said, "No it's got to be bottom up." You need to open it. You need to listen. You need to see where people want to take it.

But my hope is that during that session, we take it towards a working group - a volunteer group some kind of - start putting together structure. But Monday is about listening and engaging everyone in that process because many people are still dealing, also, with the shock of that.

Somewhere in between a statement of work and a completely - Tuesday Buenos Aires like session - that was just a venting session - somewhere in between we'll find a good formula on Monday.

And Theresa's preparing a good plan. And I encourage you to please talk to her. I know you can reach her and share your ideas. And yesterday I asked you please share with me what are the things we should aim for so that the outcome is a positive outcome.

And frankly, I couldn't second your request more because I am very concerned that as the world is watching us on Monday, we look, frankly, like we're unable to come together and plan for a response to the U.S. Government saying, you're mature. That's what they said.

You seem like a ready group. So here you go. And if - so, hopefully, we'll find that all of us in our minds and in our hearts to come together and look like we're ready for this challenge. But you have my commitment to that, as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Fadi.

Man: Thanks Mikey, thanks Fadi. Maria, I've got you next. And I've got (Thomas) - were you next? I've got Maria. And I've got James. And I've got (Thomas). And then I've got - and yes.

Maria Farrell: Hi this is Maria Farrell. Fadi, how are you? And so I guess, well mine is the actually hardball question. My question to you is how do you - as a member of the board and a member of the ICANN executive - how do you plan to walk the walk on the multi-stakeholder model.

And this is the GNSO counsel. And this morning we talked about a lot of different concerns we have. That the GNSO is dying the death with a thousand cuts - and dying the death of a thousand cuts - a thousand small little cuts to the flesh.

And I'll tell you what we mean by that. There a lot of varies - basically, GNSO is the primary policy initiation and development vehicle for the GNRA TLD space.

But we're dealing with board initiated PDP's. We're dealing with the board rejecting or disregarding policy outcomes that the GNSO has come to. And, you know, frankly, in the words of one of our contributors from the floor this morning - being disrespectful and not coming back to us to talk about policy - substantial policy issues that they disagree with and things like, you know, top down things like strategy panels, et cetera.

For I appreciate what you said about IANA. We think that the multi-stakeholder model is found on the ability of the GNSO to do its work and to do it in a manner that is respected in terms of the substance of what we do.

So, you know, my question too, really, is what are you - as a board director - and the CEO going to do about that. And I'm just going to tell you quickly about a conversation I had over drinks last night.

And there were three of us gathered around - one from the non-commercial world - which is me - one from the commercial side, and one from the government. And one of the people started out saying, what ICANN staff thinks of engagement is not what we think of as engagement.

So we each had had the experience of an event withheld or an outreach we've done to our community and there was not follow through to, you know, do you want to - are you going to be part of the GNSO? Are you going to take advantage of the possibility to be part of it?

So we felt that there is a lot of messaging that's being done but not a lot of engagement. We felt that what - a lot of the outreach to our respective communities tends to be in turns of a conversation or the delivery of a message - rather than the ongoing engagement of people into what we do.

I mean just to wrap up, what we do here is - it's the work. It's the nub of what ICANN does. And, you know, and sometimes it's, obviously, messy. And sometimes it's not particularly useful.

But, you know, where the multi-stakeholder model is slow and all of these things. But, you know, we really are concerned and want to know what you were going to do to walk the walk - in terms of internally operation within the organization and of making the multi-stakeholder model continue to breathe and to thrive?

Fadi Chehade: There were many, many questions in your statement. So I'll pare to few and just answer them. Look, I think, first of all at the board level, do we have a meeting with the board as well. So let's engage the board on that question as well.

But I'll speak for a minute as board member. But when the rest of the board comes, I encourage you to engage them on this. Even today, we had the board meeting - a detailed board meeting.

And I must tell you today there were three things. And you can go look at the record - where we actually stopped the decisions because we said this is not GNSO policy.

And in fact, there is one particular discussion that is going to happen in the hallways in the next two or three days. And when we told our staff as board what to do, the only redline we gave them is this is a consensus policy from the GNSO.

You can come up with any solution to this problem. But this is immovable. It's a redline. So I think the board - I would disagree with you. I think that maybe there needs to be better communications. So you appreciate that we actually do pay attention to the GNSO policy.

Could we do a better job - maybe? And you should hold us to that. But today alone, there were multiple discussions where we came back and said, no this is not right. We should stop short of that and let the GNSO policy prevail.

I think you continue to sensitize us to this. Please keep doing so. I mean do not stop doing that because there are new board members. There are many new people engaged.

They should keep hearing that policies get made here. They shouldn't be made at the board level and especially when a consensus policy was reached by the GNSO.

In fact, our count today was arguing very hard at the board meeting that even if we think it is not the right thing. But it is a consensus policy of the GNSO. We should stick with it because that's how it should be.

So I must tell you at least the tone that I'm hearing is not consistent with, you know, let's ride over the GNSO. I don't hear that. I really don't. Good communications may make you feel better about this.

Now the other points you made is really about things like the strategy panels which continue to make many people in the community upset. Of course, the strategy panels are done. As I blogged ten days ago, they're done. They submitted their work.

Please watch me now to see if I take any of the strategy panel recommendations. And I implement it. If I do, then you should come after me. But if put the recommendations for you to look to review - to consider and to either throw them out or make them part of the strategic plan, what's wrong with that?

Why are we so afraid of people giving us recommendations? It's good. It's good practice. It's good practice. It happens in corporations. It happens in governments. It happens in churches. It happens everywhere.

People hear from third parties. They take input. The question is, if I take this input and I make it a decision, then you should be very worried. Because suddenly I'm bringing outsiders into our home and telling them what do you think? How do we fix the house?

And then I take their decisions and I fix the house. And we haven't discussed it. This is your home. I work for you. I don't work for them. And they work for us. They're outsiders that were brought in to give us input. Some of these outsiders, you know, we may disagree with. We may like.

But the intent was to bring some fresh thinking. If we're afraid of fresh thinking, then we become like members of our church, you know, who think that, you know, they're the only people on the planet that really, you know, matter.

So we should not get closed to outside ideas. That's all the panels' debt. They gave us ideas. That's all the panels that they gave us ideas. They put them on the Web site. And they're gone.

And the advisory groups were equally misunderstood. People are, "Oh, here he goes, Fadi, again is doing advisory groups." The advisory groups were designed so that we can take a discussion that happened at the board.

And the board members can go out and discuss it to the community. That's what it was. I told them, I cannot be dealing with all these areas you want to attack.

Why don't we have four or five board members go out and discuss it to the community and bring back advice to the community - not to me? In fact, if you

look at the record, you will see that insisted they don't call them president's advisory boards.

They are the ones who insisted. They said, "There's no precedent." You have to call the president. These were intended to be community advisory groups that bring a subject to the floor.

So there is so much going on that we think it's all top down because there's a lot going on. But my job is to really step back a little bit which I will do at this meeting - lay out what's on the table. And then discuss it with all of you.

And we as community could say, that's too much. Let's stop these things. Let's focus on these things. And the ones we focus on, how do we deal with them.

So I will do that. On Monday morning, I will kind of show a map of all the working groups, the activities that are going on. And then we have to - as a community, for the next few days - discuss where do we focus?

So I'm with you. I understand how people feel. And I don't ignore perceptions. You were talking about real perceptions. I don't intend to do this. So if there's anything I could do differently, please come and talk to me.

Tell me, look this appears this way. You told me the advisory groups appeared like they're top down. I, today, asked the board to eliminate three. And the other three which are important subject list, just defer them until we decide whether we create working groups to replace them - or whatever.

I just didn't want the subject to die. Because they're important subjects, right. But I stand ready to change in any way that would serve the community better. I'm committed to the multi-stakeholder model.

And on that point, I'll make my last comments. If I wasn't committed to the multi-stakeholder model, I would not have spent the time I spent to convince the President of Brazil to hold an entire conference called the Multi-Stakeholder Conference on Internet Governance.

It took me a long time to nail that. She was at the UN telling the UN to hold the conference. If I didn't believe in the multi-stakeholder model, I would not have asked (Larry) to - that it's time now to let the multi-stakeholder model shine.

What we agreed with (Larry) is a triumph of the multi-stakeholder model. How could I be the one trying to bring that down? So I think we should all be - we should all take a deep breath and think about where we put our actions - what we've done and if there are things that we can do better that are including myself - first myself.

I'm happy to change. I'm definitely someone who is ready to change in any way that the community feels is necessary. So I hope this helps a little bit.

Man: Thanks, Fadi, for that. We've go - I've got three people - in fact, four in the queue which includes - and there be a time constraint on this in the end. But it includes James, (Thomas), (Silaf) and John.

If any of you are going to ask a question in and around topics related to Maria's - like follow on the strategy panel - and so on. I think we could be - we should try and be brief on it. But we should keep it continuous. And then close that issue.

So if we're going to open new issues, then so be it. There's a follow on then let's just have that quickly.

Man: I have a follow on to Maria's question and your answer, of course. So it's clear that you we're sensitive to criticism of the imposition - or the creation of the strategy panels.

What do you think was the reason for that? Why do think there was that reaction to the strategy pane?

Fadi Chehade: Do you want me to be direct about the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: And honest if you can.

Fadi Chehade: We are sometimes insular as a community - to be frank. Every community is a little insular. I've never been one. I come from a minority. So I know how insular we can be.

So I think anytime an outsider is being asked to give an opinion - now you think I did - is that we did not discuss it. It would have been better if we had discussed, hey let's go get an outsider to come and give some opinion.

That's a learning for me. But we also - let's admit that there's a little of, you know, who are these guys to come and tell us. We are the multi-stakeholder model. Who's (Beth Novak) to come and tell us what is the multi-stakeholder innovation, you know, something like that.

So there's a little bit of both. But I will take most of the blame. Had I conferred with all of you that I'd like to do something's to get some outside opinion that would inform us.

I think, frankly, most of you may have said, great let's go do it. You know, let's charter it. Let's put a clear chart around it. So I will not do this again. And that's why I was frankly a little bit disappointed when we - I and the board

made the same mistake by calling these advisory groups which were not intended in any way like the panels.

These were just intended, hey let's go engage with the community more than anything else which, again, was misunderstood as another top down group. It wasn't. It was just asking the board members to go and take a topic and engage us.

And as soon as we saw the working groups or the sense of working groups coming around IANA globalization and so on, I, today, asked the board to have a resolution to this band, immediately. So I hope - I'm candid - but that's what I think John.

Jonathan: Fadi, if you and others - will be two very quick remarks. I mean with the multi-stakeholder innovation panel, I think we could have done - we could have done better if we had engaged with them earlier.

And that was - that would have improved things. But notwithstanding that, we are committed to picking up their work and sifting through it and looking for the nuggets that are relevant and valuable. And we will do that. But there's no doubt about that - James.

James: Thanks Jonathan - and hi Fadi, James from North America Registrars. And interesting news about the panels that you mentioned and it's a surprise. I think I have to digest that.

And I think a lot of folks will have to kind of think about what that indicates just like the NTIA was a surprise to a lot of folks. And we're still chewing on that.

And I'm getting a lot of request, internally, externally - - media, customers, partners, investors - - asking us, like what's our reaction. How do we feel about this change - this announcement? You know, what's our position?

And, you know, I want to say, this has been a long time coming. And we welcome this. But I have to pull short of that. Primarily because I think there's just so many examples of - and this is peripheral to - I think what Maria and John were talking about.

But just, recent sort of high profile examples of ICANN - particularly, ICANN staff and executive staff acting very independently - very unilaterally and, you know, having now entered into new - what I consider very concerning agreements like the new RAA that give ICANN sweeping new powers and authority.

The idea of a fully independent ICANN is a little troubling and gives us pause. And says, maybe we can't jump on board and say we welcome this announcement.

So my question or my comment - disguised as a question - would be something along the lines of, what sort of either internal accountability mechanisms do you think would be beneficial? Or do you think that there still needs to be some external body that ICANN is going to need to be accountable to. That's going to have to be, you know, holding the reins somehow.

And I'd welcome your thoughts on that. Because I think we have - we can anticipate not only that this announcement will bring a Tsunami of new participants into the process.

But it will also reopen a lot of those issues that we discussed that where ICANN was perceived to have acted - gotten far out in front of the community and acted on its own.

Fadi Chehade: James, I disagree with you. First of all because this - I didn't get ahead of the community. This was not my decision. This is a decision by the U.S. Government. Let's be very clear on that.

(Bobby James): Sorry and I didn't mean to imply that this particular decisions was...

Fadi Chehade: Okay.

(Bobby James): I'm meaning for example, we've been discussing things like the RAA data retention waiver. We've been discussing late breaking changes to the new GTLD program. Things that it felt like maybe we're not fully vetted by the entire community.

Fadi Chehade: Yes, felt is not a good word for me. You know, I need facts. So if you're saying things don't feel right. Let's sit down and talk about them. If there are facts that are - if there are decisions being made behind the back of the GNSO, speak up, say this is not right.

But if there are things that are felt, I don't react to that. As to the USG, let me be very clear. The U.S. Government made a big decision that is going to give ICANN an incredible - an incredible edge in preserving our position globally in the role we do.

There was huge attack on ICANN that many of us don't even know about for many quarters to try until now. We're still watching all the proposals coming down on various (unintelligible) to actually take over what ICANN does.

We needed to create a mechanism to stock. The most damaging thing that people say about us is that we are controlled by the U.S. Government. And the U.S. Government gets that.

They're extremely clear that this is damaging for ICANN. It is a cancer that is going to - would have gotten us into a worse and worse situation. We have to solve that.

And believe me, it wasn't just a Larry Strickland decision. This decision went across all the agencies of the U.S. Government - every single agency from Department of Defense to DHS to everybody was involved because this is a big decision.

It's a very courageous decision that the U.S. Government did. Now let me answer your question on the very important subject of how do we bridge ICANN - is what you asked. How do we make sure ICANN is bridled? And this is a good question James. This is an important one.

On Monday, there will be two new tracks that will be discussed. One is related to the response to the U.S. Government which says, "Go and replace our role in IANA with a set of global mechanisms not institutions." This is all picked up wrong by the press.

And we're writing - I just wrote the editors of the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal - one after the other because this was a mistake. They all assumed the U.S. Government said; go replace us with an institution. They didn't.

And I just cleared with (Larry) some language I will use Monday morning. We're looking for mechanisms to replace the role of the United States Government as a steward of the IANA functions. That's number one.

And these should be mechanisms that ensure that the IANA function gets done the way the policies have been written by the IETF for the political parameters, by you - for the generic names - the CCNSO and TLD's for their names, et cetera.

We should be accountable to a mechanism to be designed to replace the U.S. Government role. That's one side. In the afternoon on Monday at 5:00 pm, we're going to have a session to address your question which is okay.

This is for IANA. How about ICANN - now today, what holds ICANN? What keeps us in check is your question. Well two things, one, the U.S. Government. They have a role.

You know how many letters they get all day from people around the world saying, check ICANN. They do. So the U.S. Government has a role there that will change.

And the second thing that is designed to hold ICANN is the affirmations of commitment. That's a document where we commit to the world that we're going to perform things according to certain clear commitments.

The problem with that document today, is that even though it's a commitment to the world, it is signed by the U.S. Government and us. That will change. We don't want it to be signed by a 100 governments. Because I don't think that's the solution.

We want it to be signed by the multi-stakeholder global community. How do we do that? So on the afternoon of Monday, we will have a session precisely to answer your question. What are the mechanisms that we need to put in place to ensure ICANN sticks to its commitments to the multi-stakeholder community.

I invite you to come and help me and help us figure out what are the mechanisms to do that. Because, indeed, as the U.S. Government ends its unique involvement in our world, we need to make sure that we have the right mechanisms in place to keep us in check. I agree with you.

And I encourage us to be involved. And please keep in mind these are two different activities. One is about IANA and how are we to place the U.S. role in IANA. One is about, frankly, ICANN commitments to the multi-stakeholder community.

And how do we - as a community - will keep ICANN in check? And my hope is that we don't go design yet another institution to do that. My hope is that we address that with a set of mechanisms that are legitimate, that are affective and that indeed keep us in check. Is that helpful?

(Bobby James): Yes I just have one quick follow up - Jonathan, if you'll indulge me - sorry. Is one possible - sorry, is one possible hypothetical outcome of this whole thing that we can't replace the U.S. Governments role with internal mechanisms only.

The status quo - as much as we may all hate it - has to prevail. Is that one possible outcome?

Fadi Chehade: That's, actually, I disagree with that. I mean the U.S. Government, of course, is an institution that has a certain weight and a jurisdictional, you know, reach. But if you say this - especially, in front of the whole wide world - then people will question that we believe in the multi-stakeholder model.

And the multi-stakeholder model - if we believe in it - says, that we could bring in - and ICANN is blessed to have a 130 plus governments sitting at the GAC. It has the business community. It has the ISB's. It has civil society role here.

If we cannot put together review mechanisms that can keep us in check, then we are raising a white flag saying, only a government can us boys in check. Is this the message we want to send to the world? I hope not.

We are able to do it. We just need to put in place the mechanisms and the escalation points in the mechanisms which don't exist today to ensure that you have the teeth - in a way - the community has the teeth to keep what we do in check.

And I'm committed to that. So let's get together in the afternoon on Monday and put all of our thoughts around that.

Jonathan: So, I can see somebody waiting in the wings. It (unintelligible) Fadi away. And I can see two very patient people in the queue. So I've (Thomas). And we all have - and we really all have to close it at that point. So (Thomas) let's hear from you.

(Thomas Haggard): Thanks Jonathan, I'm (Thomas Haggard). I'm (unintelligible) to the GNSO counsel. And thanks Fadi for being with us and for the brave decisions that you've already took on this which I think is great.

Even though most of the counsels will only have the opportunity to discuss what the stakeholder groups and constituencies on Tuesday. When we prepared for this discussion there was a unanimous sense in the room that the GNSO and its counsel is cognizant of the responsibility that it has in working on this.

So I guess what we would like to ask from you as the CEO and as you said earlier that you are at service to the community to insure that you support us in this effort with allocating resources and staff so that we can deliver in the time that we have.

I mean 18 months looks a lot. But that's going to be approaching very rapidly. I would like to reiterate one point on the redline discussion that you referred to earlier. I think that ICANN will be under very severe scrutiny - whether it means bottom up consensus driven multi-stakeholder in the best sense of the meaning or whether that's just lip service.

And I guess we need to insure jointly that there's not the slightest room for allegations that the decision making is top down. But I guess that the outside world will not only look at the NTIA question. But I think they will look at ICANN as such.

And there was one recent occasion of the PDP that has ended. And I think - I hope that this PDP is the one that you referred to with respect to the discussions that you had earlier. And that is the IGO and GO PDP effort.

And we recently received a letter from (Sherwin) which sort of showed clearly that the board or the MP and GPC is considering to not follow the policy advice that it got from the community.

And we found that sort of alarming because it was not only a motion that was passed by the counsel. But it was a motion that was unanimously passed by the counsel.

And not everybody liked the outcome. But even those that didn't like the outcome, went on record during the GNSO public session and said, we don't like the outcome. But we very much respect the process which was an integral process.

You know, it was - there was integrity there. And so and we, I think, need to insure that this integrity is carried on and that we don't give any room for people making allegations that this doesn't properly work.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you (Thomas). It wasn't - the discussion wasn't on that one that I mentioned. But I think it's very important when the board and I all come back to visit with you that we take some time to talk about these subjects. It's very important.

I want to, frankly, myself go back and consider some of the positions I'm taking on these board meetings to support the GNSO. I need to work with you on that a little bit because sometimes I need to be better informed.

So I'll talk to Jonathan about this. So I may need some of you to help me.

Man: Thank you Fadi. And I think we can (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Yes but on the other issue - the issue of the continued appearance to some of you that a lot of things are being decided by staff. I can speak for staff - not the board - top down.

I have a monthly call with my team called the what's up call. I'm suggesting that I do a call with the whole community called the bottom up call. I'm not kidding by the way.

And the purpose of that call would be simply for any community member - once every month or two months to actually come and call me on things that I or my staff are deciding top down.

Because we can't come every four months and feel that, -you know, I'm going to do that if it's okay with you - as a suggestion that I just thought about because it seems like the sensitivity's high. And hear it sometimes. And I respond to it.

But it seems like there's a lot building up about this that I don't feel directly. So it could be me. It could be other people on my team. Why don't we have frank engagement once every few weeks that is purely about that - where people can come in good faith? And say, look this looks too top down. Can you explain? I'll do that.

Man: Thank you (Thomas) - thank you Fadi. I'm very conscious of time you have. And then will wrap up this.

(Rob): Yes, (Rob) (unintelligible) Counselor for (unintelligible). I think there's - I've heard some people talk about the NTIA letter. And I feel that there's a little confusion.

The letter doesn't say that ICANN is going to own the administration of IANA. It asks ICANN to manage the process to determine who's going to do that. Okay, that's all I have - if you clarify that.

So this was my question, what gives you - because I hear the tone of assurance that ICANN is actually going to do that. What I kind of understand, what gives you that assurance?

Fadi Chehade: I think this is very important to appreciate that the U.S. Government - and they're here, by the way. So I encourage you to meet with (Larry) and (Fiona) and others to just clarify this with them, as well.

And they've been very generous with their time to talk to the community. But the U.S. Government has a contract. This contract, hopefully, will just laps now. By the time it lapses - for it to laps, we as a community need to come back to the U.S. Government with a proposal that meets their four principals.

That proposal is to replace the role of the U.S. Government as a steward of the IANA functions that gave confidence to the world that we perform these functions. The role of the U.S. Government is largely a role that holding us accountable - accountable to what?

Accountable to perform on the policies that were handed by the various policy bodies and specification bodies, but the relationship between us and the policy body is defined through other means. So take the protocol (Paramus).

I have a NMOU with the IETF. Who owns the protocol (Paramus)? The IETF owns the protocol (Paramus). There's no question. I don't own them. They own them. Who did they sign a contract to perform the function with ICANN with IANA?

So we performed the function on their behalf. Similarly with RIR's - we have NMOU with the RIR's that allows us to manage the registry for them. So

please be clear that the relationships between ICANN and these bodies that produce these policies is defined very clearly.

Critically, on the same day the U.S. Government made their announcement, every ISPO organization - including the regional CCTLD organizations - co-signed a statement saying, we appreciate the decision of the United States Government. But we affirm our respective relationships and the fact that ICANN is the IANA administrator.

So this is already on the record. And, you know, it's moving forward. What we need to do on Monday is to say, the U.S. Government had a function to give the world confidence, we're accountable.

What do we replace this with? Nothing else is in play. It's the role of the United States Government that insured that we did our work according to the community's policies and specifications.

That is what needs to be replaced. And I think that's clear. What we need to do is focus on that and get it done calmly, you know, without upsetting the stability of the system.

So I'm talking to (Verisign) directly. I had several meetings with (Jim Beaters) last week to insure that we are continuing our partnership for the security and stability of the system.

So these things are ongoing. And we have to be very careful with what gets to be - perceived to be in play because none of us want the system to be unstable.

We'd like to - we'd like it to remain very stable. And that's our priority - number one, without a question. I hope this helps a little (unintelligible). And, again, I encourage you to meet with the U.S. Government's representatives as needed.

There's also one other clarification I'd like to make because a lot of people ask me this. And we had the meeting with (Larry) this morning to clarify this. The U.S. Government is going to - is announced its intention to end its unique involvement with all the root zone functions.

Now that clearly implies - as we checked with (Larry) today - that this means that their relationship with us - as it relates to the regional management, their relationship was (Verisign) as it relates to the root zone management, is going to be sun setted when these contracts end - when this period ends.

So this is important to appreciate that this is where we're heading. Now, again, this is not about - this should not be perceived - as some people might as a power grab. This is - all we're doing is insuring the system remains stable through a period of immense and important change.

And all of us have that responsibility - not just me - to keep things very stable and then to build - as James was saying - to build the accountability mechanisms on ICANN and the accountability mechanisms on IANA. That's our job this week to insure we set (unintelligible).

And lastly, I want to say Monday, when you hear us all speak about this - as per our agreement with the board today - we are not presenting any mechanisms - - e the staff, we the board - - no.

We're just tomorrow - Monday we're going to talk process not mechanisms. What is the multi-stakeholder, open, bottom up, consensus based process that we will all adopt to do both these things.

We're not going to get - so please don't come up to the microphone and say, I have an idea on how to replace the U.S. Government. We will say, thank you very much. You know, we are talking about process.

We need to nail the process. So that Mikey's happy. And, you know, we get things in place. That's our job to make Mikey happy. So we will do that on Monday. And hopefully, we're successful. Thank you.

Man: Fadi, on that note, it's up to me to thank you very, very sincerely for coming here on your own, unarmed, unguarded and taking, you know, straight questions that you were unprepared for. I think it's brave, creditable and appreciated.

And at least you'll know that if you've left the room with one person happy, it'll be Mikey. But I suspect you've made a few others, at least, happier if not happy - so thank you sincerely very much for that.

END