
SINGAPORE – GAC Briefing from ICANN CEO
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 09:00 to 10:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. If you could take your seats, please.

Okay. Let's get started.

Okay. Good morning, everyone.

So we have about 30 minutes now this morning to have an exchange with the CEO of ICANN, Fadi Chehade. When we first scheduled this session, some things had -- well, some things have changed in the interim. But as to how we make use of our time this morning, Fadi can take some questions. And I know that from our exchange yesterday, that there is an interest in talking a little bit about internationalization and globalization and how those concepts relate to each other, and as well, a suggestion that we talk a little bit about the organizational or process aspects of the organization's work and how, for example, with WHOIS, the GAC would be better able to prepare for its meetings and track issues if there was an easy way to get a summary picture about all the different tracks of work under way on WHOIS.

So those are a couple of things that I have in mind. And we have also some other requests I see coming to comment as well.

Okay. So, Fadi, you would like to start by saying a few words or should we just go right into the questions?

Okay. So I will give the floor to Portugal, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

PORTUGAL:

Thank you, and good morning.

So my point is about globalization versus internationalization.

I think it's a bit unclear now in the discussion and is conveying confusing signals to the community what really the board and the CEO they mean when they refer to the globalization of ICANN.

I'm not referring to IANA now. ICANN.

So according to the established understanding of these terms in political science, at globalization, the product helps to globalize, but the structure of the entity that managed it remains the same. And large, it's worldwide scope of influence. So when a self-interested corporation owned by individuals of same nation reach out to do business worldwide for exploitation of opportunities of self-profit, we say the corporation is globalizing.

Also, the current so-called globalization process is generally recognized as being associated with the opening of international trade agreements. So I think that neither of these two meanings allows ICANN to reach out worldwide and to be accountable to worldwide multistakeholders.

On the other hand, internationalization, the entity becomes internationalized, meaning that there are other countries and entities involved in its management and it's fully compatible with the involvement of worldwide multistakeholders of all possible organizational or individual origins, is desirable for ICANN, I think.



International law procedures provide an appropriate framework for the evolution of ICANN's institutional nature and the strengthening of its accountability to worldwide multistakeholders. So it appears most appropriate to internationalize ICANN, but you are talking about globalization.

So thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Portugal.

How about we drop both and create a new one?

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE:

We do not let definitions define our work. We should decide what's the right thing to do. And if it's a new label, let's create it.

We have a French board member who keeps telling us "mundializacion." Maybe we pick a French word. Why not?

I think definitions and political science, of course, are important frameworks. I'm not a political scientist, nor am I a lawyer. But I'm a pragmatist. And I believe when we used the term "globalization," it was a choice. It may have wise or not wise. It doesn't matter. What is important is, what is it we're going to do? And on this, I hope we can all agree.

Some people argue globalization is an overriding term that includes internationalization. Others -- and so instead of getting into these



arguments, I think let's agree what we want to do. And I'll go right to that.

What we mean by globalizing ICANN was expressed best in the board resolution that we issued about a month ago now, and we created these five tracks, as we called them, for making ICANN a global organization.

One -- and this should give you a sense at least of what we would like the discussion to be around. But everything's on the table. This is also important to know, that we are trying to figure this out together.

Number one, we said, is IANA globalization, which, again, means for us to apply the term that I used when I started of multi-equal stakeholderism. We felt at the time that having the United States have a unique involvement in the management of our affairs problematic in the sense that we were not truly multi-equal stakeholders. And so the board has as the first track the discussion of this issue. And, of course, since that time, a lot has happened that opened now the door for us to actually implement and operationalize that concept.

Second track relates to the legal structure of ICANN. And so this was put on the table as an important discussion. What is the right way for the legal structure of ICANN to evolve so that ICANN itself is a more -- is viewed and is -- its action is truly of an international legal structure?

Third track was about our commitments, you know, our Affirmation of Commitment document. If you read it -- and I know many of you have -- it's a commitment of ICANN to the world, to the community. But what was strange about it is that it is signed by us and the U.S. government.



So it's almost like, you know, I commit to this group of something, but I sign it to this group.

Now, of course, the U.S. government is part of the community. They're not a separate group. But, still, it was -- we discussed that it is important for us to think about that document and that we did not think that the solution is to simply have that document signed by everybody else. The solution was that that document should be put on the table and people should discuss it entirely, evolve it, extend it, and then make it a global document. So that's the third track.

Fourth track was the discussion of the root system. Right? We have root operators. We have Verisign, we have ICANN. We work together on operationalizing the policies that come from you, from the GNSO, from the ccTLDs, and also from the IETF and the RIRs. So we wanted to discuss amongst us and this group how we can strengthen the accountability of that group to the world. All right? That's a very important area.

And the last area, if you read the details of the board resolution, was about our policy structures. So yesterday, when I addressed our colleague from Iran, I was saying that it's important that we appreciate that our policy structures are open. Everyone is welcome. Governments are welcome to our policy structures. But is that enough? Is it not enough? I don't know.

So the fifth track was let's look at our policy structures. Let's make sure they are ready for the brave new world we are in.

This is what we meant by globalizing ICANN.



Having said that, if there is a sixth or seventh area that we all come up with as a community, let's look at it. It's -- that's why we created this track yesterday -- Monday now -- at 5:00 p.m., where we said aside from discussing how we're going to transition the United States government's stewardship of IANA, we now need a second track, completely separate but interdependent. They cannot be completely viewed as separate, but interdependent, that looks at the accountability of ICANN and its globalization as an institution.

So all of this is on the table. It's a remarkable time. We are shaping ICANN for the future. And we have an opportunity today that has been put on the table for all of us to shape this.

And I want to say this in this room, and I hope the United States can close its ears for a minute, because I might embarrass them. But I said this publicly in other places, and I will say it here again. I want to commend the United States government for the courage they have shown the world. Many of us would not, frankly, give up control or stewardship easily. They have. And they have been great stewards of ICANN for the last 15 years. Great stewards, and with great courage, and with graciousness. We discussed with them over the last year and a half, of course, over the full 15 years, but in my year and a half, how can we wisely and carefully trust the world to take over that stewardship? And now they announced their intent.

So, please -- I know Larry's gone today, but I had asked my staff if they see him in the hallways to give him a hug or to at least thank him. But you can do that to Suzanne. I'm sure she would appreciate it as well.

But thank you. Thank you, United States.



[Applause]

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. So I see some more requests.

Peru, as you are next, is it on the same topic?

PERU: Yes, it is.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Please.

PERU: Mr. Chegade, I would like to speak in Spanish, if you don't mind. I am right here.

I am the representative of Peru.

I am the representative of Peru, and I will refer to a conversation that took place yesterday when you referred to the Dot Amazon TLD application. My colleagues from Brazil made a presentation on repeated occasions about the accuracy with which Peru and Brazil have closely followed the guidelines in order to meet every requirement, only to find or to get to know the board's final decision based upon a GAC recommendation.

Yesterday, after my colleagues from Brazil gave a presentation, we learned that the board might also be considering communicating an



independent advisor's opinion or sharing that independent advisor's opinion. Peru would like to know the following:

First, is this procedure contemplated in the applicant guidebook? Because if anyone does whatever they feel like doing, then this is not a serious process. That in the first place.

Secondly, I would like to know what deadlines we have before we get to know the board's final decision on the substantial issue. It is my understanding, Mr. Chehade, that you are the most interested person in having ICANN projecting the image of a transparent organization, an image of transparency. However, this is not the image that my government is seeing after waiting for nine months.

You have to understand that Dot Amazon affects the Peruvian population, which largely resides in the Amazon area. This is a topic of great interest in the public opinion, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that I represent is permanently receiving communications from congressmen and state ministers in our republic.

How are we supposed to reply to them? Are we going to say that you are once again reconsidering the issue, that we have to wait for another ten months for you to stick to the GAC recommendation?

And, finally, if I may, I would like to urge all the GAC members present here to please reconsider your reply to this issue. Please reconsider including your reply to this issue in the communique for this meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Peru.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah. Thank you very much. I appreciate your passion and your commitment to this issue.

But there is one issue I have with your statement, is that you are in a rush. Why are we rushed? I think it's better to make the right decision slowly. I don't understand what the rush. So long as the -- the TLD's not granted, then let's take our time and make the right decision. We shouldn't be rushed to make the wrong decision in either way, to be honest.

Secondly, the board has not made a decision. The way the board works is, if it reaches a decision on a TLD, it will publish it in a resolution. The board has not. In fact, the board has clearly asked for us to get a legal opinion from a top legal expert in the world on this issue. And that was published. That was the resolution of the board. It wasn't a decision either way. We received GAC advice.

And that advice came back and will be made available. So we will share that advice.

Now, I am very sensitive to this issue that we need to engage in together. And I have suggested that maybe before the board makes a decision on this issue that we have a chance to have a dialogue between the applicant and the affected parties, including, obviously, your country. So I'm today proposing that ICANN facilitate a discussion before the board makes a final decision, in an attempt to see if we can defuse this tension before a final decision is made. And I'm happy to



come to Lima and visit with you and bring along with us the corporation, Amazon, and invite other countries in the region to come and join us in Lima, if would you welcome me. And we can have a discussion on that before the board makes a final decision. Because their decision will be final then.

And right now, the advice that you will see is not necessarily black and white. So I think we have an opportunity to strengthen the clarity of your position. And if it's helpful, I'm willing to make my good offices available in Lima, along with you and other affected parties, and Amazon, to see if we can come up with a decision that I think is satisfactory to all parties.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Did you have a follow-up, Peru?

PERU:

Yes. In regards to what you just said, I want to tell you in English that Peru and Brazil, we have always agreed to talk with Amazon and with ICANN. In fact, those conversations already took place. And we did not reach an agreement. In fact, the situation hasn't changed.

So as far as Peru is concerned, I don't see any sense in -- I will go back to Spanish. Okay?

See no point in the idea of going back to our intention to hold a conversation. (Non-English audio)



A threatening attitude or is showing a threatening attitude that gives no signal of having changed their mind.

What Peru and Brazil have requested, and we have been supported by the GAC, is (non-English audio) our own right and the decision that the Board will take in this regard will send a legal precedent, and will lay the foundation so that in the future, this situation doesn't happen again.

I expect -- I mean, rather than seeing you in Lima, where you will always be welcome with a good Pisco Sour, rather than seeing you there, I expect to see the Board has the guts to sit down and reach a decision when the time comes to reach that decision. Then clearly, we need to modify the guidebook, because if the guidebook does not mention any deadlines, and you can take as long as you need or as you want, then why should we stick to the rules so strictly? It makes no sense.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Peru.

Okay. So I have more requests. France, Spain, Iran, and China.

We have about another 15 minutes. So let's continue.

France, please.

FRANCE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I will speak French so ICANN doesn't think interpretation costs are a waste of money.



And after all, I had the pleasure yesterday of hearing that Tom Dale speaks very good French, which is really a pleasure for me. It shows me that at the end of the day, Australia and France are not that far away.

Fadi, I wanted to say that I fully share your comments, your congratulations and appreciation of the American government.

(Non-English audio)

No doubt, this decision couldn't have been reached if you hadn't inspired enough trust for them to move along that path.

I would like to go back to some points that you mentioned regarding globalization, internationalization, worldization. I don't know what term to use. This working group was set up, and, unfortunately, it was our understanding on Monday that it would disappear. Clearly this means that we are curious about this. They said that everything had been decided in a top-down fashion, but the French government will never ever criticize you because you didn't have enough leadership or because of lack of leadership. We will always support you in these initiatives. This is a question of priorities. Regarding the decision to transfer the stewardship of the IANA functions to ICANN, okay, we understand this. However, these are very important topics, very dear to us, and they cannot be left aside or overlooked for a long time. It is difficult to transfer stewardship without a prior reflection and without prior actions on what you mentioned, such as ICANN's legal structures.

Thank you.



FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, David. Let me be clear. What we eliminated are the advisory groups set up by the Board in order to engage in a dialogue with the community. But these topics, or the topics themselves, have not been eliminated. Topics will be addressed by means of public consultation on ICANN's globalization.

So topics are still there to be debated. And we are still addressing the topics. But the community does not want to address these topics by means of the advisory groups. They want a bottom-up consultation process. And this is clear-cut.

We will continue working together on these five topics, or on any other topics that we may encounter. But these are our main working topics. We cannot waste any time because these topics are really significant. We will not move as quickly in all the topics because it is one thing to speak about the legal structures and another thing to speak about the globalization of another structure. For example, a policy development or developing structure.

However, I do appreciate your comment. I do appreciate France's support. And I know that that I can count on you in the forthcoming months because we will really need your engagement to reach a good destination together.

SPAIN:

Very good morning to you. Thank you for sharing with us this half an hour.



I would like to join you in commending the United States government for having led ICANN oversight during these 15 years with what I think it's been an earnest, very professional way of exercising their functions.

What I think is the step they've taken is a very important symbolic gesture which signals the maturity of the Internet, their coming of age as a global structure that has become crucial strategic resource or two for every country in the world.

So it's just very (indiscernible). They kind of give up or render that oversight function to the world as a general.

But what I think is the real challenge for ICANN now is to strengthen and enhance its accountability. You pointed it out, and that's -- I think that's the real challenge.

And let me explain why we think this is really important. ICANN depends on funding of registrars and registries mainly. And that gives them more influence, I think, more power in decision-making processes.

I see that other agents, other stakeholders don't have the same avenues and have the same opportunity to influence on decision-making processes. They can, of course, seize the opportunity of expressing their views in public comments, but when it comes to take decisions, their influence is not as great or as -- well, it's not as important as the other stakeholders.

So I think ICANN should become more inclusive organization. It's not just a question of attracting more countries and more governments to this model, but to try to take more into account the views of those who can lose something when ICANN takes decisions.



I refer to the cases of amazon, vin, wine. I think some decisions impact stakeholders which are not covering participants in the ICANN model because there are Internet users but are not in the Internet business.

So I think that's the real key issue for ICANN to become more legitimate, as I said.

We have to be imaginative, as you pointed out, in finding ways of strengthening the accountability of ICANN. As the setting up of the government-led structure has been discarded, we have to screw up our minds to find other ways.

But I also think that letting ICANN keep on being subject to the laws of a country, on the court of a specific country doesn't help in finding these ways of strengthening accountability. It's something that is written in the Affirmation of Commitments as well as the need to be headquartered in the United States and that can be useful as well in strengthening accountability.

And just a very quick word on the condition stated by the United States to globalize the IANA functions; that it's they cannot be transferred to a government-led organization.

I agree, but we have to take into account that the IANA database includes ccTLDs as well, and according to the GAC principles on delegation and redelegation, public authority over who should run its ccTLD (indiscernible) with public authorities.

So when it comes to ccTLDs, I think governments might have an important say in those decisions. And I stop here.



Thank you very much for listening to me.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. Thank you. Your English is far better than my Spanish.
Thank you for helping.

You made three points. I'll cover them quickly.

On the last point you brought up, I want to be very clear, the U.S. government did not say that governments should not have a role or should not have a key role. And, in fact, for ccTLDs, governments have a very important role. I mean, in many cases, they are the -- there are sovereignty issues that we respect and understand around the ccTLDs. So there's no question there.

I think the U.S. government did not want to see its oversight collectively being under a government or a group of governments or a place where decisions are made solely by governments; right?

So I think on that we all agree. But we equally agree, as I said in my opening speech, that without government true participation, and in the case of ccTLDs, critical participation, then we don't have a legitimate solution. So we're committed to that.

We'll work with you to figure out the best way to do that.

This is a great time for us to really design this, as you said, creatively.

The second point you brought up was about the legal structure. I want to emphasize that in one of the five tracks, one of them is our legal



structure. We have to look at that constructively and critically, what is the right structure moving forward.

Everything in the AoC is up to us.

Now, the core principles of the AoC are solid. They're very good. If there are parts of the AoC that need to be now evolving because of the agreement of the community to evolve certain parts of our operations, accountability structures, et cetera, then we will evolve them. It's on the table for us to discuss wisely together.

And the third point you brought up is the one closest to my heart so I'm going to take a minute on that. Inclusivity.

Inclusivity is a central principle of multistakeholderism. Frankly, of any institution that purports to be a global institution.

And I am not a fan of labels. As you saw when Portugal was asking me about globalization, international. I feel that labels divide us. Labels divide us. So you will notice that I don't use the word "multistakeholder" too much, because it divides us. Multilateral divides us.

I grew up in Beirut where so much divided us. In little Beirut, 18 different factions that fought for 15 years over labels.

No labels. Principles.

Inclusivity is a core principle for our success. So if there is any perception that a group, like registries and registrars, has more say than another group, then we are failing our core principle. And it's not just perception. It's reality; right?



So perception is already bad, if you have this perception or others do, and we need to address that through communications and clarity. But I must tell you, from a practical standpoint, when I came to ICANN, a lot of people told me the registries and the registrars really have some kind of a spell on ICANN. I must tell you, it's not the case. If you attend the policy-making work that happens and you see how hard the noncommercial group, the NGOs, everybody participates in the decisions, it's extensive. And I hope you do as well. You need to be part of these discussions. Participate and influence these discussions.

So inclusivity is a core principle. It's more important than multistakeholderism and multi-whatever. It's a principle, and it's a core one, it's a foundational one.

And I hope when we meet in Brazil Ambassador Benedicto and we principles for global Internet governance that inclusivity is almost the number one principle.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay. So we have time for just a few more speakers.

We have Iran, China, South Africa, and the African Union Commission. And then we're running out of time.

So Iran, you are next, please.

IRAN:

Thank you.



First, good morning to everyone.

First of all, let me -- a small statement. We appreciate your enthusiasm, your energy and your dynamic. When I saw you on the podium, taking off your jacket, microphone in hand and walking, I thought this is an electoral campaign for a presidency of somewhere, sometime. I don't know where and which time and which country. So good luck for you in future.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE:

I will be farming, Mr. Arasteh. That's my plan.

I will be a farmer in my future. My wife is in the audience, so she is my witness.

IRAN:

Don't rush.

[Laughter]

Now, Fadi, there is a legal gap with juridique, (phrase in French). (Non-English audio). Separation of powers, separation of responsibility is not met and is not considered. You cannot have a Affirmation of Commitment drawing yourself, implementing yourself, and observing yourself and judging yourself. You are only the implementer. Someone else should write it off. And someone else should watch whether or not you implement that.



Unfortunately, you want to have a sword of the kingdom without having these three separate powers: legislative, executive, and judicial. We mix them up in one single. It is not correct. And we have to really consider that.

You say that U.S. government and ICANN have this set of Affirmation of Commitment. This is not true. Affirmation of Commitment is the sort of responsibility to which you are answerable and you should be accountable. Should have a legal framework. There is no legal framework. It is unilaterally written, unilateral by someone.

We are not criticizing anybody.

I have written a document, 35 page. Never I put my finger to criticize anybody at all. Take the professionalism. Really, we have to look at that one.

Your main work is to talk about this vide juridique, this legal gap that is today, and we have to really address that point.

I was in the other room in the morning. The chairman of the ICANN says that U.S. government has not withdrawn from its stewardship on the Internet. He has withdrawn -- or not withdrawn. He is going to transit the stewardship -- the stewardship. Somebody told me yesterday. I said ownership. No. A stewardship. A stewardship of IANA.

I don't understand. What does it mean that the U.S. has not withdrawn its stewardship from Internet? What does it mean that? Where we are now? We are just talking of one thing, or what the United States has given us is not a gift. It is coming from the events. Situations push them to take this decision. Otherwise, why was not this decision taken two



years ago? Why not three years ago? It is years and years you are talking and talking and talking of the root servers, of this management, of the lack of the involvement of the government, and so on and so forth, but all of the sudden come, after the 7th of October, your statement, and after so many other things that we take it positively. Let's appreciate and take it positively, although it is conditional in our view. It is still condition.

There are a lot of thing to be done. The issue is not so simple.

The problem is there's the lack of the legal framework. You have to have a framework, legal framework. Then you have to fill this legal gap.

Once you did that, you can go to the other steps.

So perhaps you need to slightly review your priority or your steps that have to be taken. First you have to start the legal framework and legal gap, and have this accountability, and there should be these three party that I have mentioned yesterday.

You could not have a self-evaluations. You establish the law, you implement the law, and you judge that you have implemented the law yourself. It is not correct. There would be three part (indiscernible).

Thank you very much.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Arasteh. Thank you, Iran, for your good comments and, again, I think you and I are in a race for the most passionate person in this gathering, but I think you win on most days.



Let me be candid. We have not said that we want to be everything. We have said let's come and find the best accountability mechanism. Tell me what organization on the planet does that. Putting everything on the table and saying: Come, let us figure it out to go. I would like some institutions that I know very well, including my own church, to do this some days, but they don't because institutions don't typically open up and say, "Come, let's all figure out what is the right model." And if the right model creates a legal framework that has different components that do different things, judiciary, as you said, legislative, whatever, then let's do it.

The debate is on. Let's come and work it out together.

So I want you to know nothing is presupposed. We're working together.

I think from a -- Separate that from the U.S. government piece which has to do with transitioning IANA.

I wasn't here when my chairman said the statement you refer to him about stewardship, but if I can, I will tell you, knowing Steve's mind and heart that is very straight about these things, I think what he meant to say is the U.S. government is not abandoning the Internet as, in fact, some people in Washington are saying.

The U.S. government will be involved equally to everyone else. That's the only difference, is that they had a unique involvement to date in the affairs of ICANN, and that unique involvement will now be replaced with an equally vigorous involvement, but on an equal footing with everyone here.

I think that's a great thing. And that's what we're commending.



So I hope this helps a little bit, that, you know, we're willing to work with you and with everyone to figure out the model going forward.

This is true openness. This is true inclusivity. And ICANN should be commended for being in that position today.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

I have China next, please.

CHINA:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Fadi, to join us here.

I'd like to also thank the ICANN to provide the Chinese translation. It will be helpful to promote the Chinese community to participate in ICANN activities.

So I will speak in Chinese.

First of all, I would like to thank your efforts, Mr. Fadi Chehade, for your work on globalization and internationality -- internationalization. Sorry.

One of the most important things is that ICANN has established three hubs, and also the engagement centers, which has greatly improved internationalism and also globalization.

Also, we have noticed that ICANN has a lot to do and to improve. For instance, in developing countries, in participating the ICANN activities, we have some limits.



So within ICANN, in the working groups we have noticed that participants in the North America will account for about 75%. From EU will be about 15%, and Asia, Africa, South America participants only account for like about 10%.

So this has shown that community participation is not balanced.

ATRT2 has also asked for request of comments from all over the world. However, they receive limited feedback.

First of all, this has shown that developing countries are not active in this whole process.

Also this has shown that governments do not recognize ICANN on a high level.

So while improve the transparency and accountability, ICANN has a long way to go.

We're delighted to hear that you just mentioned multistakeholder. We would like to hear your efforts on improving the balance of participation of all stakeholders, including the participation of developing countries.

Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, China, very, very much. I know that China, as many other countries, is equally anxious, as I am, to increase the participation of people from the developing world. And I will -- you know that I've been to China more than almost any other country, more than my home in the last year and a half, to engage and to build relationships with the



great number of people that use the Internet, close to 600 million people, working through the community and the various people there. And I thank you for the facilitations you've given us in building a great engagement center. In fact, the first engagement center in the world was built in Beijing, and it's already taking calls from Chinese users, citizens, anyone, in the Chinese language, and responding to them in Chinese to support them.

I will agree with you 100% that when I arrived to ICANN, ICANN remained very U.S.-centric, very western-centric.

And that's changed quite a bit since I arrived. Are we done? By no means. We have a lot of work to do. And these numbers you mentioned, by the way, are old. It's gotten a lot better. But it's not quite there. We still have a largely Western-centric ICANN. But as I showed you on day one, in Asia, we had a couple of people. We now have 14 people in Asia, and more to come, opening engagement centers, engaging with the countries. And I moved to Asia earlier this week personally. I'm living here now for the next few months to show my commitment to all the world. And I'll be moving to Istanbul later this year.

So I want you to know that we are completely aligned, that we must change the posture of ICANN. We must make it a global posture, not just through legal structures, not just through accountability structures, but also through practical structures, operational presence around the world. We will do that. You have my commitment. And we will build these numbers you showed today. And I want you to know that I will make them part of my executive dashboard, and I will share them with



you so we watch the trends and we have metrics to say, how are we doing over time. So I will share these with you.

The one thing I would beg to differ with you is, you said ICANN is not yet -- or is not doing well on accountability and transparency. I must tell you that most global measures of transparency put ICANN quite at the top. Quite at the top. We are a very transparent organization.

Now, what we need to do is strengthen our accountability mechanisms so they meet the global test. And that we will do. I agree with you, we have a long way to go there still. But I invited you to come and join me with that, because recognition of ICANN comes from how we translate these concepts into reality. And I think I have shown in the last period that what I say, I mean. And when I announced on October 7th, as I was reminded by Mr. Arasteh from Iran, that U.S. relationship with ICANN is not sustainable as is, people thought that I was making this up, and I wasn't. And we delivered on that. And we will continue delivering on our comments.

Thank you. Thank you, China.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Next I have South Africa, please.

SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you.

You know, when you begin a dialogue with conditions, it makes it difficult to properly engage. Conditions in more ways than one direct engagements with such an outcome.



I think it's important to let the process and the discussions dictate the outcomes.

What happens when one of the conditions is not met? What then? I think that's a big question.

Secondly, coming from a developing country, we have a big issue with the whole issue of multistakeholderism. We're not against it, but in terms of civil society organizations, who are they, who are they representing, because most of the time, they're headquartered elsewhere in the world. So the question is, we would want, if people are going to speak on our behalf, coming in the whole multistakeholder model, there should be legitimacy to know that we are who we say we are. Because I can be a civil society organization all by myself, and I could stand and say that I speak for 15 million people, which is -- which wouldn't be fair.

So going forward, I think it would be really important to identify these other -- civil society in the whole process. And also to say that with regards to accountability, I think that is a major issue to say ultimately who will actually be responsible for the Internet. Because it has such impact on our daily lives and (indiscernible) security and all of it, taking into account that everything is I.P.-based at the moment. So I think we need to -- when we pave the way forward, we really need to be carefully in how the final outcome is, where the final outcome is. Thanks.



FADI CHEHADE:

If I could -- thank you, South Africa -- you make two separate points. I want to address them quickly.

On the second issue of civil society and participation and is this civil society truly representative of, let's say, your local civil society, it's extremely important that we consider the need for national dialogue between the constituents within a country. I think this way, at the country level, at a national level, you're engaged with the different parts of your constituencies. That's the most important one. More important than the global engagement of -- with civil society, it's the national engagement with civil society. And here I commend Brazil, for example, Indonesia, different countries that have built -- Kenya -- that have built, you know, efforts within their country to create truly open fora, open platforms for discussion amongst government, civil society, private sector within their country. That's where the truth will company.

Now, it needs to be synchronized with global activities such as ICANN. It cannot be divorced from it. And here, I bring to your attention the importance of NETmundial. Because we're not talking about ICANN when we start discussing these things; we're talking about the Internet. And ICANN is not the Internet. ICANN is one piece of the puzzle.

And as we get busy with ICANN, sometimes we forget the importance of ensuring that we have a global set of mechanisms that respect national mechanisms for dealing with technical and nontechnical issues arising on the Internet. And NETmundial will tackle this in a very open and constructive way. I hope every one of us is there to participate in that dialogue.

This is where these issues need to be addressed.



And your first point was about the conditions laid out by the U.S. government.

As you know, we spent ten minutes earlier thanking the U.S. government for their generosity and their graciousness. We should keep in mind that as they cede control, which most of us won't do in normal conditions, as they cede control, they also have some principles that they hope the world will embrace. After all, this was all their doing. We have to respect that.

I think that the conditions they've laid are good conditions. Openness of the Internet, I think that's good. If we have an issue with that, frankly, we shouldn't be part of the conversation.

Secondly, they said we should participate in our own fora at all levels. Everybody should be there, whether it's governments, civil society. Whoever needs to participate should participate, but this should not be closed to one group or another. That's what multistakeholder means when they use it properly, because sometimes it's also used improperly. Inclusive. Everybody should be at the table, equal partners.

That's a good principle. I don't think we have an issue with that.

Your point is, you know, are these freely representatives of my civil society. That is for us to ferret out. But the principle is good.

The third principle they bring is, let's make sure that it doesn't affect the security and stability of the Internet. Who would have any issue with that? Of course we would be supportive of such a principle. Right?



I mean, these are good principles. I don't think there is anything they laid out that any of us would stand up and say, "That's impossible. That's a nonstarter." Everything they said makes it good.

I understand the reaction we might have to anybody putting conditions on the world. But we should not forget that, after all, there's a lot of graciousness in their decision. And it's up to us to shape it now. I invite you to join me. I know that South Africa has been a great participant in this dialogue. But now we have the chance to shape it. Let's not miss it. Let's take it on.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Next, African Union Commission, please.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: I will be speaking in French, so --

First of all, Mr. Fadi Chehade, I would like to thank you for being with us, on behalf of the African Union Commission. I can't help but congratulate you on your leadership, because you have taken the reins of this organization with great leadership.

We see that Africa starts to find its place in this organization. We are really happy with your presence in Africa and with the African strategy. We are really happy to see the way you engage with us, because you are part of the great leaders, and you are always present whenever



there is an event in Africa. You were there in many events, in many conferences, and we really thank you for that.

We are also really pleased to know that we had a successful Dot Africa event, because that was one of the most important strategies adopted within ICANN. So I commend the entire African community and all of us. And I would like to thank all the people who participated in this undertaking. The GAC members really supported Africa. So thank you for that.

We will continue to support all those who encounter the same problems as we have regarding geographic extensions.

The U.S. government announcement was welcomed by the African Union. And we also supported in our statements what you talked about: openness, inclusivity. All these are words that we use in our statement, because we believe that these terms should guide our actions in the framework of ensuring an open Internet.

I join my French colleagues in their comments regarding their conditionalities existing in the dialogue. And I also join the Chinese representative in her request to include all stakeholders, those who are not part of North America or Europe, support all these interventions, and we hope that Africa can also play a very important role. We really want to join you in addressing the challenges ahead of ICANN. We would like to make contributions to these efforts. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

I would also like to commend you on your efforts, because you have done a lot over this period, a lot of problems we have overcome. So the



African spirit has been amazing, and I would like to personally thank you for your participation.

CHAIR DRYDEN: We've already taken far more time than, really, we had anticipated, and I can see a number of more requests. So, unfortunately, we do have to conclude here.

But thank you very much for coming to brief us and respond to questions and comments from colleagues in the GAC.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay.

[Applause]

We now have a break.

Okay. So we have a coffee break now for 30 minutes.

[Break]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

