
LOS ANGELES – Board with the ccNSO
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 09:45 to 10:45
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

BYRON HOLLAND: Good morning, everybody, and welcome to our regular board/ccNSO meeting where we have a chance to have a discussion about some pre-thought-through agenda items as well as an open Q&A on those specific items as well as any others that may be of particular import to the respective groups.

We have a proposed agenda that you should be able to see on the screen above, including a final report on the -- from the framework of interpretation working group as well as discussion around the two big themes of this meeting, the IANA stewardship transition as well as the accountability issue, and from the ccNSO perspective, in particular, the board's role in that process.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Keith, who will provide an update and a status on the FOI final report.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Good morning, everybody. My name is Keith Davidson and I'm the chair of the framework of interpretation working group within the ccNSO, and a brief report to you today but a very positive report as well.

The framework of interpretation is a piece of work that's been undertaken by the ccNSO working group over the last three years and its job has been to develop a framework of interpretation for the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.

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

This framework is scoped to develop color and depth to existing policies and guidelines and not to create policies along the way.

It -- we have been in the home straight on this for quite some time and we had a bit of a jitter at the last ICANN meeting in terms of some final wording changes that just seemed to make a little bit of sense at the very last minute, so we've just come from the ccNSO members meeting now where there has been unanimous approval for the framework from the ccNSO membership.

So the steps going forward for the framework are now to take the framework to the GAC and seek the GAC's approval for this final draft report, and that is where we've had further stumblings because the former lead within the GAC was the New Zealand representative in the GAC, Frank March, who retired, and that's left a gap with nobody taking up the leadership role within the GAC.

So we're seeking to address that here and we're hopeful that we have approval for the final framework from the GAC as well by the time we get to the next ICANN meeting.

And then the original intention of the approvals process was that the GAC and the ccNSO would jointly provide the framework to the ICANN board, and because it's coming from the GAC, it would become binding policy along the way and that would save the ccNSO from having to go through a policy development process to get this to the same level of status within the ICANN board.

Just the final reports in total are about 104 pages, so not for the faint-hearted, but most of the color and depth is usefully displayed.

I think the intention is that it will help the ICANN board in terms of its decision-making. It will give consistency and predictability around the assessment of, measurement of, and reporting back of, delegations and redelegations and it will give a consistent use of terminology along the way.

So if you are reading the documents, please be aware that it is out of scope for any policy to have been invented on the fly. This is purely interpretation of existing policy and guidelines.

So the question that you should measure is not whether or not the framework is right or not, but whether it's a correct interpretation of existing policies, and if the existing policies aren't right, then what should we do to fix those policies.

So with that, I'll hand back, unless there are any questions in terms of both process and so on.

Perhaps one final point.

The issues contained in this report will, I think, have -- will seek to inform the IANA transition to a degree, so it's very important and perhaps useful that we all encourage the GAC to address this report in the shortest possible term so that we could maybe get that behind us, you know, rather than leaving it till the last minute in the IANA transition.

So with that, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Keith.

And I would just like to also thank Keith and the rest of the FOI working group. This has been a five-year labor of love, a very, very significant and substantive piece of work, and certainly critical to our community, existential, effectively, to our community, and we would like to think the work done here can extend to some of the other communities as well.

We certainly -- and just not to put too fine a point on it, we see the next two issues on the agenda here, the stewardship transition and the accountability issues, as very directly linked to what happens on the FOI-related issues.

We almost see them as three completely interlinked threads in the overall bigger discussion.

So on that note, are there any questions or comments?

Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

So let me share in congratulating Keith and the entire set of people who worked on the FOI. It's been long-awaited and desired, and we're eager to see it.

It will be a big step forward, and at the same time, as you've emphasized, doesn't create any new policies.

The big question that actually overhangs all three of the agenda items here and has been waiting for attention is: Where does -- where do the hard problems get dealt with that are not currently within existing policy?

All of this IANA stewardship transition, which involves many communities and different aspects, the absolute core, the absolute center of the -- that's interesting, if you will, is the redelegation of CCs in -- where there's contention, where there's not uniformity of decision and how does that resolved.

Speaking from the perspective of the IANA group, it's an extremely uncomfortable position to be in, and I think speaking on behalf of the IANA group, the board, and indeed, the entire community, it is not a desirable position for that question to have an absence of solution, and everybody kind of struggles with it. And one of the dominant themes about this stewardship transition and the accompanying accountability is to gain a bit more clarity about how to deal with those cases in a way that does not look preemptory or inappropriate from a decision-making point of view.

Are there any insights, any comments, any advice that is coming along with this FOI final report that identifies where the open issues are, yet to be dealt with, that are not within the FOI?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Steve.

The answer -- the short answer is no, and -- but the long answer is, undoubtedly it is an issue for the ccNSO council to look at those aspects that are important to the ccTLD community, including issues like redelegations.

There's also issues like retirement of ccTLDs where there is no policy whatsoever currently, but, you know -- you know, and we have already

highlighted that there will need to be a policy development process for that.

We don't have time, on the time frame for the IANA transition, to do a policy development process. It's just not conceivable to get through it in time.

So whether or not we can park such issues but agree some overarching principles between ICANN and the ccTLD community and the GAC along the way may be one way of resolution, but certainly we -- you know, agreeing some first principles or agreeing to a time line for policy development processes might be the only way that we can get through this and abide by a deadline.

But certainly to me personally, and I think to my ccTLD, we would rather forgo the stewardship than to have uncertainty and unknown aspects of what we're signing up to.

So we do need to note these issues along the way and seek to have a method of resolution. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Mike?

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Byron, and thanks, Keith, and congratulations to all of the people involved in the FOI working group. I think they've done a fantastic job.

I suppose my question is: Would it be possible to bake some of this policy process into the IANA transition going forward? Keith, I agree with you completely, it's not conceivable to complete beforehand, but to either, as you say, have an interim or placeholder approach with a mechanism which clearly indicates that this is how it gets -- it gets changed or when there is a clear process and there is a PDP, it gets baked in and it gets replaced, do you think that's conceivable? Do you think that's the right route to go down?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Mike.

I think identifying some first -- identifying and agreeing some first principles, rather than trying to evaluate an entire policy, but having some commitment to abide by some overarching principles, would provide a useful way forward, and of course in that instance it would be a question of good-faith negotiation to then continue that through a PDP at some future stage.

And part of the commitment might be that a PDP be completed within X time frame after the IANA transition.

MIKE SILBER:

Sorry. Just to follow up, is the FOI working group willing to take on that work and to start the PDP process within the ccNSO? Is it a ccNSO-only process? Does it extend cross-community?

I'm just interested because I think the idea is fantastic and I think this notion that we can create a perfect transition with no flexibility for change going forward is an interesting one.

So I'm just interested in your view, having worked on this and trying to document what is in existence and having noticed what's missing, how you would see that going forward.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I think I understand more fully.

It is not something for the framework of interpretation working group. It is limited by a very limited scope. But I think you've given us some excellent food for thought, so I think as we go forward and we get to our ccNSO council meeting tomorrow, let me raise the concept and come back to you in due course, Mike. It's not really for me personally to answer, but I think my colleagues will discuss and will come back to you in due course.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Mike. Any other thoughts or comments on this issue? Questions from our own CC colleagues to the board on this issue or vice versa? No?

This issue is definitely swimming in the deep end of the pool on this one. They have done some great work. I would really strongly

encourage reading this report. I recognize it is a long one, but it is very insightful and a good one.

So let's move onto the next subject: IANA stewardship transition and timing issues. I thought -- we thought that this would be a good one just to get a better perspective on how the board is viewing it and thinking about these issues. And I think we could break it down into two components, probably more but let's at least start with two. One is just strictly the actual pace and some of the milestones along the way and how realistic some of those are and the board's thinking about that. And then the other is the notion of linkage between IANA stewardship transition and the broader accountability issues because there is many words that have been used to describe whether they are coordinated or what the linkage is or how they are going to work together. Just would like to get an understanding of how the board sees the timing of these issues working together.

So just first on pace, perhaps I could throw it out to the board, whoever wants to speak to it. If we look at the September 2015 deadline, if we look at the ICG January 15th deadline, if any of you had the opportunity to see the initial work of the cross-community working group on IANA transition which had its first face-to-face meeting yesterday, when you look at the project plans required to try to people those dates, to say they are formidable is a significant understatement.

And I would just like to get a sense of the board's thinking and ICANN's thinking on how realistic those are or how much flexibility there may be in the timing.

STEVE CROCKER:

There's been some discussion of it. And your sense that the timing is formidable is shared. It is very natural in this sort of process for a lot of attention to be focused on the organization, who should be in the room and what process should we follow in order to decide what the process should be for deciding who should be in the room, et cetera, et cetera.

And to lose focus on the fact that there is quite a lot of work to be done, even after the basic decision is made and shaped into a proposal, the implementation and the transition process in order to make it all smooth, we do not want to be -- nobody wants to be in a position in which the proposal is accepted on September 29th and then, oh, my goodness, it is going to happen tomorrow and that's just an implementation detail. That's -- we all know better than that.

So I think there are two guiding things. First of all, in the extreme -- and I hope it is the extreme, the September 30th deadline of next year is not an absolute hard and fast deadline. The contract will remain in place. The structure of the contract, to remind people, is that it is a three-year contract whose termination is that date but it has two two-year options that can be exercised by the government at their option, no negotiation or further proposal required. But that -- but the target really is then. So that's one side of it.

The other side is that once there is a -- the shape of a substantial proposal coming out of the ICG, I suspect -- I believe that multiple things will start to happen in the implementation aspects, although it won't be set for certain because there's a -- got to be an acceptance of the proposal and so forth. But preparatory steps will take place by all the relevant parties.

Some of the -- there are some alternatives in -- among the implementation steps. And depending upon which of those alternatives are taken, it will take longer or shorter. Some of them are feasible within the time frame. Some of them would force running over the September 30th. So that's the broad view.

But I do think that you're absolutely right, that it is helpful to have a total picture in mind and not just of the immediate focus of who's making what decisions or what the process is to get to that point because there is a lot of work to do to actually put the change into effect, even if the change is, in the end of the day, basically pro forma. There is still a lot of work to do: Contractual work, technical work, overlap of operations, and so forth.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Steve.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I agree with Steve. I just wanted to take a slightly -- that's the wider view. I wanted to take a slightly narrower view from the ccTLD point of view because I do have serious concerns about timing.

If you assume that the accountability piece which was kind of started yesterday is for everyone and that we as a ccTLD community we would have input into that and be part of the accountability working group, that's about reaching consensus with the rest of the community, that

will either make the deadline or it won't. It is not in our control other than to participate as best as we can.

I'm much more concerned about the other side of the coin with the IANA piece. Right now we have an ICG which is -- and we are all clear what its role is. We have a cross-community working group, which has just been started to deal with the sort of -- if I can put it, sort of the service-level issues that are meaningful to both the gTLDs and the ccTLDs, this sort of stuff in the IANA contract that you would find in any contract where technical services are being delivered.

What we haven't started talking about yet and what is going to be essential to come from the ccTLD community to go up to the ICG is what -- is our input into the structure that we want to see IANA have. And that needs to be negotiated with everybody else in the community, if we have firm views about IANA -- the structure of the department within ICANN.

And, secondly, and most importantly, above all else is the -- and the shorthand for it is the appeals mechanism, the last port of call to go to on a revocation and delegation, which I believe that most of the ccTLD community thinks is an important thing for us to have.

It's contemplated in RFC-1591 that there will be an appeals mechanism, a final place to go to check on an IANA decision. Someone is -- someone is firing bullets at me obviously.

>>

We are trying to locate it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Nancy.

>> We are going to have to come out and find out if it is a cable that is loose. If you don't mind, we're going to walk down towards the board table.

[Applause]

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, we've finally learned how to silence Chris.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. It is the first time I have been stopped by a woodpecker. It is extraordinary.

So RFC-1591 contemplates an appeals mechanism, and that's purely CC work. And we need to put that in place. And right now that hasn't started, and there is nothing on the table. And we really, really, really need to get a move on if we've got any chance of getting that sorted out. It is complicated. There are differing views in the ccTLD community about how that should be put together.

So I want to encourage all of us -- and I'm a part of that -- to get on with it and make the time and the effort necessary to get that done. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Chris. Any other comments?

Young Eum.

I noticed the mics --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We have microphones on your left-hand side of the room, guys.

BYRON HOLLAND: Our left-hand side.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Your right-hand side. Sorry.

Is there a roving mic we could have down? Thanks, Nancy.

That's not working.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are you okay? No?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Thanks, Chris. Young Eum Lee, .KR. On a similar vein, we at the ccNSO, when we were trying to decide on the candidates for the ICG and the CWG, for example, have been working a very tight schedule and actually a lot faster than the time frame that we're normally used to. I mean,

not that I'm really complaining because I know there is a pressure for time.

But, first of all, my question is -- and I'm assuming that other SOs and ACs are working on a similar sort of mechanism in terms of time frame. And I'm wondering if my assumption is correct, and they are pushing things a bit faster than they usually do.

And, second, is that, I mean, within the ccNSO, I think we are pretty much managing things so that there isn't any serious concerns about the -- let's say, the properness of the time frame. But is this your sense as well? Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Please, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Young Eum.

I think the point I'm making is that the pieces that I've just talked about are unique to the ccNSO, that -- and that's why we have to -- so we have extra work to do which cannot be done in a cross-community working group or in an ICANN-wide working group. So I just want to make sure that we -- and it is probably the stuff that's the most important to us. So we need to get that done.

And as to the properness, well, it just is what it is, right? The time frame is the time frame. And if we can't get it done, we can't get it done.

YOUNG EUM LEE: My comment wasn't related specifically to your comment, Chris.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY: Hi. Lesley Cowley, ccNSO council member. Just to really build on Young Eum's point about time frame, I was struck by the time scale for strategic plan production yesterday, just 17 months, which is apparently the gestation period of a baby black rhino, by the way.

That's an incredibly long gestation period, but one obviously with ICANN is very different because it is a multistakeholder period.

But I think generally as a community, it would be great for us to think about how we do things more quickly in the multistakeholder model. And the IANA stewardship transition discussion needs to be a test of how we might do that without losing the multistakeholder elements or producing black rhinos.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Lesley.

Chris, did you -- any other thoughts or insights on this topic?

Could I just ask the board again -- sorry, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: I just wanted to understand from Lesley. Given that we are talking about the gestation period of a black rhino, are you contemplating being a horn in the side?

LESLEY COWLEY: Sorry. I didn't hear the last bit of your question, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: I asked if you thought this was going to be a horn in our side.

LESLEY COWLEY: I think it is more general. But this is a real example of where we want to be multistakeholder, but we are going to need to move faster. And I would very much encourage the board to wrestle with that challenge.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Lesley, I agree with you. But there's a sweet irony in the fact that up until recently, we've been talking with the community about slowing everything down and everything going too fast. And now we are talking about how we do things faster because we have a deadline.

But I agree, we need to find innovative ways through this. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Dotty.

Roving mic over here, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Xavier is the microphone fairy. He will be with us shortly.

DOTTY SPARKS de BLANC: So I certainly wouldn't want to in any way undermine the importance of process and all that it entails and implies. However, it's very hard to have passion about process. And if we could entertain some ideas, those are what generate passion and speed and drive and, you know, working towards some goal that could happen.

And then I wonder what's going to happen when ideas are developed and are they going to be tossed in the ring for everyone to comment on or is it going to be secretly dealt with and we just know once whoever is going to choose chooses. That concerns me a lot.

I mean, I'm really -- I'm coming from the stock market and investment business. I want to see some ideas for this because we can do procedures all day long, but it is very hard for me to come up with ideas for this. And if other people have them, I would really like to hear.

STEVE CROCKER: Isn't the ICG producing regular reports?

BYRON HOLLAND: Steve, can you say that again?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Isn't the ICG being fairly transparent in delivering regular reports on what their deliberations are? So that includes the ideas phase of what you're talking about. And so I -- if I understood -- maybe I have

misunderstood the force of your concern, but I would think that it's there to see. One just has to follow that process, and there's mechanisms for feedback as well.

DOTTY SPARKS de BLANC: --- have to study that. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe I could get somebody from the board to speak to the notion of linkage and how tight you see the linkage between IANA process and the accountability process and more specifically if there are accountability elements that must be in place before we have a satisfactory resolution to the IANA stewardship transition stream.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm expendable. Thank you. Yes.

So I think the two are clearly linked. I think the concept in the accountability piece of having the two streams, one being stuff that has to be done in parallel with the transition and then stuff that doesn't have to be done and separately all could be done at later date.

I think we've acknowledged that the two things are linked. What I think would be fantastic is if there could be some flexibility in the community so that if we can't -- if something is in the "should be in time for transition" bucket and actually reaches a point where for some reason it cannot be done, that there will be an understanding and an agreement that we could come to an agreement about how we will handle that post-transition.

Much in the same way as I think Keith was talking about earlier on, about the CCs having a whole list of things they would like to have done but accepting they can't all get done in time. So as long as we've got an agreed process to deal with that in the future.

I also know that there is concern about -- in the community generally about how we will -- how the board will deal with recommendations from the accountability piece, and I think we'll have an answer for that relatively soon. Well, a suggested answer to that relatively soon.

Does that handle what you were after, Byron?

Sorry, Fadi. Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: Go ahead, Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE: I think the linkage between the elements or recommendations that come out of the accountability track that are deemed necessary prior to transition, the linkage of these with the other track, the transition track, is now extremely clear by the statements of Larry Strickling.

Larry made it very clear in Istanbul that he will look for these two things together. He made it superbly clear. There's no ambiguity anymore. He said, "I need the proposal from the ICG and I need to see what comes from these recommendations, and if I'm not satisfied that there is consensus in the community on what this community needs to do to satisfy its stakeholders in the area of accountability, I am missing a piece that may not allow me to move forward."

So I think that linkage is now clear.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any comments or questions on this specific item?

Maybe with that, then, we'll take this opportunity to segue into the third and final point, recognizing we have about 15 minutes left, on the board's role in the accountability process, and I think it would be interesting for the CC community and others to understand how the board views its role in this process.

Let me back up a step just to say -- my pesky woodpecker, yes -- that I think the community in general recognizes the substantive changes that ICANN made in terms of the proposed process, and that is very welcome and very encouraging that clearly ICANN listened to the community feedback and should be duly recognized for that.

That said, I think we'd like to understand, in the current structure as we know it, with the cross-community working group on accountability, whatever that ends up being in terms of its final form and shape, and whatever output that entity comes up with, how does the board see receiving that? What does the board see in terms of the process where it gets involved? Does it see itself accepting whatever that output is in whole? Cherry-picking key elements? If it's not satisfied or can't accept it for one reason or another, a process where it would go back to the community?

Could you comment on how you see the board being involved, the process, and the interplay, and maybe some comments on some of the specific questions I've just asked.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

I think that -- I think that is directed inescapably at me.

So there's several facets to essentially one question there that you're asking.

There's a mixture here of attitude on our part and formality, so let me talk about the attitude.

Our expectation and our desire is that what is proposed out of the community, we can accept in whole, so our bias will be in that direction.

We are very supportive of the community process, and the touchstone at the end of the day is whether or not the accountability processes meet the test of acceptability and sensibility across the community. It doesn't matter if the formalities are all appropriate, but if the process does not actually work in a way that people say, "Yeah, it's -- we're satisfied with it," if there's an issue, it gets dealt with, and it's all visible and so forth.

So that's the attitude.

The formality, if you ask for a hundred percent guarantee of anything that's written down we will just adopt without question, we'd be derelict in our duty if we didn't say, "No, we're going to read carefully, we're going to try to understand carefully, and if we either don't understand or if we think that there are issues raised, we're going to come back and have a consultation with you."

So that speaks to one of the points that you asked very explicitly: What would we do in the event that we don't have immediate agreement.

We will not go down the path of saying simply "no" and no explanation. We'll go quite the other direction and say, "Let's talk about this, let's understand what's behind it, let's understand what the consequences are, let's understand how it's linked to other things," and try to bring to the surface whatever the difficulties are.

Now, there's not enough -- we don't have any cases in hand, so I can't be more specific about it, but that's what we'll do.

At the end of the day, the board has a responsibility to be able to execute on anything it agrees to, so we will -- we will be more than just pro forma in saying, "Thank you very much and we'll put it in the books," and we know that we have to turn that into the internal way in which we operate and how everything fits together.

I don't think that it's possible to be a great deal more specific, although perhaps you have, you know, some area of that that you want to probe.

At the end of the day, we're your board, the whole ICANN process is the community's and belongs to each of the stakeholder groups, and we're here to serve. We're here to make effective the thoughts and hard work that everybody does.

And we don't have a separate agenda, actually. I mean, that's -- so we're not in any fundamental -- there's no underlying tension that leads to deep disconnects. Our legitimacy depends upon making this process work, and you are the substance of it, so that's where we come from.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Steve.

I have Chris --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Everything -- +1 to everything Steve said. One addition and that is that we are currently working on a -- putting all of that into a process that we can tell everybody, "This is how we will deal with it."

And Bruce, do you -- Bruce, do you -- what -- are we hoping to get our process out on dealing with the recommendations before the end of the week or are we anticipating that will be after that?

Sorry, Bruce. I think it's -- I think we may be ready to -- almost ready.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. Look, I think what we're trying to do is get feedback during this week, but we also want to, by the end of the week, at least give the community certainty on our plan in that regard.

So I think it's basically as Steve had articulated.

The easiest way is perhaps have a look at the bylaws with respect to how the board deals with recommendations from the ccNSO, and it's going to roughly be in that format, which is, you know, if the board thinks something's not in the global public interest, it would go back to the working group and say, "Look, here's some areas we're concerned with," the working group would send it back to the board.

But ultimately we think it's unlikely to ever reach that point because, you know, if we're all engaged in the process, it shouldn't ever get to the point that suddenly we're going to raise something at the last minute.

But the mechanism that we'll have, just to give you certainty, will be along the lines of what's in the bylaws for the ccNSO, handling recommendations from the ccNSO.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Bruce.

And I think it's also important to acknowledge that the community -- that it's not just the CCs who have been asking questions about how we will treat the recommendations and I think it's important to acknowledge that that's a perfect legitimate question and that we should be providing you with a -- the community with a firm answer to that. So -- and we will. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

I've got Fadi and then Erika.

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah. I second our chairman's comments that the good intent is going to drive our success together on this.

But in order to provide just a sense of comfort, during the Istanbul exchange with the community, a very specific question was asked of Larry Strickling regarding this. He was asked, "What if the

recommendations coming back from the accountability working group to the board entail some changes in the board structure, into the board's decision-making process, et cetera, and the board refuses them?"

And he was very clear about that.

He said, "My expectation" -- as Bruce just said -- "is that the board will engage with the community in a full iterative cycle of consultation," because if the recommendations related to the transition are not arriving to him in full community consensus, including the board, then they're no good.

So I think he gave, frankly, the community a very clear signal that if the board and the community are not aligned on the accountability improvements necessary for the transition, then the transition is missing a key ingredient and he will not move forward with presenting the ICG proposal to his government.

So I think we have a very powerful, clear signal from the U.S. Government that the board's role in accountability is what the board typically does, as Steve said: To engage the community to consult back and forth until we have proper community consensus. That's just a reminder to everyone of this important safeguard that the U.S. Government has put.

BYRON HOLLAND:

I just want -- sorry, just before you get going --

STEVE CROCKER: I just wanted to note that the -- on the transcript it says that I was speaking, but it was actually Fadi who was speaking.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's exactly what I was going to say.

Erika? That's fine?

>> ---

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thanks, Fadi. That was actually a very helpful intervention.

Are there any other comments or questions on this subject or any other, since we would appear to have --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We're not going to finish early, surely.

BYRON HOLLAND: -- finished the three proposed agenda items?

STEVE CROCKER: Let me just comment that one of the things that will be important on the board's side is to be well-prepared to focus on the proposals coming out of these processes, to have our time allocated, and a plan to engage so that we are in sync and operating at a proper pace here and don't let any time pass.

And so that's something that I think that we will pay close attention to.

So in the -- in the planning process, let's lay out a time frame and then within the board, I will make sure that we have people who are -- have the time allocated and have attention scheduled and will fit that into our schedule.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Steve. Fadi, did you have comments?

FADI CHEHADE: Yes. Since we have a minute, I will use it to take a moment to thank the ccNSO for the extremely lucid and valuable input that you have provided us to make sure the accountability process works.

It was extremely valuable for us to receive your input, and I want to take a moment to assure you that we -- I and we, the team, have learned a very important lesson through that process, a lesson that we will keep as we move forward, that when something does not seem to fit well with the community, we should stop, we should listen, and we should adjust to make sure that this reflects what the community needs.

And this accountability debacle which reached a boiling point in Istanbul is a case in point that we will remember as a reference for how we could go a little farther than the community wanted us to and how we need to adjust course.

And I think we did and I thank you because your contribution was particularly helpful, and I believe that most, if not all, the things you

commented on during the 21 [sic] period have been accepted and adopted at face value. Thank you for that.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Fadi.

Any final comments or questions for the board?

All right. Well, then I'll give us all five minutes back in our day. Thank you very much to the board. I appreciate the candid conversation and the fulsome answers.

And just to remind my ccNSO colleagues that we will be meeting the GAC next in the Santa Monica room at 11:00. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]