
LOS ANGELES – What the Journalists Think
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 13:30 to 14:45
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

BRAD WHITE:

I think we're good. We're going to start this session. There may be a few people that come in late but, that's cool. That way, this could be the first session that an ICANN meeting is starting on time or a little bit early so mark this point in your calendars.

This panel is going to be a little bit different than your usual ICANN panel. It's very much a session that we pioneered in Toronto, if any of you were at the Toronto meeting, where we had a group of journalists who cover us. These are folks, who are paid to be critical of almost of everything and believe me, these three guys are critical of everything. Except me of course, right?

It's kind of interesting to hear guys like this who are trained observers, paid critics looking on our world and hear what they think and hear what they have to go through. ICANN, what we see, what we do is very much seen through the lens that they have. Whether it's writing an editorial, whether it's covering a story about dot wine, whether it's internet governance, whatever it is, it comes through the journalists. My job at ICANN is to be the point person for journalists.

I should explain that I have a certain bias. I used to be a reporter myself. I live in Washington D.C. and my friends are journalists. Shockingly, they're not domainers. I like domainers but my friends are journalists. So, I kind of like these guys. I like the openness. I like the willingness to

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.

be critical. A lot of people think that what I hate is the flack (which is journalism lingo for the guy who deals with the questions from reporters) is critical questions or critical stories. I don't mind that nearly as much as I do lazy reporters who I send the links to or try to background. They either don't have the time through no fault of their own or they're simply lazy or they don't pursue it. None of these three guys fall into that category.

With that, let me introduce these guys and then we'll start throwing some questions at them. We're not going to have opening statements. This is going to be very much give-and-take. I'm going to throw a few questions at them at the beginning. I hope that you're going to come at them with some questions. We also have my colleague James Kohl who's manning the chat room. He'll signal me if there's any questions coming into the chat room. I'll toss to James and he'll voice the question.

With that, let me introduce our panelists. Glen Chapman, closest to me, is a technology reporter for L'Agence France-Presse, AFP based in San Francisco. How big is AFP? Is it bigger than AP or how do you rate with the other wire services?

GLEN CHAPMAN: We're on...

BRAD WHITE: Use your mike, Glen.

GLEN CHAPMAN: Sorry, I'm just used to shouting it. That's what reporters do especially when they do that prep-walk from the back of the station house.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Lots of prep-walks, I am sure.

GLEN CHAPMAN: I have had many interactions as a reporter and I'm critical of them all. The AFP is the world's oldest global news wire and we compete with Reuters and AP. Quite candidly, I haven't done any stats. I just know we all have clients all over the world. So, whether it's the South China in China or Australia or Middle East, we're all represented around the world, old school newspapers, websites, TVs, radios. So, all of us are huge in our reaches globally.

BRAD WHITE: My job, if [Fati], for example, is going into an ICANN 51 (his schedule as you can easily imagine as CEO is wall-to-wall), I'll say, "Look, I'd like you to talk to a few reporters." He'll say to me, "I'll give you two or three 30-minutes slots." A lot of times, I'll go to Glen or I'll go to Anick Jesdanun at the Associated Press because they have a very large megaphone. They can get the word out globally. Of course at ICANN, we care a lot about that.

Next to Glen is Joe McKnight. Joe covers internet news for Warren News Service, Washington Internet Daily. Joe carries a very unique perspective because he covers ICANN in the context of Washington. So,

a lot of his stories involve congressional reactions to ICANN. When we're called up on The Hill on either The House side or The Senate side for hearings which happens roughly every year or every other year, something like that, Joe is very much at the center of that.

Next to him is Jon Healey. Jon and I had not met until today but when I was researching some editorial, some opinion pieces that had been written about ICANN, (ICANN generally and specifically the IANA Stewardship Transition) I found the LA Times editorial (which was done on March 14th) and John wrote that. A lot of people don't understand this. In most newsrooms, at least traditionally, there's a firewall between the opinion pages and the reportorial pages. So, the reporters are not involved in the opinion pages and vice versa. Those two worlds don't cross a lot. That's changing to some degree depending on the news outlet but John is the one who wrote that editorial on the IANA Stewardship transition. So, he will, John correct me if this is not an accurate description, you basically cover technology internet issues and that editorial capacity. Is that roughly it?

JON HEALEY:

Among other things. I also do the economy, fiscal policy, tax policy, health policy, things like that.

BRAD WHITE:

Okay, cool. So, as you can tell, we've got some very seasoned reporters up here. It should be an interesting session. Let me start very broad. Let me just ask all three of you this. What is the biggest challenge for you

guys covering ICANN? You all have covered other things. What's the single biggest challenge in covering ICANN?

GLEN CHAPMAN: For me, it's making sense of what you guys are talking about at the time.

BRAD WHITE: That's a big challenge for us as well.

GLEN CHAPMAN: No, it's really huge. Again at AFP, as you can imagine, because we're global in scope, we write for regular people. I have a dear editor who used to say, "Why should the guy in the noodle shop in Shanghai care?" The only place I've seen more acronyms go when I was imbedded with NATO back during the Bosnia crisis when the civil war was going on. You lived on acronyms. I found it really challenging to interview scientists because they have their language and the only way they think is interesting which regular people don't. You always find it difficult, as for me as a reporter interviewing politicians because they have agendas, they really care about their images, they have motives and they're often committed to not letting you know the truth the way it should be seen versus the way they want you to see it.

In my impression in ICANN we put those two worlds together. We have the politician world that comes over and we have the science world that comes over. So, you have two mind-numbing often sort of areas and then you've got to go in and answer that question that I threw at you

earlier, "Why should the guy in the noodle shop in Shanghai care?" To me that's the biggest challenge.

BRAD WHITE: But, I might add, there's one important difference. You mentioned Bosnia, as far as I know, none of our executives has gone to the War Crimes Tribunal in Hague. So, I think it's important to make that distinction.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're still working on those Warren.

BRAD WHITE: Joe.

JOE MCKNIGHT: I'd say, for me, I cover and write for the wonkish crowd in D.C. so, I'm allowed to go in-depth as I want. The flip-side of that is there's an awful lot to cover there. There are committees for a committee for a committee to develop a proposal to develop a proposal. It's easy to get those groups confused. I think there are sixteen committees?

BRAD WHITE: AC, yes, advisory committees and supported organizations, yes.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Sixteen advisory committees that have any number of comment periods at any given time, just the IANA transition, the corresponding

accountability review in and of itself separate from gTLDs. It's an awful lot.

BRAD WHITE: Now, expand your readership. Who do you see as your readership?

JOE MCKNIGHT: Readership would be obviously, folks, congress, congressional staffers, industry associations, a lot of law firm and just sort of general policy wonks in the Beltway but definitely inside the Beltway if that's what you're...

BRAD WHITE: Right, but you're not seeing your readership as being mainstream viewers or mainstream readers, ALFRED for example. It's pretty much inside the Beltway.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Right.

BRAD WHITE: John?

JON HEALEY: My readers are people in LA who are over the age of 60, basically. We have two different audiences. We have policy makers in California and then we have sort of a national audience of people who are drawn to the LA Times for the things they associate with the LA Times which is

not ICANN. My biggest challenge is persuading my editor who is still coming to grips with the concept of the internet. What ICANN does that's important enough to use up a piece of a relatively small amount of space that we have every day? So, for me the challenge is finding the points, the inflection points when the organization actually does something, makes a final move or makes a move consequential enough to write about. Then persuading the people that supervise me of why this matters to, as Glen put it, the little guy who owns a shop down the street.

BRAD WHITE:

Let's expand on that just a minute. I'd like to hear from the other two of you. When you're covering an ICANN story, most of the time and I know it can bore in both ways, are you getting your editors saying, "Hey, go cover this" or I you guys pitching the piece to the editor?

GLEN CHAPMAN:

For me, my editors are brilliant, (in case they're listening) but they're also as you can as global news wire imagine someone who's also handling maybe a shooting or an earthquake or the latest political crisis in D.C. or ISIS. They're handling all that so they don't have time to do a thousand percent brain power to this. So, they'll see it when it jumps up simple and easy to grasp as you referred to dot wine or something comes up that's easy to grab that's like, "Boom, how is that being handled?" Other than that, it's my job/responsibility to-

BRAD WHITE:

To pitch them.

GLEN CHAPMAN: To look into it, to make sense of it and go to them with that summarized back into the start of what you just described which is why should the guy in the shop down the street care? Like go to him and say, "Here's why we should care enough to do a story about this while you're juggling all those other major breaking news."

BRAD WHITE: Yeah. Joe, what's it like for you?

JOE MCKNIGHT: To the best of my ability, I try to cover everything under the sun. With ICANN and certainly since the IANA transition, there's been no shortage of news.

BRAD WHITE: Given how unusual ICANN is an organization and the way we function, the way we move, (John you had said it very specifically) I always have reporters saying to me, "Okay, if I come to ICANN 51, what's going to be the end action?" As in a lot of things, it's a process that's percolating along and ICANN 51 is the next step in that process. So, given that, how much time, when you guys are writing a piece, you're spending a hell of a lot of time back grounding people, explaining the systems or no?

JON HEALEY: Yeah, particularly for me. This is a process that you hear from anybody who's at a mainstream publication, there's a lot of explanation that

needs to be done to the people above you that's invisible to the readers because you don't want to devote half of your piece to what ICANN is. The news is what it did. So, if you can't encapsulate the background in a phrase or a sentence, it's not going to get into the paper.

JOE MCKNIGHT:

Yeah, I apologize to people who are very news savvy but we always have the thing that whatever newsroom you want to talk to, they call it the nut-graph. There's that one graph that usually if you're a reader, you'll get second or third graph down because you don't want to take the heat out of your read. You've got to grab the attention. So, there's going to be that graph that's the nut. It's like, "Okay, what's really the deal? What's the summary of the deal and if you care enough, you'll keep going." So, that's how you usually can get a well-written story. You can get the gist in about three paragraphs because they've done like, "Here's the hot new thing. Here's some relevant context and here's the nut-graph as to the big situation. Now, if you're interested, keep going." The thing with an ongoing thing like ICANN and gTLD you know it's going to keep on going, (you said a percolating process) is like lazy/ (I don't know you guys can criticize me and I'd like to hear the feedback) when you're hustling and you're moving like any of us do in a job, why do we write that graph every time? You take that nut-graph, you save it, what you just said, the thing you bothered to take the energy to boil the thing down and you just keep throwing it into to every story that comes along until the situation changes enough that that graph needs to be changed.

BRAD WHITE: How much time do you spend actually educating your editors as to the process as to what ICANN is? Do you have to?

JON HEALEY: Too much.

BRAD WHITE: Do you have to do it every time or if you do it twice are they going to remember that?

JON HEALEY: It depends on what the topic is, right? I covered things that my editor isn't terribly interested in which is a nice way of saying that he's aggressively not interested in it. So he does not devote a lot of his short-term cranial memory to the stuff that I pitch. So yes, over and over again, I have to say, "Yes, ICANN, it's about how you find what you're looking for on the internet. So make sure that when you go to this domain, it is that domain and not something else that somebody else wants it to be." It just goes around and around every time.

GLEN CHAPMAN: At AFP because of the nature of the beast, there'll be time of day, time of week there are different people slide in an out of the editor slot, whereas as at some publication you might have consistency where someone could actually over time retain it.

JON HEALEY: If they were interested in it, yeah.

GLEN CHAPMAN: If they cared enough to devote some space because Brad and Angelina weren't involved, you could count...

BRAD WHITE: That's a different bribe, by the way.

JON HEALEY: I would point out that the .xxx dispute was really easy to explain.

GLEN CHAPMAN: Yeah, .gay, .xxx and that sort of gets to the other meat of this. One of the great things about not having the editors always remember it and not always get it is that it reminds that somewhere out there, believe it or not, is a first-time reader to a subject. As much as it might pain all the rest of us who were tracking a topic, we're taught to always write with the assumption that somewhere someone just first learning about, "ICANN? What is that?"

BRAD WHITE: Sure, I want to make sure I understand this. You're there are people out there who have not heard of ICANN? Is that what you're saying?

GLEN CHAPMAN: As brilliant as you've been, there are just a few people, I think it's somewhere in South Africa that don't know ICANN.

BRAD WHITE: We utter in this organization the phrase, "Accountability and Transparency" like every third sentence. You can't go to one of these sessions and not hear that phrase being uttered but, a lot of times, it comes in the context of the community, this reporter, the status on this or a board meeting or something else. In terms of our interaction with you guys, are we as accountability and transparent as we think we are?

JOE MCKNIGHT: If comment periods are any indication, absolutely.

JON HEALEY: I see we have a moderm for debate because it really depends how you think of it because I think not. I think there's an intent to be transparent and accountable and then there's the reality.

BRAD WHITE: And we don't always live up to that.

JON HEALEY: Right, like you might intend to but, if you intend to be transparent and then speak to me in Tagalin, you might be giving everything you know but if I don't get it. There are processes, like you said, there are multiple committees and then there are acronyms. There's all this stuff that goes on and then there are people who are all, "Oh, that's going to be considered." They don't give you access to the people who are actually considering. They don't often times, there's the politician thing and they always balancing different influences going on. There's that side to

it that makes a little bit of ambiguity of the process is obviously a veil to transparency whether it's intended or not.

GLEN CHAPMAN: Fair or not, ease of use is also part of the transparency thing. I remember when I heard that ICANN 51 was going to be in LA, I thought, "Well, let's see what's on the agenda." So, I went to the website. Ten clicks later, I was still looking for the agenda. Granted, I'm not the sharpest tool in the shed and I do have a memory hole but still, that was ridiculous.

BRAD WHITE: So, we don't make it as easy on you as we could?

GLEN CHAPMAN: Yep.

BRAD WHITE: Joe, because you work for a smaller outlet, what is it like interacting with your editors? Are you still re-educating? Do they get ICANN because; it's much smaller than what these guys are dealing with?

JOE MCKNIGHT: Yes, Warren Communications is been covering ICANN since its inception. So, at this point, unless it's a new copy editor, a new reporter or just a new editor, everyone's pretty well-versed. I usually don't have much trouble explaining what it is that I'm covering unless there is some kind of breaking event like the IANA transition where we suddenly need

to re-educate ourselves about what exactly is at stake here. Day to day, it's not much of an issue.

BRAD WHITE:

Most of the time when I'm contacted by reporters, they're interested in one of two stories, internet governance or their interested in newgs, newgs kill these. From you're prespective, what is the story for the next year? What is the coming story? At this meeting, I don't think it's an exaggeration to say that there are other dialogs going on but, to a large extent, there's internet governance and there's newsg klg. Those seem to occupy a lot of time and attention. What do you guys think about that from your prespective? Is that the story of the future? Does anyone care?

JON HEALEY:

There's only one story for the general public and that is how Obama is giving the internet back to the Kenyans.

JOE MCKNIGHT:

Yeah. The story going forward is always going to be the reality. It's nice that we set the context early. It's what people are going to see. So people hear about these new gTLBs that .xxx, .gay, .bmw, .whatever, when they start seeing it that will become a story again. When it gets abused, that will be a story again. It's always for us; the stories are very humanically driven. It's the interface. It's when it gets misused or done poorly or taken advantage of, those will be stories going forward, right? Then it's when ICANN, for whatever reason, it starts to pick up

questionable if and who they're accountability to or if they're running to...

BRAD WHITE: Accountability issue.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Again, that will be only a problem if what Fatid Shahoti spoke about earlier in the week was that, "Well, we've lost control of that root domain system, we'd have two internets and all of a sudden you'd type in your website and you go to completely somewhere else." That kind of reality couldn't...

JON HEALEY: But that's not what's going to make a story. I'm sorry Joe. What's going to make it a story at least from the point of view of folks like me and probably Joe too is the degree to which it is seen by some people as a political issue that they can capitalize on. The United States giving up control of the internet meme is incredibly powerful and we might be seeing a lot more of that if Obama hadn't got a bulletin on it. The question with going forward would be, will folks like me ever be able to tease out for the public the difference between what ICANN does and internet governance at large because those two things are completely com-plate today and they're com-plate by people who need to com-plate them in order for it to be a political issue. To a certain extent in the news business, political issues drive what's on the pages.

JOE MCKNIGHT: It's also a human issue. John and I were discussing this earlier. It's like, people always need someone to hold accountable. People need someone to blame. If my child is sick, it was because of the ground water or because of the vaccine or because of something. People always want, there's a human need to have accountability and you're right. There's a lot of stuff ICANN does not have anything to do with on the internet but, people need someone to hold accountable. I'm sorry, sometimes, you're seen as it. Your head is sticking up the heist. I'm with you but also, it goes beyond political and it becomes a very human issue when people start feeling some effects, they want to point at somebody and say, "Fix it."

BRAD WHITE: We're actually working on our logo. We're going to replace the little globe with a little target and so people can take aim.

GLEN CHAPMAN: This is kicking the can a little down the road but not too far. June 30, 2105 the IANA transition proposal, the accountability proposal supposedly will be hopefully from ICANN's point of view will be submitted into the IEA, I'm going to be really curious to see how Capital Hill responds. If it's anything like how they responded after the initial announcement of the .com act to delay. I think the delay isn't going to be a key for me going forward.

BRAD WHITE: When you're covering the shempisk fill, the .com act for example, it always interested me, living in Washington, bills are introduced, they go



nowhere, they die a death, is there an active movement? In other words, how much interest is there within your news organization on something like that?

JOE MCKNIGHT:

For us, there's enormous interest but I can't certainly, the IANA transition has taken a back seat to say another acronym that starts with an "i", ISIS. It's not at the forefront but, it's going to get some traction when the proposals come forward next year. There's no question. I don't have any sense right now of where people stand on Capital Hill other than where they stood four months ago.

BRAD WHITE:

Right. This raises an interesting issue. Is it really that important? We get very hung up in this world, in the internet ecosystem in our ICANN meetings about internet governance. Is it really necessary for the public to concern itself about internet governance? I mean, most people get on, they want to check their Facebook page, they want to buy something on Amazon, they want to get their email. We certainly, by we the ICANN community, think it's important that people are engaged and involved in that but, is it really from your perspective?

JON HEALEY:

That's sort touches on the classic debate of how responsible, how much should people just enjoy living their daily lives and how actively involved should they be with making sure the society remains stable. I think that most people shouldn't care. The internet works but if not caring means you let things decay...

BRAD WHITE: You could lose what you have by not caring.

JON HEALEY: That's interesting, that goes to this broad societal debate. Those activists would say, "No, we always need to be involved because those who aren't fighting for their rights and what they have are only destined to lose it."

BRAD WHITE: Yeah, when you write a story, of course, being a wire service, your stories are going around the world. How do you write a piece? You've explained the difficulty of covering this meeting or covering anything ICANN-related. How do you make that interesting to readers in D.C., in LA, in Johannesburg, in Tokyo because your story is going to go everywhere? Does that require a certain approach by you or are you not thinking of end readership?

GLEN CHAPMAN: You got to write it 26 different times. It really sucks. Right, John?

JON HEALEY: I always have a deadline in somebody's time zone. I should be like head in the hierarchy. It's intriguing because as important of a topic as the governance of the internet is, I think that for journalist, people are writing a good story whether it's about very local issue, about a homeless encampment, no matter what you're writing about to see the

humanity in it and to see how it affects people in society. Once you can touch the humanity, I think you've broadened up as wide as it can be. Not that it's easy to find but that's what you look for or when you're asking your questions, that's how you frame your questions. Like, "How is this going to touch people's lives?"

BRAD WHITE:

Back in the day, we used to call "putting a human face on it." I worked on TV. I didn't work in print but it was very important, you had to have a human face to tell the story. I say that to a limited degree in print but it strikes me, in this subject area, that's particularly hard to do.

GLEN CHAPMAN:

Not if it's .wine, right?

JON HEALEY:

I'll drink to that.

GLEN CHAPMAN:

Seriously, when you start getting into the trademark issues with the TLDs, there's going to be global interest that will vary from place to place. I don't think that Saudi Arabia is going to be interested in the .wine dispute.

JON HEALEY:

Or they might be in a place that bans alcohol, what do you do? You're concerned because you want to talk about how we can block that

address in our regions. Some addresses, some issues make it easy like the .xxx, the .gay, anything that touches hot-button issues.

BRAD WHITE: It's got headline value.

JON HEALEY: Like .prolife, anything that's a hot-button but, again what we've done is we've touched that human issue. We've just given it the context of an internet web address but what you're really diving into that hot issue. I think an editorial would have a field-day with this kind of stuff.

GLEN CHAPMAN: I'll dig of into the .xxx as much as I possibly can.

JON HEALEY: And I'm sure your hits are way off the chart when you do.

BRAD WHITE: What was coming at you from Paris on the .wine controversy?

JON HEALEY: Fury because of course it's my fault that ICANN was....

BRAD WHITE: I think everyone in this room recognizes that fact. We agree with your editors.

GLEN CHAPMAN: It's understandable. There was an intent interest and demand from my editors in Paris because again, I'm like three global news watch AP US-based collaborative model, like Associated Press, Reuters it's Britian-based so when they get nasty-grams or whatever there from the UK. Me, even though we're global, my bosses are in Paris so, when I get the furious emails, they're in print. To me, what it touches on, to what degree is ICANN take into account when certain addresses represent a national identity. They're different places for France, they're different things that culturally seen at their heart and obviously wine is one of them.

BRAD WHITE: I can promise you if that wasn't in everyone's minds at the beginning, it is now. I can assure you that.

GLEN CHAPMAN: Right, exactly but why did it have to come later? So where was it in this transparent, "we're sharing everything" process?

BRAD WHITE: I would actually argue and I think what my executives would argue is that it was a process, it was a voice, there was a system. The problem is that a lot of people who are voicing opinions on that didn't enter into the system, they just discovered it one day and then, "Bam."

JOE MCKNIGHT: I was going to say that was...



BRAD WHITE: Is that correct?

JOE MCKNIGHT: That was what got heard was whether what some called "trade dispute" should be handled within ICANN. That gets into the nature of what falls under the remit of ICANN generally and that's a subject of great debate right.

BRAD WHITE: I wanted to ask Glen about, this is a story that Glen did on October 13th and in this piece he's got this quote, "ICANN has gone from being behind the scenes, tending the task of managing website address to being center-stage in a play for power on the internet." Very poetic. Is that bit of an overstatement? Does that over-inflate ICANN's reach?

GLEN CHAPMAN: I toned it down.

BRAD WHITE: I toned it down.

GLEN CHAPMAN: No, I wouldn't have written it if I thought it was a bit of an overstatement. It is hopefully a dramatically presented scene-setter because that's the core of a lot of what we're doing. The reason we're here, the reason we're about writing these stories and the reason I'm

saying things like, "Push back stories from ICANN about Russia. We're not going to let Russia push its way in. We're not going to let China push its way in." There are people pushing for influence over the address system whether it's for good reason or not. So, the fact that if you take something like ICANN and just say, "Don't blame us for content on websites because we're just managing the addresses. Don't mind us in the back room here." Well, you've come out of the back room because it's touching these other issues and people see it as the influence. The internet's become such an incredibly economic social communicative social-justice tool in modern culture. The stronger the internet gets the person in charge or has an influence over how it operates can't hide behind a curtain.

BRAD WHITE:

I'd be interested in hearing your opinion on this John, the way it came at me one time is someone said, "There's understanding that ICANN doesn't control the internet but the bottom line is, you're probably the closest thing to such an entity so, you're going to get those queries." Is that an over statement or what do you think?

JON HEALEY:

I think that's right at least until the ITU gets its way. The thing ICANN really does come close to controlling is whether there's going to be one internet. That is very threatening to some governments and it's tremendously important to every individual person on the planet. I think that's what helped elevate this story and that's what Glen was getting at in this piece. The notion that control the internet is to some

degree whether or not there's going to be one internet or a bunch of segregated government mediated versions thereof.

BRAD WHITE: [Bulcanization] is often said.

JON HEALEY: Hold on, I was ready for this. I'm going quote from the ICANN.org website. "The functions coordinating the unique identifiers that make the internet run." So, on your website, you are taking credit for making the internet run. If authority over the internet or governance or the overseer is what the power-play is here which is happening, well it's over the group that claims to make the internet run.

BRAD WHITE: I think that's an understandment. I think I should personally control the internet.

JON HEALEY: You're the guy who lines up all those cats.

BRAD WHITE: Let's look at another piece from Joe here. This is a piece. I put that up too quick. This ran today, didn't it? "The ICANN 51 conference opened with a likely resolution to recent disputes over its accountability processes hopes that Obama administration officials and ICANN's leadership [Ensakos]" Obviously, you're talking about [Priska], right?

JOE MCKNIGHT: Yes, [Priskers Rickling].

BRAD WHITE: Sorry?

JOE MCKNIGHT: [Priskers].

BRAD WHITE: Right, I'm taking from reading that that the accountability issue is as good as solved?

JOE MCKNIGHT: I would say it solved for the week. It's solved for this week. I'm not sure. I'm looking at that now, I should have said, "Recent and months-long."

BRAD WHITE: Yes, you can't edit after. It's out there man, it's done.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Yeah, this has been seven months since the announcement. That INA transition, the corresponding accountability process, it's been a seven-month arm wrestling contest between ICANN's upper management and the ICANN community at large. There's a flurry of letters a month ago between Jadhi, Dr. Crocker and ICANN's major constituencies and stakeholder groups. For the week, based on the revisions, people are happy, business constituency, civil society. I don't want to speak for certainly

everybody. I know it's hardly a done deal but, people were pleased with the revision which was...

BRAD WHITE:

That brings me to another question. I think most people in this room know Kevin Murphy with Domain Insight who is probably one of the more prolific trade reporters that covers ICANN. It's always interesting to me that whenever Kevin writes something it kind of resonates everywhere. A lot of reporters I know with mainstream media will tune into Kevin's stuff to see his take on various things. When we were in London, Kevin never made it over to the venue which kind of blew my mind. I said, "Kevin, what are you doing, Man? We're a couple of clicks away from your flat." Does being here, actually physically at the meeting as opposed to seeing these sessions on a video stream, does that add anything? Does that help you?

JOE MCKNIGHT:

Absolutely, I can walk up to an ICANN board chairman afterwards and if he wants to talk to me. I can never do that obviously if I was watching it remotely. Obviously, the majority of internet governance stake-holders aren't in the Beltway. It's a great opportunity to network as a reporter.

BRAD WHITE:

John, help me out with the LA Times. We've here all week. I haven't seen a flood of LA Times reporters in the press room.

JON HEALEY:

Yeah?

BRAD WHITE: Not to put you on the spot.

JON HEALEY: We're not a small newspaper but, we're not a specialized newspaper. We're a general interest newspaper. So there are I think about five tech reporters, one in Silicon Valley, four in the business section and they're covering the waterfall. This, it's tough to get them to go to any conference other than maybe the consumer electronics show or whatever Apple is doing which it's doing tomorrow. Other than that, something like this which is process-orientated as opposed to results-orientated, I think the chances of them coming here are between...

BRAD WHITE: So, in other words, they'll dip into the story when there's some sort of resolution or when it's reaching that end point?

JON HEALEY: There will be a policy reporter who will. It will be Jim Pusingara out of Washington most likely. Not one of the people who writes about the internet all the time.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Just to build on that same thing, it's the operating principle is some breaking news, meaning something meaningful that you can relate to the community. Aside from that, it's a resource issue which is

increasingly lean in these days in the media but, it's a great opportunity to deep-dive.

BRAD WHITE:

Right.

JON HEALEY:

Surely you could go, "You know, there is no breaking news today. So, it's a great chance to dive into all these people above and see who is who and see what is the real context? What is the real deal here on this whole battle between privacy and making a directory of who the people (actual real-name human beings) behind every website. Fascinating issue and I think a lot of people just conceptually would like to read about it and then the people who actually would care about wanting to know the human being behind every website. That goes to the other issue, the content issue we discussed. Maybe ICANN doesn't control content but it has a directory that's going to show Brad Light's address when he's got some wickedly offensive site he's operating. They can go to your house. It's a great issue to dive into but you need the time and the resources to go there.

JOE MCKNIGHT:

If I could pile on there, it also gets to the point of whether it's an incremental development or an issue that you really can sink your teeth into, the issue over anonymity. We could do that story at any point, because the developments on that are like a very slow moving train but it's the direction that its heading is incredibly important and the destination that it reaches is incredibly important. If I would try to

interest somebody in this story, if that was my job or something, I would probably say, "Look, these are the big issues and these are the people that it's going to effect and yes, you don't have to do it today but, when you get a spare day, this is something to do."

JON HEALEY:

That's why this kind of event is an opportunity because you get involved parties, relevant parties, informed parties coming here and for reporters you can have more of the fish-in-the-barrel effect rather than me having to chase them down in various countries if not across just this country. You can go, "Oh, there's a significant meaningful group of them here. Opportunity, when I have the time and the ability to dive into one of those really great meaty issues."

BRAD WHITE:

I must say that Glen is always very kind. Now and then I'll make a strategic mistake and call him up to pitch him on a story or telling him about something that's happening at ICANN and he'll tell me something insignificant like Apple's releasing something called the iPhone 6 and he's got to cover that. For God unknown reason, he seems to think that more people will be interested in that than our latest paper on internet governance. I don't get that.

JON HEALEY:

I will be in Cupertino tomorrow night. Unfortunately, another broad debate, just general news thing is that do journalists write about what we think you should know or do we write about what you want to know about? AFP has a D.C. bureau obviously connected, big on to national

issues, international issues, everything out of the political scene. We have an LA bureau. What do you think they spend most of their time doing. Really? It's not the ICANN meeting. It's if anything Kim Karedashian's mobile phone game might make it if they don't have me write about it. Some of it is you just hold constantly going battle in the media is like, "This is a really worthwhile issue." "Yeah, but people want to know about this."

GLEN CHAPMAN:

That's the existential challenge that faces all three of us, maybe to slightly less extent Joe because he's got a professional audience but for mainstream audiences, the editors are actively the bid. Do we approach this as a service in which case we ask our customers, "What do you want to read?" The answer is "What can you tell me about the latest Game of Thrones development?" versus the educational mission that those of us who are used to live high on the mountain top and bringing the stone tablets down. That business model is failing. So, given that, we tend to have to pay attention to what is it that people actually want to read. The dance is how do we get them interested in the things that we think are important to them? How do we get them to eat their vegetables?

JOE MCKNIGHT:

It's a little bit of the Mary Poppins model like; a spoonful of sugar helps the medicine go down. So you hope you can find that celebrity issue that somehow ties to the meaningful issue that you as an experienced journalist really kind of know that if people really stopped and thought

about it, they'd see this is important. At least that's what you hope you're on target with and then you kind of couch it in.

BRAD WHITE:

Following on that, let me ask you another question, where is that line? You've got to make what we do which clearly often times to the people outside of the ICANN community, it's boring. It's slow. It's as we've talked about, it's process. In an effort to make it both interesting and understandable to take all these dense documents and to boil down, you have to simplify. I get that but at what point is that simplification process gone to far? If I see one more headline that says, "ICANN's controlling the internet" or "The US is turning over control of the internet to an international body", to me that reinforces a misperception that the US controlled the internet.

JOE MCKNIGHT:

Why was the Commerce Secretary here the other day saying, "Well, if there's going to be one party that replaces us, it ain't happening." She seemed pretty adamant about that unless this is a model...

BRAD WHITE:

She wasn't saying we're controlling it. We're turning over entire control of the internet.

JON HEALEY:

If ICANN.org does indeed "coordinate the unique identifiers to make the internet run" and if there's an overseeing body. This is that transparency thing you tell us about. Is it really clear what veto capacity they have? Is

it really made clear to regular people? What does it mean to oversee? What control does it really do? Is there a coffee meeting between somebody and somebody? If it's that important that the Commerce Secretary is going to come here say, "We have to like it or it ain't happening." Why can't ICANN, if they're so independent (and this is not really controlled), say, "You know September 30 next year, we're done with you."

BRAD WHITE:

Let's deal with that for just a second. The whole IANA stewardship transition thing, it's largely symbolic. That's the last thread of US control, right? They're basically saying, "We're leaving it." There's a great deal of symbolism involved there. The actual process of what those technical functions are I'm not sure most people understand. I'm not sure most people in the community understand it but, I'm very sure that most people in the outside world don't understand it. What's wrong with simply saying, "This is largely a symbolic move and that in this action, the stewardship of this function, this technical function is going away"? The value here is symbolism." Is that more accurate?

JON HEALEY:

This thing that Brazil has been worried about, this thing that we've been making a big deal out of (we being ICANN), "Hey, we're just kidding. We're just doing this for your attention. It's all symbolic." Is that what you're talking about? Can I write this down right now?

BRAD WHITE: This is off the record. This entire meeting is off the record by the way. Spinning off that, let's look at the editorial that John wrote and this was right after...

JON HEALEY: I've already committed this one to memory; I'm sure just a few months ago.

BRAD WHITE: This was right after the stewardship transition had been announced. Again, keep in mind; this isn't a straight news piece. John's job is to write an opinion piece, so, this is an editorial. "The rest of the world can't trust the US to keep its hands off (I inserted the internet). The best hope for preserving the internet as we know it is to make sure that no governments are in charge." Some would argue that's an overstatement. I don't think it is personally.

JON HEALEY: But look, remember the context of this. This happened not long after the ITU discussion, right? Joe can tell this story better than I can. I'm sure you can. Last year on the Hill, there was a bunch of legislation introduced around the time the ITU was meeting to make sure that the United States didn't let anybody challenge the multi-stake-holder approach to the internet.

BRAD WHITE: Correct.

JON HEALEY:

So, we had all this tub-thumping and this was particularly by Republicans because they felt that the Obama administration wasn't doing enough to preserve the multi-stake-holder model that they cherished, even though they didn't understand it. Then, a couple months later, this happens, right? The reason I phrased it the way I did was my impression was what was motivating a lot of this back in the 90s when Clinton first started this ball rolling (or his Commerce Department first started this ball rolling) was they perceived there might someday be a challenge to the multi-stake-holder approach to the independency one. If people thought that Commerce Department really was putting its finger on the scale and so, that started the transition that is now culminating today in the pure commercialization for lack of a better word, our commercial control of the internet. What we were responding to you there was cross-current. You have other governments that would very much like to have a say over the technological underpinnings of the internet, the rules of traffic management, the ability to determine who is saying what to whom, the ability to make sure that all the data on the web that their are viewing comes from within their country. That's the Brazilian notion. So, you have all of that out there, that's government driven and at the same time, you have the United States saying, "You know, we really want to maintain the status quo and maybe the best thing that we can do to maintain the status quo is to say, 'Hey, even we don't have our fingers on the scales. See?'"

BRAD WHITE: If I remember correctly from our conversation beforehand, you covered ICANN to some degree before you got the LA Times, right?

JON HEALEY: A little bit, a very little.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Speaking from inside The Beltway, the smart money is it on the ICANN not renewing that contract September 30, 2015?

JON HEALEY: I'm not a betting man.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Oh come on! Nobody's getting out of this one.

JON HEALEY: Yeah, I'm skeptical and I'm not skeptical of the ICANN community. I'm more skeptical of Capital Hill allowing it to happen but then we hear pretty often there's a four-year extension to passing it over to the multi-stake-holder community.

BRAD WHITE: Right.

JOE MCKNIGHT: Which I'm playing off this whole model about, who should be involved? Is it important to hold on to it? Somebody wants to hold on to it and as

you said, it seems to be and the impression is it's on the US political side and not necessarily the ICANN side.

JON HEALEY:

Yeah, because the political side believes that we noble Americans are the firewall protecting the internet. We're going to see that next year. I'm a lot more confident than Joe that there's going to be legislation next year that will pass. It will part most likely of a must-pass, must-be-signed piece of legislation like a debt-ceiling bill or say a "keep the government open bill" or an annual appropriations bill. It's going to say that the Commerce Department must renew that contract.

BRAD WHITE:

I think we've got a question in the chat room. James?

JAMES KOHL:

Right, we have a question from Rimey Nulecki, IT Runs in Nigeria. "Do the panelists think there's a need to form a synergy between journalists in advanced countries like the United States and developing countries in Africa?" If yes, how fast should we go about improving ICANN's coverage and understanding beyond advanced countries?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

There was some hiss in his microphone.

BRAD WHITE:

Hold it a little farther away, speak a little slower, and try it again.

JAMES KOHL: Sure. "Do the panelists think there's a need to form a synergy between journalists in advanced countries like the United States and developing countries in Africa?"

GLEN CHAPMAN: A synergy between journalists?

JAMES KOHL: Yes.

GLEN CHAPMAN: Even in the same news room, that's the herding-cats model. I think that's great for journalistic collaborate. I appreciate the goal that they want but, I think that since what we do, what we put out there every day; there's is this natural symbyosis, a synergy that starts to happen. We're not keeping it secret. The whole purpose of our job is to take it and get it out there as quickly as we can. In which case, the journalist in Nigeria can go, "Hey, look what AFP just wrote. Bam, I'm jumping on it" and we can build on each other's work just by the nature of the model right now.

JOE MCKNIGHT: As long as there's one internet, his work is always going to be findable. His work is always going to findable although, you're probably behind a paywall.

JON HEALEY: Yeah and I don't know how much longer there's going to be an LA Times but my work will be findable. If you're in a developing country, you don't want the LA Times model. Maybe you want the AFP model but, you got find your own.

GLEN CHAPMAN: You always want the AFP model.

BRAD WHITE: Sure.

JONATHAN ZOOK: Thank you, Jonathan Zook from ACT the app associates, Brussels B.C. I think it's really great that you guys are here and having this conversation. One of the principle challenges of ICANN has always been to expand the number of people that are somehow involved in helping to make some of the decisions it makes. There's this constant call to involve more people, etc but the constant challenge of that is how do you make that involvement less onerous than coming and participating in this conference and learning has much as everybody here had to spend learning. I guess I am one of those people who would argue that transparency in and of itself is useless. It has no innate value except as a tool of accountability. So, unless that news, unless that transparency is sufficient to give me a basis for helping to make a decision or make a decision about who I elect or vote for, etc. or what concept I support it's valueless, it's just entertainment. So, I asked to say that the biggest the challenge that I think that ICANN has is to find a way to boil down some of the essential decisions it makes into a forum that more people would find approachable or accessible. That seems very interesting segue into

your role because, a lot of what you're trying to do is boil things down into a more palatable and a more digestible forum of information. I guess one of the things I want to push is that everything you write has to be accessible to everyone. I know that when somebody gets the paper, the LA Time, different people in the house pick up different sections of the paper and read different parts of it. You can write for different demographics for example. Is there a way to...? {Phone ringing} Excuse me.

JON HEALEY: If that's for me, take a message.

BRAD WHITE: If that's my mother, I'm busy.

JOHNATHAN ZOOK: I'll let her know. She was fine this morning.

BRAD WHITE: Good thing we're off the record.

JONATHAN ZOOK: That's my question, is there a way to shave off some portion of the demographics for which you write to get them more engaged and get them a little bit more information so that information is of a value beyond entertainment to them by reaching out to them specifically. I know it's different for you because you're serving wonks that at least pretend to care about a lot of things but even then, you're probably

lucky to get a subsection of them as well. That's my pushback is that some people pick up the cartoon section when they get the paper but, if we had to boil everything down to something that could be in a Marmaduke cartoon, I think we'd probably had failed our purpose.

JON HEALEY:

I would just point out and congratulate for waking up the people in here who were asleep. The different sections of the media that you see here and decreasing percentage of the media and we're heading towards a vanishing point, there are so many folks out there playing the role that used to be played just by Glen and me and that's because there's more and more entities like Joe's both professional and non-professional that are interest-based. I was thinking about the people who did the Pippa and Soapa protests.

JONATHAN ZOOK:

That was horrendously handled, I thought, in the media.

JON HEALEY:

When that protest got steam, the things that I'd been writing about because, my editorial board was into anti-Pippa before there was a Soapa. The things that we had been sort of declaiming against that weren't having any impact whatsoever on Washington, these other guys came out of no where, spread the word in an easily digestible, not necessarily entirely accurate Forbes and got people motivated. That's what's going to be communication's pathway to the future. We're not the guys who have got the monopoly.

GLEN CHAPMAN: You're asking a misanthrope, at least on this end, to believe that if we just more clearly distill cthe message, people will act for the greater good just of their own initiative. Through the course of my career, I've had a hard time embracing that model. I will be really quick because I don't want to take too many people up. In early in my reporting career, I wrote this major story, I actually got death-threats because it was this problem with the juvenile justice system and it was scandalous and I went out, didn't get a phone call. A couple nights later, I'm working a night like cop-beat, there's some goof-ball sheriff's deputy who was out on a county road somewhere, nowhere and he gets blinded by a flash. He dives behind the patrol car and goes, "I'm under attack by aliens." I wrote this thing totally tongue-in-cheek because the movie Pnemion was out with John Travolta. I finished off my graph, totally tongue-in-cheek and there's been no improvement in his IQ. That night and they had to send out traffic control out to that road because people were blocking the lines cars and cars and cars looking for the aliens.

JON HEALEY: I take it there was no improvement in their IQ's either.

JONATHAN ZOOK: It was like War of the Worlds, right?

GLEN CHAPMAN: We can tell people as clearly and as brilliantly as you want and I'm with you. We've had some pressure in newsrooms and I agree with it over time to put more actionable components in it. It's like, "Here's the story

and here's what you can do." That's our world. We can go that far. We can clearly distill it as you suggested and say, "Oh and here are things that you can do to act." Then, we wouldn't need ICANN or whomever or you or someone else to come with us and say, "Well, here's a place where people can take action because, we're the messengers in a way. We try to do our best job to get your attention, to get to the truth, to make it clear, to make it interesting, to do everything we have to do but, we can't make you act. We can tell you what you can do and hopefully, we've provided you with news to take action. We can at least give that our there and then tell the misanthrope to be quiet.

JON HEALEY:

Sadly, we can't even make you pay.

JONATHAN ZOOK:

That's right; I wouldn't want to climb up the misanthrope ever. I think it's very important. So, I should have mentioned Heathcliff or something instead of Marmaduke. I guess my point is that having to try to write everything for everyone feels like something that you're setting out to fail. I don't mean just write things more clearly. I mean bury the piece about this in the middle of the book reviews and be elitist about it or something like that so that people you think may take the time to read it are the ones coming across it instead of it turning it into the headline, "The US is giving away the internet," or something like that. A year from now, we've been tasked by the US government to assess whether or not the new gTLD program promoted consumer trust and increased choice and competition in the internet. I don't claim to speak for consumers

but even if it's not all of them, is there some subset of them that you could be trying to reach instead of trying to always reach all of them?

JON HEALEY:

Let me throw some numbers your way. We have about 500,000 daily readers of the print version and north of 6 million on line. Depending on the type of story, it's between 30% and 60% of those readers who come to us not from latimes.com but from Google. So, you have people who already have an inclination that there's a story out there that they might be interested in. Part of it is, continuing to cover something so that the people who have a natural interest in it will stay up to date and will have a reason to act. As far putting it in a different section of the paper, that's a fraction of the audience. The audience now is on line and reaching them, Google is the best friend.

GLEN CHAPMAN:

Narrowing a scope of a story, I'm not quite sure that's an effective way to get the message out. You're suggesting that rather than look for the common human element that puts into most people's lives, is to focus it at geeks or politicians or small businesses. That raises questionable issues about effective use of resource. We actually do some that like more people in the wire service included have eco-departments and that's when you go into the store. Heck all the time, it's coming again earnings. Those are all eco-stories doing the deep-dive that you talked about. Some people inside the wire service would argue some of the stuff wrote about ICANN is for a select audience. As much as you hard as you try, you're not doing it for the broadest audience. Some of this

stuff we do reach and try to write about the fact we're doing it is trying to reach that more segmented interested community.

BRAD WHITE: I like the way you guys, we have five minutes left and everybody's lining up now. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi guys, I was watching the Page One documentary which I'm sure you've probably all seen, the one about the New York Times. Not in the documentary but in the extra bits you get with the DVD...

BRAD WHITE: We can hear you. It's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's an interview with Carl Bernstein and he says that the most important thing a reporter does, a news organization does is to decide what news is. On that basis, do you guys take any responsibility that the people get more of a nut-grab from Kim Karedashian than they do out of ICANN? Especially when you look at in LA, Steve Crocker Monday's lecture, he introduced the fact that three of the guys who set up the internet came from the same family's high school. Surely, that's a story. Why is it these guys who have had an impact (it dwarfs the impact that the Beatles have had) are unknown?

JON HEALEY: Chances are we've written that story. We just didn't do it Monday.

JOE MCKNIGHT: I did actually write that story. See, now you're hurting me. Now, my heart's broken. I wrote the story years ago at one of the anniversaries of the internet, was it Rockwell? He was here earlier this week.

BRAD WHITE: [Clinewell].

JOE MCKNIGHT: [Clinewell] I and I flew down to LA because I'm based in Northern California and I met with him and it was an awesome union and I did the whole thing. I did pictures. We did everything. So, I'm with you. We do it.

JON HEALEY: But it's an absolute valid criticism. If you look at the demographics of my portion of the business (which is probably quite different from Joe's), the LA Times used to only hire people who had at least 10 years of experience. Now, we hire people who have about 10 minutes of experience. Those of us who are left (I've been doing this for 34 years), we take very seriously that first part that you mentioned, our judgement of what is news. It's how people perceive the bias of the newspaper; you decide what news is and what gets into the pages. Many of us are chagrined by not just the shrinking size of the newspaper because it's happening to every newspaper but also the selection of things based on...

going to put my energy today?" Whether you like it or not, whether you think you are being fair or not, you're subjectively going to take your news judgement and go, "This is where I think I should spend my news today unless my editor really cracks the whip on me."

BRAD WHITE: I'm sorry to interrupt. We are basically at shut down time now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

JOE MCKNIGHT: I would say in answer to that question that you're trying to ask, reach out directly to us. If you've got something that you think is meaty enough that the people for whom we write is going to take an interest in it then, we'll recognize that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you know the auction sale of three gTLDs that raised 15 million would put a valuation on the first gTLD application at about 7 billion dollars. I don't know if that's enough news for you but maybe it is.

BRAD WHITE: Grace. I should have said this in the beginning, if you would say your name and who you're representing if anyone just for the record that would be helpful.

GRACE ABUHAMAD: Hi, I'm Grace Abuhamad and I am a member of the ICANN staff. I read your pieces as one way to get information about what the sense of the community is, what they're thinking about certain issues. It's just a way to inform myself as staff when I'm working on things. One of the things I've noticed is that you tend to quote the same people over and over again and ICANN is large community. So, I was wondering if you could speak to perhaps how you choose your quotes and how you reach out to the broader community as ICANN continues to grow.

JOE MCKNIGHT: It is part of the reason I'm here. I'm frustrated with that all the time. I get sort of caught up in The Beltway internet governance folks obviously. There's a rainbow of opinion available all over the world. Yeah, it's a challenge. A deadline is a challenge because we're a daily. Being in the same time zone helps a lot and that's a challenge. Covering this conference, my deadline is still 4:30 EST. So, I'm filing everything at 1:30 anyways. It's something that can be improved and I don't think there's a great excuse for it but there are those that are better at getting back and there are those that don't get back at all.

JON HEALEY: In the ICANN case, the idea of community isn't really clearly defined. There's not like an ICANN community directory. So, like you said, if anything daily deadline news wire. Seconds, I get measured in seconds on breaking news, minutes if I'm lucky. If I have an hour I think I'm in heaven. So, to find that community, a lot of times on stuff especially if we can't do this all day everyday, we end up going through gate

keepers. So, really if you want, you're inside ICANN, complain to Brad. He's handing the reporter the same people every time.

BRAD WHITE: Please complain to me because I don't hear quite enough complaints so, I'd be happy.

JON HEALEY: There are sources as a reporter that you trust more than others. There are those that know this stuff better than others and one of them is standing right behind me. I try to talk to [McKaley] when I can but we're in a different time zone so that's tough. It's tougher to talk to [McKaley] sometimes. It's not his fault. It's my fault.

BRAD WHITE: Since you've introduced [McKaley], go ahead.

[MCKALEY]: Thanks, sorry Brad. I think this is very good that you've organized this kind of session again. You've did it, is this the second or the third time?

BRAD WHITE: We tried it in Toronto. We tried it in Durbin and it didn't work so well so, this actually the third.

[MCKALEY]: I think it's interesting because I think there's a problem here that a lot of us have come to ICANN meetings on a regular basis, we're in the

bubble. We think that ICANN is terribly, terribly important. Whereas the reality is that a lot of the stuff that comes out of this is but the day-to-day stuff is boring. So, you have my sympathies. I mean, how to make these meetings sound interesting to the general public is a challenge. I do talk to you and don't normally have trouble getting your hands on me. It isn't that hard. I think I will bring these up with Brad later. I think the vetting of different views from yourselves on how you have to speak to normal people about this base is probably very helpful both for those of us who attend the meetings and the ICANN staff because if the journalists who follow us professionally have difficulty understanding it, then how on earth is ICANN going to be more accessible to the broader public. If they language that people are talking about is so impenetrable, this is not a reflection on you Brad but, you are ICANN staff and you are in my line of sights so, you're getting the full brunt of it. Thank you, I think it's interesting.

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks. Alright, thanks [McKaley]. We're going to wrap it up with that. Let's give these guys a hand. [Applause] Thanks everyone, appreciate it.

JON HEALEY:

Thank you all.