

**NCPH Intersessional session, January 29<sup>th</sup> 2013**  
**NCSG Meeting with CEO, 10:45 Local time**

Coordinator: At this time the recording has begun. You may begin.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Hi, my name is Robin Gross and I'm the Chair of the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group. And this is the meeting of the Non Contracted Parties House intersessional session. And we're meeting with the ICANN CEO, Fadi Chehade, in this session.

So we had three basic issues that we wanted to discuss. And first was just a quick introduction about NCSG, what we are, who we are, why we're here, that sort of thing, a couple of institutional dynamic points to talk about, policy versus implementation, try to get down to some of the nuts and bolts on these things.

The second point would be diversity, outreach and global engagement. And then we thought we'd touch briefly upon some of the key substantive policy issues that non commercial users have typically (unintelligible).

These are the topics that we wanted to propose. And I should say the three substantive topics are the RAA, Whois and gTLDs. These were the topics that we wanted to discuss with you, Fadi, and if there's anything that you'd like to add or any alteration to that please.

Fadi Chehade: Well thank you, Robin. Well, first of all I'm here for you so I'm here to address your questions and to listen to you. But welcome - welcome to our home - your home in LA for those of you who are here for the first time, welcome.

We have no more space already which is a good thing because we really need to move out of LA into the world. So we will be presenting our Board of Directors, actually, this week a plan to break the headquarters of ICANN in three. And the new - two of the new headquarters will not be in North America. I hope you will agree.

So we are moving actively towards the internationalization of ICANN. And I think - I and the community should be pleased about that.

Maybe I will give you - if it's okay with you, Robin, just a few updates since I met you last and then I'm all ears to listen to you. I just came back from Davos where I was at the World Economic Forum on behalf of you. And this is a forum where the leaders of the business world and many of the leaders of the governments who all meet.

And I must tell you that I left rather disappointed about how much out of touch they are, at least those I met, for some - much more tune than I am. There was a lot of being out of touch. An MIT professor said at one of the sessions the age of the org chart is dead.

And I extrapolated this also to governance; the age of governance - top down governance is dead. That's the only delightful thing I heard there. Because, indeed, we live in a world where top down governance in companies, top down governance in governments, top down governance in the world, is, quote, unquote, threatened. Thank you. It's completely threatened.

Marc Benioff, the CEO of salesforce.com, said in a morning breakfast on Thursday he said one employee at salesforce.com could ruin the company now as would one employee could make the company great fortune. The

power of the individual was clearly on display at Davos. And it was a bit unsettling for some of these folks; very unsettling. And they don't know how to deal with it. It's interesting.

But I was pleased as someone who's, you know, my own book is - it says (unintelligible) because I'm a great believer in that philosophy. I was very pleased that the world is now taking notice of this change.

I had a chat with Professor Noveck of NYU, Professor of Law, who also wrote the great book Wiki Government. People who really - Professor Sadie at Oxford who is the only professor of cyber security in Europe, spoke greatly about the power of the individual there.

These are usually, I was told, discussions that are not welcome in Davos, not welcome in Davos. But I think they're all taking lots of heat as to what's coming.

One particular session, in which I actually thought about you, Wendy, and I'll give you the papers of that sessions, which are still unpublished, was a 2-1/2 hour session on personal data; on who gets your personal data.

It was moderated by the CEO of Bloomberg but it had lots of CEOs on it, CEO of Visa, CEO - many major players in the industry but no one from your community, no one from the user community - sitting there arguing who should get data about you.

Now Viviane Redding, who was the only person from government in that room, the European Vice President for privacy and citizenship, she was the powerhouse in that room. Jon Leibowitz was in the room, the FTC Chairman. And this was probably the most intense session I attended at Davos; 2-1/2 hours of intense debate.

And the bottom line is, first of all, that our governments don't agree who should submit personal data; they don't. In the view of Jon Leibowitz versus Viviane Redding is very far apart even though they were sitting next to each other and hugging each other and all this but it was very clear they were far.

The users of (data) today are the corporations. And they are very nervous about the rise of the individuals' rights. It was obvious too. And it was an excellent debate. And came out - out of that debate, which lasted, 2-1/2 hours there but had been raging for 2-1/2 years at the WEF, a paper is coming out.

The paper will be published in the next three months. But I have a pre-version of that paper which I will share with you before you leave. I think it would be good for you to read it and give me some comments on it as well.

But some of the people involved in that debate could also enlighten our debate on Whois just to see that other side and how they view who owns the data. So I talked, for example, to the Chief Risk Officer of Visa, Ellen, and I met her at the airport again leaving Davos.

And she - I told her, listen, we want to hear you. We want to hear how Visa believes the data it collects about every transaction we do on the planet should be used. It would be interesting to hear her and her view and the view of that. So that was something that happened at Davos that brought your group to mind and I thought about you when I attended that.

I was largely quiet until they asked me to speak. And when I did speak I did speak frankly for you. I spoke for the user. I told them nobody in this room, other than Viviane Redding who is still a government person but at least someone who's (handling) the users' rights, is speaking for the user.

Have you really thought about that? Oh yes, of course we have thought about that. I said well then, you know, I think it would be good for you to engage

with the organizations that take a lot of time to involve users and have multistakeholder environments.

Again Davos is a top down model, right, it's the top people of the world who arrive with all the trappings of we are the top people of the world and we run the agenda of the world. They even say it, it's like, yeah, we run the agenda of the world.

I attended one lunch, and that's my last Davos comment, that was also interesting. This was the lunch involving the 40 people who are all CEOs of the largest IT companies on the planet.

And the only non CEOs of IT companies who were there were myself, (Kelly Kruse), the Vice President of Europe for Internet and Technologies and the Minister of Telecommunications of South Africa. She was there; superb lady. Had a great meeting with her and her husband, really spent a nice time with them.

And we will be visiting them, as you know, in Durban, and we have some issues with her office so that we solved in Davos. That was a good thing to do in Davos.

But at that lunch they were all sitting discussing the future of the IT industry and how fabulous it looks and how much money they're going to make all this good stuff. And then I asked John Chambers, who was sitting next to me, the CEO of Cisco, if I could speak. And he said absolutely, please. What's on your mind?

And I told him this story. I said I have a friend, a couple, who live in Manhattan Beach here down the street. They're very good friends of mine. Who spent the last year remodeling their home; beautiful remodeling. They changed the floors, the wood floors, everything. The house looked fabulous.

And right before Christmas (Sally), the wife, who's a physician, she's the pediatrician of our kids, actually, (Sally) told her husband, there's a smell in the house. And (Matt) said, I don't smell anything. She said, no, there's a smell. She has a keen sense of smell and she's very allergic. And he dismissed her.

And then a few days later he's walking down the main hallway of his brand new, you know, all redone house and he sees the wood panels on the wood floor kind of popping. And for those of you who are not from California houses are mostly made of wood here and underneath the house there is kind of area where you can go and have the pipes.

And so he didn't understand how the wood is popping; it's brand new. So he goes under the house and he opens that little entrance to the underbelly of the house and it was like a sauna coming at him. And when he gets a light - and I have a picture of that, which I didn't bring today - the entire underbelly of the house was rotten.

And when he brought the experts in and they crawled under the house they found a pinhole in a water pipe - in a hot water pipe - that had been giving steam under the house for months. And the entire underbelly of the house was rotten. They had to almost commission the house to be demolished but they ended up removing half the walls and most of the floors and it's a mess.

And of course John Chambers is looking at me and thinking what does this have to do with us? And I said well, John, all of you are sitting in your beautiful house discussing the beautiful plans you have to make so much money with the Internet. And underneath your house there are a few pinholes.

And one of these pinholes is Internet governance. Another one of these pinholes is data privacy. And you're not paying attention to these but they're going to burn your house down. So while all of you are delighted in the fact

that you're going to make all this money unless you pay attention - he says, yeah, but I have this fellow, Dr. Pepper, who works for me and he takes care of it.

I said I know Bob Pepper very well. And that's not the issue, John, I said the issue is that as business leaders you need to engage in this debate and understand that you cannot, on your own, decide who governs the Internet and who governs the data on the Internet. You need to talk to the stakeholders. You need to get down under the house and figure out how this thing runs.

And if you don't all your plans will be ruined sooner or later. And then I talked to them about the (WCKT). Now Cisco knows about the (WCKT). But half the companies in the room didn't know about the (WCKT). Marc Benioff was making billions of dollars salesforce.com, had no idea what this thing was about.

I said, Marc, do you know that we were maybe a few hands away from having Article 3.8 in the treaty which would have meant that we don't have a single Internet anymore because the - as Hamadoun was there by the way so, you know, I spent - I had a very nice dinner with Hamadoun and his wife and we talked about this - Dr. Toure, the Head of the ITU - who fully was there when we were there in Davos. We were on the same agenda.

Because he also was running around telling people, listen, you got to pay attention to this stuff. So he was quoting me and I was quoting him in various meetings there as it should be. As it should be.

Anyway I thought I'd share this with you. My few days, I'm not going to tell you how painful Davos is because you can't really enjoy the snow and you're on top of each other; you're literally stepping on top of all these people all the time. The hotels are terrible. The - I mean, they're good if I'm skiing and I'm

there with - but everybody dresses like this and have snow boots and quite a remarkable place.

They claim that Professor (Swab) does it there in order to bring everybody down to earth. So everybody feels equal, yeah, so everybody sleeps in the same bunker hotel and all this. But then he may have a point about that. Of course he missed the part, you know, half the participants showed up in their private jets there and were scurried up the hill with massively expensive limousines.

I didn't, by the way, so, you know, I was tracking through the snow to get to my meetings when most people didn't. But anyway that's my two minutes on Davos.

Let me tell you two more minutes on ICANN. We have a lot going on at ICANN right now. I'll give you just some tidbits. But in Beijing I plan to give you a full briefing on what we've done since Toronto.

But small things, you know, that are happening right now that you should know about. As of Friday, for example, we completed the rollout across all of ICANN for the first time of the portfolio and project management system which means as of Monday morning this week when I meet with any of my team members I can, on my iPhone or on my iPad or on my screen, literally find out the full portfolio of this person.

What are they working on? What are their projects? How are they prioritized? What are their dependencies, what are their risks? Do they have too much on their plate? Do they have too little on their plate? We now have for the first time 509 projects at ICANN that are outlined here and I can manage every person in this company whether they're filling the coffee machine with beans or they're managing the next IGF meeting through that one tool.



Now I promised you in Toronto that when I can I plan to take that tool and make it available to all of you so you know who's doing what with your money at ICANN. And I will. I'm a few months away from that. Right now I'm cleaning it up in the sense that I'm starting to use it and I'm finding out that, you know, David Olive of these 509 projects has 107.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I expected 112.

Fadi Chehade: Yes. And Wolfgang was expecting 112. So what this means, without boring you with the details, is that for the first time I can be accountable for all of you as to what's going on here. And you can be managing us through this lens of real accountability. This never existed here.

People here worked as hard as they can, as fast as they can but without an understanding of the portfolio of things that they are responsible for. And it broke people, by the way, it's very hard to work at ICANN, very, very hard. Not fun because there isn't a clarity of - as to what is my remit and my scope, things get piled.

You need people and they have 16 projects. Where did you get these? Well some are from my boss, some from this board member, some from this community meeting, some - and it's just piling, okay? And how are you going to get all of this done? Well I'll go at it as fast as I can.

That's not a recipe for scale. And we're about to add hundreds of new gTLDs. We're engaging the world. We're doing activities in (unintelligible), we're doing major activities in Africa starting on the 8th of March. In Dubai, I'm doing the whole Arab (reg), every minister, every head of company, every person we can get in their world is showing up at a big event we're doing there on the 5th of March.

So as we engage - and I can get later into your questions and explain...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...all these events. But as we engage the planet we're going to have a lot more people coming under this tent. We've got to be ready and scalable. Otherwise we're going to fall on our knees. Oh yeah, I'll give you a very simple example.

When I came to ICANN I said if any member of our community current who knows - Marie knows who took all (unintelligible) Robin does, but does a new person who to call? Who do I call at ICANN to get something resolved? You know what happens? They call me. They all call me. And I feel terrible for them because they don't know who to call.

How do I get help? So those who know David, who know me, call me. Those who don't, you know, are at a loss. They go on the Website, oh boy. Go on our Website. Put another comment. We have 29 Websites at ICANN. Why? Why do we have 29 Websites? Why do we need 29? IBM doesn't need 29 Websites; why do we need 29 Websites?

So there is so much we need to do to improve the experience of people who come to ICANN for help. At a minimum we need a 1-800-ICANN Help, you know, at a minimum. And we're doing that. We're bringing a CRM system. I'm deploying a CRM system.

And we're going to have people who can answer the phone and say hi, let me log your request. Let me make sure somebody can get back to you. And I can track them and say how come it took us 72 days on average to get back to somebody? I have none of these tools. Tools, people, processes, things you've built, I've built in every company I've been at, are missing at ICANN. They're just not here.

We're good people, we have great wealth, we have every willingness to work all the hours necessary but that doesn't scale. That keeps us as a nice little

corner grocery shop, right? We cannot scale and serve the world and show the world a model of multistakeholder governance that I can go to Davos in a couple of years and stand up and tell them we know how to do multistakeholder governance.

I'm a little bit afraid to do that now because if they really checked it's not a pretty picture sometimes. Anyway, I didn't mean to get passionate about this. But there's a lot going on at ICANN that we - that - I'm in a tunnel right now. So I'm not in a position where I can stand up and tell you exactly.

I went to Toronto. I told you that we need to head to the promised land. I'm in the tunnel now. There is a lot going on. I'm not going to bore you with it but there's a ton going on to actually get ICANN structured so that it can serve the people it promised to serve.

I finish by saying two things, I made a comment in Amsterdam that I want to clarify because it was misconstrued - it was not misquoted; it was misconstrued so I want to clarify it and I had no time to go to the press and fix it because you are who matters to me. You are our family so I'll clarify to you.

I said in Amsterdam that I made a mistake, okay? And so let me explain what I said and what I meant by that. The mistake I did was that in the trademark clearinghouse process I did not fully understand the process. I'm not going to take away from the importance of what we were doing and the importance of addressing the issue of various constituents about where we are with this.

In general I believe that many parties at ICANN have not embraced their responsibility well and fully. And I have started a whole series of CEO round tables not to, again, do another mistake and say hey I'm working secretly with people behind doors, no. I'm bringing the leaders of the community especially on the contracted side and telling them you need to stand up and be responsible.

You cannot continue to hide behind your current agreements and say hey that's all I can commit to because my reputational analysis of the industry, which came back from (ECCO), one of the leading firms on the planet, show that the DNS contracted parties have the reputation is four times worse than the average technology sector.

And I showed that to them and I told them how do you plan to fix this? We fix this by becoming responsible. How do we become responsible? Well, let's start with the basics. What rights do registrants have? Are you abiding by these?

Let's start with simple things. Are you signing up to a common agreement that gives ICANN the ability to actually tell you when you're out of line? How about you start telling the world who's a good registrar and who's a bad registrar? Can we start with that?

Or do you want Viviane Redding and John Leibowitz to tell you? How about you do it? Why don't you rise and self-govern yourselves? We need a good housekeeping shield that says who are the good actors and who are the bad actors. Do it. If you don't do it somebody will do it to you.

So I challenged them to take responsibility. I also challenged them to improve their reputation and I told them that I will help you do that. But you have got to rise up to the level of being a mature industry that understands what it means to be responsible.

So I met with the 10 CEOs of the leading registrars on January 17 and I gave them that message, here, right in this room, including the new CEO of Go Daddy, Blake. And I'm meeting with the top CEOs of the registries right there in this room next Monday including Jim Bidzos from DotCom, from VeriSign, Hal, etcetera. All of them are coming.

By the way most of the CEOs had never heard from a CEO of ICANN. Never. Most of them told me we've never received a call from the CEO of ICANN. All of them had never been to our office; this or the old one. We have not engaged with the leaders who have the responsibility to make their companies responsible.

So when we hit our heads to the wall asking them to rise up and be responsible frankly my experience tells me when you talk to the leader of an organization you can get a lot farther and you can look them in the eye and say you're not living up to your responsibility and I'm going to go after you.

But I need to make sure that I have the tools to do that. And I don't have the tools today to do that. And the tools, in my opinion, as Alain has showed me the way with ITU, start with engagement; not with waiving a baton at them. Start with engagement by bringing them to the table and saying let's talk.

So calling them, engaging them, bringing them into the fold and telling them you, as the leaders of the registrars, you as the leaders of the registries, you as the leaders of the new gTLDs, take your responsibility. And if you don't someone will. And that's what I've been doing.

So when you ask me, Robin, what is happening on the RAA, what is happening on the new gTLDs, what is happening with Whois, what I'm doing first is I'm resetting the canvas having spent Saturday was my only day off in many months. I went to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam and I enjoyed some of their (mirrors), beautiful work and Rembrandts.

And you look at the backgrounds, the canvases on which they put these pictures. It's the canvas that actually does most of the work for them. It's what's behind the picture. And here what's behind our picture has been broken so we've been trying to rearrange things in the house meanwhile underneath the house ICANN has pinholes; we have pinholes under the house.

So I'm getting to the bottom of the house. That's what I'm doing right now. That's why I told you I'm in a tunnel. And it's not a pretty tunnel; it's a dark tunnel right now but it's a tunnel. And I'm racing through it. I'm pulling my whole team through it.

And I'm saying all of us need to go through this. And it's a cleansing effort. We're going to fix how we work; we're going to fix how the industry works and we have to do with courage and we're going to make mistakes along the way.

As I told the people in Amsterdam I said, look, there are two ways I can do this; I can do the IBM way which I'm very good at which is, hey, this is going to take us four years; there is the plan. And hopefully we'll beat the plan and finish in 3-1/2 years. That's the IBM way. I can do it this way.

Or I can just charge through the tunnel because we have no time because in six months we're going to have hundreds of new people here because it's the reality of where we are because the world is changing. So I'm doing it the start-up way, not the IBM way. I'm just charging.

And in the process I'm going to make mistakes. And good people amongst you will stand up and tell me you made a mistake. And I'll say yes, I did a mistake and I won't do it again and I'll keep going, you know, because we have no time. There's so much work that should have been done for the last four years that has not been done.

So my attitude is fine, I'll take the punches. I'm enjoying this simply because I feel I'm accomplishing something for all of us. There's no other enjoyment; I have my relationship with my own children, with my own family, with the people I care about is suffering greatly from all of this. This is not enjoyable in that regard.

But you know what? It's a mission and I signed up to do it and you trusted me to it so I'll do my best. But I need you to keep telling me when I make mistakes because of the mode I'm working. If I had all the time in the world I'd lay out my entire plan to you and it'll take four years and we'll go at it one step at a time calmly. But the world is not waiting for us.

So I'm going to go as fast as I can and I'm going to pull my team as fast as I can and I'll count on you to be as tough and as honest with me as you can. And when I make a mistake you will understand; I will understand. We'll fix it and keep moving.

Back to you, Robin.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thank you very much and again thank you for getting us here and giving us this chance to introduce ourselves to you and discuss some of the issues that are a primary concern to us.

I'll just take five minutes really briefly and give a very high level overview of NCSG and then each - I'd like to ask each of the chairs of the two constituencies within NCSG to do the same thing.

First I want to just lay out, you know, who are non commercial users. And I would say all of us are non commercials; everyone is a noncommercial user. We all use the Internet for non commercial purposes. And we recognize that that is an important part of what the Internet is for and how we evolve as a society and such.

So it really isn't the case of an us versus them when it comes to the commercial versus non commercial users because we're all non commercial users and we're, by and large, also all commercial users. We all use the Internet to do our jobs and to do our bank transactions and that sort of thing, commercial uses. And we recognize those as being important.

But we also recognize that there are these other things that we use the Internet for that have nothing to do with making money or personal financial gain. And those things - these things are also important.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Robin Gross: And so we need to build these kinds of concerns into the policies that we come up with for Internet governance. So when ICANN was created there was this recognition that there is this need for purely non commercial interests to have some influence in policy development.

And that's why NCUC was created, which is now NCSG. So if you take a look at the overall structure of ICANN all of the other places have - are not purely non commercial.

If you look at the other three stakeholder groups they're all commercial in their nature. And, again, we don't begrudge them that. We recognize that's an important interest. But we also want recognition that non commercial are important also.

So you take a look at the At Large. At Large is individuals and some of them are non commercial and some of them are commercial. So again it's a mix of commercial and non commercial views that find their way into At Large.

You take a look at the GAC...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Robin Gross: ...GAC is - conducts a balancing act of its own within their own jurisdictions. They're lobbied very heavily by business and as a result often takes the views of business.



So again this is a place where there are commercial interests. And so NCSG is supposed to be that one place at ICANN that is purely non commercial where we recognize that these non commercial interests are enforced and need to be built into policies that come out of ICANN. We're not saying commercial is (unintelligible) it's the (unintelligible) both need to be open to the policy.

So, you know, again we're all non commercial users. We all use the Internet to share pictures of our children and our nieces and our nephews far around the world. It's non commercial use that's important. We use the Internet to organize protests, comment and criticize things. These are all non commercial uses of the Internet but they're very important and we need to make sure that these kinds of uses are protected in the policies that come out this institution.

So that's just really a very quick overview of why NCSG matters, why we matter to Internet governance and how we (unintelligible) from the other parts of ICANN. We're the only place that is purely non commercial.

So with that I just wanted to ask Bill Drake, the Chair of the NCUC and Alain Berranger, the Chair of the NPOC, to then just give a quick five minutes on their views of who we are, they are, their constituencies and why we matter. Thank you.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you, Robin. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Who we are, I would say, is probably not part of the rot underneath the building but rather more the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...us down and make us part of the house. You know, I met you in Davos while you were speaking on behalf...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...well you were (unintelligible) there. But you had opportunity to expose ICANN...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: And to me there is multistakeholderism and then there's multistakeholderism, there's weak multistakeholderism and there's (unintelligible) multistakeholderism.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: Multistakeholderism is all the rage now; governments and business people run around in all kinds of context to say how much they support it, it's the way of the future, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. But then when you look at the way the processes actually work you realize that the (unintelligible) is not really, you know, equal. That there's hidden biases...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...built into the (fold). So, I mean, ITU runs around all the time saying they're a multistakeholder body. Everybody claims to be a multistakeholder body now. But the reality is that when it comes to civil society and non partial interests very often there's kind of systematic impediments to their voices being fully taken seriously.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: And I think that there's a feeling in ICANN amongst many of us that ICANN is the closest we've gotten to a level playing field and an opportunity to really

weigh in on policy processes in a meaningful way. But there's still more that has to be done to make it a level playing field.

If you look across stakeholder groups in terms of all kinds of matters...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...for example, participation, (unintelligible) I don't know NPOC's numbers but (unintelligible) NCUC has 277 members, 193 individuals and 84 organizations. I think well over half of them being outside the United States.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Seventy percent of them outside the United States. Okay? We are, both NPOC and NCUC, are very transparent in the way we operate. You could go on NPOC's Website and look at their ListServe, look at their discussion, see all their documents; same thing for NCUC.

Now if you look at those same kinds of dimensions to how some of the other parties in ICANN operate it's not quite the same. You don't have the internationality, the representation of diverse interests. You don't have the transparency of operations.

I can tell you that if you look at the - I'm not going to name any names - but if you look at some other constituencies that happen to be in LA right now there are no - they don't have publicly accessible ListServes, no transcripts or recordings of their meetings publicly accessible just brief minutes put out after a meeting saying we talked about X, you know, very generic way. No details about who are the membership, who's the leadership.

We are very, very transparent to the world. And when you go and talk to governments and others and say we have a multistakeholder model I think you are implying probably that we have a (unintelligible) process going on but

in fact in terms of which we all are participating across the same set of rules and in living up to the norms that we all share about multistakeholderism I think that there's a lot of variation.

So I think this is something that has to be given some attention going forward. We are, I think, vital to ICANN's mission and we're not here as a concession like, you know, oh well normatively we have to bring civil society in because otherwise we'll be out in the streets (unintelligible). We're here because we're an asset. We're an asset that can actively contribute to the mission if properly leveraged and given full scope and opportunity.

And so I guess what we would like to convey to you is that we're really willing to work hard and try...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: We've been doing that with very little...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...all volunteer efforts. But we need also some understanding of the constraints we face, of the challenges we face, of the difficulties even if you look at things the way the GNSO Council works (unintelligible) and the difficulty for us to get our views carried given the configuration (unintelligible).

These are all things that I think we hope that we can talk with you more about so that you're aware that for us to be providing the kind of vitality and (unintelligible) that you tell the outside world all your players are making we need your help, your support, to make that happen.

Fadi Chehade: Can I comment on what Bill said and then Alain can? So, two things, first of all it is unequivocal to me that you are an asset. It's unequivocal. I have - in the sense that you are not an ingredient in the cake, from my perspective,

you are critically what we should show on top of the cake so people know this is real.

There's no question. That's my comments earlier when I told you at Davos that nobody was seeing that. Nobody - this is what was missing at Davos. I said this earlier. And so I sincerely believe that.

But as I also said earlier I believe that - I'm a little bit shy about standing up and saying what you said to Davos people or to - I'm saying to leadership in general - that we have a great multistakeholder model and it works perfectly because I sincerely believe it's not working yet perfectly. There's quite a bit to do.

So, yes, we will herald it's working beautifully but I think amongst us here as family we could say we have more work to do. We have much more work to do to ensure that, as I said on my very first day in Prague, that it is truly a multi-equal stakeholder environment. It is not there.

That's why if you notice I also haven't been using that word a lot because I don't know that I can frankly stand up back it big time right now. We have work to get there. But you are right also, Bill, that we are the closest thing to the real thing. But we have work to get there and to improve it. And I'm committed to that.

So I wrote down in my little book here that I would like, by the time I leave you here today, to at least put my hand - myself - on what I would call the two, three things that I can take to heart that would allow me to close the gap between what you call, you know, a great multistakeholder environment and kind of where we are today.

What are the next two, three things we could work on together to start closing that gap?

Bill Drake: Certainly one thing to write in there is take us out of the rotting basement and put us on top of the cake.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: I think much like a good cake...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: But let's get to that, really, I'd like to understand what this community could guide me as someone who's here to serve you not to lead you. You don't need my leadership. I just need to serve you better. What would be the two, three things that we could do that would very quickly start giving you the sense that I intend to close that gap? So we'll come back to that; let's let Alain go first. Alain.

Alain Berranger: Merci beaucoup, Fadi.

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: You know, Fadi, you are an inspirational speaker, really. And but of course I speak as - because the reason that you touch me is because you use metaphors and metaphors help in communication. I spent the last 10 years of my life in an academic environment where metaphors are absolutely the biggest no-no you can make because it's all based on evidence. And - but thank you for that.

And I'm going to use a metaphor before I answer the three questions I'm supposed to answer and I'm being (unintelligible). There is no doubt in my experience that the multistakeholder model at ICANN is robust and doing well. It needs improvements, like you've just mentioned, that is obvious.

And the metaphor I've always used in - in my work when I was giving grants to multistakeholder organization was that - was the three-legged stool, public sector, private sector, civil society. There's no way that stool - you can sit on that stool if you don't have those three legs.

So (unintelligible) metaphor works for me; I don't know if it works for everybody.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Alain Berranger: Who we are, well, NPOC is really - has been an experiment and a pilot for ICANN to introduce a new constituency. This group was faced over the past two years, almost, huge legacy issues and misunderstanding and miscommunication.

And there was such bad (hurt) that we had to give it time for people and process to heal. We had to give it time. And, you know, in San Jose we had a truce; we got to - the two constituencies got to feel each other out. And Toronto we started getting real with putting down the issues on the table.

And one of the marvelous outcomes for me of this meeting is that about two weeks ago a number of the so-called leaders of this stakeholders group and other colleagues really rushed through to accelerate the process of making the stakeholders group (unintelligible) I've seen since I've joined ICANN. There is a feeling that NPOC is accepted for what it is; that it is not responsible for any of the legacies that came to us but we had to fix them.

So it is, for me, the - for NPOC and I think for the stakeholders group the most wonderful outcome is that we can absolutely move forward now as a united group. Not that we always agree and have the same viewpoint but that is not worrying me.

So who we are at NPOC is - we are a group of not for profit organizations and NGOs. We started from a legacy of large American NGOs and we're now moved deliberately into the emerging and developing economies so 80% of our new members are from that world, from outside the OECD countries.

And the..

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: Yeah, of the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: The new ones.

Alain Berranger: And the new ones. And the average would be we probably have 40-45 members. We have about...

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: ...pending. And so we would give 65% now, 60%-65% international if I can - or I'm sorry, OECD countries. Yes, we are important as a constituency and a stakeholder because the - as you know, NPOC only accepts now institutional memberships.

That - it's because, I think, in that three-legged stool, the weakest stool is the (unintelligible) end users communities. And we don't want it to break. So that's why we're critical to keep on making that stool stronger. And my friend, Klaus, later on will talk a little bit more about that.

And I wanted to share one concern or actually two where I believe there's risks to the multistakeholder model in this house if two things don't happen. And this is my personal opinion although they have been discussed at the



stakeholder group and we are progressing and we've actually progressed even to some request for.

And what I want to say is that we need help from you to - we need you to help us help you. We cannot have - there is a huge body of experience around this table which is not being captured. Because what do - what do many of the Executive Committees do? They, you know, they are Web site coordinators, they are database - data input-ers.

And of course while we're doing that we're not doing the thinking about policy and about planning. So - and I know that you're convinced of that because in August you called the leaders - or the community leaders, as you call them, and you said that. You said I'm amazed with a couple of travel tickets and wikis that you can produce the output you can produce.

But now this is becoming critical that we scale. We have to scale because the numbers are going to also grow in this house. Now there is another risk, and I don't have an answer for that, the other risk is when your VP or when your director of IT does not perform you have a system to manage that performance, performance appraisal, reviews and corrections, promotions, firing, whatever. You control...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: ...human resource. Tell me how do you control the productivity and the input of a volunteer? Can you fire a volunteer? Can you fire a volunteer? No, you can't fire a volunteer. Now we are at the stage where we have to change the level of management operation of this house - of this stakeholders group.

The various executive committees must be fully operational and there must be a way of evaluating them. And if tomorrow I go on the (unintelligible) of

NPOC is going to take a while to kick me out on election, just a year luckily enough. But it's a year where it's going to be a lot of trouble. So I don't know - I don't have the solution for that.

But we need to be more efficient as a stakeholders group. And I think the two are interrelated because if you give volunteers more resource then maybe their priorities - they will be able to adjust their priorities time wise and otherwise.

So thank you. That's a little bit too much housekeeping probably on the last point. But I do think it is a risk.

Fadi Chehade: Okay.

Alain Berranger: An operational risk. Thank you.

Fadi Chehade: Noted, thank you. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Alain. If we could just move into the next part of the agenda we can talk about institutional dynamics. And the first issue is the great controversy of policy versus implementation. And I was going to ask Avri if she could get us started on that discussion.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Yeah, I guess I'm one of the ones that is very, very concerned in that and I think I bring it up at just about every occasion I can. And one of the things I like is I'm actually starting to see a shift in it where we're actually starting to talk about it.

I read the documentation that was put out by the staff on the issue. I have bunches of issues with that including one notion that somehow one can find a separation line between the two because there's always elements of the one and the other it's just a matter of degree.

I think part of it starts to be based on changes that we're starting to see in ICANN. For example, this morning - and I'll single you out, David, because what you did was such a great example of the issue to me where you introduced yourself and you started to introduce yourself as Vice President for Policy Development and then halfway through Policy Development Support.

And I was really quite impressed at that shift of perspective that is an ongoing shift that I'm seeing. But that notion of ICANN staff - and one of the things that I do see in that document also was sort of a sometimes ICANN means staff and sometimes ICANN means all of us.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And is that policy versus implementation issue that becomes a critical issue. And so there never can be a time in my mind where it's staff solely that gets to determine, ah, this is just an implementation issue; we can go off and do it. I think the ccNSO - I mean, the, you know, had...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...a good proposal of always having something. So I think it's a critical. I think it's an issue that sort of always has to remain at the top because part of the - is this multistakeholder organization working as a multistakeholder involves that particular issue being clear...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...and never ending up in the oh but no that was policy you just did but always having it front-loaded. So I guess that was - and I think that that issue can derive a lot of the tensions and stress whether it's trademark clearinghouse or other decisions that somebody decides it's just implementation.

Fadi Chehade: May I just say something to that? Thank you, Avri, again spot on. Your concern about that is very important. I will say one of the best things that came out of the trademark clearinghouse effort was me understanding that policy versus implementation is a very, very important question that we're not answering right right now; that we're muddling through.

So one of the outcomes of that effort was that I asked David and his team to at least start putting their thoughts onto this paper which Marika released for all of you to see.

Now I just asked David in the prior session - and he forgave me for that - in front of everybody that I don't want this to just kind of be out there and people give me comments. I want a plan. So I would like, by the time I get to Beijing, to have all of you having given us very clear input onto that paper the issues with it, what needs to be changed, done. Give me some guidance. I need that guidance.

But I don't think we can keep that pinhole open for much too long. It has to be addressed. We have to sit down as a community and face the fact that we need to have a roadmap that says when is it policy, is there a clear line? There isn't a clear line.

And if there is a clear line what is it and when there isn't a clear line what do we do? But we can't keep it open like that and then find ourselves really constantly hitting contentious places like we did. I certainly didn't understand that myself so I will admit that I now understand it. And many of you have contributed to my understanding, thank you.

But there's more to be done. We cannot leave this open and continue to place it above being - when the wood is popping. We need to go underneath and say what is the issue? Why are we still not agreeing on this? So this paper, to me, was just an effort to start the debate and the dialogue.

Please send your comment. I'm going to ask David to put a timeframe around that so it becomes more of a well managed effort not just, you know, let's listen to each other. Okay we'll listen to each other but we need to listen and then reach some important guidelines that manage our behavior and allow us to look to the world like a functioning place not a place that seems broken at every juncture because we can't agree.

And this is going to be a tough one, as I'm sure you know. If it were easy it would have been solved. But it's okay, as I said to people in Davos, I think, as Bill was saying, we may not be perfect multistakeholder environment but let me tell you I don't know many places where there are the minds that are around this table ready, volunteering time to actually make this work. I don't know of any other place.

This is the place where it - if we're not going to make it work I don't know who will make it work. So we have the best minds and the best intentions. However contentious we get we get contentious because we care and that's a good thing.

So thank you, Avri, for bringing this up. And this is top of my mind. This is not something I just said I made a mistake and, you know, we carry on and then we'll hit the next issue and we'll make a mistake again probably. We need to address the underlying philosophical clarity between these two areas and understanding when things should go through.

And beyond that I should not, you know, the first time I hope you will all forgive me but the second time you cannot forgive me for breaking process. So aside from the lack of clarity between truly what is policy versus implementation the other issue is that I actually did something out of process.

That's the mistake that I declared in Amsterdam, right? And that's the mistake, you know, Maria called to attention correctly. So anyway that aside I think we move on.

Robin Gross: Okay, was there anything else on this issue?

Maria Farrell: Yeah just a quick one on - sorry, this is Maria Farrell speaking.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you.

Maria Farrell: On policy versus implementation I've made a comment to the GNSO Council list, not gotten any feedback, but I will send it to you, David, and hope you develop it more. I think one of the things that will help taking a bit of the heat out of that subject is to make implementation a bit less of a black box.

So at the moment it feels like stuff goes into implementation, you know, having gone down that decision tree and then there's a gap and then it pops out and there's the decision.

And so I think if there was a bit more transparency around, you know, why and how implementation decisions are made and also a bit more transparency around what are the contacts that are - let's not say permissible but what are the contacts between community members and staff when something is in implementation.

I'll explain it a different way. You said earlier on that I know who to call on staff if I've got any, you know, any issues that I want to take up. And - but I actually don't do that because perhaps wrongly I think it's almost cheating to, you know, to be constantly making this back channel.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Maria Farrell: And just because...

Fadi Chehade: I didn't mean to pick you out.

Maria Farrell: No, no, no...

Fadi Chehade: I was just using you as an example that you know people.

Maria Farrell: Absolutely and I would know who to call. And I kind of don't do it because I think it, you know, that we have to follow the proper processes and be transparent and be fair. But I do know that those contacts happen and many of them are helpful, they give staff, you know, objective information about how to operationalize things and how stuff works and, you know, stuff they've not thought about.

But it can be problematic if you - you just don't know what's happening. So one of the concrete suggestions I made was to look at - in Brussels in the European Union and increasingly in the UK there is - there is a requirement for policymakers, typically politicians but increasingly senior civil servants to just document, you know, what are their contacts with the people in the communities that they're serving.

So it's basically, you know, you're going to have to say register a lobbyist, register a contact and that's one way to just say okay who's someone we've been talking to...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Fair enough. That's a very fair comment. And I actually wrote it down with a small AI next to it which is action for me so I'll think about that and see how I can improve that. I'm attracted to the idea of opening the windows on the implementation side of the house.

I think what is helping now a little bit but that's not a solution, that's just a happenstance, is that all the new people looking after the implementation side many of them are new so - also their 10-year relationships in the community are not there.

So in a good way, you know, they don't get calls from people and they're new. You know, Christine Willett is new; Cyrus Namazi is new. These are guys who never worked in the DNS sector. They're just coming in to make it happen. But that is not a solution; that is just a happenstance and it may change.

Your idea to implement a more sustainable transparency regime is a good one. So I took that to heart and I will see what we can do.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Anything else on this point? Shall we move on?

Fadi Chehade: Someone on the line...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: Oh is there anyone on the line who has a point on this? Okay, not hearing any we'll move on. The next issue was diversity and outreach global engagement. Klaus, would you like to kick us off on this discussion?

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. This is Klaus Stoll of the NPOC. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Fadi, let me talk about another pinhole. A pinhole has a lot of names, one is internationalization, the other one is out reach and whatever you want to call it.

Basically what we need to do and think about is that the Internet - the whole ecosystem has become so important that Internet governance really has to become a topic of interest and common use like climate change, like human rights and things like that...

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: ...because it's becoming that. We haven't done that yet.



Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: I would like to make one clear observation right from the start. When I said we haven't done that yet we are not alone in this too. It's not ICANN alone who can do this but ICANN needs to take maybe the lead or whatever...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah, or participate in changing that.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. And we really have to become that conscience building. This is a vital issue.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: And as somebody who's coming from Germany (unintelligible) in Germany and might correct me the German courts last week made a decision that you can't just remove the Internet access from somebody anymore.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: It's a human right; it's a civil right.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: This is - and I'm coming from the development - from the development point of view. When I'm working in a developing country, yeah, I need Internet governance for all my development aspect be it from (unintelligible) to connectivity (beat) to getting somebody a toilet.

Fadi Chehade: Correct.

Klaus Stoll: It is somewhere in the background and we need to establish that.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: So the question is how can we do that best? And one of the solutions - not the best solution - is, for example, really to have a better look at the so-called NGO world. I would like to give three reasons why we might have to have - should have a look at the NGO world.

The first reason is quite simply if you engage with an NGO you engage typically with hundred, thousand, sometimes millions of people. And it's quite simply to reach the numbers; to reach that all of us because what Robin said is basically we are all non commercial users in one way or another.

The other reason, which might be the most abstract and non attractive but which is for me the most important one is Internet governance needs to be relevant made to the users.

And it becomes relevant to the person at home when the interest group (unintelligible) the NGO, whatever they engage with, can explain why it is relevant for them.

If an NGO knows they can't operate anymore and they can't deliver water into a village or they can't get something done because Internet governance doesn't allow it or things are going wrong there it's become suddenly relevant to the user at home and that's important. It's only - things become only interest - people only get engaged if they're relevant.

The next thing is quite simply the simple fact, the third fact, the new gTLD program. Look what's happening we start NGO, we start (ONG). That will be a mini revolution in the NGO world. It is important, it is something which we really need to be actively working on.

And I know here that (ARC) already did a very good program in India and they're doing that stuff. We need more...

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: ...we need more players, we need more people. We need - I know we are talking about the implementation of DotNGO, DotONG in 2014 one or two given the draw. But we need to start engaging now.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: We need to do these things and reaching (unintelligible) down there. And the other thing what I'm absolutely pleased about - I know a lot of people said - look, there are only three new gTLDs coming out of Africa. Why didn't they do it?

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: Quite simply I think that at the moment there's a hell of a lot of good stuff coming - sorry that I'm using it - out of Africa and trying to engage. But the reason why it wasn't - the engagement wasn't there because we didn't speak their language, we didn't - we didn't speak their methodology.

And now suddenly Africa is coming. And we should take this opportunity. And I was very pleased that you said look, I'm going there and doing that. And you're going at the right time.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: And, yeah, the last thing and just to bring it to a point is I want to come back to that black box of implementation. Yes, that was (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: It's for me absolutely vital point. You've got really good people here but you also got people who are not only (unintelligible) who are ready to get things done, to implement, to do it.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: And I think one of the lessons learned with ICANN should learn to cooperate with a number of people on these issues because a lot of things are really...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Klaus Stoll: And there is, for example, working with the NGOs it is - it isn't really real - real for the NGOs who work with ICANN is a win for ICANN to work with the NGOs. This (unintelligible) sustainable relationships. We are not asking somebody to do something which doesn't (unintelligible). And this is what...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...truly beneficial relationships, yeah.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. And that's - with the implementation I think ICANN has a lot of potential friends and partners out there which just simply needs to be developed. And ICANN doesn't need to change like it's (unintelligible). What ICANN needs to do is to have a little bit look how do I implement this? And implementing in the black box is not conducive to partnerships.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Is there - Bill, did you want to get in on this point?

Bill Drake: Depending on the definition of the point, yes. Outreach, generally, and engagement - I would just say, I guess, two things. One is for me personally

when I came into ICANN I came from the Internet governance world and the broader debates. And I spent a lot of time around the United Nations and I live in Geneva and I get to hear all the time about how people perceive ICANN.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: I've actually been at dinner parties with UN people who, when I told them that I work in ICANN they said, oh you're with the bad guys. I'm not kidding.

Fadi Chehade: I'm not surprised, no.

Bill Drake: I'm not kidding. My wife works (unintelligible) which is a very pro-developing country organization and her colleagues all think ICANN is the devil. (Unintelligible) so I'm fairly sensitive to that. And I've always felt some frustration up until recently that it just seemed like ICANN wasn't getting it.

We used to come - all the time NCSG would have these meetings with the Board at each ICANN meeting. And I would get up on my little horse and I would raise the point about, you know, we have to think about how the developing world, so on, is viewing ICANN and figuring out how to engage this.

And certain chairs - past chairs of the Board - and others - would say, well that's their problem; who cares? What's the issue? And people would sort of act like they just really literally couldn't comprehend that there was any problem with ICANN in their global ecosphere.

I feel like now that's changing. You've brought good people on who I think are more aware of that and have real concerns about working with governance and working with the general optics and you've intimated to that too.

But in doing that, I would say, I think it's important to leverage the community again. Okay? This is my concern. You've got a strategic relationships - Global Relationships Committee on the Board. I have asked repeatedly at these meetings with the Board isn't there a way for the community to work with you guys on these issues?

You've got a lot of people around this table who are very well versed in this stuff, who know government people, who have some credibility in some of these environments who could maybe bring some insight that would be useful. And I've always gotten kind of like somewhat removed responses.

And I think that's a bit of a pity. And I would say even more generally if - on the outreach initiative that's going on now if it gets defined as - and with all due respect to David sitting here - as something that the staff is going to just do while the community sits off on the sidelines that's a huge mistake to me.

When there was an announcement of a Speakers Bureau and I saw that it was just the staff were going to be the speakers that would go around and tell ICANN's story and I thought, wow, you've got all these people here who could get up and talk about the, you know, where we are on top of the cake in a way that probably staff couldn't on some issues.

I mean, for some things some people are right; for other things other people are right. And the point is there has to be an openness...

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...to leveraging us as an asset. It's fine to say we're an asset; you have to use us.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Bill Drake: You have to create the space and relationships where we can actually partner and make a difference and be helpful. Not that we're all going to necessary sing off the same hymnal in exactly the same way but, you know...

Fadi Chehade: Certainly. Robin, may I comment on the whole outreach...

Robin Gross: Please.

Fadi Chehade: ...thing a little bit? Immediately after Toronto, Bill, and to your point, Klaus, I told my team we're 170 people, there is no way we're going to get to the world with 170 people. That's everybody including the people who change the coffee in the machine. It's just - it's impossible.

I mean, we cannot be a global organization with 500 people. It is a lot to do. So leverage is the key word. We have to leverage our community. Now in order to start leveraging our community we need to be prepared to manage the leveraging. Let me explain what I mean by that. So the Speakers Bureau, which sounds like a very simple thing, right, requests come, we hand them out for people to go speak.

You have no idea how messy this was before we came on board. You know, Board members just sent the request say, hey, I'm going to Guatemala to speak there. People go - it was just a zoo. And even my own staff, I mean, where is this guy? Oh well he went to Costa Rica; there was some conference he's speaking.

Well do we know if this is the right place to go? Do we know who's there? It was a zoo. So the first step we have to do - I'll be very - I'm being very candid with you - was to set up what I call management systems for these activities. This is a lot of money. This is the community's money. This is a lot of responsibility.

Who speaks where, why, has to be managed without being a bonanza for everybody to say oh I'm going to these six trade shows or to this important conference in Singapore. Well, why? And all these trips cost a lot of money.

So the first thing I had to do is pull all that back and say okay let's first come up with a system. It starts with staff. It then extends to the Board, then extends to the community so these are the three circles I drew for them because the staff I can immediately stop, say no, you're not getting on planes. Let's talk about why you're doing this.

Then the next layer was the Board. And I'm being candid with you; I'm addressing the Board layer this Saturday morning. I'm sitting down with them and I'm saying okay, end of the bonanza. This is how this works. This is the system, right?

And then I plan to come to you in the same way because you have also amongst you a lot of people who could be very helpful to us, right? So this is what I'm doing. And I'm doing it for three things.

I'm doing it, you heard already about the Speakers Bureau so I'm doing it first for speaking engagements. I'm also doing it for a new program I'm rolling out called Ambassadorships. This is a program where I engage someone from the community or the Board to be helpful to achieve a particular project that has a beginning and an end. And I call these people Ambassadors.

Right? So I may be coming to you in the next few months and saying here's the Ambassadorship program. Klaus, I'd like you to come with me or with David or go on your own to go achieve this project in this place. This is the beginning of the project; this is the end of the project. This is how you report on the project. This way everybody knows how your time was spent for the benefit of the community. So we're rolling out an Ambassadorship program as well. Okay?



And then the third program is a program where I'm actually involving Board members and community members to support me on specific missions; not projects, missions. Like I'm heading to Japan in the next couple of weeks. Well, I'd like - I picked a couple Board members to come with me because they have relationships, because they can support me in certain ways that I don't know how in that particular market.

Now I would like to expand that eventually to other people as well because I know that, you know, if I'm going on a mission to visit, I don't know, Hamadoun, I know that Alain could be very helpful because he knows that organization, he understands how they work, he understands how to leverage with them. So it would be helpful for me to Alain to come with. And in fact we tried to do that on a couple of occasions.

That's how a community works. But I need a system to manage that. It's been nonexistent. And that system, part of it, has to be transparent so when people ask why the hell was Klaus in Nigeria? Well, he's there on ICANN work. He was an Ambassador. That was his project. This is the outcome of the project.

To do that I need a system. I need a portal. So we're building all of that as we speak, folks. It's going to take a little bit of time because I'll be candid with you...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...today all of that was done mano-a-mano. Who knows whom calls them, they show up, they go. It doesn't work. This is not scalable.

And one final comment about outreach. Outreach is a major issue at ICANN. We have done it very haphazardly to date. How we outreach is what I'd call artisanally as the Italians...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...it's fun, it's cute but it's artisanal, you know, it's not structured. We are completely changing - did they meet with Sally?

Bill Drake: That's after - at two o'clock we will, yeah.

Fadi Chehade: So Sally Costerton is now going to own our engagement execution. Notice the keyword here, execution. What does engagement execution mean? She will own all of the people on the ground who are orchestrating activities around the world of engagement.

Now she has a number of vice presidents. And as you saw we added three recently, right? And we'll be getting more. We have a big announcement in the Economist in December looking of a VP of Asia and we'll be looking for people in China and people in Russia and people in New Delhi. We're really engaging in a major way.

And as I told you - I think now I'm losing track - did I tell you when I walked into this room we're changing the structure of our headquarters?

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Right? So we're going to create time zone headquarters. There will be a time zone headquarter for North and South America, a time zone headquarter for Europe, Middle East and Africa and a time zone headquarter for Asia and Oceania.

So these will be hubs where we will have people supporting our community doing all kinds of activities. And then around these will be satellite people in all the key territories. That's all being presented to our Board of Directors this Friday.

And I hope to get the go-ahead and then we are already ready to move forward. This way I don't have to build more offices in LA. I want to move out of LA and get to our stakeholders.

Now as Sally owns all these resources on the ground how does she decide what to do? Key question here. And this is an action item back to you, Klaus, based on what you said.

How does she decide what to do? So she has a vice president in Africa. What is his plan? Well the first thing he did is he sat down with people in Africa. As you know we did a big meeting in Mauritius; he brought people. So he developed a bottom up plan.

But that's not enough. In my opinion while a bottom up plan is a good piece of data the other piece of data is, for example, what does the NPOC want to do in Africa? What are your plans in Africa? Who should be involved in Africa for the NPOC? How about for the other constituencies? What is your plan there?

So how do we get that input? Here's the plan: Sally will have three sources of input to her execution. The first is Tarek Kamel on the government side. So Tarek owns governmental engagement. He will come to Sally and say okay, in Africa I need to get closer to these 16 governments and that's why; because they have laws coming through their, you know, legislatures or because etcetera.

So if he's studying all of that and he has his team of people understanding what is moving at the governmental level and based on that he gave Sally that's what I need to do in each of your engagement areas.

The second source coming to Sally is the new guy Cyrus Namazi, who just started. Cyrus is the VP of our DNS Industry Contracted Parties. Now he's the one paying attention to all the people who sign contracts with them. And

he, again, goes to Sally and says, look, I have 16 new gTLD applicants in Africa or four, unfortunately or sadly, however many.

I need people in Africa to make sure they adhere to their contracts. I need a compliance person in Africa or half a person, etcetera. So he's giving her his need that she's building into her regional plan.

And the third and last source of (unintelligible), and this is where you could be helpful, is this man. So (David) is the third engagement (prong), right? He comes to (Sally), I have all those SO and SE and constituency. That's their strategic plan for each region.

And he's supposed to (unintelligible) this amongst you. Go to (Sally). (Sally) will take the resources and build her plan for 2014. That work is starting right now. (Sally) just filled her team, (Tara) just gave her her plan, (Cyrus) just came on board. He's giving her her plan. And I just asked (David) to expand the role of his department from being purely policy support department - thank you. And I'm learning as well. To a department that also understands, what are the leverage points of engagement that you all want in these territories? He'll feed it into her plan.

So (Sally)'s job is not to decide what is the outreach plan. (Sally)'s job is to execute the outreach plan that was coming up through the sources to her. That's what they're doing right now. So please, you know, you have as a constituency the opportunity working with (David) to let him know what you want to see happening from an outreach and engagement standpoint in each of these regions. He will put that together along with (Tara) and (Cyrus) and (Sally) will present me shortly with a plan across all the regions. And that will be built in to my 2014 budget.

This is a very, very important exercise. That I invite you to do. And I lied. I said that was my last point, there was one point you brought up that I want to comment on (Klaus), and you're right. You said, "Internet governance has to

be right.” I don’t know if all of you are on the regular Economist - have The Economist on your regular reading list. But two weeks ago The Economist had this superb article on internet politics that if you haven’t read, please ask any of my staff. It’s on my desk, they’ll make you a copy.

It’s a powerful article because it is the first time a prominent magazine read by, unfortunately, only the who’s who. Because sometimes it has some good things in there and I respect it’s editor, who is a good man. But they wrote a great article on the politics of the internet. I mean, it was exactly what you said in more pages. Which is, the internet is now central to the agenda of the world.

And just like the Germans brought the environment to the center of the agenda a few decades ago. The Germans are again doing it by the way, because if you go see the new (parties) in Germany. Which are well discussed in that article. And how they’re bringing the internet to the (fore) of the political debate, it’s remarkable. And The Economist predicted, and they don’t do this lightly, that the internet will be at the center of the global policy agenda for the next decade.

So you are spot on, you’re right. And we have roles, not just ICANN. All of us. To make sure that people understand that if - as I told (Chambers) and his team. If they don’t pay attention to internet governance, which is the pipes underneath their money making house. Their house will not be happy. They have to pay attention to this. They, as we, as everybody.

And the idea is that’s why we met with (unintelligible) in Paris at the (unintelligible), if we go with a plan across Africa. We want you involved. We need the NGOs, we need these people involved. And he agreed by the way.

So I will announce to you something that I hope you don’t go tweeting. I know you have public records, but I hope you don’t go tweeting because then I’ll get 20 calls. But we are doing an experiment in March. We’re starting

something called MIG works. MIG stands for Multi-stakeholder Internet Governance. MIG Works. MIG works is a road show that will be hosted under the idea of internet governance (forum) of the United Nations.

We are members of it. There will be - (ISOP) is a member, (IRR) is a member. In Africa, we're doing the same thing - the MIG Works - with the ATU Department. With the African Telecommunications Unit. These are new things that Africa has never done. We're engaged with all the parties in going out and doing this road show.

What is this road show about? We're going to test it in two cities in March. We're going to do it in Dubai and we're going to do it in (unintelligible). In Dubai and (unintelligible). And if it works, we're going to do it across the world. And the idea of MIG works is to go prepared with all the people involved in internet governance. And tell the local community two things.

Why does MIG works - why does Multi-stakeholder Internet Governance work? And here's how it works. And secondly, how do we get you involved and engaged? And how do we do that in a sustainable way?

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Fadi Chehade: It clearly, why is it? This is very, very (unintelligible). And if these two work, then believe me we will be coming back to you for the plan to propagate this around the world. And asking you to bring everybody to the table. So governments will be there, also businesses will be there. In (Dubois) I convinced the three CEOs of the largest telecommunications in the Middle East. (Unintelligible), (Cata Telecom), and (Saudi Telecom) to attend MIG Works. They will be at MIG Works.

And I told them, "You have to bring to society." And we are there calling on civil society and academics to show up. Now we're going to try. I know you may be itching to say, "We can jump in." Let's try this for a couple of cities. If

it works, well I'm convinced we can do this across the world. I want to budget in 2014, in every major - we should do at least four in Africa. We should do multiple ones in South America. We should do it all over the world, and (Klaus), you will be on my ambassador list for that one. Because we're going to need a lot of help to go out and talk to people...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...why it is working and how they can participate. Very important. And I don't want to do this just as ICANN. I want the (IGF) there, I want ATU there in Africa, I want (ISOPP), (unintelligible), all of our friends who believe in this need to participate. So we will be giving you some news on that in Asia. And how it went, and hopefully it will be - okay, enough on outreach and internet governance. But I just wanted to get back to the comments...

Man: We do have time to take maybe one last few questions or two.

Woman: Oh, we started so late can't we go a little bit over? If you want you can talk about our three policy issues concerned. We could just do a couple minutes?

Man: Just a couple minutes because we have to break down this room and you have the luncheon break.

Woman: Okay, okay.

Man: Could I just ask? Will the staff be ta- you're not going to be here in the afternoon right?

Man: No, tomorrow for lunch. Of course.

Man: But will you be briefing him about the three policy discussions this afternoon?

Man: Yes, I will be. Of course. And we'll do a recap for him before the lunch tomorrow with Fadi and the group.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, I'll be joining you for lunch tomorrow again. But you wanted, the three things that you wanted to talk about (unintelligible) in the beginning were RAA, who is, and new details...

Woman: That's right. If I could - if we could have one minute on each of those topics right now. Three minutes total.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: By all means, yes.

Woman: On the RAA agreement, (Wolfgang).

Man: (Wolfgang)?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Wendy). (Wendy Wolfgang).

Man: Tell me something about RAA.

Woman: I have to continue on architectural metaphors. Just to make it a little bit broader and to think about some of what (James Jacobs) tells us about city planning and the importance of diversity in keeping a city vibrant and it's community working effectively. I think we're here to help and the RAA specifically was here to make sure that the user's interests are represented in that (process).

Users are the ones bound by those contracts, but have very little say. So we've used our contacts, we've reached out to the Article 29 working party to



hear from European privacy regulators and on the state of their legal constraints around the collection and use of personal data. It's critically important, of course, for a global organization to be listening to all sources of law that will bind it's contracted parties as well as through them as users.

And so we want to be more in front of those discussions and have found it frustrating to try interacting through the (wiki) org, through letters. And welcome opportunities to have more direct conversations of how those contracts are negotiated and what they wind up looking like.

Fadi Chehade: So quickly on the RAA, we have - as you know, with the few people who have been discussing the RAA with ICANN in the registrar community. They had reached by end of December or so, an agreement on a number of points. Are you aware of the points that they reached agreement on? Do they - so I'm asking - did they communicate these agreements to you?

Woman: Eleven and a half.

Fadi Chehade: Eleven and a half (famous) points.

Woman: Yes.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, so we stopped there (Wendy). Why? We stopped at that point. So nothing has happened since then. We tried to meet them again in December and it was not possible. Just physically not possible over the holidays. So we actually have been working with them on finishing these talks and the date is now set. They're all coming here, to this room, on February 6. Which is next week actually, next week. So they'll be here next week.

And for the first time, I will be personally attending those negotiations all day. I've never attended these negotiations before. And I know you'd like to be a fly on the wall for these meetings, but I would like to tell you this. I plan to come to my registrars contacts on these discussions with a new perspective.

I plan to tell them that they need to raise the level of their responsibility to (unintelligible).

And I plan to have some things prepared for them that I think they will meet with resistance, is my guess. But I think if they reflect on it and they understand the inflection point we're all at. And the reputational opportunities that they have to fix the reputation of their industry and raise its value. I think they will probably move forward and embrace what we're talking about.

Woman: So I'm very curious, and I'm sure it's a longer discussion than we can engage right now. But what do you mean by responsibility to the industry?

Fadi Chehade: To the users. To all of us as people who use...

Man: The services right?

Woman: But let me just say what I fear is the responsibility becomes a bonafide word for censorship. Sometimes responsibility becomes a tyranny of the majority view. And we need to...

Fadi Chehade: No, it's much simpler than that. First of all it has nothing to do with that area. Let me just say to you, that from my perspective - for example - I won't be able to manage these contracts. These contracts are not highly manageable by ICANN. So I have to go and stand in front of a government official and get dressed down, because I'm not managing my contracted parties.

My contracts are very weak right now. I have no ability to tell someone when they're not doing what they're supposed to do. And they can stay on an old contract for the next ten years, until it expires. And I have no mechanism to tell them, look at this time you move on to a new model. To a new place. I'm going to be strengthening our hand, but without trying to be - I don't. Remember, I come from a background where I want it governed the least. I

grew up in places in the world where, you know, I wanted to see less government every day of my life.

And so I'm not looking for governing these people more. I'm looking for them to do the right thing. But I need to have the leaders to make sure they do them. I have no leaders right now. Nothing. This is not sustainable. I cannot be responsible to you, I cannot be responsible to the wider kind of community, I cannot be responsible to governments who are asking me to be responsible. And I have no leaders. So we need to fix that and that's starting to happen.

Now, I need your input as I get into this quote unquote tougher discussions. And if you're the one who - because I can't talk to all of you, I wish I could but I can't. If you're the one who, you know, wants to be talking to me and giving me some guidance then you better leave me your cell phone. Because I'll be calling you in the next few days. I won't share it.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you. Okay, if we could do one minute on the who is issue. And I'll ask (Cathy) if she can give a selection about that.

(Cathy): Easy to summarize.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: She's going to be mad at me, not you.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Yes, correct.

(Cathy): ...had to reduce (unintelligible) to one. It would be (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

(Cathy): Where we understand that it seems like everything might be up in the air. Protocols, the directory service providing the data itself. And if this is all up in the air, then we share concern from many of (unintelligible) who is on that working group. (Unintelligible). The way the task forces have been (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

(Cathy): Many people didn't because there is so much else going on (unintelligible) so many other issues, many people didn't comply. So it's just a concern that there is someone there or (multiple) people there who are experts in (unintelligible). Data protection and the free speech and free expression laws which a lot of privacy (unintelligible). Did not need them. Because that's where our concerns come from. (Unintelligible). Of who is talking about, you know, who's coming from minority groups to (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: So, who are they meeting with today? Who are you meeting with today on this subject?

Man: (Margie).

Fadi Chehade: On the who is?

Man: And with, I think, (Denise Michelle) as well. Yes.

Fadi Chehade: Is (Denise) coming?

Man: I think via teleconference.

Fadi Chehade: I see. Okay, two comments (Cathy). The first is, (Denise) will clarify that but we're not standing still on many of the Who Is recommendations. We are actually, especially in the area of managing director - which is compliance. Most of the recommendations that came out of the Who Is group, are being implemented already. Some of them are done. So we're - I'm moving very fast on some of the recommendations that need to be happening anyway.

And please ask (Denise) for that list. Tell her, of the recommendations, what is being implemented? What has been implemented? So we get the sense, as you should, that we're not just kind of throwing everything in the air saying, "We're going to put the new working group."

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: Well no, I met them a second time and now they do. So they are clear. The first time they felt that they didn't get exactly what we're going to do, what we're not going to do. So I met them a second time and I explained to them, "Look, these are the things we're going to do." And we have a list of that. But please ask (Denise) for that specifically. Today. Say, "We understand that you have a working group that is kind of looking at the bigger picture. And trying to address the bigger questions. The kind of bigger questions that I heard in (Dubois) about personal data. But now hopefully not just older working group that presents all these things."

But then we also have a whole bunch of things that we talked about that your team was spot on about. They were doing that. I'll tell you, one of the key things that Who Is team came up with was please make this a priority. Let's start with that. That was their number one recommendation. We don't feel it's a strategic priority like that. It's kind of there, kind of (unintelligible) about it.

So the first thing, to me, was well let's take this seriously guys. Let's solve this once and for all at that level. And make sure that we don't just sit and do nothing until that solution is designed.

Now that group is near finalized I understand. I haven't seen the list of who is on it. The only two people I know are on it are frankly two people that I felt it'd be important to have an independent view. Someone who is independent. Now I don't think we can have 20 independents, that would not be a solution.

But I needed a couple of independents, who are people who have - if I could be blunt about this - that have the heart in the right place. That can actually facilitate this with a clear eye, with a mature eye. And actually bring people together. And these two people, (unintelligible) who you met.

And I can share with you, I may not supposed to, but the second one is actually a Finnish gentleman who was between 2002 and 2006 the president of Nokia. Very, very well-known figure. If you look him up you will know who he is. But a superb individual, a very smart individual, who actually is known at Nokia for all the reasons you wouldn't want Nokia. When Nokia kind of changed plans and went in different directions. But he is the epitome of balanced, Finnish mentality. Very calm, very - and you know how Fins are about...

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: I'll talk to him later. But I have deep respect for the way they are. This is the only country in the world where the corporate culture is - the boss doesn't decide. There's no other country in the world like this. I went to meetings where the top guy was saying, "Give this guy the business." And the lowest level person, who is actually not convinced, and they can't move. This is a \$30 billion country, imagine this happens at IBM.

So this is a culture that I respect. That's why I wanted this person on the list, because it's a culture that understands that consensus (building) is how they make the best decisions. Not just in Finnish culture, but Nokia culture. Not recently, Nokia culture before - frankly - Microsoft took over. Then Nokia was really run still by (disseminaries) that built a great entity for a lot of people.

Now, around them there is going to be a lot of experts. You are correctly concerned, is there someone around the stable who understands, as we might have, you know, the view from the privacy standpoint. The view from the user standpoint. The views, frankly (Cathy), you write so eloquently about. So the answer to that is, I don't know. Because I haven't seen the list. I'm supposed to be the first one to see it. So I'm about to get it. And I want to give you the assurance that if it is not balanced, I will not vote for it. And if I'm unsure, I know your cellphone. I will call you.

((Crosstalk))

(Cathy): And, of course, data protection. Which is new to the...

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

(Cathy): (Unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: And the speech writers. Of all the minorities and all the people that needs to be respected. Absolutely. And (Jean Francois) gets that. You see, the reason I told him that's all I want you to do for now (JF), is because he gets that. He's one of the most high integrity, high sensitivity people I've ever met. He really, fully understands the delicate balance he needs to find and build consensus around. And if you're not certain about that, I urge you to meet him. In a transparent way, and talk to him about your concerns. I would urge you to do that and I'll happily facilitate that.

And you, I think, come out of meeting with him as an individual feeling fantastic about the kind of person that will finally, hopefully lead us to a better understanding of how to do Who Is. And, of course, he's also North American. So at least he brings, he's going to understand your point of views that I saw in (Dubois) when (Vivian Redding) was speaking. It is a remarkably different (unintelligible), remarkably.

I mean (Vivian), it's like she was from Mars and he was from another planet. The way she was speaking about how - and by the way I have some bit of good news for you. During that personal data discussion, we would all appreciate that, there was a point where the business guys were getting very anxious. Because (Vivian) was very tough. Saying, "For us in Europe," she said, and she pounded her fist, "it's a matter of law." It is not a matter of guidance. (John Lebowitz) was speaking about guidance. "It's a law", she said.

And then the business guys, again this is an open forum right? They were all saying, "Well what do we do if the European's basically set the bar so high. What do we do as a global business people?" And one very senior CEO from a big company said, "Then Europe will be the standard." And many people took that as blasphemy. "What do you mean Europe will be the standard? Europe's standard is too high." And he said, "Well what options do we have?"

If Europe sets the standard this high, and Europe is the largest economy on the planet now. If you add up all the countries in Europe, we have no choice. This is now the new standard. It was very interesting. I don't know if they'll do that but I thought (unintelligible).

Okay, I took more time than I wanted. And you have one more subject.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, so we'll do it in one minute.



((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: I think the only way you can do it in a minute is if I don't speak. Because you've been doing it in a minute.

Woman: I'm going to add Maria to lead us off on this.

Maria Farrell: So on the (unintelligible), well actually I should probably...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Okay, I'm sorry I had my notes. Well does anyone else want to (raise) this issue or shall I? Okay, so did we have issues about the concern about the process and (unintelligible). We're concerned about a lot of the objections that we're seeing from governments on sensitive issues. And we're concerned about the free speech implications about that. We also, as you know, we're concerned about the (strong) man proposal and we wanted to ask how is staff going to handle the comments about that proposal? That was really just the two points I wanted to raise on new GTLDs.

Fadi Chehade: Sorry, on the second one I did blank out for a minute. But on the second point you made, on the (strong) man proposal comments, I will tell you this is the first time - and hopefully the last time - that I will be actually reading through these one by one. I want to be very involved in this.

Because it was my learning (ground) and I learned what works and what doesn't work in this community. So I want to be personally very involved in reading these comments and understanding them. And once I do, and I absorb them, and I understand what they are. Needless to say we'll do the normal thing of recording all the comments, making sure everybody understands everything. But I will also be very involved in where do we go from that point on.

I don't know if you consider that a good thing or a bad thing. But at least I'll take this particular process, which I (shuttered) it as one I need to finish. And finish well. So I may be, just as I did during the process, calling on many of you in this room, as I did to get your insight and your help. So that we do the right thing.

But I'm going to be extra (judicious) on that particular process. Because it is a critical one and it's one that effects - it sets the tone also. You know about it. So I need to understand, also, how to deal with it in light of the process concerns that I have. But you had a part A also.

Woman:

Yes, the other concern that we wanted to raise were a lot of the objections that are being filed in the new GTLD program by governments or by competing businesses. But we're concerned about the opportunity for censorship. That these objections, you know, if the board says, "Oh, well geez Saudi Arabia objected to (Todd Bebe) I guess we better not go there." (Unintelligible) sort of censorship of domain names. So we wanted to just raise this point.

We don't see this as being a point that gets discussed very often in ICANN or these free speech rights with respect to these new GTLDs. And we also wanted to point out that when the GNSO recommendations went through the GNSO and were originally passed and approved by the board. We did have, I think it was principal F, or maybe Principal G. Which was that the free speech rights of individuals would be protected in the process.

And maybe you don't know this, because it's kind of been forgotten but it actually is in the GNSO's recommendations. This principal that freedom of expression rights individuals would be protected in this process. So we just wanted to flag that issue.

Bill? Did you have something?

Bill Drake: We're trying to rush to conclusion but in 30 seconds I've requested the (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: 30 seconds, please.

Fadi Chehade: Please, and you could always write me Bill. But please go ahead.

Bill Drake: It would be really great if you, and not that you don't have enough to do. But if you could get to the point where you're familiar enough with our stances and positions we've taken. That you could actually - and when you're (unintelligible) someplace else and people ask you, "what (unintelligible) advance?" Or why (unintelligible). You could actually - and accurately say, "Here's the position that they've taken on (vertical) integration, or Who Is, or whatever else. And here's how it has or hasn't impacted the policy."

In other words, if we could get to the point where you understood where we were coming from or where we've tried to contribute. And we of course have to help you with that. That would be really good business. Sometimes we get the feeling a little bit that (unintelligible) and it's hard to calculate whether or not it's resonating with everybody (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...quickly ask for (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Can you prepare for me something like a one page cheat sheet on your position on the four, five, six things I'm working on? Just a cheat sheet that makes sense to everybody on the Who Is issue, just like (Cathy) just did. Please, our community wants you to make sure that these four, five things are considered. (On) this issue, when you sit down with the RAA guys, please

pay attention to these four, five things. They could slip your mind but we want you to pay attention to them.

But just like if you've done cheat sheets when you were in college, make it concise. You know, less words just key points is what I need. That I can literally put into my little booklet here and then when I'm going to a meeting and I'm not sure how these guys can be thinking about this, I could take it out. Could you help me with that?

I'm sorry to bug you with this but it would be very helpful to me. And I promise not to show it to anybody in case you want to put things in there that are just in my mind, rather than quote unquote published. I don't do that. Just give it to me and call it, you know, a (Friday) cheat sheet. From his good friend here.

Man: And then my second point would be, in terms of building strong multi-stakeholders.

Fadi Chehade: Yes?

Man: Good governance within the organization. Standard of norms that are applied throughout the community. (Unintelligible) as well. When it comes to things like the openness of (unintelligible) or the transparency of our operations, etc. I think there should be certain standards across the board.

I can tell you that in the other room I logged onto their Adobe Chat, and people were saying on the chat, "Hey, this is a closed meeting." There seemed to be people who are not from CSG on the Adobe. Now my understanding is that we are not here having a series of closed meetings, and in fact everything is to be transcribed and recorded. But there is just a different culture in different parts of ICANN community.

We do everything open, online, everything can see all our works. Every fight we ever had amongst us. Every nasty exchange, it's all publicized. And then

we're partnering with colleagues from other stakeholder groups going off in closed rooms saying, "Nobody should be on our chat. Nobody can hear what we're saying. We don't put anything on the web." This makes it very difficult to (deal) with those stakeholders.

If you want to have a strong, vibrant multi-stakeholder process here, you have to have consistency of standards across the board. And anything we do to start to encourage that and explore that issue, we'd be happy. I know we did a little comparative assessment of how the different stakeholders do or don't approach this transparency (question). And we were kind of shocked. (Unintelligible).

Man: I would like to see your guy's results.

Man: Yes. And I think that (unintelligible). We're all in this together and we're all in the pickle. (Unintelligible) in order to have good communication (unintelligible).

Man: This makes the difference (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Okay, I have an idea. Will you forgive me if I blurt out an idea. I would like to maybe hire someone from Transparency International to establish a benchmark for us. That actually looks at how we even individually, as various groups within ICANN staff, (board), community. How transparent are we on some kind of a benchmark? And then compare that to quote unquote other organizations. So that we can have a benchmark that we can track.

Are we getting more transparent? Are we getting less transparent? Who is less transparent and who is more transparent? Because I am a great believer in this and you saw me make some decisions that you may have not completely appreciated about people who were doing things that were not transparent at ICANN. And I walked people out of the door and said, "You don't come back here." Because to me, this is critical.

You're right (Wolfgang), this is what separates us. Just as much as you separate us from many organizations on the planet. But our transparency is our legitimacy. If it goes away, I mean, what is left. And when we go and tell - I met with, when I was at the ITU at (Twickett) I met with 16, 17 governments on that Tuesday. It was a grueling marathon of meetings and half of them didn't know who ICANN is and the other half are saying, "We want to get engaged in this ICANN thing because it's a multi-stakeholder, open, transparent organization.

You know, our emperor has to have clothes. We have to show that it has clothes. So I took note of that. Again, I said an idea, it doesn't mean I'm going to do it immediately. I need to prioritize it with the 509 projects we have. But I'm interested in this and I like it. And I think it might, in a positive way, promote our transparency within us and to the world.

Man: May I only ask that again, if you're going to bring an outside expert. That this be real consultation for the community. So they're not just doing outside analysis...

Fadi Chehade: No, no, no.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: And the folks at transparency are qualified in that area and they also are recognized. Which means they actually say we are that transparent or we're not that transparent, people will believe them. And it will reflect on our reputation I guess. But certainly they are not going to do this in a vacuum. They will come, they will sit with you. And I if I do engage them, which I haven't committed yet. I will think about it. If I do engage them here's the promise I'll make. You'll be the first group they'll meet. Okay?

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...and we do expect (unintelligible). I don't believe you can say we are the (norm). So we will benefit first.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Man: We will benefit first and...

Woman: Check.

Fadi Chehade: But you have the most commitment to that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: We are delighted...

Woman: If we could bring this meeting to a close right now, thank you. And (unintelligible) I thank you so much for inviting us and for engaging with us, listening to us, and staying after the time. I really do appreciate...

Fadi Chehade: Great pleasure, great pleasure.

Robin Gross: ...a treat for us to get a chance to directly give you our views on these things. Very important, so thank you very much.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you Robin.

END