

**Director Voting Statements for Resolution 2011.06.20.01
Vote on Approval of the New gTLD Program**

20 June 2011 Board of Directors Meeting

The statements are produced in order of submission.

Cherine Chalaby:

Today, many people may think we have reached the end of the journey for the new gTLD program. The Board would say no. It is only the end of the beginning. The hard and difficult work is yet to come.

ICANN must execute with excellence a program of such scale and importance. The ICANN Board understands that there will be continuing challenges ahead, and looks forward to a long-term interaction with the GAC and the community for the mutual benefit of all.

Yes, the multistakeholder model is alive and working. But the Board however understands that the model is not set in stone and is not complete. The model must continue to evolve and we must continue to improve. In particular, the Board recognizes that it can do more in fostering better consensus in the community and in reaching closure.

We will continue to work hard at building trust, at better explaining our rationale, and in developing more mature and responsible relationships with all members of the community.

On that basis, I support the launch of this exciting and innovative program that will have a major impact on the global Internet community.

Thank you.

George Sadowsky:

This is one of the most important votes in which I will participate within ICANN. I have agonized over it, and I finally decided to vote against the resolution. The reasons are complex and they are not obvious, and I want to provide a more thorough explanation.

This is a vote regarding expansion of the gTLD space but it's also a vote that will fundamentally affect two of ICANN's most important relationships. The first relationship is internal. That is the relationship between the Board and parts of the ICANN community with the GAC, which, lest we forget, is also a part of the ICANN community. The second relationship is external, and it is the relationship

between ICANN and the large mass of people in the developing world, plus many who are disadvantaged in special ways in other parts of the world, with respect to Internet access and use.

I don't take comfort in opposing this resolution. Legitimate demand for new generic top-level domains clearly exists. Satisfying this demand is critical for IDN gTLDs. And they are absolutely essential for many script and language communities.

These IDN gTLDs have long been held hostage to the overall gTLD policy process, with the only possible alternatives being the newly-established IDN ccTLDs, which may or may not be available to individuals in businesses and which may have undesirable properties regarding privacy of information.

However, it's clear that there are still some significant and strongly felt differences of opinion between the content of the resolution and the views of the GAC and some of its members.

In the last months, the Board/GAC relationship has been tested by many differences, and there has been progress in resolving many of these, some by compromise and others by the development of better communication and better understanding of common goals and what consists of mutually acceptable solutions. However, this process is not sufficiently complete, and there is more work to be done, including making significant improvements in our understanding of each other's culture, and making our communication patterns more effective.

Advancing this agenda should not be based on the results of a residual zero-sum game.

I strongly favor the creation of new gTLDs, but I want to see this process concluded satisfactorily. We need to launch this program in the right way on the basis of strong and shared agreement among the community, but we are not yet there in my opinion. While I reject this motion, I would welcome a vote in favor of launching a new gTLD program several months from now, but only when our differences are largely resolved.

The second relationship involved in this vote, the relationship mostly with the developing world, is, I believe, as important as the new gTLD decision, even though it rates only a passing mention in the resolution, and I think a line or maybe a paragraph in the *Guidebook*.

Long after our current fascination with our current creation of new gTLDs has diminished, we will be increasingly involved for a long time with what might best be called in this context the rest of the world. That is the class of people, mostly in developing countries, who do not have adequate or usable Internet capabilities

by virtue of shortcomings in DNS capabilities. It's very important to get this relationship started on the right track.

I don't doubt the sincerity or the motivations of those both in the JAS and in the GAC who argued for subsidization and assistance to so-called needy applicants. However I believe we can and should do significantly better and the current proposal is not, in my opinion, an effective way to assist these populations in a manner consistent with the mandate of ICANN. It's my sense that the focus of this resolution, which was limited to assistance of various kinds with regard to applying for new gTLDs, is inadequate in scope and advances our relationship on the wrong basis.

Let me explain, and I will do so by making two observations followed by some reasons why I believe this is so.

The first observation is that I strongly favor planning for and providing assistance to the developing world. I have personally worked in more than 50 developing countries, some intensively, about 20 of them in Africa, and I have spent somewhere between a third and a half of a long professional life working in them, with them and on their behalf. I have seen more than my share of the effects of hunger, disease, lack of education, illiteracy and poverty. People in these countries need all kinds of help, and we should provide assistance that will help them most, consistent with our strengths, with our resources, and mostly important, within the scope of our mandate.

Secondly, I'm painfully aware of the optics of this intervention. I'm from the north and I am sitting next to my friend and colleague Katim Touray who is from the south, and I am in effect saying that what he is passionately arguing for is not best for him. This goes counter to the conventional wisdom that southerners understand their problems and issues better than northerners and that assistance provided to them should primarily enable them to address those problems themselves. To this I would say I hope we can, in this discussion, rise above political correctness and admit that the opinions of northerners regarding such matters are sometimes correct and the opinions of southerners are not always the more effective.

Now I would like to provide reasons why this initiative, however well meaning, does not serve its beneficiaries or ICANN effectively or well.

The proposal is based largely, but not totally, on making funds available. Casting ICANN in the principal role of funder or banker -- that's not the only role, but that's the principal role. Given what ICANN could provide in terms of assistance, do we want the developing world to see us largely as a source of funds? If they do then demand for assistance is likely to be high and will inexorably grow. Once a funder, we will always be seen as a funder. Demand will grow more based upon this perception than any other.

The proposal ignores the opportunity cost of directing the resources elsewhere. Assuming the amount of \$2 million for such a program, that's the net figure that's been mentioned from time to time, one could probably assist from 20 to 40 so-called needy applicants.

One could equally well provide 1,000 additional fellowships to ICANN meetings, or one could provide 100 to 200 consultations and workshops in the field in developing countries on aspects of security and stability, or one could provide assistance to establish local registrars in developing world, or one could construct multiple other combinations of goods and services. \$2 million can be a lot of money if it's used well.

So which of these alternatives or which mix of those alternatives is most effective for achieving our goals in the developing world? I don't know. And I would argue that collectively we don't know.

And the reason we don't know is that we never asked the question.

Instead, we asked the wrong question, which was in effect, how can we get money to propagate new gTLDs about which we're really enthusiastic into the developing world.

This is a tool-based approach, not a goal-based approach.

Another problem is posed by the insistence that such an initiative be included in the first round of applications so that, as I understand it, I'm not sure of this but I think I understand it, needy applicants somehow have equal access to good names.

In doing so, it's my feeling that the proposal implicitly exhibits a lack of faith in the private sector led orientation of the program. In my opinion, what matters is that good names become available for consumers, and whether a needy applicant or a non-needy applicant offers the name should not really be an issue. Why should subsidies be granted when there is no evidence to indicate whether and where they are needed to provide consumer choice? If the market doesn't provide them in the first round, then we do have the option to adopt in the future a more sharply formed set of remedial measures based upon actual experience.

I believe it is not ICANN's job to influence the choice of winners and losers in such competitions, but that is implicitly what we will be doing.

The selection of who is truly needy, whether decided internally or by an external body, nevertheless guided by ICANN's terms of reference, is fraught with danger, is political sensitive and has nothing to do with ICANN's technical mandate. It is outside the scope of ICANN's mission, whether delegated or done internally.

I would like to suggest an alternative. Recognizing that we do have a responsibility for helping the developing world, let's make a serious effort to determine what reasonable goals for ICANN might be in this space, given ICANN's substantial wealth of talent and experience and potential financial resources.

The goals are likely to be met by a combination of products and services, and one that may well vary by geography and by time.

I don't believe that the ICANN community alone can define such a program effectively. We don't have the combined skill set or depth of experience. So let's figure out who our most effective partners would be. Let's then move promptly to execute so we can achieve these goals and meet our obligations to the global public interest in a manner consistent with and within our organizational mandate.

I would be enthusiastic about affiliating with such an alternative and about voting for a resolution that resolves to create it. In contrast, the approach contained in the current resolution offers a poor and misdirected substitute and should be rejected.

Thank you.

Erika Mann:

My experience from my 15 years' experience from the political world and always being engaged in international foras and international agreements, I think it is actually time to take a decision. And my personal opinion, being a relatively new member on the Board, is that actually the multistakeholder model is working pretty well.

There is, of course, never a guarantee that one can find a compromise in such a way that everyone, hundred percent, will agree on all of the decision which will be taken, but that's part of the multistakeholder model. That is embedded into the philosophy of it.

But that's the beauty of it, because if you look at it, how otherwise one could negotiate something, it is much more complex. If you look into all of the international agreements, the way they are negotiated, it takes as long, if not even longer, than the time it took for us to find a decision, and it is not uniform as well.

So there is no guarantee if one would look into another solution of finding solution that the outcome would be more harmonious.

So my understanding is that we have find the best solution, the optimum solution possible.

There is always the need to improve. Improvement is always needed, but this is true for the way the multistakeholder model and ICANN is designed, but that's true for all other way international operate -- international organizations negotiate their agreements.

So I am confident that the way we have drafted the resolution is the optimum of what we can reach, and I will support it.

I am deeply convinced that it will enhance competition, that it will bring more innovation into the ecosystem, and that it will help many new businesses to involve. And I am deeply convinced as well that for the developing world, the seed fund which we give, and it's a seed fund which hopefully will be matched by other donors, and will actually help developing countries -- or not developing countries, but organizations and companies from developing countries to find their way and their access into this ecosystem.

I think it's time for reality check. One can continue forever to negotiate, and I have deep respect for all the governments and for all the stakeholders involved, particularly the GAC. I know how hard they have worked, and I know how deeply governments must stay committed to their national regulatory environment. But I'm deeply convinced as well that the Internet, it's a global, as we always say, environment, it's an international environment, which automatically means that compromise is needed on this level.

So my support for this resolution is there.

Thank you.

Mike Silber:

I've made a decision to abstain on this vote, and I wanted to make a statement.

My decision to abstain on this resolution has taken a great deal of thought and internal debate. I am aware, as one of my colleagues will no doubt shortly point out -- thank you, Ray -- that in terms of the voting procedures in the ICANN bylaws that my abstention amounts to a vote in the negative. At the same time I wanted to be clear that I am no way opposed to the concept of new gTLDs or to their introduction.

Instead, my abstention relates to the process that has led to today's vote. In fact, I am a firm believer that the introduction of new gTLDs will enhance competition, innovation and consumer choice.

However, a belief is, in my view, scant grounds for exercising my fiduciary duty, especially when the Affirmation of Commitments calls for a, and I'll quote, "bottom-up policy development model for DNS technical coordination that acts for the benefit of global Internet users and further calls for fact-based policy development, cross-community deliberations, and responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions, including how comments have influenced the development of policy considerations, and particularly requires that ICANN will ensure that as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved, including competition, consumer protections, security, stability, and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns and rights protections, will be adequately addressed prior to implementation."

Based on the interaction between the Board and Governmental Advisory Committee on Sunday, 19 June 2011, I'm of the view that the process is close to finality but not yet there. There are still issues open that prevent me from concluding that issues have been adequately addressed before this vote. In addition, as the Board sat in workshop last night heading towards midnight and still working on substantive issues, I could not conclude that policy was being developed based on facts and on a bottom-up basis. In particular, it is my view that all aspects of the competition implications of the manner of the introduction of new gTLDs and, in particular, the issue of separation between registries and registrars and the impact on both existing and new registries and registrars has not been comprehensively resolved.

In addition, I have grave concerns regarding how the new gTLD program affects the least developed countries. I greatly appreciate the hard work and effort that have been done since the issue started receiving the attention it deserves. However, I cannot agree that providing assistance, financial or otherwise, to a few needy applicants, actually addresses the needs of communities in the least developed economies. I refer, in particular, to the work done by several colleagues in the ccTLD community. Using surplus funds generated by providing domain names to then support the development of technology, policy, and community involvement, rather than handing out a few free or price-reduced domain names. While new gTLDs could be useful to many communities, including in the least developed economies, believing that we have fulfilled our responsibilities to assist such communities by subsidizing a few new gTLDs is, in my view, naive. I must indicate a great deal of sympathy with my colleagues on the GAC and their frustrations regarding this process and at times a perceived lack of willingness on the part of the Board to engage in responsive consultation. I do, however, believe that many of the issues raised in that engagement were the result of communities forum shopping and, having not achieved the desired result in one place, lobbying their governments to raise it in another. However, that is the result of the multistakeholder model. And, whether desirable or not, it is a consequence with which we must deal to obtain all the other benefits that multistakeholder engagement brings. I would, however, encourage the GAC to

be more responsive as a result of these interactions and not to retreat, to raise issues earlier, if possible, and to consider how best to respond to the fast-paced and fluid nature of policy work in a multistakeholder environment. They have done much work and managed to change thinking and influence policy in many areas. And in all that, they have achieved much.

I congratulate my colleagues on the Board, in the SOs and ACs who have worked so hard on this issue over many years and, in particular, the staff for their dedication and expertise.

However, when the end is in sight, I cannot bring myself to vote in the affirmative for a resolution that is brought to the Board now based on artificial and ego-driven deadlines, particularly when, in my view, the program is so close to completion but still weeks or only days way from adequately addressing those considerations contained in the Affirmation of Commitments. I will, accordingly, abstain.

Ray Plzak:

For the community, you need to understand that in the bylaws, the rules of quorum for the Board, basically, says that, when you read the fine print, that, if you abstain, your vote in effect is a "no" vote.

It's unfortunate that persons who wish to recuse themselves for legitimate reasons, such as Bruce has done, in effect are casting a "no" vote, particularly, someone in the case of Bruce, who has worked so hard for this program. However, because of that peculiarity, I have grave misgivings about anyone who abstains for other than reasons of conflicts of interest. And, therefore, I consider any other reason for abstaining to actually be a "no" vote. And the preface of both George, who is voting "no" and Mike who is abstaining is, basically, the same. The peculiarities and details of why they're casting their vote are similar. However, they do have some differences.

Therefore, I just wish to go on the record stating that I consider any abstention other than the one that's given by Bruce as being a "no" vote on this matter.

Steve Crocker:

This has been a very, very long process. Enormous amounts of work has been put into it. You've heard from my colleagues Cherine Chalaby and Erika Mann talking about the work that's been put into it and the quality of discussions and the need to move on. And I fully support that.

This is one of the obligations and expectations that was part of the founding of ICANN. And this is a quite historic point in time in that this will discharge -- but,

as Cherine said, it will be the end of the beginning, not the end of the process. But it will discharge the long, longstanding obligation to open up the TLD space.

I've been involved in and listening carefully to the arguments back and forth about whether this is a good thing, whether it will actually generate any interesting ideas, or whether it will be to the advantage of everybody. The case for the IDNs was very strong. The case for new TLDs is a little harder to pin down. But one of the most important principles in the creation of the Internet from a very long time ago was not to stifle or prejudge what the paths for innovation are.

So the default has to be that, absent a strong case that such things will cause harm, we must move forward. And I strongly support this.

Is this program perfect? Of course not. Is it solid? It is. Every imaginable aspect has been examined six ways from Sunday. Everybody has had a voice. Not everybody who has spoken and has a position has had their position satisfied. But that is the nature of the very big environment and all-inclusive world that we live in.

I want to say a little bit about support for developing countries and for needy applicants. Katim has been very forceful and consistent and persistent about pushing in that area. And there is a great deal of empathy and desire to be supportive.

I also very much appreciate George's and Mike's comments. Just because we are empathetic and sensitive, doesn't instantly create a clear path forward. So, as you've seen, we are committed to figuring out what makes sense in that area. But it is also equally clear there are many things we could try to do that would have the appearance of being helpful that, in the end, would not necessarily make a significant difference. So we continue to wrestle with that and to find a way forward. And I think we're all committed to doing that. That remains a part of the refinement of the process as we move forward.

If you take time to work through the applicant guidebook and imagine how much work has gone into that, the number of iterations that you've all seen, the dedication of the staff to put the pieces together, what you'll see is a very solid program. Many people will write positive and negative things, I'm sure.

I hope that this is studied in business schools going forward and analyzed in many ways, and we'll look back and try to understand what the results were compared to what we expected. And I think that's a very healthy process. But, having been involved in a series of key decisions along the way from the very beginning, I fully understand that trying to do it exactly right and particularly trying to hold things up to get things exactly right, is exactly the wrong thing to do.

So with no hesitation, really, I plan to vote and not only vote in the affirmative, but to be wholeheartedly behind the execution. Hard work remains very much in front of us. And the hard work will be for the entire community. As hard as it is for the ICANN staff to be organized and staff this up, I know full well how much work everyone in the community will do as applications are prepared, as plans are put in place to bring forth new gTLDs, and then the enormous amount of energy needed to promote and bring them in to live operation and make them succeed. And strap yourself in. There will be a little bit of turbulence along the way, but it will be a quite exciting ride. Thank you.

Katim Touray:

Good morning, everyone. I just want to very briefly take this opportunity to say a few words dealing with a profound sense of gratitude I feel toward the community. I think we should all be genuinely proud of what the community has been able to do over the past 6 or so years in putting this thing together, the new gTLD program, through a very highly consultative multistakeholder process. I dare say that, for me, I've always told people that the multistakeholder process is not just something that I like to see work for ICANN but to have it really serve as a new paradigm for development partnership and international cooperation. And I'm glad to say that I think it's actually having its effect beyond ICANN. Because I think it was just sometime last year when there was a lot of hew and crying amongst the international development community. When an attempt was made to really steer the IGF process, it was, I believe, in a direction that was not multistakeholder. And, of course, the resulting pushback meant that there had to be an effective clampdown and make sure that we ended up with a multistakeholder process. So congratulations in not only achieving this, but in the very process that you used to achieve it. I think it's one of evolution, and I'm sure a lot of people will take the cue from you.

The process has also resulted in an addition that's been taken to ensure that we provide support to applicants from developing country and needy applicants generically.

I say this is a very important issue because, from the get-go, the desire has been, as articulated in the resolution that was put out by the ICANN Board in Nairobi last year, resolution 20, the desire was that we have an inclusive process; that is, those that can have genuine grounds for applying for a new gTLD to serve a community, serve a cultural need, geographic need, or whatever but do not have the wherewithal by virtue of their economic disposition, by virtue of being located in a developing country that do not have the wherewithal to come up with resources to meet the application requirements will and should be provided support.

And I think the issue here is that we are not quarreling about whether we should do it or not. I think that that much has very much been resolved now. Generally,

people now understand or agree that we need to do something about providing support to needy applicants. The way I see it is that we have decided that we're going to cook dinner. And the issue now is whether we're going to have chapati or pizza. So I think that's a huge process. And I'd like to congratulate you for that.

I'd also like to say that this commitment and a desire to provide support to needy applicants from developing countries is something that's very much along the lines of prevailing practice, prevailing best practice and sentiment in the international development community, of which ICANN, I consider, is becoming an increasingly important player. It was just last month, actually in May in Istanbul, Turkey, that the U.N. organized its fourth summit on least developed countries that was attended by over 10,000 people, including heads of states from all over the world, where, basically, the meeting was they brought in all hands on deck to discuss the agenda for agents in a developing community and providing support and assistance and partnership with and for the developing countries.

And I think ICANN needs to pick a cue from that. And I'm glad to say that we're also in the process of trying to see whether it would be possible to organize a summit along those lines in Senegal when ICANN has its last international public meeting this coming October.

In the same vein, my good friend, Dr. Sadowsky, and a couple other people, including myself, are organizing a workshop in Nairobi in the upcoming IGF to be held there to precisely discuss the role of the ICANN and IETF and similarly named "I" organizations and Internet governance and their role in development assistance and development partnership. So let's see this as really one plan in the very important series of steps that we need to take to build and strengthen the partnerships that we have. I think, given where we are, what remains now is to really figure out how we implement. And, again here, let me take this opportunity to say a big thank you to the JAS working group, the GNSO Council and the ALAC and the GAC for wonderful support and incredible effort that they put in and continue to put in developing a strategy and devising ways and means that we can use to support the community. We really couldn't say thank you enough to them.

And, finally, I always keep saying let's keep in mind this one simple thing that, to me, I think should be key to everything we do in regards to our support that we provide to the developing world. We should not do this from a very patronizing perspective. We should do this because I think -- because it's what's best for the developing world. But also it is what's best for ICANN. And indeed, on a very much larger scale, I'd like us to really remember this as we move forward in our engagement as we move forward with the implementation program, that the world is a better place if it is better for all of us. It is not going to be a better world

if it's only better for a few, for the rich, for the wealthy, for those that have the wherewithal. Thank you.

Sébastien Bachollet:

This new gTLD program brings a lot of challenges. I would like to underline some of them.

First, a point about the way we organized the debate here in Singapore. Stakeholders should have been able to interact on an equal footing. "Equal footing" means to listen also to the non-GAC part of the community about the new gTLDs program before it's final adoption.

In line with ICANN's values, it would have been better if all the parties had had an opportunity to express their views. Limiting the debate to GAC-Board increased the potential for misunderstandings.

Another point I wish to make is about the principle of "cost recovery". Despite the pleasant sound of the word, it is not always a good idea. It is just as if we asked the new TelCos that enter a monopoly market to pay for the cost of introducing competition. Cost recovery can mean discrimination against newcomers and favoring incumbents.

The proposed timeline is too long. But I hope it will help new projects to emerge. I believe it allows the ICANN community to prepare a satisfactory solution to help needy applicants.

Some people fear that new gTLDs will cause confusion. To decrease the risk we need to be able to adapt the program without letting the timeline slip. Most importantly we need to announce when a second round will be open. That will decrease the pressure on the upcoming round. Many potential applicants will prefer a later round. But they can only do so if they have a reliable timeline.

Concerning the fear of confusion: for any reform, there will be a phase of stress until people get used to the change. The longer we defer a reform, the more there will be stress when we finally act. In the case of new gTLDs, I trust that we have the tools to ensure that the phase of stress will be brief. It means, of course, that we need to be able to apply remedies once problems appear. Taking GAC advice, and other stakeholder input, are key mechanisms for this.

The only way to complete the preparations of the new gTLD program is to place it into real life. This is why I will vote for the new gTLDs program.

Thank you very much.

Kuo-Wei Wu:

[Translated from Chinese] Please allow me to speak in Chinese. The reason is we're here in Singapore. And also the Chinese is around world, you know? In every country, every region you can see all the Chinese. So please allow me to do that.

Today we have the opportunity to express our views in a non-Latin language system. First of all, we'd like to thank the few persons who were involved in this whole process. The first is Dr. John Klensin. He has helped this team with the IETF that this working group would be able to progress.

And, secondly, we would like to thank Professor Qian Hualin from China and Dr. Kenny Huang from Taiwan and Dr. Konishi from Japan. Today we have this development. This would not be possible if not for the efforts of these four persons. Without them there would not have been IDNs. So, for those who use the IDNs to service an organization and make use of the services, they're very glad that we have this development.

The IETF has a lot of functions that has not been perfected, for example, e-mail, FTP lock-in. And there are a lot of functions yet to be perfected. So we must know that we still have a lot of passionate and participatory nations to make sure that the IDN can have the same effect as the other Latin-based language systems. So this is a long way to go, I think, for anyone who provides IDN to service, has the duty to let people know our limitations.

Today I support this resolution because I feel that, for most of the registry organizations, that you have concentrated in a few places only. I am hoping that IDNs would enable this organization to be developed in more countries and more territories, not only in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong or, in fact, any place in the world so that the registry or gTLD registry would not be confined to just a few places.

And another point that I'd like to raise and to remind all our participants today, domain name is not the only challenge that we have to face in the future. In fact, we still have IPv6 that we need to promote.

So on the 6th of August, I shall attempt to make a proposal this is a great development. But it is not the end. So I hope that IPv6 will be as secured and as convenient as IPv4. Many of us in the domain name market, we please do not feel that we can nominate this market. If we do not have full support for IPv6, our development will be limited. And, of course, we want to support some related development in this field. So, no matter how the voting goes, how the result will be, and this will be a very important beginning for our future development. Thank you.

Gonzalo Navarro:

[Translated from Spanish] I'm going to be brief, because I think that most of the important things have been already expressed by my colleagues in the Board. But I do believe that it is necessary to be grateful to the community as a whole because of the great amount of hours devoted to this project. I am really impressed. I've never seen such work. And I want to congratulate my colleagues on the Board. It is also very good to see that the system of the multistakeholder model is working and is working in a good way. Perhaps in some -- at some time we'll see that what we are doing right now represents the first step in a change of an internationalized system allowing a better dialogue and more productive dialogue in different areas that in the past didn't have the possibility of communicating, not only in topics related to Internet but also in other topics of the international community. When it comes to the program we're approving now, when you think of public policy, you have to be open enough to accept that in public policy, nothing is perfect. Because it can be ideally perfect from the very beginning. But what we do have is public policy that might be better than other policies because they have more effort or because they imply more opportunities.

Then, after more than one year of hard work with my colleagues on the Board and, as I said, with the input of the community, I think that we have reached a level of seriousness and maturity. And we are about to approve this program. And this allowed us, or at least it allows me to see the most difficult part, which is the implementation of this policy. When we implement this policy or this plan, we will realize, if it is a quality policy and a good one, I think that we are on the way. But, in order to reach the goal and to build something useful for the community we are representing, we will need not only your help, but we will need to continue working in the conversation or communication framework. In this situation or this role, the GAC will be very important. And I am very happy and satisfied to see how all this dialogue has been carried out, the great amount of hours devoted by GAC. And the input, very valuable input are very positives. And, of course, we have the possibility of going on with the conversations within this framework or respect.

So I would like to say, not as enthusiastically as Rita, but I would like to say that I am in favor of this program. And I have my commitment with you.

Rita Rodin Johnston:

New gTLDs. Woo hoo! Can somebody please pinch me?

I'm sure many of you are not surprised that I'm thrilled at the idea of having what I hope is going to be a vote in favor today. After six years on the Board of working through these issues -- and there's been so much more time spent by people in the community. And I'm thrilled not because I agree with everything in

the *Guidebook*. It's not because I like disagreeing with the GNSO constituencies or the GAC or other community advice. It's not because I think the organization or the community, frankly, is close to understanding the massive undertaking that we are all embarking on. But it's because I really believe in this multistakeholder process and this community, all of you out there. I believe in compromise, and I believe in innovation.

I also agree with what Ira Magaziner said at our meeting in San Francisco. I think, by the introduction of this program, we're continuing the tradition of allowing the Internet to operate in a constant state of creative chaos, with some ground rules that would give investing huge sums in it some degree of predictability. And we're also fostering cooperation and rules, so that the Internet would be secure, stable, and resilient, but in such a way as to allow as much freedom as usable for the users of the Internet to create standards, content, modes of access and economic activity without government interference. And that was a quote from what Ira said in San Francisco. These are very noble goals. But, as we can all see, they're somewhat difficult to implement. The amount of content and information on the Internet is exponentially greater than under Ira's watch. The community here and around the world is much larger and more international and diverse than it was.

Both the commercial and the non-commercial interests involved are infinitely greater. Yet we also have one thing in common: The love for the Internet.

The Board today will, hopefully, be executing on a plan the community first approved in 2005. And we are putting into motion arguably the largest shift in the DNS history. We're ratifying community compromises and ideas, but we are not necessarily making everyone happy.

And what's interesting to me is we really have no idea what will happen. But I, for one, am extremely excited to find out. As many of my colleagues have said, the work here is far from over. Think of this as Phase I. There is a lot more to do. I want to join Gonzalo and others in thanking this Boards and Boards before us both for their hard work and for their difficult and sometimes courageous decisions.

And my true hope for everyone, when I leave the Board, is that everyone will continue this hard work in the collective spirit of cooperation, progress, and adventure. Thank you, everyone. And good luck.