

---

SINGAPORE – ICANN Public Forum  
Thursday, March 12, 2015 – 13:30 to 17:00 SGT  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

NANCY LUPIANO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's with great pleasure that I introduce ICANN board chair, Dr. Stephen Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Welcome. Here we are in Singapore where we've been a few times. And the facilities are excellent. The weather is excellent. The food is excellent. So I hope all of you are excellent, too.

It's been a long week. I suspect we all share a certain amount of fatigue, a certain amount of excitement that the week is almost over, and I hope we share a sense of accomplishment on all of the quite substantive and engaging discussions that we've had.

Before we get into this meat of this session, a few housekeeping matters. As you know, the ICANN community has developed its five-year strategic plan which takes us through 2020. You may have seen the strategic plan posters scattered around this venue but have not had a chance to read them. If that's the case, please pick them up. There is handouts over between the doors there.

---

*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.*

---

And if I am fast, I will find my copy that I can hold up for you. There it is. So this is what you should be looking for, and they're over there. So pick one up. It contains our strategic objectives and our supporting goals. This is literally a guide to where we are going as an organization.

Okay. Let's get to it. This session is one that we have made a standard feature. We're extremely proud of it. It is intended to give the community a direct line to the board of directors and the rest of the community, without formality and without filters. Few organizations allow such unfettered access to their boards and their senior leadership.

We have a few things to say about it, however. First, let me tell you what this public forum is not. It is not intended to be a replacement or an addition to public comments that ICANN seeks on issues and policies. Please continue providing your formal feedback on specific issues that are open for public comments using the online system. It is the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committees, supporting organizations, and staff members.

Now let me ask Brad White, our director of communications for North America, to give you an overview on how questions will be fielded.



---

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Steve. For those of you -- many of you have been to the public forum before so you know the drill. So this may be a little repetitive, but it is for all those who are in the room who have not been here before or for those who are joining remotely.

There are two microphones here. You can queue up. When these people are ready to start taking questions, you can start queuing up here in two lines. Remote participants can join in two ways. You can email your questions in at [engagement@icann.org](mailto:engagement@icann.org). For those of you who are on the Adobe chatroom, you can ask a question there as well.

We'll get your questions. They will toss -- the board facilitator will toss to me, and I will queue up your question and introduce you. You can ask your question at that point.

You also may be familiar with video hubs which we've tried in previous meetings and previous public forums. The feedback we got from the participants was very favorable and also the people who were in the room. People like that. We're doing it again.

We have a number of video hubs scattered around the world where they will be asking questions. Of course, it depends on the time zone of those hubs as to how much feedback we're going to be getting.

When you come to the microphone, please speak slowly. I am an example of what not to do since Nancy is always on my case for



---

speaking too fast for the scribes. So please speak slowly. Give us your name and who, if anyone, you're representing.

In terms of standards of behavior, please act in accordance with respect, dignity. Be very respectful of the people who are at the microphone. We want to hear your feelings, but we don't want to get this into an emotional ad hominem sort of thing.

There's many voices that want to be heard at the public forum, which is why we go out of our way to have all these remote access points. Because we're trying to hear as many voices as possible -- and this is the community's chance to talk to the board in an unfiltered way and talk to the community as a whole -- we put a limit on the. Time. We have the rule of 2s, again, those of you who have been to a public forum understand this. You will have two chances to ask a question. You will have two minutes to make your comment or ask your question. There will be a clock on you. You will hear a gong when your time is up.

The board, likewise, will have two minutes to respond. You will then have an opportunity to ask a follow-up question if you so desire. Again, two-minute timer on that. And, again, two-minute response for the board.

So that's the basic lay of the land. And with that, Steve, I'll toss it back to you.



---

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Brad.

So before I turn the floor over to our first facilitator, let me ask those of you who have a question or comment to begin queuing up at these microphones. For this particular public forum, we have three blocks of time and the subjects are anything that you want to raise from accountability to new gTLD program, everything in between or elsewhere. We're trying to encourage dialogue, not merely a soapbox. So comments are allowed. Questions are preferred.

And with that, I will turn the floor over to Rinalia Rahim who will facilitate our first hour.

It's yours.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Steve. As you know, the board very much looks forward to the public forum. And I'm waiting for the queue to begin.

Yes, sir, please, go ahead.

TIM MCGINNIS:

My name is Tim McGinnis. I'm the registry administrator for the .PHARMACY registry. But my question is coming from myself in my personal capacity. I guess it is mostly directed to Dr. Crocker. As you noted in your opening remarks that two of the three



---

groups have submitted their pieces of the transition proposal after a lot of hard work, my question then is: When will the ICANN board review these submissions and provide any feedback to the community? After all, lots of people have put in enormous efforts into these proposals and I think they deserve fair and prompt consideration. It wouldn't really be fair, I think, to wait until the final hour and ask them to start over, if that's going to be the case.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. That's quite a good question. As you pointed out, two of the three groups have provided their proposals. Formally, they have provided them to the ICG but they have also, of course, made them public. Board members have participated in these groups, been watching them. And so in some regards, feedback has already been provided, melded into the process. We have a formal liaison to the ICG which is the overall coordination group. Kuo-Wei Wu -- where is Kuo sitting? Right where I can't see him, over there. So he's directly involved.

I don't know that we have deep comments to apply to any of the proposals -- to either of those two proposals that we've had. Does anybody -- does anybody think that we need to say something other than "good show"? I mean, we applaud the work that's gone on. There are some very detailed points that are not quite perfectly aligned between those two proposals. And we



---

are watching that dialogue take place and offering comments along the way.

Is there anything more that needs to be said? Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU:

I will speak in Chinese. I attended the ICG. First of all, we have to respect the independence of the ICG. In the process, ICG is independent. ICANN should not interfere in this group. The most important thing is ICG has a role -- ICG -- if ICG needs some questions from the board, we will ask support. For instance, in a couple of weeks ago, ICG asked the board for the process of this proposal submission. The board said ICANN board should offer appropriate and timely comments to the ICG, just like other stakeholders.

Second, the ICG asked how can they submit the proposal to NTIA? Board also replied the ICG in a very clear way. The proposal the ICG submitted would not be changed by the ICANN board. Board will have comments, and all the comments will be submitted to the ICG through the process.

As for ICG operation, I would like to say that ICG members should answer this question on the operation of the ICG. Thank you.



---

BYRON HOLLAND:

Byron Holland speaking in my capacity as the Chair of the ccNSO. Yesterday was a very big day for us, and I wanted to share that on behalf of the ccNSO with you. Listening to Steve's comments, however, rest assured, we will be submitting a formal letter to you in the days to come.

But the ccNSO, working closely with the Governmental Advisory Committee, or the GAC, has now completed a multiyear effort that started in 2009 with the delegation and redelegation working group.

Having given unanimous provisional approval of the ccNSO's framework of interpretation at its meeting in Los Angeles in 2014, the council yesterday gave its overwhelming final approval. The FOI working group, in which the GAC was fully represented, has been a good example on how different parts of ICANN can work together.

The framework may not constrain the operation of applicable law, nor may it limit the role of national governments as the ultimate decision maker in matters of public policy. And the framework says so explicitly.

We welcome the GAC's consideration of our work as noted in their communique. The ccNSO Council directed the chair of the council and the chair of the FOI to transmit the framework to the board, and we look forward to working together with IANA staff





---

as they start to use it as a tool to assist their day-to-day operations. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

And I would be remiss if I did not thank Keith and the entire FOI for the multiyear heavy lifting that they have done to get this complicated subject to resolution. Thank you to the FOI.

[ Applause ]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Byron. We congratulate you on your success.

Any comments from the board? Yes, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: I, too, want to add my congratulations. I've been following it intermittently, the FOI, and feeling the pain for the lack of it. And I think we all are very, very excited that this has come to fruition and look forward to watching it take hold and work closely with everybody in the community.

So congratulations to everybody who worked on it, and I'm sure I speak on behalf of the entire board.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Steve.



---

Next, please.

EDMUND KATITI:

Edmund Katiti on accountability from NEPAD. March last year here in Singapore, a successful applicant for the .AFRICA top-level domain signed the Registry Agreement with ICANN. Since then, the process seems to have stalled because of the independent review initiated by .CONNECTAFRICA, the unsuccessful applicant that did not get the required support from the continent.

It is now almost a year and .AFRICA has not yet been operationalized. While we acknowledge that the IRP is an important accountability process, it is governed by ICANN bylaws where it is provided that the IRP panel should strive to issue a written declaration on its findings in no later than six months.

Almost a year since that time, the process seems not to be coming to a conclusion. We now wish to request that the ICANN community and the ICANN board in particular ensure that the mechanisms that we put in place function in such a way that they provide accountability and enhance the system that we have put in place for the benefit of all the people are in the ICANN community, especially from the African marginalized people. I thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, sir.



---

[ Applause ]

Is there a comment? Fadi, do you want to comment or Akram or anyone?

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you very much for your comments. And I can assure you, we would like this to be resolved as soon as possible. There is a process. We're engaged in it. And we're engaged also on the sides of it to ensure that the parties can move towards resolution. Every day we're not getting this done, Africa is missing another opportunity to get on the digital map.

You have -- you know that I'm very engaged personally in making sure that we move as fast as possible. Today I had a meeting with members of the African community who are engaged in .AFRICA to advance this agenda as fast as we can. So my commitment to you is that we are on the same page. We just need the processes to be finished as soon as possible so we can solve the problem.

EDMUND KATITI:

Can this process be time bound?

FADI CHEHADE:

You cannot time bound legal processes, but you can expedite all you can the activities. As I mentioned the other day, we had an unusual situation here in that the panelist that we selected on this



---

panel passed away in the middle of the process. And by the time then we suggested another panelist and that wasn't accepted by the others, so it took -- we had an unfortunate procedural delay.

So we're doing everything we can. But you cannot bound a legal process. You can simply do everything you can to encourage all the parties to move towards a solution as fast as possible. And that's happening. That is happening by my team and by myself personally and by all the parties. So let's hope for the best.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Fadi. And, Mr. Katiti, before you start, it is a time for an online comment. Hold on a second. Thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from Anne Aikman-Scalese, an attorney in Arizona in the U.S. In evaluating incentives for increased volunteer participation, will ICANN consider models to provide significant additional funding for travel support tied to active participation and working groups?

In this regard, applicants for funding could be screened as to whether they have any other funding source for the travel to ICANN meetings, e.g., from their employers or clients.



---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you for the question. Is there a response from board or staff? Okay? No. We go to the next question, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: My name is Christian Dawson, and my constituency home is in the ISPCP. Today I'm speaking to you on behalf of the newly formed universal acceptance steering group, or UASG.

The topic of universal acceptance shouldn't be new to anybody on the board or in our community. Many Internet systems are unprepared for the growth of TLDs and IDNs bring a sharp focus to this issue. In order to ensure widespread adoption of TLDs, improve market confidence of operators and enhance consumer trust in the DNS, we have long needed to do something about it. A small group of community members sent a letter to the board announcing the formation of a universal acceptance steering group. The global multistakeholder community needs to work on outreach, best practices, and knowledge repositories that should be disseminated Internet-wide and track our progress along the way.

The UASG has been founded to guide a central community effort to make that difference. We expect this to be a long-term initiative stretching as much as ten years in duration.

Today with our letter already on your desk, we are calling on ICANN to support our effort. ICANN staff should be the



---

coordinator in a formal community effort on universal acceptance and provide resources to the community.

We are energized, and interest is quickly growing. Some of here for different reasons, but all are here because they want the Internet to be global, interconnected, and multicultural. The community is diverse, but the need is vital. We from the community call on ICANN to support this community-led effort. This isn't policy, but it is one of the most important things you can do support the expanding promise of the global Internet.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Comments or response from the board? Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, thanks. This is a great effort. Although it is unintended, there's actually two meanings to that. This is a very important effort, and it is an extremely positive step that this has been formed. And we're quite excited about it.

It's been a nagging problem from the earliest days when the first new TLDs that were more than three characters, even though they were all in ASCII, were added. And now, of course, we are in a much more complicated world with IDNs.

It is also a great effort in the sense that it will take a great amount of effort over a long period of time. And I think we all need to



---

understand that this is not a one-shot, get in there and fix it quickly sort of thing but a campaign that has to be waged continuously engaging a variety of vendors and a variety of implementers and users and enterprises, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And so it's an important element, and one that I think will take multiple parties. But certainly from the ICANN perspective, we will do everything we can to foster it and support it.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: We thank you very much. We agree, it is a complicated issue that will take a long time. Thank you for your support.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Next, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, hi. Good afternoon. My name is Jonathan Zuck. I'm with ACT - The App Association. And I'm in this particular moment speaking on my own behalf.

When we are kids, we are very creative in coming up with the insults that we use on each other. And I remember a pretty well known one that we used to do, which was: When God passed out



---

brains, you thought he said "trains" and you missed yours, right? That was a really good insult when I was in the fourth grade.

But it is relevant now because I think there are some trains we're going to miss and we are going to feel stupid if we do.

I want to talk a little bit about time lines. It is good that this is sort of an open topic part of the forum because I think this question -- or three questions is going to sit at the center of accountability, of volunteer burnout, of almost a number of the things that we've been discussing this week. We have eight reviews, compulsory reviews, if you will. Some statutory, some contractual that are coming up the next fiscal year. And that's in addition to the work that we're trying to do on accountability and rollouts of the new gTLD program, et cetera. So at a time of people being stretched very thin, volunteer burnout already being a problem, I think that's an impending problem that we need to address. And part and parcel to this timeline problem is also making sure that we really understand what things are critical path to other things, so that we don't just say well, we said we would do this at this time and even though we weren't ready with the things we would say - do in advance, we're going to go ahead with it. So you don't want to miss your connection at the airport if you're going to send an empty airplane, right?

So timelines. I want to find a way to migrate us from statutory or compulsory time frames to responsible timelines. And there's





---

two components to that. One is I think spreading out the reviews in a way that they can be accommodated. Figure out which ones need to happen now, which ones are too soon because the previous one hasn't even been implemented yet. And also looking at the other things we're doing such as the new gTLD programming -- program and making sure that it doesn't -- the next round doesn't happen until the reviews associated with it have had a time to affect policy before that round goes into play.

So I have three questions -- I'm sorry, I guess I've gone long, I didn't realize it. I'm sorry. Three questions that I really want to ask, direct questions. One is, what is the best way to approach this, because it's not immediately apparent to me how we address this problem as far as its ombudsman, is it through the GNSO, et cetera, what's the best way to deal with this issue globally. The second question is, can I make a request of you to task the staff to look into how we actually go about changing the timelines that are in fact compulsory. The AoC and the bylaws timelines. Can you get that research done. And the third is, can I get a commitment from the Board that there won't be a new gTLD round prior to the completion of the relevant reviews such as the AoC mandated review on consumer confidence, choice, competition, and trust. Those are the three questions.



---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I think you missed a session on exactly this topic during the week. So I think Ray will respond to it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This was in reaction to the session this week, in fact.

RAY PLZAK: If you recall, during that session the first thing I said when that slide went up was that this is impossible. So you're not the Lone Ranger in this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know.

RAY PLZAK: Okay. The second thing is is that as was evidenced in that presentation that there is work underway to do this, to figure out how to sort this out and to figure out where there could be some synergy between your reviews and maybe some things being moved around, and staff is actively engaged on that. I believe it falls in Denise Michel's area. And the third one was with regard to the next round. It's my understanding, and I stand to be corrected, that we won't start the next round until we complete the reviews of the first round.



---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ray.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Before the next person starts there is an announcement. Apparently the time over bell is broken and it's being fixed by tech. So until it is fixed, there will be verbal warnings. I don't know who is doing the verbal warnings. I'm sure we'll hear that person's voice.

BRUCE TONKIN: I think it's been hacked, Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Spear phished. Anyway, next please.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you. I'm Martin Sutton and I chair the Brand Registry Group. And the BRG members have been engaged on the issue of the release of country names and two character codes. These are key to efficient navigation and the customization of web presence to the benefit of our customers and consumers. We were, therefore, extremely disappointed with ICANN's recent reaction to a letter from the GAC chair on this subject which called



---

primarily for improved information for GAC members. But ICANN's reaction eroded business certainty. Certainty of process is vital for all of us. And we were encouraged to hear this restated in public by Board members this week. We were also encouraged to hear from Board members that they will look to develop practical solutions for the future, to deal with the different types of communication from the GAC. Such solutions would bring clarity and benefit to all parties, GAC, Board, staff, registries, and ultimately users.

We'll be writing to you in greater detail on this but hope that we will shortly see an implementation of these practical solutions to ensure certainty for all parties. But in the meantime, the Registry Agreement does provide for the release of the two character codes with ICANN's approval where there are measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes. In the case of a brand registry by the very nature of how it will be used in conjunction with that brand, there is no realistic possibility of confusion with the country codes. We urge ICANN, therefore, to approve the release of these two character codes for brand registries with a minimum of delay.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Bruce, I believe you have a response.



---

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you, Martin. With respect to two character codes, that's on our list of topics to discuss in the Board meeting later today so you'll get a response on that one.

With respect to country names, I think that's still under consideration, is that correct? In the new gTLD community, the country names topic? No. Okay. Well, we'll -- we're still considering that issue separately with respect to the names of countries as opposed to country codes. But with respect to country codes, we'll have a response later today.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Bruce. Next, please.

MATHIEU WEILL: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Mathieu Weill. I'm one of the co-chairs for the cross community working group on accountability, along with the other co-chairs who will say a word after me. So this cross community working group is part of the transition effort, and we have been tasked to enhance ICANN's accountability. And we've spent a considerable amount of time in this week meeting for two work sessions, engagement session, a meeting with you and the Board, independent advisers, as well as



---

numerous presentations in the respective communities. Our main goal was to gather feedback on our initial Board directions, and I want to express my -- our gratefulness to all those who provided this input in a very constructive manner all across the week.

We have discussed this input received this morning, and we wanted to report that one of the comments that was made, that our outcome had to be as simple as possible out so that it is put in place and implemented swiftly is a message that we have heard loud and clear. Our work has made good progress this week. We are trying to be as agile as possible. We do include a number of stress tests, as is required, in our work, and I will encourage everyone, including the Board members, to go into our wiki space and check the 25 contingencies we are currently considering. It's work in progress, but it's already well advanced, as well as the up to five stress tests that are already being done.

We are also very pleased to report that we have a very close cooperation with the cross -- the working group on naming for the IANA transition and that this cooperation is getting closer and closer. We have pledged our support to be at their service to enable the transition to happen in a coordinated manner but also in a timely manner, and we will work hand in hand to ensure delivery of this proposal.



---

And finally, I want to thank Bruce Tonkin who is our liaison for the Board for his continuous efforts to engage with our group and is providing a very valuable contribution. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Weill. Any response? Nope? Okay. Yes, next co-chair.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you, Rinalia. My name is Thomas Rickert, and I'm the GNSO appointed co-chair to the CCWG on enhancing ICANN accountability, and we would like to update the whole group on our thoughts on what an accountability architecture could look like.

As of today we think that accountability mechanisms can be made out of four components, an empowered community which has the right to reject certain Board decisions which can call the Board to action in case of inactivity as well as equipped with the right to dismiss Board members as a last resort, if need be. Then we have the bylaw principles, general principles that should be put into either the bylaws policies or contracts that ICANN has had -- has, for example on security, stability, resilience of the unique identifier systems on the Internet. Then as a third component we would have the Board which runs the organization basically and an independent appeals mechanism. And we think that



---

accountability mechanisms can be constructed out of those four. So at the moment it doesn't look like we need to create an overly complicated structure.

The accountability will be group in two categories. Look at this like a cookbook. We have two chapters, triggered mechanisms such as complaints, someone in the community raises a hand that something goes wrong, and non-triggered mechanisms and those would be regular reviews such as the ATRT. We're now working on a standard template, standard format to further flesh out the individual mechanisms, i.e., enhance existing mechanisms or invent new accountability mechanisms, and we hope that soon a full cookbook where it's not only the index but also with recipes for the individual accountability mechanisms will be put in place.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Thomas, for the cookbook. And the next co-chair, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: This is Leon Sanchez, the appointed co-chair for the ALAC in the CCWG on accountability. Well, just to follow my co-chairs, the CCWG will continue its work meeting on a weekly basis, and we will hold a face-to-face meeting soon. And, of course, the -- the further work will be organized into sub-teams which will, as Thomas said, flesh out the recipes of each dish in the cookbook.





---

And we will continue, of course, to coordinate closely with the CWG. So far we have had very good interaction with our co-chairs in the CWG, which we are grateful for, and I -- we believe that -- and we're confident that we will be able to achieve our joint goal of making the transition happen in a timely and effective fashion.

We would also like to thank the group members and the participants as well as remote participants in remote hubs that contributed to our work this week. And, of course, we would like to also thank our wonderful support staff. Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Leon. The Board would like to express its thanks for the work of the co-chairs. We've noted how well you work together as a team and we're very, very impressed and we thank the work of the team and the whole working group. Thank you so much.

[ Applause ]

Before you start, Steve, we have a question from China.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a question from Jiankang Yao from China. "The community has made many efforts to push the deployment of IDN email. Google has deployed this technology. Coremail, one of the top email software technology providers, has supported this



---

technology. CNNIC has sponsored Postfix to support this technology. APEC project meeting for deployment of this technology was held in October 2014. Is there any effort from ICANN to support the IDN email technology deployment in 2015 such as promoting big email service providers, for example, Microsoft to support the IDN email technology as soon as possible."

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you for the question. Ram Mohan.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. And thank you for the question and the suggestion. Internationalized email is a very interesting technology with lots of potential positive ramifications. ICANN has been spending a little bit of time focusing on universal acceptance because IDN email is but a component of universal acceptance and the advent of IDNs has actually brought all of these in sharp focus. It's not just email. The Universal Acceptance Steering Group -- and Christian Dawson just read out a statement -- that steering group met here at ICANN 52. Included in that were people from Microsoft, from Apple, from Google, among others. So already there is quite a good amount of interest and representation from many of the large software vendors and software providers.



---

I think ICANN's role, just to be clear, is really not to promote the -- the technological advances. It's really coordinate and ensure that it brings the right parties together to help find solutions. But thank you very much for the suggestion, and we hope that you join also the universal acceptance work that is community-driven.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Next, please.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Steve DelBianco with the business constituency, and I'm also the commercial stakeholders group representative to the cross community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability. You just heard from our three able co-chairs about the progress that's being made, and indeed, it's pretty impressive. I'm just one of the workers on that group, and I've had the unfortunate assignment to be the one to describe and articulate the stress tests. And when one listens to the stress tests you can't help but think that I'm describing some roque or completely unresponsive board or management team that's unwilling to listen to the community. Well, that's because that's exactly what stress tests are supposed to do. And when you hear it's just too easy to somehow take it personal and to believe that there's embedded criticisms of the current Board and management, no matter how many times we say it, it's hard not to sense that. So I want to say once again, it isn't about you. At all. It's about us. It's about the



---

community. I wanted to make sure if in fact we have a rogue board or unresponsive management in the future that we have the capability to exert leverage on that group. So please understand, it isn't about and you the stress tests themselves are for us to assess whether we can build mechanisms that can be responsive. And so far I think it's actually helping, and it's quite useful in Washington, DC to describe the effective stress tests as reassuring critics or doubters who aren't really sure this transition could still accomplish all the objectives that we had. But thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Steve. I'm sure that we're not taking it personally. We can rise above it all. Any comments? Okay, Steve, and then -- you want to yield to Erika? Yield to Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Steve, I think that's well understood, but it's a good point that you raise it because none of us are of course without emotions and it's easy to attach critical issues to oneself. Just part of our nature. But I think it's well understood on the Board, and I'm personally -- and I'm speaking for Board, I hope I can do this here, we appreciate very much the efforts the community's putting into designing the ICANN environment in an even better way. That's totally understood, so there was never -- I've never felt a frustration, anyone in our debates, quite the opposite. It helps us



---

as well because the Board is -- you know, I wouldn't say we are sometimes on an island, but we need sometimes these kind of pushes to reach out into different areas as well, to ensure that our work is effective. So quite the opposite. Very helpful.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Erika. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Let me also add a note of appreciation, Steve, to your work and to your emphasis on stress test which has resonated and been adopted as a -- a primary concern. My own background is software development and security and stability over a long period of time and so that mode of thinking is deeply part of my own background and orientation. I appreciate it very much.

I have heard multiple times that these emphasis on stress tests and various disaster scenarios shouldn't be taken personally. I think there's greater fear that we're taking it personally than the facts warrant. We don't take it personally. If anything, we're on the same side as you and everybody else, and what we worry about is not whether we're going to go roque but whether our successors are going to go roque. So we're part of that same line of thinking. And although it may not appear so, we worry about these things on a pretty active basis. And so we look at our own processes, we look at whether or not it's possible to improve



---

processes, and, you know, we don't spend all of our time on that. We do spend some time actually getting some things done, of course. But the idea of future proofing is as much on our mind as it is on the community's. And we appreciate this effort. We don't take it personally at all.

STEVE DeBIANCO: Great. Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Both Steves. Next, please.

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: Good afternoon. Amadeu Abril i Abril, first time public forum speaker.

I have one question, one observation, and one comment. The one question: In the bylaws and the regulations we have, there are deadlines for things like reconsideration requests and independent review panel. We've always been a little bit generous in interpretation, or relaxed in interpretation, but lately it seems to be that most of them come clearly after any deadline we can count.

So the question is: Is there any decision, is it just a succession of individual accidents, or is it general policy that deadlines shouldn't



---

be there so we act as there were not deadlines for submitting any of these accountability mechanisms?

On accountability, just an observation.

I am puzzled by, you know, since we are talking about IANA transition, how much effort we put in accountability and how little effort we seem to put in in general, altogether, in the other aspects which probably are more critical.

And now the comment.

I am absolutely in favor of improving ICANN accountability, but we should worry about certain aspects of the discussion that make me a little bit nervous.

We talk about accountability sometimes like it was shareholders or like it was a public utility and some users. You provide me a service, I'm not satisfied with the service, so I react.

The thing is that ICANN is not a trade association. ICANN is not a public utility with some users. We are here to manage the DNS in the public interest. It's not because one given constituency or one powerful player is dissatisfied that this means that this is an accountability problem.

We have the registrants and the DNS users who are the ones that we all are accountable to, not just some powerful insiders.  
Thanks.



---

[ Applause ]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Any comments or responses? No? Erika said, "Good point."

Next, please.

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you. My name is Aziz Hilali. I am APRALO chair and I will speak French, if I may.

So the intent of my intervention is to present to you the draft statement of the African community concerning accountability.

It is a meeting that we had yesterday between the members of African at-large and AFRALO.

So this is the draft statement.

The African ICANN community members participating in the ICANN 52nd international public meeting in Singapore and attending the joint AFRALO/African meeting on Wednesday, the 11th of February, 2015, discussed the issue of ICANN accountability in light of the NTIA intention to withdraw its stewardship over the IANA functions.

After reviewing the existing accountability mechanisms, currently existing ICANN bylaws, Affirmation of Commitments, jurisdiction





---

of the state of California, jurisdictions of the other nations where ICANN has a presence, and contracts, the participants found these mechanisms in need of improvement to satisfy the Internet community's stakeholders' expectations.

They think that any improvement or new accountability mechanisms should be based on a multistakeholder approach, issuing all kind of diversity -- and when I say "diversity," I'm talking about culture, language, gender, et cetera -- be implemented in a timely manner, once definitely adopted; avoid bringing more changes than the required and appropriate ones to the organizational structure of ICANN; preserve the multistakeholder nature of ICANN; avoid giving privilege --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- to one or more stakeholders over others; keep an enhanced bottom-up decision-making model; empower the community to ensure ICANN remains accountable to its stakeholders; ensure and improve the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS system, serve the public interest above any other kind of interest, be it political, financial, or other; improve the trust of all interested parties in the organization.

In the end, the AFRALO and African joint meeting participants strongly believe that all stakeholders should participate in the ICANN accountability process on equal footing and should be engaged in this process in that way. Thank you.



---

[ Applause ]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Any -- Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: To Aziz and to all the participants of your community, of the African community, I would like to thank you. I would like you to take those excellent ideas and to pass them along to Mr. Sanchez, Mr. Rickert, who started this effort, but I think that the spirit of what you offered truly is the spirit of the work that they are engaged in right now.

But the impression that you leave us with that you are expressing, that diversity is at the core of this effort, is extremely important; that it might not be one person or one institution or a few associations that might be at the core of things and that others are outside of the effort.

So I really do appreciate the work that you did and I would like to invite you to pass it along to our accountability team.

And I would like to also take this opportunity to thank the African community, and especially you, Mr. Hilali, and all of our friends in Marrakech, for the work that we did together last year as we were deciding to change the venue for this meeting from Marrakech to Singapore.



---

And I would like to repeat again to all that this decision was taken by us, not by the Moroccan government. The Moroccan government was very clear that they were expecting us. We made this decision based upon the risk, but we will come to you in one year. We would like to thank you for the help that you provided during this time that was quite difficult, as you know, but we truly appreciate your involvement and your participation in our effort. Thank you, Mr. Hilali.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you very much, Fadi.

[ Applause ]

Thank you, Fadi. And I would like to repeat again that you are all welcome in Marrakech. Everything is ready for you. Everything has been arranged in order to have an unforgettable meeting, inshallah.

[ Applause ]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Shukran, Aziz.

I have a question for Brad, in terms of when we close the queue given the remaining time.





---

related to alleged contractual violations, and should, on a regular basis, publish aggregated anonymized data for the community's review. We believe that the compilation and publication of this data will assist the community to develop FAQs in multiple languages to provide guidance, to improve overall compliance methods, and to identify areas that may require new policy development or improved implementation methodologies.

Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Corwin.

Any responses or comments?

Akram, do you have a comment? No? Okay. Thank you very much.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Next, please.

NARELLE CLARK: Hello. My name is Narelle Clark. I'm a member of two at-large organizations, the ACCAN, the Australian Communications



---

Consumer Action Network, and the Internet Society of Australia, but most of you know here know me as a member of the Internet Society board and also more likely as a member of the ICG.

So the question that I've been receiving on the floors for quite some months now is pertaining to a motion that the ICANN board passed at one of its previous meetings, and that was that the ICANN board has reserved the right to alter community proposals on accountability.

So we also hear from the NTIA that accountability must be part of a complete proposal for the NTIA transition.

So what I'm asking, therefore, then on behalf of the community is: Can the board please give the community some guidance or -- perhaps a softer word -- some indication of the type of scope or the scope of such alterations that the board might make?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Narelle, let me respond to that.

Where are you getting the perception that we're going to alter community proposals?

NARELLE CLARK:

I didn't say I had the perception that the board would alter. So you've just shifted it from being a -- "the board will alter," but that the board has --



---

My impression is that the board has reserved the right to -- should it feel necessary, to alter proposals coming from the accountability --

BRUCE TONKIN: No, we have not reserved that right.

NARELLE CLARK: So in that case, I need to get somebody to pull out the --

BRUCE TONKIN: Resolution, yeah. Be happy to --

NARELLE CLARK: -- the resolution for you. I think you know which one I mean, Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I know the resolution, yeah.

There's a process for dealing with the community input, and it says if we don't believe that the proposal is in the global public interest, we would refer it back to that accountability working group to work on any issues we identify, and we specifically said we would not make any alterations to the proposal; we'd simply



---

send it back to that group to consider. And there's a quite clear process in that board resolution for doing so.

It's pretty much the same process that's used with respect to the ccNSO proposals for policies in the bylaws.

So I think I just want to correct that. If you go back and read the resolution --

NARELLE CLARK: Okay.

BRUCE TONKIN: -- it says nothing about us altering any proposal.

NARELLE CLARK: Well, the impression still persists on the floor, and I'm merely acting as its -- as its messenger here.

So in that sense, then, is the board able to give any indication of the type of scope where -- what type of concepts might be out of bounds for consideration?

BRUCE TONKIN: Well, we haven't made any comments about any proposals that would be out of bounds.





---

What we've said is that the standard would be -- which is actually what we need to do in terms of our role.

The organization itself, ICANN, is actually created -- and it's in its articles of association -- to operate in the global public interest. And so an example of things that would not be in the global public interest would be if there's a possibility of capture by any one group. So if any one group can capture the ICANN organization, that wouldn't be in the global public interest.

If we saw that there was no consensus in the community for whatever proposals come to us -- say if we found that large sections of the community were objecting to the proposals -- then that would be evidence, I guess, that at least those sections of the community did not think the proposals were in the global public interest.

But regardless, just being absolutely clear, the only action we would take is to take those proposals back to the group and ask the group to work on them.

And the other thing that we've committed publicly is where we identify anything or we hear anything that people are raising, we would notify the group of what we're hearing along the way.

So what we don't want to be is in a position where at the end of the process, where suddenly there's a surprise coming from the board. Anything that we thought there was --



---

If we thought, for example, that there was a concern for capture, we would articulate that during the process and allow the working group to consider that issue.

So being very clear, we're not making any alterations to any proposal.

NARELLE CLARK:

So you -- you can't conceive of --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- any area or any specific topic matter that might be, at this stage -- or do you think the board is able to give an indication of when it might be able to draw the line around certain topics as to be acceptable within proposals or in the public interest or outside the public interest?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Well, I think, Narelle, we actually gave feedback on Sunday to the proposals that the CCWG is working on and we said at a high level we didn't see any issues.

So I think you're sort of -- it's a circular discussion. I think we're actually very pleased with the progress of the cross-community working group, and once it gets into implementation details --



---

For example, one of the proposals could be recalling the board. There might be different ways of recalling the board. If we then look at the implementation, we might say, "Gee, that way looks like it might be captured," and explain why, and then the group can consider that and come up with another way.

So there's nothing out of bounds.

NARELLE CLARK: Okay, Bruce. So how about beyond recalling the board? What about terminating the contract?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Bruce, do --

BRUCE TONKIN: I don't know what contract you'd terminate but I don't want to get into a back-and-forth dialogue. We need to stay at the principles. So the principle is we're not altering any proposals from the community. If we see issues, we'll let the community know. I mean, that's all we can say.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

Next, please.



---

STEVE METALITZ:

Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Steve Metalitz. I'm here representing the Coalition for Online Accountability.

On October 30th, 2009, this board adopted a document, "Publication Operational Policy for ICANN International Public Meetings." That policy says that there's a single document deadline that all documents to be discussed at these meetings will be published 15 working days before the official opening of the meeting.

The policy goes on to say there's the same deadline for meeting agendas. And that doesn't simply mean titles of sessions. It includes a breakdown of the topics to be discussed, a list of speakers and panelists, explanation of the session's goals and other information.

It also says that compliance with this policy will be reviewed by the ICANN staff and report to the board within 45 days of the end of each international public meeting.

If you get into your time machine and go back to January 23rd, which was approximately 15 working days before this meeting, you'll find that very little of this was adhered to.

We've been asked here to discuss documents that were produced three, four, five days before the meeting opened. And the agendas, of course, were not there either.



---

This is not a minor issue, in my view. It contributes to the impression, in many quarters, that ICANN simply does not follow its own rules. It makes it much harder for us to bring new participants to these meetings because we can't tell them what's going to be discussed. And I think it has something to do with the problem of volunteer burnout.

So let me ask three questions.

First, is this policy still in force?

Second, will there be a 45-day report as this policy provides? When I asked that question at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica in I think 2012, the answer was there had never been a report prepared that this policy calls for.

And finally --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- perhaps it's time to review this policy, but if so, I hope we will do that at a high level and look into whether this organization -- I wasn't here at Singapore 1 but I've been at the vast majority of ICANN meetings since then, and my conclusion is, this organization meets too often, it meets for much longer than it should, and it doesn't allow adequate preparation for a useful and productive meeting. Thank you.

[ Applause ]



---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Steve.

Is there a response? Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Steve, very much, for bringing this to our attention.

I will make two comments because first, I want you to know that I completely agree with you, that it's very hard to have a productive meeting when the materials are arriving late. You cannot plan what you will attend, what you want to focus on. Communities can't prioritize. So there's no -- no argument here that this is a problem.

Now, how do we solve it is the issue.

I just will mention two things that we're doing now.

First, that in December we moved to one management grouping all the parts of ICANN that actually manage our work with the community, including the meetings team and the people who work -- the folks that work with the community to set agendas.

So that's all been moved under what I would call a coordinated management group. They were not part of the same management group. And Sally and David, who are here, will be taking leadership to make sure that happens.



---

I hope this will improve the situation a little bit, and let's -- I'll be -- I'll be -- and the board -- watching this as we get to Buenos Aires.

The second thing is, a big reason why agendas and things keep changing days -- as you guys are getting on planes to come here is, frankly, the fact that we're trying to get things from the community for sessions they want.

So we could address this in one of two ways. We could be pretty strict about it: "If we don't have the material within X days" -- it will be more than 15, obviously -- "before the session, then the session is cancelled." We'll just cancel the sessions. Because that's part of our problem is that we're working with you, many -- oftentimes, so you want to lead the session, where's your material, what is your agenda, what -- a lot of that doesn't come from us. It comes from the community.

So I think we need to support the community better --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- no question, and then we need to have some stricter deadlines on our part. We will work on it, and thank you for bringing this to my attention.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Fadi. Kuo-Wei.







---

KUO-WEI WU: Any comment? Thank you.

Next one.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Okay. My name is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy. My company based in India has a TLD application with a valid change request for the string .INTERNET. The business idea of the TLD application is such that, among other things, it will contribute to the IDN program by helping to connect IDN web spaces across barriers, be a solution to the universal acceptance problem, and in general be a registry with valuable public interest commitments and good practices with a firm commitment to give away at least 20% of the profits for the good of the Internet. It's an open string that would work to preserve the Internet as a free and open ecosystem. The change request followed by the applicant support request was declined without stating specific reasons. The Board declined to accept the request for reconsideration. None of this is explained.

With several unanswered questions that are still pending, ICANN has directed me to the reconsideration processes. Of the processes, the external processes such as the IRP processes are prohibitively expensive for me as a developing country applicant based in India.



---

So it is not fair on the part of ICANN to first act in a manner that is discriminatory and then expect the applicant to go through a process that is difficult and time consuming. Even with the priority of 150, the application is not moving forward for the last two years.

My request to the Board is to act on this application, do the right thing through the internal processes. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU:

Any comment? No?

Okay. I think we are going to pick up another online call. Brad, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION:

We have a question from Aaron Pace with .LESS Web site domains in Texas in the U.S.A.

There are still some really great innovations out there to make the Internet better for everyone. My development is a perfect example. Many would like to know about the next round. How soon will there be a remedial round or second gTLD round for the business owners who are on the fence about applying or who did not learn about the program in time to apply? Is there any consensus at ICANN that maybe the 2012 application window was too short?



---

Finally, is there any effort within ICANN to spearhead a remedial round for those who intended to apply but just did not have all the facts to make an educated decision to apply?

KUO-WEI WU: This answer, actually, is -- Akram, you want to answer it, please. Akram, please. Actually, this question is asked already.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, Kuo. So the community is actually working on a review process. And, once these reviews are done, the community and the Board will decide on the next round. And, until that happens, we don't have any plans to date to give a date on when that would happen. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Next one, please.

RAYMOND KING: Hi, I'm Raymond King with Top Level Design. Our competitor dotGAY lost their bid for CPE earning only 10 out of 16 points. They would have needed an additional four points to qualify. DotGAY followed a reconsideration request. And the BGC then found that 54 letters of support were not verified and, as a result, called for an entirely new CPE specifically asking for a new evaluation panel.



---

I would submit that this is ridiculous because the most that reviewing these letters could have resulted in would be one additional point.

So why are we all wasting time redoing the entire process? If a new panel finds in favor and the old panel found against, then where are we? Do we then request a third panel to look at it again? Why did the BGC call for entirely new CPE and an entirely new panel? I'm confused. Is there a hidden agenda here that I'm not aware of to overturn the original CPE using a technicality which could at most affect one point?

[ Applause ]

KUO-WEI WU: Anyone want to comment about that? Akram, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'll respond.

KUO-WEI WU: Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I appreciate the comment. I don't really think it's appropriate to enter into debate about it. The BGC's decision is minuted. I'm not actually sure if the minutes have yet been published. But, if they



---

haven't, then I have no doubt they will be very soon. And I think that, as with all of our reconsideration requests, it explains in fulsome detail why we made the decision that we have made. Thanks.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you. Next one, please.

ALI HADJI: Thank you. I know that many of you do not know where my country is located. It's in the Indian ocean. We have less than one million inhabitants. Our TLD is .KM.

If I'm not wrong, it is my impression that this ICANN meeting was not as vibrant as other ICANN meetings or as exciting. Would you have any explanation for this? Wouldn't this be related to the fact that the venue changed from Morocco to Singapore in the last minute?

Also, I would like to thank Mr. Fadi Chehade for his words of appeasement so that we Moroccans will have the assurance that we will be hosting the next meeting in Morocco. This is also very positive for the African continent knowing that we will be hosting an ICANN meeting.

But I would like to know if there's any reason in particular for this. For instance, when an ICANN meeting is hosted in Africa, there's



---

always some kind of concern about that. So would you please tell us where the difficulty lies in terms of hosting meetings in Africa? Because maybe there's something we're not aware of.

And I still have 25 seconds left. So I would like to tell me -- or I would like to know about ICANN's heartbeat right now following the U.S. government's intention. I would like to know if ICANN believes that we will reach or accomplish that goal in a timely manner. Do you think we will accomplish that goal and the U.S. government will reach a timely decision? Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Online participant this time.

FADI CHEHADE: We have about 1,800 registered people of which a great majority of these have actually picked up their badge and are here.

I can assure you that there is absolutely no issue with Africa. And I let my -- the other African on this panel speak. But there is zero issue with Africa, that any perception, frankly, that these decisions are somehow tied together because there is an issue with Africa, frankly, I can assure you, as an African, it's not true. These were individual decisions that were made in the best faith possible.

---

And let's stay positive. We are coming to Africa. And we're going to make a great meeting there.

And, hopefully, hopefully, if this community is able, we might have that meeting after the transition, if we're -- if it's -- the right things happen. But we're looking forward to be with you in Africa. And thank you for that.

KUO-WEI WU:

I think we have another three board members that would like to respond to your questions. Mike, first.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Kuo-Wei. I'll try to keep it quick. I think there is a valid point made. I think Fadi is entirely correct that things are done in the best of faith and in the best of intention and opinion. Unfortunately, we're dealing with a perception. And it's not an ICANN perception. It's, unfortunately, a global perception. There are some challenges in terms of African venues because there's a very limited number of venues that can adequately host an ICANN meeting. But there is an issue of perception. And it's one that I think we as Africans need to deal with. And because it's not an ICANN perception that has been created, but it's how we're envisaged in the rest of the world. So we need to do our best to rise above it.



---

KUO-WEI WU: Cherine, you want to respond to that, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. Cherine Chalaby speaking. As an Egyptian citizen, as a member of ICANN staff, I hope or I'm looking forward to going back to Africa. And please rest assured that there is no issue whatsoever regarding this. We will all go back to Africa, and we are really looking forward to it.

RICK LANE: I'm Rick lane with 21st Century Fox. When the IANA transition was announced, there was a lot of concerns in the community about the view of the U.S. Congress on the IANA transition. During the U.K. meeting in London, we talked about what could and could not be done to help facilitate us helping you to get Congress to see the benefits of the transition.

I would like to read to you a paragraph from today's op ed that was in CircleID that was written by the chairman of the Senate judiciary committee and the House judiciary committee, the committees in the U.S. Congress that have oversight over the Internet policy.

"We encourage members of the public and many constituencies with interest in the process to make their voices heard and concerns heard. We also encourage ICANN to ensure whatever results from this process shows that the outcome many have





---

found a true bottom-up multistakeholder process and was neither imposed nor unduly influenced by ICANN's leaders, staff, or board or members of its board."

We believe that the work thus far by the community has met this standard. But, if you want to ensure Congressional support, we, as a community, must ensure that we're not driven by artificial deadlines. The goal should be to finish -- the goal should not be to finish by a specific date. Our goal should be to get it right. We must ensure strong accountability and real transparency. Then and only then will we ensure support of all members of the community including both public, private, and governmental entities. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Fadi, please.

FADI CHEHADE: So thank you, Rick. Thank you for your support in keeping this thing on track. I know that you and your company have been very engaged in this. Thank you.

Let me just be very clear. Our goal is to get this right. There's no question. Zero question.



---

We have to get this right. Having said that, the deadlines and the timelines and all the things that have dates, none of these come from the group you're looking at.

They, in fact, are set by the community.

So, when we go back to Washington, let's join hands in explaining to the members of Congress, whom we will be meeting very soon here, that the dates and timelines are all generated by our community, that no ICANN leader or ICANN board set a single date. It all comes -- in fact, look at the ICG dates. Look at the CCWG dates, the latest CWG dates that the naming community came up with. It's not the management. It's not the Board.

We are deeply respectful of the community's desire to do this at its own pace to ensure that we get it right. Because, if we get it wrong and finish this year, I think the price we will pay is very high.

RICK LANE:

We agree with that, obviously. But it was working back -- the concern I have is, if the dates do slip past September 30th, which it seems like from all indications it will, that some may use that who want to move stuff to the ITU. They'll say, "Oh, they haven't hit the dates." We heard some of that today.

So we have to ensure that, when we talk about dates, that it's clear that they're goals and not hard deadlines. And not meeting



---

those deadlines isn't a sign of lack of effort. So I think we need to be judged by the effort moving forward versus extending the contract and what that means. And we, as a community, have to explain that clearly so it's not misused and used against us in the process.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. Yeah. Spot on.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you for your question. I think that we give the next person have a chance.

Next one. Sorry I speak in Chinese.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: No problem. This is Constantine Roussos with .MUSIC. Page 22 of the final CPE guidelines state, "The evaluation process will respect the principles of fairness, transparency, avoiding potential conflicts of interest and non-discrimination."

We have some serious concerns. The chairman of Google, Eric Schmidt, is on the Board of "The Economist." Google is an applicant for .MUSIC. "The Economist" grades our CPE. This is a serious conflict of interest.



---

Secondly, as you may be aware, one of our competitors strategically rallied one of their supporters, which, again, is 100% conflict of interest, to file a spurious opposition letter to obstruct our application to benefit themselves. The basis of their claim was rooted on discrimination not compatible with competition objectives claiming that .MUSIC should be reserved to only select members of select organizations an ineligibility policy which is anti-competitive.

Both the EIU and ICANN agreed with this fact in recent CPE and reconsideration determinations that such a policy overreaches and that the majority of the community does not belong to these select organizations. This conflicted organization's opposition letter purposely singled us out. If this opposition was authentic, why did this organization not oppose Google or other open applicants who applied for .MUSIC, especially since these open applicants lack the restricted music tailored enhanced safeguards that our community application possesses to show the global music community and protect intellectual property.

Such scare tactics are prevalent at ICANN, especially for community applicants filed to game the CPE process and obstruct community applications to benefit their competing applications. Another clear conflict of interest.



---

Naturally, we expect ICANN and "The Economist" to receive letters from some portfolio competitors attacking our application aimed at similar obstruction as soon as we are invited to CPE.

How will ICANN ensure "The Economist" follows the CPE guidelines which state that the evaluation process will respect principles of fairness, transparency, avoiding potential conflicts of interest and non-discrimination? We will proceed with CPE but with disclosed prejudice. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Any comment or thanks?

[ Applause ]

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Constantine, for your eloquent kind of layout of the issues. I appreciate it.

May I suggest, given the sensitivity of what you shared, that you send us a formal letter with -- explaining these conflicts and any concerns you have? And I can assure you that you can trust our process to deal with these things without prejudice as we always have.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: Thank you, sir.



---

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Before the next one, let's go to the video conference, please.  
Brad.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question that is going to come from the Democratic Republic of the Congo from one of our video hubs there, Mr. Moussa Musavuli, who will be speaking in French. He's the ITC advisor for the Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Sir?

REMOTE HUB: Thank you very much. My question is this.

How can you assure within ICANN that the right -- current diversity in a worldwide scale for different countries and cultures and diversity in the future will not be confiscated by those who are quicker or who have greater resources? Because if we do not ensure rights of those who will join Internet in the future and who don't have the possibilities to be part today of the Internet community, well, the rights of those people will be affected. And later, in Internet, they will be told that they cannot exist with their cultures or with their way of living just because they were not



---

present at the right time when the rest of the world were finding their place in Internet.

This is my question.

Thank you very much.

KUO-WEI WU:

Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you very much for your comment. I'm Fadi Chehade, the CEO of ICANN, and I would like to assure you that ICANN offers engagement opportunity to everyone, without no limitation. The fact that you are here participating with us together with hundreds of people here shows, in practical terms, how we are open to participation of everyone and in Africa. We have many people from Africa, and we invite you to be part of ICANN at all levels. At the government level, we invite all African participants in Congo and in other African countries. In ICANN there are no limits in terms of engagement and participation. Everyone is welcome, and we make great effort to be able to reach you through our presence in Africa and in other parts of the world so as to improve possibilities for participation. Because without you, Internet is not complete. We need that all of you participate, everyone participate.



---

Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Please.

MIKE SILBER: Indeed. It's Mike Silber. To my friend and colleague in Kinshasa, it's wonderful to have you participating by remote this time.

I think the critical thing to note is that nobody should be left behind. They're latecomers to the table but there's plenty of room at this table. And it's not a case of anybody imposing a decision simply because somebody wasn't at the table. But as Fadi indicated, the fact that you're participating now is an indicator that there is a place here and voices of people who, late to the table, are very welcome. Because in many times, you're seeing things that those of us who have been here for a long time are missing because we've become too entrenched and too focused on the petty politics of our day and don't see the big picture.

So your participation, new views, fresh views are incredibly welcome.

And, yes, it is sometimes a steep learning curve to come up to speed with this community, its acronyms, its politics, its ways of





---

working, but it's to our benefit to have the newcomers participate in helping us grow.

KUO-WEI WU: Let's back to the queue.

Next, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Susan Payne. I'm speaking on behalf of a number of the members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Unfortunately, in the time available, it wasn't possible to agree a statement from the group as a whole.

Last Thursday, Registry Stakeholder Group addressed a letter to this Board about the recent request by one or two members of the GAC through a letter sent by the chair of the GAC requesting that ICANN stay a process that had, one, already gone through public comment; two, had been approved by the Board through a resolution after receiving GAC advice in Los Angeles; three, a process was then developed by staff and; four, the process had been implemented and, indeed, the registries were taking part in it.

This letter was not GAC advice nor was it sent at the request of the GAC as a whole; however, the result of the letter was that this



---

process created through the appropriate multistakeholder model

--

[ Timer Sounds ]

-- was unilaterally put on hold by ICANN staff.

The GAC now asks the Board to amend the policy through a new  
communique.

We respect the role of the GAC in the community, with well-  
established and predictable processes. The Registry Stakeholder  
Group requests this board defend the multistakeholder model  
and instruct staff to reinstate the process created as a result of  
the multistakeholder process. Allowing any stakeholder the right  
to come in and advise not on policy but to instruct unilaterally  
that the Board should -- Board, sorry, and/or staff should amend  
implementation of that policy is not defending a multistakeholder  
process nor our bylaws.

We have had a public comment period. We have had GAC advice.  
We have had a Board resolution. What more will another public  
comment period do but tell you what you already know? We are  
asking you to defend the multistakeholder model and not take us  
down this road.

Thank you.



---

KUO-WEI WU: Bruce, you want to comment?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you for your comment. And we also heard that from the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting on Tuesday, I believe.

We're expecting to provide a response, hopefully by the end of today. We're just currently working on a resolution.

KUO-WEI WU: Next one, please.

EMMANUEL ADJOVI: I'm Emmanuel Adjovi from International Organization of Francophonie. I would like to speak in French.

Naturally I will choose to speak in French.

I have two concerns. From the very beginning, I have always expressed that I was able to resign my comments because this was just something that was expressed by someone else. But first of all, this time I would like to say that we need to take into account cultural and language diversity. We always insist on that. We know that you have made great efforts and that you have achieved a lot, but we keep on insisting on this.

Within the ICANN context, and to have more inclusiveness, we need to take into account all geo cultural spaces in the world.



---

So I understand that in the accountability transformation, we need to ensure this integration and this participation.

And I would say that we need to speak not about participation but about contribution, because participation, although it is a formal proposal, it gives us the feeling that legitimacy is being guaranteed only through formal participation when people can contribute through substantive; that is, when we participate in the democratization of international relationships.

My second comment has to do with Marrakech. As you know, Morocco is part of the French-speaking community in Africa, and I would like to congratulate Fadi for his integrity and for the report provided. And I would like to insist on this idea that in 2016, and we were told that we will go to Marrakech in 2016. And I do see, in fact, that the risks that we had in the past or our fears are now all gone. So the greatest risk in Marrakech nowadays is to sunbathe and enjoy life.

So I assure you that you can be really safe. And I would like to have the word of ICANN in terms of transparency and its commitment to have a worldwide ICANN.

Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU:

Next one, please.



---

PAUL FOODY:

Paul Foody speaking as a domain name registrant.

There's been an awful lot of work done since Los Angeles. It's incredible amount of work. Just trying to keep up with the new acronyms is hard enough, let alone keep up-to-date with what's been written. But a couple of weeks ago in the state of the union, President Obama said, "I intend to protect the free and open Internet --"

The fact that he said that without mentioning the forthcoming NTIA withdrawal could be seen as misleading. Now, I'm sure I have no doubts that President Obama was not trying to mislead the American public, but at the same time, there needs to be -- by not mentioning the NTIA withdrawal, that's exactly the perception that the majority of Americans will have gathered; that there's nothing changing.

Now, ICANN has got a voice and it's got connections to the media all over the world. ICANN is wanting to establish itself as the trusted advisor with all things Internet related. So is it not possible for ICANN to comment and say, "You know something? This is going on. This is what's going to happen this year," so that the American people, rather than feeling that they've had the rug pulled out from underneath them, will look and say, "We were warned about this by ICANN. They're an organization that we can trust."?



---

KUO-WEI WU: Any comment?

Thank you very much. I think we do our best.

PAUL FOODY: Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Next, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: I feel so out of date coming to the microphone with a sheet of paper.

My name is Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union, and I also have a question related to the IANA stewardship transition. And I'm wondering, while I understand (indiscernible) great focus on the technical aspects of replacing the NTIA's role in all of the ICANN communities, have any specific nontechnical aspects of the NTIA's role been identified that would need to be considered in establishing the success mechanism? I'm talking about, for example, any functions or influences or legal legitimacy or any other attributes that the NTIA inherently provided, being an agency of the U.S. government. You know, things that maybe you take for granted that you only miss when it's not there.



---

So I'm wondering if apart from the technical, have we been looking at the nontechnical? And have any been identified?

KUO-WEI WU: Okay. Fadi, please.

FADI CHEHADE: First of all, thank you, Nigel, and thanks for the CTU's incredible participation and support in our work. First class all the time. Thank you, and we miss Bernadette but we're glad you're here this time.

The simple answer to your question is that NTIA's role outside the confines of the contract they have with us happens -- will continue to happen through their role in the GAC; right? They are a member of the GAC. They represent the United States government and its interests, and that's where they will continue doing this.

There is no other role they have that we are transitioning here other than what is in the contract today. But I am sure that Mr. Strickling and Fiona Alexander and Suzanne and all the great team of NTIA will continue doing their great work through the GAC. But the contract itself has very limited definition related to the IANA functions, and that's what will end.



---

Having said that, so I don't leave you kind of without a full answer to your question, the reality is that many people felt that the presence of the U.S. government behind that contract created a bit of a backstop to ICANN accountability, and this is what we're trying to strengthen through the accountability work that we're doing now. So the more the ICANN house is made accountable, the more belts and suspenders and mechanisms to make sure that ICANN is strong and is able to -- and ICANN is not us. It's not the corporation. ICANN is the community. It's all of us feeling that we have stronger. The less we will need back stops. The backstop is the community. It shouldn't be one government.

[ Timer Sounds ]

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Okay. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Before the line, let's go to the video online. Brad, please.

BRAD WHITE: Not a question but a comment by Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

"As a former ICANN board member, I would encourage the Board to respond to Sivasubramanian's earlier question which was directly addressed to the Board. Disclosure: I have no connection with any new gTLD application."





---

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah, in the same way we addressed Constantine with .MUSIC, I think that if any applicant has any issue with how we are managing their application, we invite them to put it in writing, send us a letter, and we will respond to this in the proper course of doing things. We think that's better for complete transparency and accountability of the processes. But thanks for bringing this up.

KUO-WEI WU: Next one, please.

Mike?

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Fadi. It know it may upset the community if I disagree with our CEO in the stand, but the point has been raised in correspondence multiple times, and in my opinion it's been adequately and clearly addressed in responding correspondence multiple times. It just seems the problem is that the message being received is not what the person wants to hear, so it keeps being brought up. Maybe we need to go back and see how we can respond more clearly. But it's been put in writing and I think responded to in writing as well, but let's pull that correspondence back up and restate it if we have to, but it's been very clearly stated several times.



---

KUO-WEI WU: You will be next. You still also have two minutes.

WERNER STAUB: Thank you. My name is Werner Staub. I just speak as someone who heard the word accountability cookbook today.

I think when you talk about accountability, it's good to look at some empirical evidence that we have right in front of us, such as what happens currently in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, where, you know -- and I would put it the book of accountability was being cooked.

And it is tragic because it is proceedings whereby communities who do have accountability, who achieve through the processes set forth by ICANN their respective priority or, you know, prevailing objections, and ICANN accountability proceedings were launched against them by parties who pretend effectively that they have a right to disenfranchise. The right to disenfranchise by people who reject accountability against people who are accountable, and on that basis have prevailed in objections or CPE.

If ICANN is supposed to be accountable, it is not that ICANN itself must go through proceedings and give people a cookbook of accountability. ICANN should make sure it does not destroy accountability.



---

Society is composed of many communities that are -- precisely because they are communities, they have built accountability lines already in there. And the idea is that ICANN should not destroy those but allow people to build upon what is already in existence.

And if ICANN accountability is being misused, actually it is a net destroyer of accountability and as such, leads to the -- what I call East India Company style concept of accountability.

KUO-WEI WU:

Any comment?

No?

If not, let's go to the video conference. Brad, please.

BRAD WHITE:

We have another question from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Baudouin Schombe of Kinshasa University.

Sir.

REMOTE HUB:

Hello. In ICANN 51, the stakeholders proposed that the corresponding organization, the COMESA, were under the supervision of the African Union. The RVC started mobilizing, and



---

we have addressed the Prime Minister's cabinet, the civil society stakeholders in that regard.

There are many people engaged in this process, the number resources in my city and in Singani as well as other number resource centers. But regarding the regional African network's engagement, we thought that the African government has to increase its engagement and participation in ICANN's debates. For instance, in terms of the IANA transition and the future of the Internet.

We appreciate ICANN's willingness to continue supporting Africa so that we, the stakeholders, the national stakeholders, can participate in your meetings. This is something that we look forward to continuing doing with ICANN's support.

Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU:

Okay. Any comment for that? No? Next one, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you very much. My name is Seun from Nigeria, speaking on behalf of myself. I had a comment and a follow-up question.

I've been able to say this thing, what I am about to say now to a few member of the Board, but I think it's important to repeat it to all the members of the Board. We are first participating in the



---

transition and the accountability, participating based on a different level of resources, access to resources.

In view of that, it is important to note that we have limited time and we don't want to exhaust our resources before we get to completing this process. So I would really like to request that this is taken very seriously, and we make sure that we ensure that our views are taken before the process is concluded.

I've gotten some assurance from Mr. Fadi. However, I would note that he has quite used the phrase "I can assure you" a lot today. So that also means that there is a lot to be done. So I hope that is one of the things that will be done. Attention will be paid to listening to the community and making sure that your views are taken fast.

A quick one on the question is relations to the CWG as it concerns accountability and the board engagement. During the CWG, at some point in time, the board came up and engaged with the community to raise a view about the CWG proposal. Right now the IETF and the numbers have actually done their own proposal. And I am sure there are views that the board will also have in relation to the fact that there are IRP issues. There is a -- [ Timer sounds -- ] to sign a contract, et cetera.

When is the board going to engage in discussion with IETF or the numbers community to actually reserve? Because we don't have to wait till the end. We need to utilize the time very well. So it



---

would be good to know, are you already accepting with what the two communities have already proposed or not? Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Anyone want to comment about this one? Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: So the question has come up before, and appreciate the question again. We're familiar and cognizant of the IETF and the numbers community proposals. There's nothing fundamental in them that we have a problem with, full stop.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you. Next one.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I am not going to talk about the IANA transition or accountability, but I am going to talk about a process that is going to be heavily affected by both of those activities.

Before I do that, I want to say a word of appreciation to the community that is working on both that -- both of those processes and also on all the rest of the work.

When ICANN first met in Singapore, and for its next few meetings, we had a practice when someone went to the microphone that if



---

some in the room didn't like what they said, they were booed. And if we liked what they said, they applauded.

And I would like to congratulate all of us for the outbreak of civility in how we are handling differences of opinion as we walk through this process of work together.

What I mostly want to focus on is the larger Internet ecosystem activities that are going on this year and the importance of this community, this wide community that comes to ICANN, the importance of our engagement in understanding what is going on in that space.

This is the tenth year after the World Summit on the Information Society concluded in Tunis, and many of us were there. And we will be reviewing the outcome of the Tunis Agenda and the achievements of the Tunis Agenda, of the Tunis phase, in New York. There are many other meetings that are taking place, but we will be -- the world will be reviewing this at the U.N. General Assembly at the end of the year.

As we look forward to that, I hope that I will see many of you from this community online or submitting comments or participating in the number of meetings where we are going to examine the success of the achievement of the information society.

I also want to thank ICANN -- [ Timer sounds. ] -- for its recognition of the importance of the Internet Governance Forum



---

and its contribution to the Internet Governance Forum's Support Association, which is helping to aggregate funding and broaden awareness about this additional activity where Internet public policy is debated and ICANN's contribution to this, the board's involvement, the community's involvement in the IGF is critical to helping to educate others more broadly about what we do broadly on Internet public policy while ICANN focuses on its more narrow technical mission.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

Next one, please.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. My name is Jordan Carter from Internet NZ. I just wanted to reflect briefly on how far we've come in the discussion about both ICANN accountability and the IANA stewardship transition since the meeting in L.A. in October. A huge amount of work has been done, and so I hope -- this isn't my question, but I hope the board feels a sense of that achievement.

And also to note the importance of the civility point that Marilyn just raised. I'm someone who likes to debate things vigorously. I know I'm not the only person in the community with that





---

penchant. And the good thing about coming together in person face-to-face is that it takes some of the temperature out and it makes sure you have the chance to debate things in a more low-key way.

Now, one of the questions that does come up in that, we're trying to do an historic thing, a difficult thing. We are trying to transition away not just the contents of the IANA contract but the external scrutiny and accountability that it provides to ICANN. So as we do that, it is going to be a vigorous debate. People are talking about a range of different models. I've got a view about one of them.

But the question I've got is one for Steve as the chair of the board. And I'm sure the board will have discussed this. And I think I've heard an answer to this question in a smaller forum, but I wanted to ask it in the public forum to give the whole community a chance to hear it, which is: What are the expectations that the board collectively has for board members in this discussion? Are people, the individuals that they are with the roles that they hold, able to advocate as forcefully as they would like for or against different positions? Or is there a board agreement that board members will instead play an informative role? Or is there a desire on the part of the board for its members to not engage directly in the debate?



---

So the reason I'm asking is not to hope for an answer, just to get some clearer community expectations about the answer to that question. Thanks.

KUO-WEI WU: Steve? He point to you, so go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Jordan.

You asked sort of a question formed in multiple ways as to what the role of the board members are. I don't want to get into a super lengthy response. But we try to walk an interesting line where, yes, board members are encouraged to speak their mind and engage. And at the same time, we're mindful that even if one of us is very careful to say they're speaking in their own capacity, there is a natural tendency to take whatever a board member says as meaning a position of the board or even a statement that we've made a decision about that.

So we try to be a little bit careful about when we engage. But, on the other hand, we do try to engage and we do try to be both informative and in some cases actually express an opinion.

That maybe muddies the answers that you are looking for because it is a little bit of everything. But the answer is we are definitely engaged.



---

KUO-WEI WU: Bruce, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Jordan, just to sort of identify different roles, I suppose, too. There are some board members that have different roles. Like, for example, Chris Disspain is the country manager for .AU Australia, and I know he represents the Australian view on some of the committees.

The role myself and Kuo-Wei play, we're board liaisons. As a board liaison, I would say my primary role is helping facilitate interactions between the staff of ICANN and the committee with respect to getting resources, if it is help setting up a meeting, help getting legal advice, help getting answers to questions about financial matters.

And then the other thing that I might convey, the board is monitoring the activities of the groups. So I try and keep board members informed of things that arise. And if a member of the board says, hey, have they thought about X, Y, Z, I might ask that question.

What I'm consciously not doing is try to direct the group in any particular direction. If I thought there was an issue that hadn't been considered, I would throw that in as a question along the lines of, "Have you considered this issue?" I hope that sort of helps you clarify my role as a liaison.



---

And as Steve said, individual board members can contribute. But we've asked them to indicate that when they're doing so, they're doing that in their individual capacity. They're not speaking for the board.

KUO-WEI WU:

Yeah, my position to the ICG is the same. Thank you.

Next one.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Yes, good afternoon. Philip Corwin again and appearing this time not on behalf of the business constituency but in my role as counsel to the Internet Commerce Association and the professional domain investors and developers who are its members. Although, I would note that ICA has been a B.C. member since 2007.

The other day CEO Chehade discussed the domain name industry at a press conference and noted that there were many who do it well and enhance the marketplace. I'm here primarily to assure you that ICA and its members are among those who do it right.

Shortly after its founding, we adopted a code of conduct to establish best practices for our sector of the industry in particular to prohibit intentional trademark infringement known as



---

cybersquatting. And our members pride themselves on their best practices.

They own and manage approximately 10% of all existing domains. And they've been involved with the new TLD program in a wide variety of roles, including as registrants.

I also want to note that professional investors, so-called domainers are not the only ones with large portfolios. In fact, the world record for domain name sale is held by Vodafone, a publicly traded company with a 90 billion plus market cap and a portfolio of over 40,000 domain names.

So in closing, with the new TLD program, with new business models coming into the marketplace every week and with a wide variety of pricing and other business model aspects, there's no longer any scarcity in the marketplace and that's a good thing to have all these business models. And ICA and its members are always able and willing to engage with ICANN staff to discuss best practice in our sector and how to root out those parties who engage in unethical or illegal practices. Thank you very much.

KUO-WEI WU:

Thank you very much. Next one.



---

STEVE DelBIANCO:

Steve DelBianco with the business constituency. And this will be a question for the board with respect to the scope -- ICANN's limited scope.

Yesterday morning Fadi was discussing with the GAC and took a question about Davos and NETmundial Initiative. And Fadi characterized his work on those items as extracurricular items. He said something like 99% of Fadi's time, CEO's time, would be on ICANN operations. Only 1% on those extracurriculars.

By my math, that 1%, I guess, is about four days and I guess your quota is probably met for the year, which is not a good thing.

But I wanted to point out a contrast between the extracurricular characterization from Fadi versus what I saw in a letter from the board Risk Committee at the end of January. And this was a letter that Bruce brought into the CCWG and identified 30 risks that the board sees that are enterprise-wide concerns this year. And I'll quote one of them that gave us a pause. Quote: Perception of failure to implement and help achieve a global multistakeholder distributed intergovernance ecosystem according to the widely accepted NETmundial principles, quote.

So if that is a risk, an enterprise risk in the eyes of the board, that would characterize that being much more important to ICANN that it participated in the NETmundial initiative and it implement a global Internet governance system that's based on



---

multistakeholder. And that sounds a bit more of a scope than the community has ever endorsed before.

So, Bruce, you brought the letter in. And I was hoping by now maybe I'd hear back from you about where did that come from? What does that imply? Is it extracurricular, or is it really core?

KUO-WEI WU:

Mike, you want to answer that?

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks very much. Steve, let's not mischaracterize it. The letter was not a letter but rather a response to a request from the CCWG accountability. And the request was for a listing of risks identified by the ICANN staff working the enterprise risk team and vetted by the ICANN board Risk Committee.

We also removed certain risks within there because of issues relating to confidentiality.

It was a laundry basket that we threw at you. There was no characterization. There was no prioritization and intentionally so. And the request that came from the co-chair specifically suggested that we don't do that so as to avoid the sort of mischaracterization that is now being done over here.

So I think just take that list in context. We were asked to provide input so that the CCWG accountability stress testing would be



---

able to look and see if there are any risks to add or contingencies to add to the list that they'd already come up with. That was the sole purpose. It wasn't suggesting that this was a significant priority for the organization or that it was consuming huge amounts of Fadi's time.

STEVE DeBIANCO:

Thank you very much, Mike. And it was a question. It wasn't trying to mischaracterize.

When those lists of risks came over to the CCWG, they were routed right away to the work team that I'm on that handles the stress tests. And I do want to acknowledge that 30 of the 31 enterprise-wide risks fit perfectly within the framework of stress tests we were already working on. They were very consistent. I have to say that one, though, really stood out, which is why I wanted to ask you about it. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU:

Thank you very much.

Before the line, let's go to the online video, please. Brad?

BRAD WHITE:

We have another question from Pierre Mukadi from the video hub in the Congo. Our video hub has temporarily become an





---

audio-only hub since we've lost the video signal. So this will be an audio only question. Mr. Mukadi.

Mr. Mukadi, can you hear me?

PIERRE MUKADI: Can you hear us?

BRAD WHITE: Yes, we hear you.

PIERRE MUKADI: We would like to speak about ICANN independence, the mechanisms that are currently implemented to ensure ICANN independence for a safer and more open Internet and to avoid any kind of dependence controlled by the U.S.

Thank you. Thank you. That's all.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you very much. Thank you for this message, for this idea. There are many people involved in finding a resolution for ICANN to be independent, not only independent from the U.S. government but independent from any other government and independent from any private interest for ICANN to be really an organization devoted to working in favor of the public interest and not under the control of any stakeholder in the community.



---

So this is a strong work we're undergoing. And I hope you can also be involved in the progress of this work. Thank you.

DAVID FARES:

Thank you. David Fares on behalf of the business constituency. Dot brands need the capability to use geographic names including two-character country codes in order to safely market and sell their products and services in multiple territories and in multiple languages around the world. We appreciate the GAC communique's reference and commitment to a streamlined process for approval of the use of geographic names. And we as the business constituency look forward to working with the GAC and the entire community actually to develop an expedited process for dot brands given the inherent trust that exists in a dot brand. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

KUO-WEI WU:

Thank you very much.

Next one.

PAUL MUCHENE:

Okay. I have two questions concerning the IANA stewardship transition. Oh, by the way, my name is Paul Muchene. I'm an ICANN fellow. So to the board, I have just these questions of



---

unknowns. So what if, for example, the United States Congress extends the oversight mandate of the NTIA? What does this portend for ICANN?

And then another question is on one of the working groups, that is, the community working groups on naming-related functions, this one actually deals with very complex issues about the structure of the proposed multistakeholder organization or entities that will be able to replace NTIA.

What if, for example, within the time frames because two models have been proposed, an external and an internal model, if within the time frames the community cannot agree on one of the models, so what really will happen? Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU:

I thank you for the comment and this is already answered. Anybody want to add anything else? Okay.

FADI CHEHADE:

Simply to say thank you. First of all, we need to recognize in you the courage and the participation of the fellows at ICANN 52. Thank you very much for taking the time.

[ Applause ]

And again, to your question, I think that Congress -- the United States Congress is extremely engaged in the process. It's actually



---

quite remarkable how engaged they are. Both Secretary Strickland and ICANN will be in hearings starting in a few days in here in Washington. I think we should trust the wisdom of Congress and the United States Government in working with us.

The United States Government is very supportive of the multistakeholder model. And so long as we work with their conditions that they set for us to make sure that the proposals we bring to them are from the community and that they do not impede on the security and stability of the system, I think we will have great alignment with them.

And just on your second question, I just would like to make a comment that Secretary Strickland asked here and in Washington very pointed questions about these models that you mention, the various models. And he asked our community to make sure that whatever model we propose is a model that ensures the security and stability of the system.

So as we come up with all these models, let's make sure we are committed to that. Because if we fail that test, then we're not going to be able to even go to Washington and ask for this transition to occur.



---

KUO-WEI WU: I think the queue is closed. I don't want to, you know -- we have a break, but before that, before we still have last online video, a break. Would you bring it up?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Sure. It's not a video hub but rather a question that was sent to us online from Ernest Kirui of Kenya. "What is the future of Internet if governments are trying to censor the Internet to avoid certain information or facts from reaching its people?"

KUO-WEI WU: Wolfgang, you want to answer that? Briefly.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: We all know that unfortunately in many countries they have strict regulations with regard to content of information. But to be very clear, ICANN is not in the business of content. ICANN has to deal with names and numbers, and ICANN should not be pulled into the business of content regulation. However, the right to freedom of expression is an important value and ICANN as an organization has to consider if they make decisions that it does not violate human rights. So that means ICANN has to do everything to avoid -- which is in their internal competence with regards to names and numbers, which would be in contrast to human rights so that once again ICANN is not in the business of content regulation.



---

[ Applause ]

KUO-WEI WU: I think we -- before I pass to Steve, since we are in Singapore I think I have to say something in Chinese. Because it is -- next week is the Chinese New Year. So I should say (Speaking in non-English language.)

I would like to say that I hope you have a great year for 2015.

STEVE CROCKER: ...too often unrecognized -- I'm standing up so I can point to the partition with people hiding behind the curtain over there. Thank you. So I'm referring to the people -- yes. A better idea. Get by with a little help from my friends here. So I'm referring to the people behind the partition to my right, part of ICANN's meetings and IT teams. Let's see, quickly show you very briefly what they go through to prepare the room you're sitting in for this meeting. Roll tape.

NANCY LUPIANO: It will be ready in one minute, Steve. Thank you.

[ Laughter ]

STEVE CROCKER: Take another 15 minutes.



---

VIDEO STARTS ---

NANCY LUPIANO: So setting up for any ICANN meeting is a particularly detailed and actually quite difficult issue and program to do. In order to set up a welcome session room, it takes approximately two and a half days, full days. We can start at 8:00 in the morning. We run oftentimes until 9:00, 10:00 at night. And this room looked like an ant hill. There were people climbing over steel rigging, they're climbing over black anvil packing cases. They all have an individual job to do. They're all running to get their job done. So it's really quite interesting. If you could be in the sky looking down, if there was an open ceiling, it would be fascinating. You would feel as though you were in an ant hill.

Before the welcome ceremony occurs we have to wrangle -- I think we can use the word "wrangle" Dr. Stephen Crocker. So then we do the usual welcome. I'll quiet everyone down.

So it is a real rehearsal process. There's 1,000 people milling around in their chairs. I have to constantly say...

so if you would be kind enough to quickly take your seats. When I see Steve in his position without many, many people huddling around him, I can go in into the introduction, the voice of God.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like you all to welcome, please, Board Chair, ICANN, Dr. Stephen Crocker.

[ Applause ]



---

BRAD WHITE: So tell me what is going through Nancy's head just as you're about to announce Crocker.

NANCY PULIANO: Well, I often think of the cruise ship I would rather be on.

VIDEO ENDS ---

[ Laughter ]

[ Applause ]

[ Standing Ovation]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Nancy. Thank you, everybody.

[ Applause ]

Ten-minute recess. If you're not back, Nancy is going to wrangle you.

[ Laughter ]

[ BREAK ]





---

NANCY LUPIANO: Ladies and Gentlemen, if you would be kind enough to return to the ballroom, we'd like to begin the second portion of our public forum. Once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you would be kind enough to return, we'd like to get started with our second portion. Thank you.

NANCY LUPIANO: Ladies and Gentlemen, please take your seats so we can begin the second portion of our public forum. Thank you.

Once again, please take your seats. Those of you that are out in the foyer, if you would be kind enough to bring your friends inside, we would like to get the second portion of our public forum started. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. We're back in session. Welcome back. As you know, ICANN is returning to Buenos Aires, Argentina, for its 53rd meeting in June. Here to give us an idea of what to expect is Gabriel Brenta, the national director of the network information center in Argentina. Gabriel.

[ Applause ]

GABRIEL BRENTA: Gabriel Brenta speaking. Good afternoon. Thank you very much, Steve, for this introduction. I would like to thank the ICANN board



---

for this opportunity to be hosting an ICANN meeting once again in Argentina.

Our domain registry center, NIC Argentina, has evolved quite a lot in the last years and ICANN has supported us and helped us in many aspects that enabled our improvement and enabled the implementation of the domain name administration and implementation within the Internet realm or ecosystem in our country.

I would also like to thank Nancy and Nick whose company we enjoyed in 2013 as great collaborators and supporters. They made something -- you know, a very -- a very difficult task such as turning a hotel into the venue into something really, really easy and smooth.

I would also like to thank all of the people in those little booths at one side of the room who make Internet multilingual so that people whose mother tongue is not necessarily English can engage and contribute their knowledge and their ideas.

11 time zones away from here more or less there's a city of Buenos Aires where we look forward to hosting you in next June. And let me give you some updates of what we have been doing. The administration of Internet domains in Argentina has undergone a very significant change process. And in that regard we are using ICANN's best practices in order to reach out to our



---

population so that our population will have many of the tools that other countries already enjoy.

I would also like to say that Argentina's population is becoming increasingly engaged in ICANN's cross community groups. We want to enhance that participation even further in the framework of ICANN 53 in next June.

So once again, I would like to thank you all for this recognition to our team, to NIC Argentina's team as the host of an ICANN meeting. We look forward to seeing many of you in our beloved country so that you can enjoy its beauty, its beautiful geography, its people, so that you can exchange ideas, and so that we can enhance positions on the IANA transition and net neutrality.

For those of you that also enjoy activities outside the ICANN meetings, our evenings and our nights are quite interesting in Buenos Aires. We have delicious food and drinks and we look forward to seeing you all in next June in our city. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. It's not too early. Start tweaking your tango. We're now going to continue to discuss issues of community interest. Asha Hemrajani will be the facilitator. Take it away.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Steve. Can I have people to come up to the microphones, please. I think are we going to you first, Brad?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We do have a question that's waiting from our video hub in Kiev in Ukraine. Oksana Prykhodko from the European Media Platform has a question.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: (indiscernible) we highly appreciate huge progress in communication with ICANN. Such remote hubs are part of this problem. Another problem is regional events with participation of ICANN VIPs such as round table or which took place in Kiev on 28 of January with participation of Michael Yakushev. But I think that we need a lot more efforts in this way. For example, regarding procedure of this communication, do you have enough level for such procedures? For example, regarding addressing to ombudsman. Do you have enough awareness raising regarding user-friendly understandable, transparent, accountable process for this communication? Do you have enough educational program in local languages? Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Is there anyone from -- any of my Board colleagues that would like to answer that? Yes, Erika, please.



---

ERIKA MANN: Hi to all our friends in Ukraine. It was a bit hard to understand, so we had some difficulty. I think we would appreciate it if you would send us your question so that we then can answer to it properly.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Now I would like to go to the queue. Yes, ma'am.

APARNA SRIDHAR: Good afternoon. Aparna Sridhar for the business constituency. Our comment is on the IANA function stewardship transition. We want to make four fairly simple what I hope will be obviously points.

The first is that the IANA function operates well today, it is a straightforward, technical process, and the process itself as well as the functions operating work well. Because the process is working well right now and the current arrangements are relatively simple, the future arrangements should be simple and efficient as well. However, for instances where there is systemic failure or gross negligence or worse, which I hope will not obtain, we need a fail-over backup mechanism and a way to move the functions out of ICANN if absolutely necessary. These are sort of the three key principles around which the business constituency has coalesced.



---

I want to just add our appreciation for all of the commenters who have said today, including repeatedly members of NTIA, that getting this right is more important than getting it done in September, and with all of those commenters we wholeheartedly agree. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Yes. Is there anyone from the board who would like to address Aparna's comments?

If not, yes, please.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Good afternoon. Michele Neylon, for the record, not -- speaking on behalf of myself and nobody else.

A couple of things.

Overall, I thought this meeting this week was pretty constructive. We had some good dialogue with the board, both in full sessions and in other meetings. I thought that was very helpful.

I'm finally in a position to have -- to say that my government has actually turned up, so I can actually stop whining about them. So the Irish government is now a member of the GAC.

[ Applause ]



---

Hopefully they'll keep coming, but they're here now. This is good.

On the --

One of the things that I am a bit concerned about -- and again, it goes to the GAC -- this is just personally -- this thing around two-letter domains. Do we really have to have a situation where every single registry who wants to have -- to release two-letter domains has to go through some completely unpredictable process involving iterations backwards and forwards with an unknown list of governments, while in the ccTLD space most of them have either released two-letter -- two-letter and shorter domain names or are in the process of doing so? Why are they being special about it in the G space? This doesn't make any sense.

I have no skin in the game on this. I mean, as a registrar, we don't even offer premium names, so I'm -- all I'm concerned about is I'm going to end up Astroturfing the RSEPs by doing a copy-and-paste of the comment I've already submitted like three or four times saying, "Please just let them have them."

With respect to the .BRAND registries, again, you know, they're a closed space. It makes sense to me semantically, if somebody wants to have fr.brand, and that that would be content targeted both in that local language or to that country, let them have it. What's the problem? Where's the harm? Thanks.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Bruce?

[ Applause ]

Bruce, would you like to respond to that?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah. Thank you, Michele.

First a quick response. I'm expecting we'll see the Irish government at the ICANN meeting in Dublin later this year.

[ Laughter ]

MICHELE NEYLON:

Hopefully they'll turn up for that too.

[ Laughter ]

BRUCE TONKIN:

On the second part, yes, we're expecting to be able to provide a response on the two-letter name issue, but essentially what we're looking for is a process that works both for the registry operators and also for the affected parties and that they can efficiently respond.

So, you know, we're basically looking for an efficient process that works for everybody.





---

MICHELE NEYLON: The GAC chair, I think, wants to jump in, Bruce.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Hello, everybody. And hi, Michele.

Just one word, that if you look at the -- that thing that has a history that goes beyond my time. I will not refer to that.

But if you look at the latest communique, which is consensus advice like the letter that I've sent, there was an agreement to send that letter to convey that message. Just to make that clear, the letter was consulted in the GAC before it was sent.

I think we need to look forward and try to find ways, mechanisms, that make it easy for governments who want to have a look at this, as well as for registries and registrars who want to use these names, so we're looking forward to working together and making this better in the future. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Thomas. Thank you, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Next, please.

JANIS KARKLINS: Hello. My name is Janis Karklins, Chairman Ambassador of Latvia, but I will be speaking in my capacity of the Chairman of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group of Internet Governance Forum.

I will start by thanking ICANN, ICANN board and president and CEO, for ongoing support to IGF, and since the MAG in the last meeting agreed on the title of the IGF 2015 which will take place in Brazil in November -- and the title is "Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development" -- as well as agreed on eight subthemes of the IGF in Joao Pessoa -- cybersecurity and trust, Internet economy, inclusiveness and diversity, openness, enhancing multistakeholder cooperation, Internet and human rights, critical Internet resources, and emerging issues -- I would like to invite ICANN and the ICANN community to submit proposals for workshops by 30 of March.

And then in the end of May, the MAG is planning to convene a meeting to decide on the structure of IGF in Brazil and retain about a hundred proposals for this meeting.

So thank you very much for your ongoing support.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Janis.



---

Anyone who would like to respond? No?

If not, I think it's the lady next. Thank you.

SIDRA IQBAL:

Hello, everyone. I'm Sidra Iqbal. I'm a first-time fellow to ICANN. And first of all, I must begin by saying that I speak on behalf of all the fellows that this past one week has been an intense but rather an enlightening journey for all of us, and we can all say with some -- or a little confidence that we now speak and understand a bit of ICANN, which is a lot of acronyms.

There's a huge -- there's a huge promise to what you guys are trying to do, and with so much compassion and commitment. I see every one of the staff right here very early on in the morning, which shows their support and their commitment to the cause, but as a first-time gatherer, what I notice is that you committed to a poly-centric Internet governance model but the divide really lies between the governance of Internet and the governance on Internet.

What I noticed in my one week over here, the voices that speak for the governance of Internet -- that's matters dealing with the legality and the technical issues -- they're far more unified, they're far more sorted out, if I may be allowed to say that, whereas the governance on matters have a lot of gray areas.



---

You speak about, you know, issues relating to censorship. Now, I understand that this doesn't directly come under the remit of ICANN, and it shouldn't expand you to the level of thinning you out, but I also wonder how it cannot be directly affecting what you do.

For example, I speak from a firsthand experience what happens in Pakistan. As a knee-jerk reaction, the government responds by banning access to a few sites. Censorship. And that automatically creates, for a lack of a better word, a bootleg to the market. We see people using proxies, and that is your domain.

How do we identify a huge mass of -- critical mass of users who are lurking in the Internet space faceless? Masked? How do we know if they're a friend, a savior --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- or an attacker.

So this does come under your domain, and I would like to know what is being proactively thought of and set up as the agenda on the Internet governance on Internet. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

That you for that question and I'm very, very happy that you are an ICANN fellow.



---

Would any of my board colleagues like to address Ms. Iqbal's question?

Oh, sorry. Okay. Wolfgang, yes.

**WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER:** Thank you very much for your statement, and also thank you very much that you make this differentiation between the governance of the Internet and the governance on the Internet.

Because the governance on the Internet is part of the general environment in which ICANN operates, and it's certainly in ICANN's natural interest that ICANN operates and can do its core business in a healthy environment, which is -- follows human rights and, you know, have -- gives access to everybody and fights against cybercrime and all this. And that's the reason why ICANN is engaged in the NETmundial Initiative, because this could become the place where all these issues are discussed with relevant stakeholders from all five regions in the world.

Not discussed in a way like in the Internet Governance Forum, because there is no need to duplicate the Internet Governance Forum, but to bring some of the issues which has been discussed in the Internet Governance Forum to a certain -- I would not say "solution," but that we see at the end of the tunnel some light and can move step by step forward. And the issues you have raised belong to the issues, you know, where probably the



---

NETmundial Initiative can help to take the next small stumbling step forward. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Wolfgang.

Next, please.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Good afternoon. My name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje and I'm speaking here on a personal level.

First of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be part of this meeting and I want to particularly thank NCUC for bringing me here.

This is more of a pragmatic approach of what I've experienced here this week. I'm a fellow alum- -- fellowship alumni as well.

In this meeting, I've heard a lot of -- this word repeated a lot of time: Burnout and lack of -- and overwhelming work by the volunteers who are committed to the work ICANN has given to them, or there is ever-increasing work. And there's been a desire to bring in new people on board, and I guess that's one of the reasons why I'm here.

But my question to the ICANN board, or to ICANN in general, is: Wouldn't it be fair for you to implement like a program that



---

would motivate the overwhelmed volunteers who are presently burnt out right now to bring in new blood to help with the work they are doing? Because I've seen around -- around the corridors people who are interested in engaging. I've also heard people in all the meetings I've gone to who complain about too much work and how tired they are.

So I'm saying it would be fair if there is an incentive for them to personally go out and get people that they can give some kind of little, little task to and help some kind of succession in the approach. Because I saw it on the board where they're drawing and people writing "mentoring," "engagement," and things, so for me, this is an approach I think it would be fair if the board can take a look at, and I'm wondering why wouldn't they do that. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Benjamin.

[ Applause ]

Any of my board colleagues would like to address this? Fadi or -- thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Benjamin, very much, for your enthusiasm. Many people who are burnt out in this room lit up by your comments



---

and we appreciate very much the proposal you make, that we actually link these things a little bit, that it seems that there are people ready to help and there are people tired of working, and if we could do some work at the staff level to enable the introduction of new people into these processes, it would go a long way.

So sitting right here next to me are our leaders of engagement and community participation. I'm sure they're taking good note of this.

May I ask you after this session to come and introduce yourself as well to David and Sally and make sure that they appreciate your ideas and that we implement them as we move forward.

[ Applause ]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Fadi.

Yes, please.

RICK LANE: Rick Lane with 21st Century Fox and following up on the previous speaker.

In the opening session, Fadi, you commented on the need to protect against volunteer burnout, but burnout of the volunteers





---

is not just occurring because of the work around ICANN but because most of the people in this room are working on the more general issues surrounding Internet governance, and we see a lot of familiar faces at all the different events. It's like a traveling roadshow.

Therefore, you know, what we are concerned about is a proliferation of meetings and forums on Internet governance, including the NMI. We believe the NMI will exasperate volunteer burnout, drain limited resources, both financial and human, and could challenge utility of existing long-established and proven forums.

There's enough going on between the ISOC events, the WSIS+10, the Internet Governance Forum, to keep us all busy.

Lastly, I do appreciate your offer of ICANN staff helping with the voluntary effort. However, I do caution the community that handing off too much of the work, especially when drafting documents, could diminish the power of the community.

The strength of the multistakeholder process is not just the ideas that are generated by the community but the power of holding the pen. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Rick.



---

Any of my board colleagues would like to address?

If not, can I go to Brad now?

BRAD WHITE: We have an online question from Brendon O'Shaughnessy.

What is the status of the fight between ISOC and ICANN on the NETmundial Initiative?

FADI CHEHADE: 2-1.

[ Laughter ]

Stay tuned.

[ Laughter ]

There is no fight.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Is there another question, Brad?

BRAD WHITE: Not yet.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Thank you, Brad.



---

Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER:

This is Milton Mueller, and I'm up here partly because there are hundreds of people with bingo cards that insisted that I come up.

[ Applause ]

Always good to know you're in demand.

[ Laughter ]

The other -- other point I wanted to make is that I'm responding to some of the conversation I heard about the nature of the CWG proposal to the ICG, and I may have mistook what I heard, but it sounded like some of you are saying that sort of the CWG submits its proposal to you and you do some kind of public interest determination of it and then you send it back to the CWG.

My understanding, and I think the understanding of the chairs of the CWG, is that they are responding to an RFP issued by the ICG that when they think they have consensus, they will send it to us.

ICANN's board, of course, is a stakeholder and is engaged in that process and they can submit their opinion, but the proposal goes to us and then we combine it with the other proposals to work out any problems and then we put it up for public comment.

Is that your understanding also?



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Thank you, Milton.

Bruce, would you like to take that, please?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. Thank you, Milton. I think the confusion is in the use of acronyms. There's one acronym called CWG, and the other acronym called CCWG, which are codes for one is part of the IANA transition process and the other is the accountability process.

So, no, there -- that is not the -- you are correct in your thinking that the ICG is managing the process for the cross-community working group on the IANA transition for naming. The board's not involved.

MILTON MUELLER: Good to clear that up.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah.

MILTON MUELLER: A lot of people were confused.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Kuo-Wei, please.

KUO-WEI WU: That's okay. Bruce already answer that.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Thank you, Bruce. Thank you, Milton.  
Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

In our conversations, I think it is before -- it is good -- or better to listen to us. I don't think Fadi had said that the staff would do the community's work, but that it would help the community to perform its work.

So I think this is fundamental. Staff helps us to work in a better way, but we ourself, we have to be accountable for our work.

I was part of the board and I said -- and I repeat this because this is essential for me -- that we share work, and to share work means to share responsibility, and if we want to share responsibilities, we need to allow new people to come in.



---

If we have one, two, three sets or -- or four -- or three or four working groups, well, then new people will not be able to take responsibility.

And we can say, "Okay, no problem, we are better than the others and that's why I'm taking over the responsibility," but if we don't give opportunities to the rest, well, at some point in time we will be overloaded.

So I am really surprised -- I'm happily surprised to have the African presence, the English and the French-speaking people, many people participating in the forum and in meetings, and this is something that encourages us. Because we are not in Marrakech, we are in Singapore, and we see great participation from the African community and this is something extraordinary. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Sebastien.

Please go ahead, sir.

PAUL FOODY: Paul Foody speaking on my own behalf. Would it be possible to post podcasts of the meetings rather than have the -- the streaming?



---

You know, I live in Canada, and even with a fairly decent data plan, it's -- it's pretty impossible to go round and listen to the -- the recordings without them failing. God knows what it must be like in parts of Africa.

Secondly, given the -- the recognition of the importance of the global public interest, is there anywhere that it -- that the items that you will evaluate in assessing whether or not a proposal is a positive or negative global public interest, is there anywhere I can find that?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

All right. Thank you, Paul. Would anyone from management like to address Paul's first question? Or Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah. So thank you, Paul, for your comment about the podcasts. We actually do have several things that are presented on our Web site with a podcast, but not the meetings. I agree with you.

So I just asked our head of digital engagement to consider if and how fast we can do this. Because you're right. I also prefer many times to download things and listen to them on the plane or, you know, at some leisure. Because also if your connection breaks in the middle, it's very complicated. So we'll look into it. And I appreciate your comment on that.



---

As to your second question on --

PAUL FOODY: Global public interest. How will you assess it?

FADI CHEHADE: Yes. We usually call ISOC. They help us with that.

[ Laughter ]

No, no. I'm kidding.

PAUL FOODY: And do I sort of --

FADI CHEHADE: It's just late in the day. No.

Certainly, you've added to the five strategic objectives of ICANN. The term "global public interest." And we -- if you recall last year, I had a bunch of groups that I formed that would advise us on some ideas. And one of them was focused on the public interest. So they came up with a definition that included people like Nii Quaynor and Tim Berners-Lee. And they produced a report on our Web site.





---

PAUL FOODY: It is there, okay.

FADI CHEHADE: But, having said that, I also want to point to Bill Drake from the community, who proposed on Tuesday that maybe the community should come together and add some more layers of definition.

And the gentleman standing right next to you, Mr. Cake, actually had some very good ideas on that, that, instead of simply defining global public interest, let's actually define how our processes will be informed by the global public interest. So we look forward to community work on that. As I said, in the morning on Monday, we're committed to root everything in that. And we need to figure out how to do it together.

PAUL FOODY: Great thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Fadi. Thank you, Paul, for the questions.

I -- Brad, I understand there's a remote question.

BRAD WHITE: Correct. Question from Fon Yi (phonetic.) Would like to hear the comments by the Board on the following: One: Will the scope of



---

accountability of ICANN include putting binding and enforceable policies or bylaws in place to stop any sovereign countries from blocking contents on the web at their will for purely political reasons?

Two: How can ICANN be accountable for ensuring the bottom-up multistakeholder approach really be implemented in countries where the voices of individual Internet users who are also important stakeholders are routinely muffled, suppressed, and hijacked?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Brad. Any of my board colleagues would like to address Fon Yi's question. Wolfgang? Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I understand that members of the community repeat these questions again and again about content-related issues. Because this is what individuals do. They exchange content over the Internet. That's their first priority. And they take the underlying technology of names and numbers for granted, because that's not their problem.

But ICANN's problem is to enable the communications, not to deal with the content of the communication. And what I said already in my first intervention, it would not be -- make any sense for the broader Internet community if ICANN would extend its mandate



---

and to enter the discussion on content regulation. We have many bodies, many intergovernmental bodies, international bodies, Human Rights Watch, UNESCO, Human Rights Council, dealing with issues which are content related. And I can encourage all members of the ICANN community to address those questions to these bodies so that these bodies, you know, move forward and bring a solution which is needed. But ICANN cannot deliver the solution for this problem. ICANN can help that everybody gets a name and a number if there is a need for it. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Wolfgang. For -- to answer Fon Yi's second question, Ram, would you like to take that, please?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Asha. The question was how can ICANN be responsible for assuring the bottom-up multistakeholder approach be implemented in countries where the voices of individual Internet users are muffled. I wanted to take that up because I wanted to point out kind of an inherent contradiction in asking ICANN to kind of -- in a centralized way take up the implementation of a multistakeholder model in a country.

So, if you really want to do this the right way, the multistakeholder model comes up from the many stakeholders in those countries. And, in general, we focus on the -- making sure



---

that there is an open and free access to the information. And then it's within the countries for them to organize themselves.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Ram.

I will go back to the microphone. Sir, please.

DAVID CAKE:

Thank you. David Cake from Electronic Frontiers and NCUC.

Yeah, about the public interest. Now, there seemed to be awful lot of -- there's quite a bunch of processes going on at the moment or that are coming up in the future or that we've had about the definition of the public interest. I realize right now everybody's attention is fully sucked up with the IANA and accountability. And those are big conversations we have to have. But I think the question of how we talk about the global public interest is shaping up as the big conversation we'll be having after that.

Some of these -- some of these things are on -- about the public interest are kind of operational time scales now. And I realize there's pressure to do some things fast.

All I can -- I don't really have a question for the board. I'm saying this is shaping up as a very important question. And, particularly, I think we need to have a well-organized process inside ICANN.



---

But it's also one of those things where we really, really need to take that question outside of ICANN as well. This is when we start talking about things -- all the -- you know, outreach to Internet governance organizations that have been going on in the last year, this is one of the things we should be doing there. We need to make sure that the global public interest is a global conversation and participated in in a wide number of ways. I know our ICANN processes -- you know, it's in the strategic plan. But we -- I don't think we can -- we need to start now, or we've already have started now. We need to crank it up. Even though I know everyone's still really busy with other stuff.

So last thing I should be saying is let's do more work. But I think we kind of have to deal with that, start dealing with that one. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, David, for your comment.

Next, please.

YAN WAI CHOI: All right. Thank you. I just want to leave a comment and suggestions. Actually, my name is Wai Choi, representing NetMission from Hong Kong and ARS APRALO. This is my first time attending ICANN. But NetMission has been making presence in previous ICANNs. As a newcomer, the experience has been

---

intensive and rewarding. Through the various sessions, the fellowship morning meeting, workshops, constituency meetings, I have my cut short my learning curve on Internet policies especially regarding the matter of IANA accountability and universal acceptance of IANA -- IDN TLDs.

Being able to participate in the process and making -- and meeting veterans of the meetings starts to make me take in ICANN bit by bit and acronyms by acronyms. New participation on Internet governance and, more importantly, letting our voice be heard by policy makers and how to be a better way than participating ICANNs.

Therefore, NetMission has been continually bringing youth into ICANN, this time two of them are masters students from mainland joined NetMission to as a village to participate in ICANN.

Coming back to my personal experience, I think that user friendliness of content on ICANN platform is the key to successful stakeholder engagement. Currently, the ICANN learn platform and the fellowship program has been doing a great job at engaging global stakeholders.

However, I think that more videos and animations on specific topics that are hotly discussed ICANN to be produced to channel these specific knowledge down to the public and other stakeholders, which will make the whole process more engaging and easy to follow.



---

Lastly, I would like to, on behalf of NetMission, to thank you, ICANN, for giving us the opportunity and .ASIA to support us through the journey. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Mr. Choi, I'm very, very happy to hear that. I'm also from Hong Kong. So I'm very, very happy that we have a Hong Kong participant at ICANN 52 and following ICANN. Thank you so much. And we'll take your suggestion on videos into account. Thank you.

Brad, do we have someone online?

BRAD WHITE:

We do. We have a question from Tariq.

"As an Arabic language speaker, it is difficult to see that the IDN program for Arabic languages still does not support alternative forms of our words. What is ICANN's plan to implement these alternate forms of words in the root, and why is it taking so long to implement something to fundamental to our language and our culture?"

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Brad. Ram, would you like to take that, please?



---

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. I don't really know what alternate forms of words means. But I'm assuming you're talking about the IDN variant program at ICANN.

We've been working -- ICANN has been working in this area for quite a long time. And a tremendous amount of progress has been made. There are two pieces to this. There is a set of characters, Unicode characters that are allowed -- that should be allowed in the root. And that has been posted for public comment, and that has progressed very nicely. In addition, as an Arabic language speaker, you should be aware that there is a -- there's a tremendously active community group that has been formed to put together a set of recommendations on what characters from the Arabic script ought to also be represented in the root.

So those are things that -- where I suggest you join in.

Now, the important thing is that, when you look at variants, there is really no easy or straightforward definition of it. It really has to be taken on a case-by-case basis. The reason why it takes a long time is because it's a pretty complex topic. And, as with many things, you cannot unring the bell. So we're taking an approach of making sure that the work is done in a complete and accurate way before we actually think about whether variants should be delegated into the root.





---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Thank you, Tariq. And thank you, Ram.

Brad, any more questions online?

BRAD WHITE: We do have the question from Kiev, Ukraine, where it came in garbled. That person did email. Oksana Prykhodko. I hope I don't massacre that too much. Again, from Kiev and the Ukraine.

"We highly appreciate the huge progress in transparency and accountability of communication with ICANN. Such remote hubs are part of this progress. Another one is regional events with participation of ICANN VIPs, for example, the roundtable in Kiev with Michael Yakushev on January 28th. But we need many more such efforts, especially regarding procedures of this communication. Do we have clear, understandable, user-friendly procedures of communication with the ICANN ombudsman? Is the level of awareness raising regarding these procedures high enough? And do we need more education and more literacy on it, especially in local languages?"

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Thank you, Brad, for those questions from the Ukraine. Is any board colleague -- yes, Fadi.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can answer that. I'd like to say something about that.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Perhaps Fadi first.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: He was pointing at me, I think.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. You were pointing. Christopher, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Now I forgot what I was going to say. You totally threw me, because the only person who ever calls me "Christopher" is my mother.

[ Laughter ]

And usually to complain about --

ASHA HEMRAJANI: I'm not going to respond to that, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I just wanted to point out that -- I thank you for the question. It's a very valid point. And we did, in fact, run a session this week on some of the -- of our reconsideration process and the ombudsman, et cetera. I think it's a fair point to say that perhaps we should do a little bit more education on what the ombudsman does and what the processes are and provide that in various



---

different languages. It's a very, very important role in the ICANN model. It's not necessarily particularly well understood because a lot of countries don't understand -- don't have the concept of an ombudsman. So thank you very much more the question and the comments. And I think we'll take those away and work out what to do next. Thanks.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Chris.

Yes, sir, at the mic.

WERNER STAUB: Okay. Werner Staub. I have a question regarding accessibility and translations. Based on the assets that we currently have -- because we have pretty impressive support facilities here. We have translations in many languages. And, most critically, we've got the realtime scribes, who, by the way, deserve an applause, I think for the work they're doing.

[ Applause ]

These assets are made available as archives. However, we could further improve the usability of this if we published with the transcript the exact timestamps of each line.

And, if the tapes or the audio streams also had, of course, a clear synchronization so that the exact time can be found, it would then



---

be possible to search for a phrase and hear it in Chinese, hear it in French, and hear it in English again and so on.

It would be relatively simple to do. And it would, however, leverage quite a bit what we could do. It would also enable people to specifically reference a certain point of a discussion that took place somewhere. And then people, of course, could possibly add further comments to it or offer additional translations or additional terminology items.

That leads me also to a suggestion with respect to translations. Quite a bit of translations are being done. Nowadays translation memories are used for that. It would be good if ICANN could publish those translation memories, because they have a standard format. And the published translation memories could actually assist many people not just for, actually, producing more content but also for learning. This would be a way to reach out to other people.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you for that suggestion.

Yes. Okay. Thank you, Fadi.

All right. Sir, please.



---

**BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:** Bertrand De La Chapelle. Just a very quick highlight. I wanted to highlight the very important difference between some of the sessions that I've attended regarding, in particular, the CWG.

One was a little bit frustrating. I understand the need to keep people up-to-date on where the process is, but sometimes the discussion of procedure takes over the opportunity to discuss the various positions. By contrast, I found that the session this morning on Q&A was extremely useful in terms of using a limited number of questions that forced people to clarify what they understood behind each of the words. And I think in terms of methodology, I wanted to highlight it because in many cases, and to be frank, in too many cases, the discussions within ICANN and in the working groups function with people putting very different things behind the same words, and any methodology that clarifies and forces people to explain what they actually mean by words like "the current arrangements" or "separation," or whatever, is extremely useful, and sometimes has not been done enough in the process regarding transition.

So I wanted to compliment Jeanette and the work that was done this morning. It was a very good session, I think.

**ASHA HEMRAJANI:** Thank you, Bertrand.

Brad, do we have any questions from online?

---

BRAD WHITE: We do have one question from a video hub in -- Which is it? From our hub in the Congo. Pierre Mukadi.

Mr. Mukadi.

REMOTE HUB: Mr. Mukadi speaking from the remote hub in Congo.

I believe that you should encourage engagement and participation so that the remote participation hubs will continue working. What does ICANN do in terms of the domain names to restrict the use of domain names? Some of them have not been used for many years, so what do you do with domain name parking? What do you do with those domain names that are not used?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes; Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: In the industry, I don't think ICANN really does anything with domain name parking. It's a legitimate way that people use domain names, and I don't think we have any comment on that.

What is parking for one person is a legitimate use for another.



---

ASHA HEMRAJANI:                   Okay. Thank you, Ram.

Any more questions online, Brad?

BRAD WHITE:                       We have no more questions.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:               Okay. Thank you, Brad.

Any more questions from the floor? No?

Going once. Going twice. If not, the line is closed.

May I give the -- may I give -- Fadi, would you like to say something?

FADI CHEHADE:                   We came into this meeting with a lot of tension in the community. And I must say, from our side, the staff side, that we have come committed to make sure that this meeting is a meeting where the confidence in ICANN goes up.

I hope we have achieved some of that. But all of us want to thank you for the trust you've put into the ICANN staff and the team that has been here to serve you.

We hope that together we can let the world know that we have confidence in each other and in the institution that represents us.



---

And I want to assure you that not just me, despite the amazing calculations of Steve DelBianco, but all of us are spending all of our time focused on the business of ICANN, focused on advancing ICANN and on making sure the world has confidence in us, not just the staff but the institution we all represent. That is my commitment to you.

And I want to ask the staff of ICANN that is in the room to stand up so, frankly, we can all recognize them for the great work they do for this institution.

Could you please all stand.

[ Applause ]

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, back to you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Fadi. This brings to a close the public forum, and we move immediately to our formal board meeting.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]

