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Operator: This is the operator. The recording is on.

David Olive: Thank you very much. This is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support. I want to thank members of the GNSO stakeholder and contingency group leaders and some of their executive members for being on this call today. We have a limited period of time – 45 minutes to discuss the topic of the Montevideo statement and other developments. We have here – I will just briefly serve as moderator for this – we will have on the call, obviously, Michele Neylon, and Elisa Cooper, Bill Drake, Jonathan Robinson, Robin Gross, Tony Holmes, Keith Drazek, Marie-Laure Lemineur, and some other of the executives, Claudio, Chris, Volker are also with us in listening mode.

With that, we would like to, again, thank you for being here and I would turn it over to Fadi for a few remarks and then we'll open it for questions and answers from the GNSO stakeholder and constituency leaders. Fadi, I'd like to turn it over to you now, if I could.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, this is Fadi. Again, I apologize for some background noise but I am at an airport, so please bear with me. Can you hear me all right, at least, despite the background noise?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

David Olive: Yes, we can.

Fadi Chehade: Okay. Very well, very well. Well thank you, thank you all for making the time. I know this is always intruding on a million things on your plate, but I understood that many of you had asked for a little time together, so we can absorb some of the recent events that have occurred, both emanating from the Montevideo statement, but then beyond that into some of the repercussions and follow-ups after that statement.

Let me just start by saying many of you have been walking this journey with me over the last few weeks. I know I've seen Bill and Robin and others in Bali and in other places I know I've bumped into many of you – Jonathan and I were together in Munich a few days ago and so I'm certain that most of you have pieces of this put together as the events have been quite fast in coming. But let me at least just step back and make sure we're in sync at two levels.

There are two (inaudible) stories going on here. At one level, we have the discussion about ICANN itself and how ICANN needs to become a more global organization and that involves, really, to parts. One part has to do with the (inaudible) and one part has to do with ICANN itself and its global, legal posture, as well as its relationship with the community through (inaudible).

And this is a track on its own that needs to be – it needs to revolve calmly. We have absolutely no pressure and rush to do that in any way that would jeopardize the core stability of what we're doing, and this is an activity that needs to happen very much within our community. We should do it with full disclosure; with full review; with full commitment that as I can evolves into a more global organization, it does so in alignment with the community and how the community would like to see that happen.

So that's one side. The other side, which is the more critical side, today, because it's the side that develops a lot of speed and a lot of momentum is the discussion about, with the global Internet governance space and I think that space, which has been brewing for a while, has come to a head recently because we realize that it's been almost a year since the (inaudible) and there haven't been truly any progress in addressing the many questions, the middle countries we're asking back in Dubai. And by the middle countries, as you know, we very clearly understood that whilst there are extreme views from some countries and communities about how Internet governance should work, the great majority of countries and communities are in the middle and they're searching for a solution without an ideological agenda, necessarily.

And these folks in the middle of the middle, you'd find countries like South Korea; countries like India, like Brazil, like Argentina – they're looking for a solution to the broader Internet governance issues. Now, you might say, "What is our job with that? Why should we be concerned with this as ICANN? And this is an important question because we'd like to stick to our knitting, to be frank, and we'd like to do what we're supposed to do well.

But the reality is if we do not solve or at least join others in the broader Internet ecosystem in solving the issues here, I think that the pressure will mount on ICANN and we will find ourselves increasingly in a place where we can no longer just sit back and either keep to our knitting, because were getting pressure to expand what we do, if we don't want to do it; or there will be people who will then create solutions outside of our multi-stakeholder model that would truly start intruding on what we do and requiring that some of what we do move into that space.

And so these are the reasons we need to move and when we look at the situation since the wicket, it became extremely clear that there are no solutions that are within the multi-stakeholder model; that most solutions are truly, in my opinion, pushing towards multilateral model which also translates into governmental and without any solutions outside of our (inaudible) that are anchored in the multi-stakeholder way. We were getting, frankly, quite worried that the push will be towards multilateral model.

This became true when we heard the head of the ministry and South Korea that will be also the chair of the 21st century for the ITU, Minister Yeun, say that, in front of me in Seoul about a month ago, month-and-a-half ago, when he said, "We're going to move all cyber security aspects of Internet governance to the ITU," and again, this is South Korea, I emphasize not North Korea. This is the government that will be heading the 21st century. And then, we of course saw the position of the US government in a recent regional meeting, preparing an agenda for the WTDC and the US government, again, aligned itself with all South American governments in recommending the Brazilian proposal to move a lot of Internet governance training to the ITU.

We started seeing signs that frankly made us quite worried that the push towards a multilateral solution and again, we have no alternative to that model and it is as a result of that that the ISAR leaders in Montevideo issues this statement to call to action all members of our community to look at an alternative solution that would move things more into the multi-stakeholder realm. Subsequently, I had a meeting with the President of Brazil, which was very seminal and very important because she, after some discussion, came to the conclusion with us that a multilateral model would not be the right model to address broader Internet governance issues and she then called for a multi-stakeholder focused solution and now, we're working with her along with a coalition of Internet organizations, not just ICANN obviously, to actually shape that conference as a true multi-stakeholder conference.

So this – just to give you a little bit of background on what led us to here and what happened, really, in the span of the last ten weeks – and I'll stop and just make sure we make this more of a dialogue, because I'm sure many of you have heard different pieces all over the place and may be some clarifications are necessary. I'm here to do that so we can hopefully arrive, all of us, to Buenos Aires with at least a common understanding of what were the motivations, what are the actions, and what are the facts.

David, may I give it back to you for moderate?

David Olive: Yes, thank you very much, Fadi. I would now like to open it up for questions from the GNSO stakeholder and constituency leaders. What people like to just raise their hand? Elisa Cooper, why don't you start? You're first, there. Bill Drake would be next.

Elisa Cooper: So the reason for this call was frankly, when we saw the Montevideo statement, we were very surprised by it and so many of the business constituency members wanted to know why the community hadn't been consulted before ICANN had signed on to the Montevideo statement. We're also wondering about whether or not the board was aware of this, so I think a little bit of information, whatever you can share with us about why the community wasn't really, in any way, informed or involved and why this couldn't wait until at least after the Buenos Aires meeting.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, let's separate the questions into substance and process. First of all, on substance, Elisa, is the business constituency has an issue with the substance, then I'll come back to talk because you have a point on that.

Elisa Cooper: I don't know if we strongly know yet, what this all means. That was another reason for the call.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, so there are questions, and other words, about what was involved in this statement as well?

Elisa Cooper: I think we have –

Fadi Chehade: Well –

Elisa Cooper: - we have more questions around how did we get to this? Why did this happen? I understand what you're saying about why it happened. You were feeling this pressure and I understand that and I think the business constituency members would understand that. I think we would be interested in hearing about, you know, will the community be involved in future positions by ICANN? Why weren't we involved or at least informed or – I don't know. It all seems to come at us as a surprise.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, no, fair enough. So your focus is more on process, because frankly, we have not had anyone look at the statement with a very simple bullets and say, you know, "This is out of the blue? How could you say this? We didn't agree to it." And I'm not hearing this from you. I think you're correctly asking, "This happened quickly; where do we go from here and why weren't we involved in the process?"

And I'll answer this honestly Elisa, and with all due respect. Look, there is – if the statement had included any announcements or positions that were not existing positions or understood positions, or if we had ventured into some new ground where would have committed the ICANN and ICANN community to new principles, then frankly, I would not have signed to it. The statement, from our perspective, was very much a putting down in writing what we have intended and said all along a million times including ICANN's globalization, so there is nothing new to it.

What was significant about it is that this was the first time the (inaudible) agreed on a joint statement. I think this is the bit of news that, to me, is (inaudible) is that in general, the (inaudible) always chose to do things very independently, to not appear as if we are a group of sorts, but this was the first time sitting together for two days talking about the issues were all facing where – it wasn't me. I mean it was someone in the team who said, "Why don't we just put out a statement for once so we look like we're a united community on these points." So that's kind of how it happened to descend rather quickly.

Now, what's happening now past that statement is that there is movement. In other words, people are saying, "You know, you're right. We need to do something. We should maybe push for a multi-stakeholder conference. Maybe we should push for a bottom-up campaign. Maybe we should push for the panel that you built (inaudible) to actually give us some answers," and if that's the case, then the community needs to be involved because now we're moving into action and activity and, frankly, time and resources and this is clearly too important and too seminal for ICANN staff to do it on its own. And hence, where moving into full gear and, you know, we did it intentionally in Bali because that was, frankly, the first time when a lot of our community was there and I spent time with staff, with our community members there. I'm doing these calls like this one with as many community members as I can; so is my staff, all over the world.

And yes, we are making sure everyone participates in the decision-making. We're building community steering groups to manage any activities that we might engage in and evaluate them and test them. So yes, at this point, this is not only beyond the leadership team and into the community, it's also beyond ICANN. In other words, we have ISOC involved, we have the RARs involved. We have the ccTLDs now involved. We have the business community involved. We have multiple members of the civil society groups have members to work with us, so it's now a broader grouping of people trying to address these matters.

And the last part of your question with our board, yes. Before I went to Montevideo, I did meet with my board and I shared with them the purpose of the meeting and why we're meeting. I shared with them that I feel that there are growing concerns post the (inaudible) that we have yet to build common positions on. And I told them that I would like to go to the meeting in Montevideo and see if we can form common opinions and kind of more of a coalition around the common principles – and the board was very supportive and authorized me to move forward with that kind of (inaudible). I hope this is helpful, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, I guess one point of clarification. I think for the most part, you're right. There's not anything in particular within the statement that was particularly surprising. I would say with the exception of the call for globalization for the IANA function. I think we – I will speak for myself. I was surprised and I'm concerned about that but I'm going to let some others ask some questions.

Fadi Chehade: No, but just to say something about that – that's an important point you bring up. The call to globalize IANA function has been recorded for the last few years. In fact, I had my team build up an entire list – and I'm happy to share it – of all the people over the last few years from all over the community who have called for that. And to be clear, the globalization of the IANA function is contemplated in the current contract we have with Department of Commerce, so this is not a surprise. It's exactly what the Department of Commerce expected us to do at some point. It's what the community has been calling for. We compiled the list of all the public comments we received when we were doing the new contract with DOC, tens of comments calling for that function to be globalized.

ISOC has made that point clear to the US government on multiple times and we've compiled these. The RARs did the same. The IAB, the IETS met with the US government in June and asked for these functions to be globalized. So this is on the record as where everybody's heading. I think what's new, and here I agree with you, is that the CEO of ICANN or the president of ICANN has never kind of said it. It was never said, "This is where we need to go now." We've kind of let the community speak in the past and (inaudible) dealt with it as a contractual matter and we didn't (inaudible) but I think it was clear that it was time to start talking about it, not to do it necessarily, the NTIA or the Department of Commerce has not agreed to change anything. This is just us making statements that has been said many, many times, but now I'm making it. That's what's new, I agree. I hope this is helpful a little bit.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. I have other questions but I see Kristina and Bill Drake are in the queue, so I'd like them to ask some questions.

David Olive: Thanks very much, Elisa. Bill Drake, you're next and then Kristina.

Bill Drake: Okay, I'll be relatively brief, although I don't think the answers can be terribly brief but since I been in Bali and talked with Fadi and others a lot about this, I don't have all the questions that some of the others will have. Fadi, I just wanted to raise two concerns: one is that – and you know this but I want to hear you speak to it – the way you've been describing the events and the way the Brazilians keep talking about it still keeps seeming to diverge. I don't know if you've seen the transcript or the video or were there for all the various comments and statements that the Brazilians made in the formal sessions or for any of the various off-line consultations they had with others besides just ICANN leadership, but they keep talking summits, taking decisions, a meeting that will announce changes, things like that and that sounds kind of inconsistent with the way you've tried to kind of mollify people and say, "Well, it's a meeting. It's a part of an ongoing process it's blah, blah, blah," so I'm just wondering about, you know, how much you feel you're really on the same page with them in terms of how they're going to represent this event to other governments, for example, when they start to coordinate and seek participation.

And then the second point I wanted to ask, real quickly, when you described what Dilma (ph) told you she wanted in terms of deliverables, you said principles, institutional framework, and decision-making procedures, and he explained that as meaning some kind of framework of general principles for Internet governance, which has been discussed in many places for a long time, some sort of institutional framework pertaining, I understood, to ICANN or to the US government roles with globalization, and some sort of decision-making procedures for orphaned issues and things that are outside the ICANN (inaudible). And I've heard that described differently also by the Brazilians, so I'm just wondering if those two points, you could kind of like nail down for me what your understanding of them is.

Fadi Chehade: Certainly.

Bill Drake: Because there's so much crosstalk now.

Fadi Chehade: Certainly, certainly. So first of all, thank you, Bill, thank you very much. These are important questions you asked and ones that I'm indeed finding there is confusion about. Let me just first say that the Brazilian government and CGI have agreed with the coalition, which is not just ICANN, with us, ISOC and all the others, that they want us to work with them towards framing exactly what the conference is about, what it will do, what it – between you and me – what it will not do, and that work will start Monday. So we are meeting with them first Monday to just kind of agree on the process and then, for the next two weeks starting Monday, we will work with the community and with them to answer these questions in a very clear way. And then we told them that they should announce this joint agreement very clearly with the conference base, place, purpose, who will be invited, what the conference will produce, what kind of conference it will be, before the Buenos Aires meeting.

That's a lot to do, but they've agreed to it and the planned announcement date is either November 13th or 14th. And this is to, frankly, address a lot of the inconsistencies that frankly even are within their own team, because this – I must be candid – happened too fast. Even their team wasn't ready when Dilma said, "Yep, let's do a conference." There is a little bit of catch-up they're all doing to put the pieces together.

So for example, some people are saying, "Oh, this will be all about surveillance." It won't be. And I already told them that if we even come close to the surveillance issue, we will pull out immediately, all of us. This is not about surveillance. This is not a conference that should come out with proposals to solve any particular problems. This is a conference that should focus on high-level principles and, as you said, these have been floating a lot of us, a lot of you have done a lot of work on this that's just putting things together for that, and should focus on an institutional framework.

They have already told us they won't get to the third piece, which is the decision model, so it will be just these two things – a set of principles and an institutional framework. It's the institutional framework that is worrying many people, because we want to make sure we don't end up with some new big organization that will very quickly get corrupted as much as any big organization can, so I think the framework for what will happen will be decided shortly and it will be decided with a set of stakeholders that we are pulling together from business, civil society, the technical organizations, CGI and Brazil, the Brazilian government, and the co-governments, the co-host governments that they're inviting. We don't know who they're inviting but we have begged them to invite other governments because we didn't want this to be about Brazil or to be about ICANN. We wanted it to be about a global group of middle countries and a coalition of multi-stakeholder players.

So I think this is going very well and we should keep in mind at a very high level that what we achieved here is we achieved, we created the possibility of an alternative to the multilateral model, which did not exist before Dilma agreed to do this. This is what just happened. Now, of course, we have to shape it and the good news is that they're agreeing to involve our whole community in shaping what this conference will be about.

And you mentioned summit. Indeed, when I was with her, she used the word summit and conference interchangeably, but what she did agree with me on, for sure, is that this cannot be a conference of government officials or of heads of state. This has to be a multi-stakeholder conference – business, civil society, technical organizations, and government. Now because she's inviting host countries, co-host countries, there was some discussion that I heard from her staff saying should the meeting start with her having a pre-meeting with senior people from, for example, if (inaudible) came or some other major world leader came, should she have a chat with them and then the conference itself would follow. I don't know where that is, to be honest. I'm not in favor of it, but it's not my decision, but I did tell them that I'd prefer quite the opposite and I told her that when I met her, that I would prefer that if anything, this meeting should start with a meeting of heads of state, but it should start with us opening the floor to hear from users around the world through virtual screens that can participate and share their opinions and views that all of us can hear – and she liked that idea when I shared it with her.

But again, a lot of that is being shaped as we speak and again, it's not just ICANN, it's a group of us working with them. Does that help a bit, Bill, to clarify some things?

Bill Drake: It does but I don't mean to belabor it, but can you just clarify then, if part three fell away, the decisions, what you were calling decision-making procedures and we're focusing on part two, institutional frameworks, is that piece about the US government role?

Fadi Chehade: No.

Bill Drake: Or something else?

Fadi Chehade: No, not at all. We actually even told them that it cannot be about that. They said then could the conference even make a statement similar to the statement that was made from Montevideo on the globalization of ICANN. I said, "Yeah, that's fine. You can make a statement. I mean, I can't stop the conference from doing that, given that I've made the statement and our fellow ISAW organizations made the statement," but no, the institutional framework has nothing to do with ICANN. The institutional framework is the mechanism by which we can create a multi-stakeholder approach on a national and global level for addressing Internet governance topics. So how does either a country or a country within an international system pick a topic and find a solution for it? [Sneezes] Excuse me. So that's basically the points that it's hard to describe and do on the phone but if you wish, maybe we could frankly have a session with a few of us to think through this together when we are in Buenos Aires, but as you know, ICANN has a fifth panel that I have not had a chance to fully put together and announce yet. And that panel, if you remember, there were four that were announced, the fifth one is called the Internet Governance Panel.

That panel, I will probably wrap up now that I'm back and hopefully announce next week. And part of that panel's work will be to, in fact, producing blueprints of institutional frameworks. Now the Brazil conference will take input from anyone, but I panel could be one of many pieces of input and this is where I hope our community and all of us, especially you, Bill, with your background, we could be influencing the models that we're comfortable with for the overall Internet governance (inaudible).

David Olive: Hi, this is David. Keith Drazek says, "How does this new structure differ from what exists today at the IGF?" And then I'll get back to Kristina next.

Fadi Chehade: The IGF will continue to serve its role as a convening body that brings people together to discuss emerging issues and to learn from each other and I don't think this will go away. This will always be here. The intent and, in my opinion, it will be very much part of that institutional framework that should be drawn. It won't be outside of it. It will be part of it. But I think there are some mechanisms that are missing that are not in the IGF today, mechanisms that would enable stakeholders to actually address, find agreement on how to address a particular topic. And again, this is complex to do on the phone, but we can do it in person when were together. This is the idea there.

Now, could these mechanisms be embedded into the IGF process and enhanced so we have kind of an IGF plus? Maybe. That would be part of what we would need to be discussing in the months ahead and develop it. Some folks are extremely nervous about enabling anything within a UN process because the UN, as Johannes Kirkland (ph) was telling me the other day, you can go up or down anyway, but the UN is, at the end of the day, an intergovernmental body. That's how it functions, that's how it thinks; and, in the UN model, multi-stakeholders, they are simply to inform. It is not there to decide anything. The multiple stakeholders can talk all day and share all their ideas all day, but at the end of the day, it's governments that make the call. That's the UN model.

So do we want to enhance the IGF to be the place where any decisions are made and a multi-stakeholder way, if that's feasible, then maybe that will be the outcome. Again, it's not for me or anyone of us to decide. This is exactly the kind of dialogue that we're starting. Is this helpful, Keith?

David Olive: Yes, thank you, Fadi.

Fadi Chehade: Sure.

David Olive: Kristina, I know you've been waiting. You're next, please.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, thank you. First, Fadi, thank you very much for taking the time to speak with us about this issue. Elisa and Bill have actually asked many of the questions that I had and the information that you shared in response to those questions has been extremely helpful.

I did actually, though, want to circle back, if we could, to the statement and drill down a little. What has struck me the more I read it is that it is very clearly limited to being the, from buy-in on behalf of the leaders of the organization and not necessarily the organizations themselves. So just circling back to the comment that you made about how you had talked with the board and that you wanted to be able to form common statements around common principles – the questions I have are these.

First, was the board aware that it was these principles around which you wanted to form the common statements; and second, is there an intention, or has that actually happened already, that the board has ratified the statement as a formal kind of resolution shall we say, of the board, as opposed to – at this point it's phrased in such a way that it could be characterized as a statement that you've made. You are CEO but not necessarily on behalf of the organization.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: So just having a little bit of clarity about the ratification and current status of the statement with regard to ICANN organization would be helpful.

Fadi Chehade: Sure. There was no particular statement or set of points that the board had when they set me off to go meet with the other leaders. It was more that the board understood the broad problem and that is beyond ICANN, as well as the issue of globalizing ICANN and they said, "We understand. We appreciate that these have been on the plate of ICANN and it's part of our normal effort. So if you can work with other leaders to start building kind efforts, so it's not ICANN, so ICANN is not leading, to address these issues, then yeah, go give it a shot and once you go there and you put together something, if this requires them that they go beyond that and do other things, please come back to us. Please come back and talk to the board."

As to ratification, I must tell you I have not thought about that, but I really like the idea. I didn't think of it, to be honest, but I like the idea of the board ratifying it. But I – and I'm thinking aloud, now, Kristina, I'm just thinking – maybe there is even a better way. Maybe if we can get our community to somehow ratify, because it's a statement of purpose, right? It's not a statement that is prescribing a solution. It's simply saying, kind of, "We believe in these things." So let me – if you have ideas, drop them to me but you definitely got me thinking that there may be a way for us to have our community look at the statement and either embrace it or in some way ratify it. Maybe the board, but more appealing to me would be if we can get the community do that somehow in Buenos Aires. I like that.

Do you have any specific ideas on that, Kristina, that you could share now or got me a line about?

Kristina Rosette: My, initially, my initial reaction is that I would doubt, quite frankly, that the ITC would, given how close we are to Buenos Aires, be in a position to participate in any kind of ratification at that meeting.

Fadi Chehade: Because of time, you mean, not so much because of what it is?

Kristina Rosette: Well, no, not necessarily. I think, as Elisa indicated, there are certainly some phrases in there that are susceptible to numerous meanings. It's my understanding, in fact, that some of the organizations whose leaders signed the statement actually view some of the statements to have different meanings and how ICANN (inaudible) them. So I think it's not as easy as it sounds, let's put it that way.

Fadi Chehade: [Laughs] okay. Fair enough, and I appreciate that. I appreciate that. Look, I mean, I think interpreting a document like this could chew up more time than we need because what we really need to do is to address the real fact, as well as the real opportunity we have, to shape how multi-stakeholder approaches continue to work on a broader level and that's the opportunity. That's the opportunity that when we looked at next year's calendar with both the WTDC in April, a purely multilateral approach or the 21st century in October, again a peer multilateral approach, we saw no momentum on the multi-stakeholder front. And if you really think about it, we were heading into a year where it's all multilateral and even the IGF 2014 was not secured. There is nobody backing and it's very unusual that we are a year away and we couldn't even announce who will be there.

So we worked, also, very hard in the background, to get Turkey and Brazil to back it and 2014 and 2015. This didn't happen on its own. So at least we put an anchor in 2014 now and it will be the first week of September for multi-stakeholder event, the IGF in Istanbul, and then we worked with the middle country, Brazil, to try and create another event before that that would at least make sure our agenda for multi-stakeholders is upheld and let's work very hard to make that the case, because of course it could go sideways. There's a risk that we have an opportunity to shape it and Brazil has been open to that. We'll go do our best to shape it.

David Olive: Thank you. I just like to know if we have a few more minutes. We're a little bit approaching our time frame. Fadi do you have a few more minutes, because we have two or three other (inaudible) speakers.

Fadi Chehade: I do. My flight is in about 45 minutes, so I'm okay for another 15 minutes or so.

David Olive: Okay, fine. Next would be, let's see Keith and then Tony Holmes, Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you, David. Thank you, Fadi.

Unidentified Participant: Can you put me in the queue as well, please, David?

David Olive: And that is?

Unidentified Participant: That was Michele.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele.

David Olive: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, I don't have a computer in front of me.

David Olive: Yes, Michele. I'll put you on the queue. Thank you. Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks David. Thanks Fadi. Appreciate the opportunity to chat with you on this today. Before I start with a comment and a question, yeah, it's important for me to note that the registry stakeholder group does not have a formal or agreed to position on the Montevideo statement. You know recent developments in the Internet governance arena, frankly, we just have not had the time. Things have been moving quickly, as you noted with everything where preparing for with new GTLDs and getting ready for Buenos Aires.

We simply just have not had a chance to get our heads together and determine whether we have a formal position. So I want to make that clear before I start. I think I'd like to echo the concerns that Elisa and I think a few others have raised about so that the process and a little bit of, I personally and in conversations with colleagues in the registries group, are fairly concerned that as the CEO of ICANN, you've been making very public announcements or proclamations on the international stage with, in our view, without consulting or at least at a minimum informing the community about what's coming. So to Elisa's point, I think there's an element of surprise in a lot of the discussion points and a lot of the communication that's been coming from ICANN and ICANN's leadership in recent weeks.

So again, just to reiterate, I would strongly encourage you to come back to the community and to engage with the community on these critical issues. I think, generally speaking, I think there's a recognition in the community that Internet governance continues to be an extremely important component of what we do, but ICANN is just an organization that has a very narrow remit and mandate and as you communicate and engage with leaders on the world stage, whether it's national leaders or management, representatives of the other ISTARS, I think it's critical that you have the benefit of the input from your community, from the ICANN community.

And to that point, my question – you know you mentioned earlier about how important it is for ICANN to keep to our knitting and I applaud that, and you mentioned that you're getting pressure, that we are getting pressure to expand what we do, and I'm a little bit curious as to what pressure that is and who is pressuring us to expand what we do and I'll stop there, thanks.

Fadi Chehade: These are largely governments that like ICANN and like what ICANN has done who have approached me, some formally, some informally. The last specific was the Minister of Telecommunications in Turkey, asking why don't we start taking on all the other topics that are left unattended in order not to arrive to the wicket with – and so you have to walk people again through why and why not, but the position that the community has made very clear to me and I am, and it is exactly where we need to be and I believe is where we need to be is that we should stick to our agreement and that if other issues need to be addressed, then the broader Internet ecosystem should find ways to address them. My hope is in a (inaudible).

So that's the part where we're vocal, you know, that we cannot address these issues in a multilateral way. It doesn't solve the issue. Because if people start solving all Internet issues or bigger Internet issues and a multilateral way, this will also come back and put pressure on us and so this is largely a set of activities precisely so that we stick to our knitting and we make sure that we don't get further pressure either to extend what we do or to have what we do go to a multilateral form and I think there is a definite weakening of the US Government in its global position in Internet governance – and this is not Fadi saying that, this is the US Government telling me that, and we saw in Bali as well.

There is a definite – the positions that were largely catalyzed by the (inaudible) of our US Government in international fora do not have a strong catalyzer right now and our US government has even come to the conclusion that they're not sure that there is another government that can actually catalyze these the communities around a multi-stakeholder way. And so we're doing our part, along with the rest of the leaders, to just make sure that we keep the world focused on the multi-stakeholder solution.

Unidentified Participant: (Crosstalk).

Fadi Chehade: Very fast piece, so I must agree with you that more engagement with our community, so that they understand what I'm sharing with you and ICANN listen also and understand what their concerns are is needed, and God knows I'm putting all the time I can and my team is, and we'll do more and more and more, as much as we can to make sure everyone listens and everyone is involved and everyone participates in how we head that, but this is an ongoing process and it takes time. But the events in the world are moving quite fast right now and that's not because of us, as you know. There are things making it (inaudible).

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Fadi. Just a very brief follow up. I know there's a couple in the queue. I would encourage you to possibly draft, whether it's a blog or a paper or something that really lays out your vision and the vision of the people that you've been consulting with and working with for the community, for the community's benefit, because I feel like we've, in the last several weeks, have new information, new statements, new decisions coming out almost on a weekly basis through speeches and conversations and interviews. I think it would be really helpful for the entire community as we're, trying to catch up to events that have overtaken us, to better understand your vision sort of in a written form. I think that would be extremely valuable. So thanks again for the interaction today.

Fadi Chehade: That's a good idea and I will follow up on it, for sure.

David Olive: Tony Holmes and then Michele. Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, David. Just to say Fadi that, just to qualify this, I think the broad unease that was exposed by ELISA and others is something that was very broad and certainly within the ISP community there was quite a bit of unease over this as well and I must also say that the ISPs have no formal position now, but picking up on a couple of points that you've made – I think a lot of us are struggling because even on this call, you mentioned that we've really got a couple of weeks to pull together some multi-stakeholder input and that's a really tough call to get that buy-in and get that achieved in the right way.

And I accept the fact that there was no momentum on the multilateral approach and that we needed to work on that, but I really have some fears over this and I think we were at the stage where most of us were really getting used to the concept of the strategy panels and I've heard tonight that the intent is to pull the Internet governance panel into this discussion, and that was something that a lot of us were still getting our minds around how that was going to work anyway – but to keep this really brief and focused, I have two real fears at the moment.

One is that the pace this is moving, I think there's a real fear that we could end up in a position where you lose the community if you are not very careful and ICANN doesn't remain as cohesive and doesn't remain having the full support of a community that really has this at their heart and cares about it so much, because this is moving so fast. A lot of us are feeling that we're on the outside looking in. That's one fear that I had.

The other fear is that if we all work together and we go ahead with this, I think governments certainly go into it knowing exactly what they want. I would suggest a number of us from (inaudible) when we're still not quite sure what we're signing up for and I think on the other side of the argument, they have that clear vision. We're still trying to pull together our views on this and my biggest worry is that if we move ahead and the event that's being planned isn't a success, I believe we actually go into (inaudible) in a far worse position than we would have done if it hadn't taken place at all.

Fadi Chehade: Tony, just on the last sentence you said, explain to me how we could be in a worse position.

Tony Holmes: Because I think that if there's some dialogue that actually takes place that isn't acceptable for the community and some of the really hard line stuff – and I do believe that the number of governments will use this event to push very, very hard for exactly what they want – some of it will probably cross that redlined that some folks in ICANN may not be able to accept and if we cannot come to some, let's say agreement over some of those things, then I think the stakes for (inaudible) have increased considerably. But –

Fadi Chehade: Well, let me just interject because I think this is where I disagree with the logic you just laid out. You said if some governments go to that event and lay out a solution that we're not in agreement with, these same governments you're talking about will be sitting at the table at the WTDC in April and they can make these same exact things you just said. And in WTDC, it's only governments at the table, which nobody –

Tony Holmes: And that's (inaudible).

Fadi Chehade: Right, same thing with the (inaudible), right? So how could we be worse when we are creating an opportunity where a –

Tony Holmes: But I think –

Fadi Chehade: - a leading government is going to have an actual multi-stakeholder conference where the president of that country inviting us has agreed already that the people sitting at the table will be government, civil society, and industry, side-by-side, participating on an equal footing. How could it be worse?

Tony Holmes: I believe it's worse because what we've actually done is go down the path of trying to solve it in a way that did get the multi-stakeholder model some input, and that is our one chance of success. If we hadn't have had that event in front of the (inaudible) event or WTDC, then I think there still room to maneuver and have that. This is a one-shot event.

Fadi Chehade: But we have no other chance, right? I mean if we didn't have this and the IGF's bag, what chances did we have to even voice our views?

Tony Holmes: Well, then I go back to our earlier point, Fadi, that is that this needs, this is so important, the arguments need to be mastered in such a way that they bring the whole community along with them. That the speed of this is going to be prohibitive on that and I think we are in a worse place.

Fadi Chehade: Well, again, I'm sorry Tony, but I think the points you're making are that we would be worse off if this went wrong, but if this didn't go wrong or right, we don't have any other chance to do anything. And as to the speed, frankly I'll be candid with you, I think all of us as an ecosystem have failed at mobilizing when we should have mobilized. So here we are, this year's almost over. The IGF in Bali was almost dead. The hotels were being canceled, so we wouldn't even have had a chance to have a multi-stakeholder meeting this year and no one was really pulling together any path other than the path of the multilateral solution heading to the (inaudible). Nothing. Zero.

So is it moving too fast? Yes, because frankly, we're almost eight months late to mobilize and I take part of that blame, with everyone else. But here we are and I ask all of you what is the alternative to moving fast? Should we slow it down? Should we slow it down? Should we – if we decide right now to pull the plug and say, "You know, we made our points. It's important to have a multi-stakeholder meeting, but we're going to just take our time to discuss this and we're not going to participate in the conference. We're not going to start a true multi-stakeholder dialogue on a broad basis across all the communities," we'll ensure that path.

Tony Holmes: Well, it's far too late for that.

Fadi Chehade: Yeah.

Tony Holmes: I agree. I totally agree and we should all take some responsibility for being late and it is too late now to have that discussion, but the measure of doing this, I believe, in the right way was to make sure whatever is taken forward, it's on the basis that we're all sure that the community is going to move down that path with full support. And I do believe there's a risk they are currently, if it isn't handled in the right way. I really hope I'm wrong. I really do, but I'm not (crosstalk).

Fadi Chehade: No, no. I don't think you're wrong, by the way. In other words, you are right that there is a risk and the way to solve that risk is to do more calls like this; to set up more working groups and teams of people that work together to bring the broader community together, and that's what we're doing. The risk will be increased if we do not do that. I agree with you on that point. The question was it's not that we need the community or if we need the community and if we should involve the community in every decision we make on these fronts, along with our sister organizations and other groupings, the question is do we slow it down, but not if we should do it. So I'm agreeing with you. And by the way, every path we take has risks, including this one. Significant risks but I hope you agree with me that the risk of doing nothing right now is probably much worse.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you.

David Olive: The last question will be from Michele. Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thank you for giving me the last word. I feel honored. I think that several people have raised some of the concerns that I think we all would share. Fadi, then to you, I'd say if you can continue with some kind of dialogue in Buenos Aires, that would be helpful. I think the information sharing is key because sometimes some of these statements are almost like a broadside. We don't know when they're going to happen. They suddenly happen, and we're all kind of running around afterwards trying to decide, you know, what the hell happened.

I think there's going to be a lot of changes going ahead in the future. From the registrar's perspective, I think we don't have any particular strong view at the moment but possibly, as Keith said, it's because there's so much other stuff going on, we really haven't had a time or the ability to focus on those specific issues, but continued dialogue would be helpful.

Fadi Chehade: That's a good point, Michele and again, we're doing a lot of that. We have been doing a lot of that. I've had, on average, about 22 briefings a day, since Montevideo. I counted. So we're, all of us, (inaudible) is doing them. Sally is doing them. David is doing them. I mean, believe me, I'm talking to all of you is not just to brief you, but in the hope that you would help me brief your community. So I'm hoping that out of this meeting, you could also help me with briefing your communities, engaging them in the dialogue, and learning what questions that they may still have and in Buenos Aires, we're going to have many sessions. We even have asked the minister from Brazil to come personally to our meetings and engage our community directly, so people don't have guesses as to what he's guessing. There he is. You know have him come and talk to them. So we're extremely focused on engaging and listening and adjusting our course and involving the community. You have my word on that and we will continue doing this every day, frankly, from now until (inaudible) as we have a couple of years of doing that.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks.

David Olive: Thank you, Fadi. I think – we have to make sure that our time is up at the stage and people have to go on to other events and you have to catch a plane. I just would like to thank everyone for participation and for the questions. We will have this session recorded and transcribed and will circulate that to you. And also, Fadi and other ICANN executives will be holding a webinar next week on the post-Bali developments to continue this dialogue on the 8th of November at two time (ph). We sent some notifications around to you as well, so we encourage you to share the transcript and recordings with your communities beyond that webinar next week and continue the dialogue and discussion with us in Buenos Aires and beyond.

With that, I'd like to thank everyone. Thank you, Fadi, and will be back to you with the details and the recording as soon as we can.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you, all of you, for taking the time. Much appreciated. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

David Olive: Thank you very much, everyone. We'll be in touch.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, thank you.

David Olive: You may stop the recording.