[background conversation]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good morning, everybody, we're going to start. We're getting started. As we are all here I am going to ask you to introduce yourselves so that we can get to know each other. We will start. If you can please introduce yourself.

Arnold Mulenda: I'm Arnold Mulenda, I'm in charge of training at the IAT Promotion Center of Congo.

Schombe Baudouin: Schombe Baudouin from RDC Congo.

Female: [Wanda Lapatee] from Mali.

Male: (inaudible) from Sudan.

Male: (inaudible) from Morocco.

Soufia Guerfali:	Soufia Guerfali from Tunisia.
Aziz Hilali:	Aziz Hilali, AFRALO.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Tijani Ben Jemaa from ALAC.
Fatimata Seye Sylla:	Fatimata Seye Sylla, Chair AFRALO, Senegal.
Female:	(inaudible).
Dave Kissoondoyal:	Dave Kissoondoyal, Mauritius, AFRALO.
Male:	(inaudible), ISOC from Egypt.
Pastor Peters:	Pastor Peters, AFRALO.
Yaovi Atohoun:	Yaovi Atohoun, ISOC Benin.

EN

Hadja Fatimata Ouattara: Hadja Ouattara, ALS Burkina Faso and AFRALO.

Michel Tchonang: Michel Tchonang, CAPDA Cameroon, AFRALO.

Igor Ciza: Igor Ciza, Burundi President.

Male: (inaudible), AOF Ghana.

Massamba Gaye: Massamba Gaye, UCAD.

Adetokunbo Abiola: Adetokunbo Abiola, NIRA Nigeria.

Male: (inaudible), I come from Cameroon.

Female: I come from Senegal.

Anne-Rachel Inné: Thank you very much then, we will get started with the organization… My apologies.

Etienne Tshishimbi: Etienne Tshishimbi from ISOC Senegal.

[background conversation]

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Sébastien Bachollet is part of ICANN's Board. He is a consultant and a risk consultant.

Sébastien Bachollet: I'm just a member here. Thank you very much.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: And now we're going to continue with the agenda, we will put together an evaluation card that will be handed out on an everyday basis and you will tell us what is working, and what is not, and how you find the course and others, so from tomorrow morning, we will distribute this document, and you will fill it in for yesterday, for today and then on a day-by-day basis.

Another thing we will have sessions where there will be exercises that will be done on a team basis, so if you could please set up four-people teams, and you will be split in four-people teams. We will draft a sheet of paper in fours at your choice. We don't want to impose any make-up. And this will help us for everybody to get on time, because I can check who is not here, who hasn't come, we

can see whether there is anyone missing, it's much easier to handle if we are a small groups, we have finished with the organization part, we're going to deal with ICANN's mission, structure and constituencies.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: We will. Ann-Rachel Inné will make the introduction today. She is the regional responsible person for Africa. Please.

Anne-Rachel Inné: Thank you very much Tijani, thank you very much all of you. We hope you have a good night's sleep. I would like to congratulate you for yesterday, it was very good, it was very nice as usual, this is Africa, and we talk a lot don't we.

I believe that we will achieve our objectives. Let me briefly introduce, as we don't have too much time you know, as usual again, sorry, but we'll have to go to the Women's Lunch at DNS, so I will try to get all the girls together, women – not boys, unfortunately, I'm so sorry, but women will come back, don't you worry, we will take them back to you. But you will have to lend the women to us for 45 minutes.

Next. So let me get started with the first slide that talks about ICANN's mission.

What is ICANN's mission? It is coordinating the three identifiers which in fact glue the global internet. You have the domain names, the IP addresses, and also the port protocol numbers and

parameters, they are the ASM numbers; and ICANN also deals with coordinating the root server systems with other people who have been empowered I think back in 1995 to operate root servers, we also coordinate anything associated to policies, high level – general high level domain names, and as reasonably as possible, and also in association to the technical nation allocated to ICANN.

We try to do this in a simple manner, not too much trouble. The philosophy is not to have trouble. This is Africa. Next.

So let me remind you that you have this graph that you have seen here. ICANN's mission is pretty limited. It is grouped with the identifiers I have just told you. We go to the next slide.

Some of you can call this an organization chart. It's not ICANN's organization chart actually, but ICANN's chart as a community, because everybody is in here. On top we have the Board with Sébastien Bachollet who have just introduced himself. He is the member of the Board who represents users.

So at this level there are 21 people. I'm not sure to have mentioned that there are three members of the Board who come from Africa: Cherine Chalaby and Michel Tchonang who come from Egypt, Mike Silber from South Africa, and Katim Touray who is completing his tenure at the end of this meeting, which comes from Gambia. And all of you were able to see him yesterday. These three people represent the region and the community.

So the 21 Board members, two of them appointed by the constituents and 8 that come from the Nomination Committee and if you have any questions, thank you Sébastien, there are 8 for NomCom, such as Sébastien is showing you: two for ccNSO, two for GNSO, two for ASO, the observers, the liaison with the technical groups around ICANN and you also have the links with government. The President, Chairs of ICANN is on the left.

From the blue in the middle such as Sébastien pointed out, thank you Sébastien everybody on the left are entitled to voting; the ones in black are (inaudible) early as some people so they do not vote in the – at the Board, at the level of the ICANN's Director, general President, there are some 140 people, 38 different nationalities. It is a very variegated organization staff wise, different languages are spoken, and to the extent possible, we want people to get the message in their own language so that everything is easier.

Now, talking in relation to the blue on the left, ASO, AfriNIC is part of the constituency for Africa. In order to talk to your colleagues from other regions, you have AP NIC from Asia-Pacific, ARIN is America, LACNIC, Latin America and the Caribbean and Europe with the RIPE network, each of them in their own regions form together with the community.

The policies for IP the address distribution in their own regions but they all talk in their own regions and agree on things that need to be done in relation to global policy, in relation to addresses. And it is a policy to complete allocating IP addresses once there is consensus, a global policy is set up for IP addresses and ICANN's

Board approves of this or consents to this. This is the way that it's done at the IP address world.

IP addresses are discussed openly at AfriNIC and worldwide in original manner with the communities so as to find out for instance what the needs and one of the current discussions is associated – sorry as Africa is the place that has more IP addresses, the before version we will keep it. Some say we have to sell it. Some other say we shouldn't, we should keep them. And some of the network members who can't come are discussing this. These are open discussions and you can evaluate them. And everybody become a part of this. There is a group for the governments to sensitize governments, so as to get them on board and allocation of addresses, policies.

You have GNSO constituency and that's saying that this week GNSO will tell you what they are doing. You will find the registrants, the people who are in charge of intellectual property, the commercial names, ISPs, the NC, UC constituency and others. There are other constituencies now, other stakeholders being implemented to become part of GNSO as a constituency. Everybody is there and why is that? Because they all take the generic domain names at some time or other, you can buy .org, .net, .whatever and there is where these subjects are discussed.

Then you have the verbal box is the ccNSO and there you can find country code managers, country code names that is then a member of ccNSO for Burkina Faso. And at the end of the day, I think that you will notice for the African region, there are 54; 24 of them are

part of the ccNSO. And then our biggest concern and something you can help us about is precisely help country code managers so that they can tell others what is the purpose of a local domain name to help them for those contents, also in the sense that you can talk to them, because you are part of the community. Many of them can ask for re-delegations, but they do not discuss with the community, so has to find out what the problems are that the community itself is finding.

There are things such as my domain name is very expensive, or it's not visible enough. So we go back to the egg and the chicken: if you don't have it you will never have the chicken, and if you don't buy it you will never have it. You will never have money enough to buy something stable and secure. So we're always coming back to the fact that this does not move forward, and I think that you have a role to help them, and to get the community to understand why local codes are required; and try to influence decision makers so they can find out what to implement to make this affordable for everybody in the community, especially to get to ccTLD to have reasonable prices permanently online so that the community can trust in them.

I'm not going to talk too much about At-Large, because you all know what this is about.

Patrik will talk about SSAC and you will have someone for the root servers throughout the week; Suzanna will tell you who they are. They are organizations and individuals who manage root servers. ICANN manages one. They are numbered from A to M

and ICANN is working with the L server. And you have the Technical Liaison Group, TLG; then IETF, as many of them are ISOC chapters you may have heard about IETF and ISOC.

And it is there where people get together whole set up standards in the web. Then you have the governmental advisory committees that group governments and all you have to do is to send a letter from the relevant Ministry, the relevant Ministry will say such and such represents our country at the level of the government. They will send their communications to everybody once they complete a job. This communication is sent to the Board Elect of ICANN but through Mrs. Heather Dryden from Canada who Chairs the GAC. This is given to the Board, and they are there to see what the public policies are around the internet, the policies that need to be taken into account by the Board. There are issues that can be useful, others that are too technical perhaps, others that appear in ICANN's mission table which can be considered a public policy in the web.

This is it, so you have a snapshot of the mission, the constituency and the structure of ICANN. And if you have any questions.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Anne-Rachel for your introduction. It was a good introduction, so that you understand the set of structures and constituencies of ICANN.

We will now move to the details and we will start with the GNSO VP who will talk about GNSO. Her name is Mary Wong.

Mary Wong: And I'm going to speak English, because my French is really bad, although I've been trying to improve by listening earlier this morning. So thank you very much for the invitation to speak to you all on behalf of the Generic Name Supporting Organization council, the GNSO council. I think you've heard many times before that in ICANN land everything is an acronym.   So everything has an abbreviation.

And I do not have slides this morning, so hopefully it will be possible for me to brief you a little bit about what the GNSO does and is, and what the GNSO council does in that role.

As you've heard, and as you know and as you saw on earlier presentations, and I think Olivier coming after me will have more to say about some of the other structures and the combination within ICANN, the GNSO is one of three supporting organizations to the Board of Directors within ICANN. And I know you're getting briefings from most of the other committees and organizations, and so one of the three is the GNSO.

Another is the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, the ccNSO, and the key difference between the GNSO and the ccNSO is that within the GNSO, we deal with policy for the generic top level domain names, which I think we've all talked a lot about, and we are hearing a lot about, because as everybody knows, this space, the generic top level domain name space will be expanded by a fairly large and significant number, starting next year. And I

know you have a briefing about that later, so I will not spend too much time on it.

In contrast or in comparison, the ccNSO deals with similar policy issues but within the realm of the country codes top level domains. So individual countries and their policies.

The third supporting organization, the Addressing Support Organization, or the ASO, deals with a lot of the technical issues regarding the security of the domain name system. And of course you know about the Advisory Committees, some mention has already been made of that. The Government Advisory Committee, the GAC, and of course the At-Large Advisory Committee, and Olivier will speak after me on that.

So within the GNSO, the fairest and easiest way to understand what we do is to note that because there are currently 21 gTLDs, and as I said there will many more than 21, possibly several hundred more than 21 in a year or so, you can imagine that there are lot of policy issues regarding how to administer, how to manage, and how to develop that space. There was a slide earlier on that shows the structure of the GNSO. And this was changed from before. I don't have time to go into the history, so what's probably most relevant is what the GNSO looks like today.

We have two houses, kind of like a Parliament, and one house is called the contracted party's house, and in that house you have all the registries, like VeriSign and Nustar, because they really are the fundamental first line in ICANN's extension towards the public in

the use of the domain name system. They have contracts of ICANN that determine how they run their registries, some of the rules and some of the different things that come up when you run a back-end registry.

The other group within the contracted party's house are the registrars, and when I was first in ICANN I was very confused as to who is a registry and who is a registrar. And so when I teach a class these days, I tell everybody that registrar is like godaddy.com for example, they are the ones that as internet end users, we have the most contact with. We don't tend to have contacts with the registries because like I said the registries really deal with a lot of the technical issues directly with ICANN.

They then have arrangements with the registrars and the registrars are the ones that interact with end users. As we register domain names, we register through the registrars. So when the contracted party's house, you've got two large groups, each of which have different contracts of ICANN, and within those contracts are the rules and parameters for each of their operations.

Then we have another house like I said, it's like Parliament, it's not an upper or lower house though, it's just different, and the second house is the non-contracted party's house. We tried to come up with a more imaginative name for that house, but it seemed that the most accurate was to say we don't have contracts with ICANN, so we are the non-contracted party's house.

And in that house, is probably the most diverse groups that you have within the GNSO, because if you think about the contracted parties, it's really two large groups like I said, the registries will tend to have similar interests because they are registries that contract with ICANN, the registrars as a group and there are quite a large number of registrars, a smaller number of registries, again, they might have very similar interests as they all have contracts, the same contract with ICANN for the most part.

Within the other house, the non-contracted party's house, we have two groups as well, but like I said, they're diverse. One group is the Commercial Stakeholder Group, and the other group, which is what I represent, is – again is not very imaginative, is the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So the division in the second house is between a commercial entity and a non-commercial entity.

And for the commercial entities they can be, and they are divided into three subgroups, one is the Internet Service Provider constituency, the ISPs. Another is the Intellectual Property constituency, the IPC, which deal with intellectual property issues such as trademarks and so forth on the internet. And the third commercial group is the Business constituency which is the group that represents large, medium and small businesses within ICANN. And all of course are users of the internet for business, for different reasons.

Within the Non-Commercial Stakeholder group, we have two constituencies. One is actually one of the first constituencies that started within ICANN and is the Non-Commercial User

constituency, the NCUC, some of whom I believe actually are members of At-Large. Then we have a new constituency that the Board approved only a few months ago, and that is the Nonprofit Operations and Concerns constituency.

And the difference between the NCUC and the NPOC, I told you there are a lot of acronyms and the GNSO is probably worst offender, the nonprofit operational concerns would be associations such as the Red Cross or the YMCA and they deal with operational issues that nonprofits will face within the domain name space.

So hopefully that very quick description of our structure will give you a sense of the diversity of participation and the different types of groups within the GNSO. And both houses and all the groups within each house managed by a council, and I'm a member of that council, each group the registries, the registrars, and each constituency within the non-contracted house will elect a number of counselors to the council.

There are rules about how you elect them and as to breadth of representation. Each group is chartered a bit differently but there are rules about for example geographical, diversity, and to some extent gender and interests. And the idea is to ensure that the whole diversity of representation and participation within the GNSO is also reflected in the composition of the council.

What the council does is it manages all the work of the GNSO, and I've looked at the schedule for you today and I've noticed that you will be briefed by a number of ICANN staff that support our work.

And so I won't go into the substance of those. I've mentioned that the new gTLD expansion is a huge initiative of the GNSO, and of course as you may know that was approved by the ICANN Board of Directors several years ago in 2008. And since then, it's a been a three-year effort to launch the gTLDs.

Olivier has told me that the slide that shows the GNSO structure is up on the screen and hopefully that helps to describe in pictorial form what I was saying.

So beyond the new gTLD expansion, which is a huge initiative, the GNSO works on a number of specific issues and those issues can be brought up by any member of the community within the GNSO, and to the extent that it is something that the GNSO community by consensus believes that it is an important issue to work on the council can form and approve different Working Groups.

One good feature of our Working Groups, and this is again is a change from the past is that anybody can participate. You don't have to be a council member, in some cases you don't even have to be a constituency member. And the whole idea is to bring expertise, as well as new participants into the GNSO community.

When somebody joins let's say one of the constituencies or they start attending an ICANN meeting, and they're not quite sure where they want to go, one easy way to decide where you or your organization might fit best is to join a Working Group that is best tailored to your particular interest or your organization's concerns.

And so for example, another substantive policy matter that you'll be briefed is the uniform dispute resolution policy, I'm going to use another acronym the UDRP, that is one of the oldest policies that ICANN made in fact it was the earliest in ICANN's history, and that policy deals with cybersquatting.   Essentially when someone's trademarks are being taken and used in bad faith by some other person without any legitimate interest in that trademark.

What the GNSO is considering now is reviewing that policy which is over ten years old and which has generated over 30,000 disputes that have been resolved one way or the other. And so we do this through a policy development process. Initially, what happens is that if an issue is spotted by a group or a member within the GNSO, as being of concern, the council can vote to have the ICANN staff prepare what we call an issue report, which essentially describes the scope of the problem, describes whether this problem, even if it is a real and practical problem is within the ambit and scope of the GNSO's mission, and tries to identify some of the specific issues that a Working Group can start to work on.

After the issue report, the council can then vote to launch the policy development process, or the PDP, which will then start its work on those specific issues that are highlighted in the issue report. Again, you'll have more a briefing on that particular detail.

I can tell you that if I were to run through the list of the projects that the GNSO is working through, I will take all of Olivier's time. So on the GNSO website, and you'll find a link to the GNSO

website off the main ICANN organizational chart, which is the slide that you saw earlier, and that will show you a list of all the projects that we're working on. There are, I believe at least 20 pending projects.

They involve very specific things like transfers of domains between registrars to very large policies like the UDRP. The council has also started considering additional work and so one of the issues that I wanted to highlight to you, because this is an issue not just for the GNSO, but for the ICANN community overall, is that almost every group that works on policy in the GNSO depends and also outside the GNSO too, I believe, and certainly within the At-Large Structures, are volunteers. Many of us do not get compensated for our time or our work, and in fact to work on a number of issues within the GNSO, you have to submit a statement of interest to show that you do not have a personal or professional conflict with that particular issue.

So one of the problems that ICANN and particularly the GNSO with our 20 projects and counting is encountering a problem of volunteer fatigue, too few people working on too many projects on a voluntary basis. From the looks I'm getting, I think this is a familiar problem to many of us.

The other issue or the other challenge that faces the GNSO, very specifically, although I think it is also an issue in the rest of ICANN, is lowering barriers of entry for new participants. Obviously, one way to get more work done and to get more good work done and to relieve the volunteer fatigue is to get new people

in who are interested in the issues and who truly represent ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. But I think as many of us found the barriers to entry whether it's the acronyms, or whether it's the fact that the community still is largely composed of a lot of people who have known each other for a very long time, so as a new person, it can be quite intimidating, as well as ensuring that as an organization, the GNSO specifically, but ICANN overall, is reaching out to sufficient people in different regions of the world, and ensuring that whether through language, or through remote participation or travel, funding or a combination of things they are able to fully participate in my case the GNSO community.

So I don't want to just keep talking. I actually was not keeping track of time, I don't know how much time I have left, but if I have time left, I would be happy to take some questions, if you have them. Yes, please, and if I need headphones, do I just use this one?

Yaovi Atohoun: My name is Yaovi for the record. Thank you for a very good presentation. With the new process of new gTLD, an applicant that will become an approved applicant, I want to know the relation between this approved and then the registry and the registrar. So the relation between that approved in the future, between this approved applicant, registry and registrar.

Mary Wong: Thank you for the question. And actually I think it's a really good question. Essentially, if you apply for a new gTLD and you're

approved, and there is a lot of processes and time that goes into the approval, then you become a registry. And that is one reason why individuals are precluded from applying to become new gTLD registries in the new process. And there's a lot of checks as to your qualifications, technically as well as financially, because essentially at the end of the process, if your gTLD is approved and delegated into the root system, you are a registry.

What I will add onto that is that that of course creates some complications for the GNSO structure, because right now the registry group within the contracted party's house is like I said a relatively small group, because it's a small group that runs 21 gTLDs. If ICANN is talking about a possible 500 in the first round for the new gTLDs, then potentially you have 500 new registries and that would be the short answer to your question. I hope that helps.

Male: Hello, my question is about the new application for the new gTLDs. For example we are in a steering committee for applying to .Arab for the region. Would it be without discussing it – will it be geographical or generic based, and it's a big issue, we are applying to geographical, you want to control the policy and everything, but what kind of geographical and what the name, this I don't know how to solve such problems.

Mary Wong:	I will first preface my comment by saying you have an expert on the new gTLD program coming today, and Karen, I believe is addressing you today, she will have very specific details about that. But I think I'll be saying the same thing at a more general level. There are two kinds of applications for the new gTLD program, essentially a standard generic application, and that would cover a lot of some of the types of existing gTLDs, but also the community gTLD application. Those are the two big categories.
	And in the example that you brought up, during the policy development process, I think a lot of people consider that a community-based TLD, so there are very specific guidelines within the Applicant Guidebook that deals with the differences between a community and a regular standard generic TLD.
	When you mention geographical TLDs, there is a specific subcategory of that, and that was actually something that the government advisory committee felt very strongly about. That is largely limited to reserved names of countries, of cities, and so forth. So that the assumption is that the kind of TLD you're talking about is a community-based TLD. Does that help?
Male:	For somehow, but when I'm sit, it's a steering committee presenting luck. It's you know we are representing… Our steering committee is all Arab countries, going and so the problem that we would like to apply for geographic, but we don't know it may be out of question.

Mary Wong: Yes, and –

Tijani Ben Jemaa: [Darak], I understand very well your question. In the Applicant
                          Guidebook, you have the details of the type of applications and the
                          geographic kind of application exists. I think that we will have a
                          session with Karen who wrote the Applicant Guidebook and she
                          can very well answer your question. Thank you.

                          We will take only one question, because we are – yes, -- we are
                          late, okay.

Male: Most African users we don't really care about the mumbo-jumbo
                          of the admin, so of what economic benefits here is security to the
                          ordinary user in Africa?

Mary Wong: I take it that was probably more of a comment than a question. I
                          think what I will say and I'm going to say this not as a counselor
                          for the GNSO, or definitely not as the vice-chair of the GNSO.
                          There is obviously a difference of opinion on that.

                          I think though if you – it may be that there no direction
                          relationship between a lot of what is happening for the new gTLDs
                          and the end user in various different regions and locations around
                          the world, but the underlying reason for having the new gTLD

program was – well, there are a number of reasons, but the primary reason was to not just encourage competition within the industry, but also to ensure that there is a lot of consumer choice about not just how you register within a TLD.

None of us will become new gTLD operators, not just because of the cost, but because that's really not what we want to do, but we can individually become registrants within certain new TLDs, but certainly in terms of when we surf the internet, when we go shopping, when we look for educational opportunities, the more gTLDs that are more specifically tailored to different interests, the idea is that that would be much more helpful to individual users and consumers.   Of course, we'll wait to see if that actually happens, but studies were done to show that that would be something that is a positive development for the system.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much Mary. If you have other questions, please send them to us, and we will provide Mary with your questions and give you the answers.

Mary Wong: Yes, thank you very much and I and my colleagues will definitely be very happy to answer further questions. I know that you have very many, and like I said, we all know what it was like to try to get a sense of the ICANN system, and we will be around. There is a GNSO council meeting this Wednesday, if you're able to attend,

and that might give you some more familiarity with who we are and what we do. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Mary. Mr. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, President of the At-Large, the ALAC. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond :   Thank you very much, Tijani. I should speak English or I probably won't find my words if I do it in French. If we can go to the first slide, please. So At-Large is the part of ICANN that is there to represent voices or to bring the voices of the internet user into the ICANN process. And I think you have already seen that diagram. You probably see it a number of times until the end of this week, and it shows that the whole ICANN multi-stakeholder model is divided in so many different parts.

If we go to the next slide of taking the opportunity to actually break it into pieces, I'm not quite sure whether you can see it so well from here, but absolutely everything in the model or many, many of the constituencies in the model are actually multi-stakeholder systems.

At-Large is a multi-stakeholder system by itself because our organizations are both commercial, non-commercial, they are very diverse – they are very diverse geographically, of course, but they're also very diverse as far as their background or their activity or their main day activity is concerned.

Nevertheless, the input from all of our different At-Large Structures is taken on an equal basis, and so whether you're commercial, non-commercial, whether your activity is to provide internet services in a country and I mean internet services, not actually internet connectivity as such, but internet services, or whether it is providing lessons or teaching about the internet, or doing outreach about the internet, on a voluntary basis, and on a nonprofit basis, the input is taken in exactly the same way.

In fact, there are several other multi-stakeholder models within the ICANN structure. The ASO, the Address Supporting Organization actually has many different organizations underneath. I think we might have some – are we having somebody who will speak about the ASO coming in? Tijani? No, okay, so maybe I'll say just one word about the ASO.

The ASO is the part of ICANN that deals with the numbers, IP addresses, the IP addresses is every computer that is connected to the internet actually needs to have a number so information can be exchanged with it. There is IPv4 addresses, which are composed of three digits, dot, three digits, dot, three digits, dot, three digits. And sometimes less when you've got a number that goes zero to 99.

And then you've got IPv6 addresses, which some of you might have heard of, which actually much larger and have more fields, and these are actually slowing coming into play because there is a need for more space on the internet, and we've pretty much exhausted all of the IPv4 addresses.

Now, in order to distribute each one – well the whole world is divided into several regions and they've got Aaron for the North American region, RIPE NCC for Europe, LACNIC for Latin America, all of these organizations are actually organizations that also have members very much like here that are also multi-stakeholder in nature. Although I gather we probably are more multi-stakeholder than others, but there is no such thing as who is more a multi-stakeholder, or who is less. It's just the idea of having people from different backgrounds and with different aspirations coming together.

The GNSO as Mary just told us is also multi-stakeholder. You saw the different houses that they had contracted parties, non-contracted parties, et cetera, and well the internet users is us basically. So if we go to the next slide please.

So what is At-Large? Well it is a community of internet users, there is 130 or more than 130 At-Large Structures, and I actually now use 130 plus At-Large Structures, because every time I speak it appears that we have another one that has turned up. So how much is it now?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: 136.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: 136, goodness, okay, I have problems tracking this, and it's good, it's good, we're growing at a very fast pace. Every region has

more At-Large Structures that are joining. In fact, yesterday evening I was at an ISOC meeting, and I saw – I'm having an echo – I saw a couple of people from ISOC Senegal chapter and they were interested in joining at some point. So there will be another At-Large Structure within the AFRALO region. There are, I think one of the latest ones probably which has just joined is in Europe isn't it.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: It's been accepted.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's been accepted Together Against Cybercrime. There is one in the pipe now, it is ISOC Cameroon.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, for the AFRALO region, yes. But in Europe there is Together Against Cybercrime, in the other regions there are also several of them in the pipeline, and in order to be accredited as an At-Large Structure you go through a full process, and I guess you're probably more aware of the process yourself than I am, because you all went, your organization went through that process to be allowed to join the ICANN discussion table.

The reason for this of course is to make sure that your organization actually is structured in a way that will bring the voice of the internet user to the ICANN model. It's important because when you join AFRALO, when your organization joins AFRALO,

AFRALO then has a contract with ICANN, and effectively is an extension of ICANN and you become an inherent part of the whole ICANN model, and that's particularly important.

Decertifying an At-Large Structure, the process of having an At-Large Structure being kicked out or something to that extent is something that has not come in effect because the selection is so good to start with that we'd like to think that there is no requirement for decertification.   Although, there will be discussions soon about the decertification process in case an organization disappears or is transferred or is unreachable and that's something which happens sometimes, which of course then means that it affects the voting structure when there is no – where an At-Large Structure has a vote but doesn't use it, it effectively counts as an abstention. And the thing with the system in ICANN is that an abstention is actually equivalent to a no vote, because all we do is to count the yes votes.

So there are ramifications to – links to how you vote and how you don't vote and this is why I really urge whenever there is a vote in your region, especially when there is a vote with regards to accepting new At-Large Structures, or if there is a vote for any other matter, please make sure that you do vote, it really is something that is important. Because a resolution or a statement that is passed with only a handful of votes, or barely passes the quorum that we have is something that is a lot weaker than a resolution with a great majority of structures voting with a much larger number.

I'll move to the next slide please. So this is the At-Large organizational diagram. And as you can see it's five regions. I guess you've probably seen it already. I just wanted to touch on a couple of things on that diagram. The first one of course is the fact that the five regions are totally independent of each other and operate in an independent way.

However, what we do like is for the regions to talk to each other as well. There is no use speaking in silos and having a discussion in one region and not sharing it at some point with your neighbors. And that's where the At-Large Advisory Committee comes in. So you've got each one of the regions has got two delegates that it selects to put onto the At-Large Advisory Committee. And those delegates are really the voice of the region in the At-Large Advisory Committee.

There is also a third representative from that region that is selected by the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee is a – you can't really call it independent, because it's not independent, as such from ICANN. It is part of the ICANN structure, but it can think independently from ICANN. It's a member committee of which there are five members selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee from five different regions, plus people selected by all of the parts of ICANN.

And I think I'm not even sure if it's 20 or 21 people all together, I'm very bad with numbers, but it's a lot of people that basically listen to the needs of community, analyze the needs of the community, and they will then send whom they think is best to

EN

either fill a gap in the current structure, and the gap can be one of two things. It could be a geographical gap with geographical balance, but in the case of At-Large, it can actually be more a case of lack of knowledge about something, not a structural gap, but a gap of let's say you need someone who has knowledge in finance because looking at the current structure of the At-Large Advisory Committee, there is a lack of knowledgeable people with finance. At that point the NomCom might select to put someone who is knowledgeable in finance in that specific position. So it's particularly important process.

But that means each region has got three representatives on the At-Large Advisory Committee. And the At-Large Advisory Committee then also selects an ICANN Board member. Now this is something that's quite recent. It's only about a year and a half, is it two – November, oh, goodness time flies, or time doesn't fly I don't know. It feels like it was two years already Sébastien. So Sébastien was seat number 15, as you can see he's wearing the number 15 shirt.

And so prior to having Sébastien with a number 15 shirt, we had someone who was a liaison to the Board, who therefore did not have any voting power, but who had the ability to influence the Board or we had a way to directly address the Board from within its own circle by passing on information to that liaison and the liaison could be the voice of At-Large on the Board.

The problem is that we couldn't vote at the end, so it was really down to the power of persuasion of that liaison. Now having

someone on the Board has got its advantages and inconvenience. The advantage is that we have someone who has come from the At-Large community, and therefore has; we would think this same background and the same ideas as everyone else in the At-Large community.

However, when somebody becomes a Board member they're not allowed to represent their community on the Board.   In other words, At-Large is now allowed to give instruction to Sébastien on what Sébastien has to vote for or against, what Sébastien has to say.   Sébastien has to be independent in that way, and when he makes a decision, he has to think about ICANN as an organization, not about at At-Large.   So it does introduce a few problems in some way, but thankfully because Sébastien has come from our community, in general he also knows what – his way of thinking is pretty similar to ours, and well maybe he will be able to explain to you how he thinks.   But that's the way that I imagined it.

So we have that, and I see thumbs up from him, so it looks as though I'm not too wrong about this.   So how do we work in At-Large and if we can go to the next slide please, Matt.

It's a big interesting because we actually tried to apply the pure bottom up process.   And the bottom up process is basically gaining input from the edges, so from At-Large Structures, users out there and finding a way to get that information and get this input to go through the regional At-Large organizations and you can see the five of them over there, and all the way up to the At-Large Advisory Committee.   The At-Large Advisory Committee can then

inform the Board or whatever process it is commenting on, it can issue a statement about that on behalf of At-Large.

I will actually expand on this; I think is it on Wednesday, when I'm speaking again to you; later on this week, when we will be speaking about the At-Large policy process. How do we develop statements, et cetera and I have a diagram for that, so I know that we're running a little bit late, I don't want to expand on this, and then have to do it again in a couple of days' time.

But for the time being, that's how we try and do absolutely everything. Of course there are advantages and inconveniences as in anywhere. The advantage is that we are able to have as much input as possible from the whole community of internet users worldwide that have access to an At-Large Structure.

The inconvenience is that we cannot say that we represent internet users, because representing 2.1 billion people, and that's another number which I constantly have to update, because when I started this presentation about a couple of years ago it is 1.7 billion people to represent this billion people in the ICANN process is totally impossible. We don't have access to a billion people.

And I think it would be particularly hard to have access to a billion people. We might have access to a subset, a small subset of that, and think well that is probably what the rest of the people out there think, but we don't then claim to represent anyone. What we do claim though is to act in the best interests, according to our own judgment and I guess that's what you do in your own At-Large

Structure, according to your members' personal judgments, you try to think well this would be good for internet users. Because I'm an internet user, and I can see that this is a solution or something that would be good for me, therefore, I would imagine that everyone who is an internet user just like me has got the same – the same thought or the same train of thought in their head.

So I' going to stop here, I see there is only three minutes left. And I thought I was going – I only had the material for two minutes, but I'm probably a little bit more verbose than I wish to. Now, just one more thing and Tijani has very kindly – and thankfully I've left a gap between me and Tijani, otherwise he would hit me on the head with it, there are a lot of brochures here, AFRALO brochures, not sure – I guess it would be pointless taking them back all the way to Marina Del Ray, so what I think would be good is for all of you to take a small pack of those, you can actually go and perform outreach, maybe first inform your members as well, so they can have material in their hand.

But at the same time, and this is where it's a little bit, I guess different than everywhere else, if you do know other organizations in your country that might be interested in joining as an At-Large Structure, and I don't know what the local politics are in your country, but you know in the spirit of At-Large, I think it would be good that you could share this with other organization in your country.

This is not a competition here as to who's got the biggest mouth, and who has the most influence. It's a case of all working together

and it's a case of having as many people out there in the world being able to bring their input into the ICANN process. So I'm open to questions.

And the great news is that they're in French, English and Arabic, so matter where you know – if well it should be able to cover most of the continent, at least I hope. And of course we're always striving to have more languages, but the problem is, it's just more expensive, more expensive and then we're very unpopular when we ask for too much money, as you know. Yes, Sébastien, so Sébastien Bachollet, number 15 for the record.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yes, I wanted to say that I agree with Olivier's description of my thinking when I vote, but what I wanted to stress is that it's important that I get the feedback from ALSes, from RALOs and from ALAC, because to make my mind, I need those inputs. It's not exactly the same thing that you need or it's good that ALAC provide advice to the Board. It's I will say something more, because an advice could be one, two, three pages, but generally it's a broader issue. I need to understand the granular of the situation, then I am very happy to get your input on every subject on the table of the Board. And fortunately or unfortunately all the subject come one day to the Board.

So the second part was to inform you that I do a presentation about the NomCom for the Board at the same time that I do a presentation for ALAC to the Board at our last workshop or retreat

in Los Angles, and I passed to the staff a diagram of the NomCom. I don't think it's already well spread, and I hope that you will get it one way or another. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sébastien, that will be really helpful. Any questions about At-Large, and in fact you can probably ask questions to Sébastien if he's okay with answering.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For the other sessions there weren't too many questions. If you would please ask your questions today, because the constituents say where we are now, so you need to understand better what At-Large is. You have ALAC's chair and it is second to none opportunity. You have the chair as selected by At-Large so I pray that you please ask questions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Because the joint applicant support is starting, but what I will say though is you can come see me all week, and you're probably going to see Sébastien also all week. Do come and talk to me, you know I'm very much available, of course if I'm not available, if I'm running around, I will tell you I'm really sorry, can I get back to you, there is something going on at the moment I need to deal with.

But I am spending the whole week with you; you know this is where I live effectively. Yesterday went from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m.

or something. So there must be some time during the day when we can talk. And I really look forward to having a chat with every one of you.   So please don't hesitate and then I look forward to speaking to you. So I'm really sorry I have to run now, but we'll meet probably later on today or tomorrow or the day after, et cetera.

So thank you very much and enjoy – that's the first thing, enjoy the capacity building program, and enjoy your time over here, because I think it's really an experience which – well, a lot of regions who want to fight for – you guys are lucky you've got the first one, and I hope it's going to be the first one you know in quite a few future ones as well. So it's hopefully not the last time that we all meet together. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier. If you have any questions you can send them to the staff. Heidi will now take the floor. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Tijani, I just wanted to talk for one moment about staff and to stress that we are here purely to help you. We are your support staff, so please contact us at staff@atlarge.icann.org. I've put the email address in the Adobe Connect. We will have a new person who will be directly appointed to help you with the regions, her name is Sylvia. She will start next month, early November, but in the meantime, we are here to help you with any matter; in terms of policy, in terms of actually logistical support, so please I encourage

you to contact us. We can also forward your emails to the relevant person within At-Large, Olivier, Cheryl, any of the At-Large ALAC members, or the Executive Committee. So I just wanted to let you know that. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Heidi. We just received here the President of the ccNSO, Mr. Hiro Hotta. He now has the floor.

Hiro Hotta: My name is Hiro Hotta. I'm a vice chair of ccNSO, which is a supporting organization consisting of ccTLD managers for today I will be very brief. Because you have heard the structure of ICANN, and where the ccNSO is in the structure, so I won't talk about what ccNSO is here. And my talk is about the current topics of the ccNSO.

Okay, next, please. So this is a graph which shows the number of ccNSO members. In the world there are around 250 ccTLDs. So as you know the number of countries in the nations is around 190, but for example, .HK, Hong Kong is a ccTLD. And the definition of ccTLD, which is borrowed by ISO at least. So amount of 250 ccTLDs currently the number of the ccNSO members are 120, it's growing as this graph shows. Next, please.

Council nominations are still are five regions defined in ICANN. And ccNSO council has three counselors from each region. And each seat has staggered three terms, by three year term. So of

course from African region, there are three seats in the council. So in August this year to September, it was a nomination period for one counselor from each five regions. And the nominees are from African region, Vicar and Mohammed; in Asia, Europe, Latin American, Caribbean and North American. And as there were two nominees in African region, the election was held between 7 to 21 October, this month. And it's concluded and the Vicar from .za got reelected. And these counselors will take seat at the end of consummating in Costa Rica in March 2012, next year.

Next, please. ICANN Board nomination elections, ccNSO sends two directors to ICANN Board, so ICANN Board seat number 12 is going to be vacant in June next year. And the current Board member, Mike Silber is the only candidate to [re-stand], so there will be a Q&A session of the candidate at the ccNSO meeting in Dakar, and nominees selected by ccNSO council are consummating in Dakar.

Next, please. This slide shows one of the topics of the ccNSO currently discussed. The framework of interpretation Working Group. This Working Group is a Joint Working Group with ccNSO and GAC and liaisons from ALAC and GNSO. And public consultation obtaining and documenting constant for delegations and re-delegations. As the ccTLD is a kind of an organization who should be trusted in the country or territory, so there should be support from the local internet community in the country or territory. So how to get the content for delegations of the ccTLD, and the work items, one of them is the obtaining and documenting

EN

support, such support from (inaudible) country interested parties. So this is currently worked, and future work will be recommendations on consented re-delegations, and recommendations for IANA reports for delegation and re-delegation. And of course the glossary of terms.

Next, please, which is an IDN ccPDP. Some of you know that the ccTLD is going to be no ASCII TLDs will be included as a ccTLD. So overall policy because before two years ago, there were only the ASCII two-character ccTLDs exist, so the members of the ccNSO were only the ASCII ccTLD managers, but for – because IDN ccTLDs emerged, they have to be considered to be included as members. So there will be some discussions for IDN ccTLDs. So for example overall policy confusingly similarities to Working Group dealing with issues arising out of implementation plan to be discussed in Dakar.

An update of processes taking into account experiences from fast track, this means that some country names were the abbreviation of such country names may be very much similar to existing country codes; so in that case, should such new IDN TLDs be included or be approved as TLDs? Maybe not, so we should think about what the similarity is, so it's under discussion.

And the second one is inclusion of IDN ccTLD and ccNSO. So the issue is voting in ccNSO, one vote per member or one vote per territory, that's an issue, big issue. Recommendations on voting to be discussed in Dakar. And study group on use of country names, update overview policies and discussion typology of country

names. So how to deal with the country names as a TLD. So it's discussed – it's being discussed.

Next, please. Final Working Group, as the gTLD registries and registrars pay under the contract with ICANN, but not all the ccTLD managers have contracts with ICANN. So it means that there is some ccTLD managers pay their money to ICANN voluntary, so we have to think about whether this is good or not, and if it's not good, we should think about how much the ccTLD should pay and so the focus is ICANN expenses as related to ccTLDs are the underlying attribution [vessel] and proposed methodology to help bear the burden of the financial contribution to ICANN. And the current status of the discussion is an overview of ICANN expenses on ccTLDs, and the internal analysis of models of financial contribution.

And all ccNSO activities listed in regularly updated work plans. Okay, and next please.

Dakar meeting; today or Monday usually we have tech day, namely from ccNSO managers. Of course experts from outside the ccNSO work comes to talk and discuss about the technology for DNS and domain names. It will be held from nine o'clock today. We usually have members meeting two days, members meeting Tuesday and Wednesday. This time the main topics will be financial contribution and strategy planning sessions. Joint session with the Board, with the GAC and WHOIS session and planning discussion on new gTLDs. The agenda is shown on the URL shown here. So ccNSO members meeting is open for all members

and non-members, you all are invited to participate actively. Thank you that's all.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you for this exposition.   I think there may be some questions that you may want to ask.

Baudouin Schombe: Okay, I at least have a question.   Good morning, I am Baudouin from the DRC.   I didn't really understand what was the relationship between the ccNSO and the ccTLDs.   Can you please clarify what is the relationship between these two, this is just for us to understand it, because we then need to convey this to others, and convince others of how the relationship between the ccNSO and the ccTLD work, because as far as I understand, you are having a look at what would be the collaboration between the ccNSO and the ccTLDs, it would be more clear perhaps if you could clarify this.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, thank you for the question and sorry for my unclarity about that.   So ccNSO is an organization under ICANN which consists of ccTLD managers.   So ccTLD managers is the organization which works usually intuitively which works in the country or territory. For example, I'm from Japan, and my company operates .JP, which is a ccTLD for Japan, and my company is a member of

ccNSO, which is a collective organization of ccTLD managers. Is that clear enough for you.

Woman: If you allow me, I also have a question. We know that from the beginning of ICANN we have progressed a lot at the level of the attribution of country code level domains. When this started, it was a first come, first served policy, but we had a lot of policies at the operator level for many ccTLDs that were managed or administered by people who are completely foreign to the country. That was the first question.

Now the second question has to do with the new gTLDs. When applicants will apply for domain names for a territory, a geographic location or a city, in case there is a political conflict, will the ccNSO group intervene? I know you are going to answer at the level of the attribution, or a location of ccTLDs, if we get support on the ISOC list, which is official at the UR level. That's my question has to do more with a political issue, because there are applications at the level of political problems. What would be the role of your organization in this request? I know the GNSO deals with these, but at the level of the ccNSO, is there anything that is pre-established?

Hiro Hotta: Okay, thank you for your questions. For the first question, each ccTLD has its own rule in registration of domain names under its ccTLD. So for example of course they're first come, first serve is

usually the typical way to register, but maybe in some countries or territories, some names may be – some names will be given a priority to some organizations or even some government organizations, so it's not ccNSO matter, because it's a local matter, how to manage each ccTLD in the country or territory.

And the second question for the new gTLDs, maybe I couldn't get to – in a spot, but for political reasons, or political issues in new gTLDs, ccNSO itself will not make any decision which we will cover on all the ccTLDs. That's the answer.

Male: …thank you for your response, I'm from Benin. ccTLD and IDN, if you have a country and currently we've seen the county TLD organization, if you want to IDN, is there a rule that the same organization can apply only the existing TLD organization can apply for the IDN variant or anybody can apply. So that means if we can have in the country in the future, maybe two or three country TLD organization. So I want to know what the situation if anybody in the country or any organization can apply for the IDN variant of the TLD.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you for that question. As I said any organization, including the existing one can apply for the IDN ccTLD.   If the new applicant has support from the community of the country or territory, so maybe one – in other words, one organization may be a manager for two or three TLDs, including IDNs; or two or more

managers will manage the IDNs in that country or territory, including the ASCII and IDN.

Male: Who chooses the manager of initials of the ccTLD? Is it the government or by any governmental initiative, and how does this kind of make an impact on this issue?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: He has asked a question regarding the ccTLD. Who does that? Is it an institution, is it an organization, from your point of view, which is the best institution, according to you to manage the ccTLD at the country level?

Hiro Hotta: You mean that in government or private or which is the suitable way to manage the ccTLD; is that your question?

Male: I mean who chooses the manager of the ccTLD? Is it government or by individuals, and how has it been chosen – the manager of the ccTLD?

Hiro Hotta: I see. It's again depending on each country or territory. So some – okay, ccTLD managers in some countries are owned or run by the government and other ccTLD managers are private sector and

some of them are from the university, so it depends on each country.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, I think we have the time reserved now for this and we will now give the floor the present of GAC which is the Advisory Committee, one of the most important components in ICANN. As I was saying, it is Governmental Advisory Committee which deals with public policy and that advises ICANN on political issues regarding the country.   Thank you for having accepted to participate.

Heather Dryden: Good morning everyone, as I was introduced I am the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee.   I am a Canadian public servant, so I work for the Canadian Ministry of Industry, and I am elected to chair of the GAC in that capacity.   It's a real pleasure to be here to speak to some people from the region.   This is my first time in Senegal and my first time in West Africa.   So it's a real pleasure to speak to you this morning.

I thought I would talk a bit about the committee and how we work, and perhaps some of the issues that are currently under consideration at the moment.   The main role of the committee is to provide public policy advice on issues arising from the coordination of the domain name system.   So we provide quite a broad prospective of advice, formally to the Board of ICANN.   Of course, the advice that we generate and use and inputs we generate

are of interest to other parts of the community, but as I say, formally we advise the Board as per the Bylaws of the organization.

In terms of membership, we have more than 100 government or public authorities that are members, and we also have various organizations, inter-governmental organizations that are observers to the Governmental Advisory Committee, and they may have expertise, information that supports the work of the committee in advising the Board.

I'm pleased to report that most of the advice of government is followed.   We are not the decision makers in this model. However, there are a range of issues and circumstances were governments can helpfully advise and draw the attention of the community to issues that will impact on governments and their citizens. So this is the main focus of the committee.

We have various governments from Africa that are members, including Senegal, who has been a member for years and plays a leadership role within the GAC. And this is important because we do need a regional voice in the committee.

We also have three observer organizations from the region, the African Union Commission, the African Telecommunication Union and the Economic Commission for Africa.

In order to increase participation in our work, we do have travel funding available, so this is one of the ways that we try to raise awareness of the role of the governmental advisory committee and

ICANN and be inclusive in our approach to developing public policy advice.

Those that participate in the committee usually come from a telecommunications policy background or they're familiar with ICTs, and related areas to the internet and the domain name system.

One of the larger areas of work for the committee recently has been in relation to the introduction of new generic top level domains. This is aimed to be a broad introduction of a variety of kinds of top level domains including those that are not in Latin script, that may be used by communities, cultural communities, language communities, as well as top level domains that perhaps brand holders or companies may wish to obtain.

So this has raised considerable amounts of interest from governments and we have been working very hard to provide advice in a timely manner on the range of public policy issues that such a large and complex program will present for governments.

One of the areas of work for the committee with other parts of the community is in relation to finding a way to provide support to applicants that may need additional support and in addition to that, the committee has taken a considerable interest in how mechanisms can be put in place in order to content with controversial or sensitive strings or applications. In some cases, governments have relevant national legislation or policies or objectives for the domain name system or the internet that may be

inconsistent with some of the applications that come forward. And so we, as a committee, looking at ways to provide it by in this particularly complex area.

Another area of work for the committee is related to accountability and transparency at the organization. This is something that can always be improved and is really important to a bottom up policy development process, that there are accountabilities and part of this is reviewing the role of the committee, and finding ways for governments to provide advice as early in the bottom up process as possible, so the governments can be very much a part of the process from the beginning and hopefully allow for better outcomes in working with other parts of the community.

We meet regularly with the Board as a result of this formal role we have advising the Board at ICANN and we meet regularly with other parts of the community as well. And we consider this to be a key way to share information and understand the perspectives of other parts of the community. Most of the meetings of the GAC are open, and we do our utmost to have those open meetings, so that we also are transparent and very much a part of the community.

Another area of considerable interest is work taking place in the ccNSO in relation to clarifying existing rules and procedures for country codes top level domains. And so we are looking for a way to contribute to that work and provide clarifications to the staff responsible at ICANN for implementing those services.

So with that I will conclude and hope that gives you a good overview of the current work in the committee and gives you an idea of how we function. And if there are questions; if there's time for questions, I'd be happy to take those.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much for your participation. I will now give the floor to the rest of the panel whether there are any questions from the floor.

Didier Kasole: I am Didier Kasole; I come from Congo. I think I understood that GAC is restricted to advisory efforts and that it does not have the decision power in the process, whereas the other constituencies do. So it's nice to have a representative with the Board, which is the one that makes the decisions.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that question.   The Governmental Advisory Committee is certainly advisory and in fact this is not a limiting role. It gives us a lot of flexibility in being advisory. What I did not point out in the beginning of my presentation is that the GAC Chair also serves as a liaison to the Board so there is jewel role for the Chair of the GAC and this allows for information exchange and there are clear expectations from my colleagues in the committee that I am able to bring forward their perspective or their views on

various policy issues by virtue of being a member of the Board. So that's a good mechanism for, as I say sharing of information.

One of the proposals the GAC has made recently is to try to have an additional liaison so the Board would have a liaison to the GAC as well as the GAC having a liaison to the Board. And this would be a way of perhaps to strengthen that relationship with the Board.

I think that you are quite right that it is critical that relationship, and the communications need to be very strong and it's important that the Board and that ICANN be responsive to the advice of governments. It's really key to making a model like this work and ensuring that the public policy concerns and issues that are raised, are fully taken into account when decisions are made at the organization.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I'm being told that interpreters need to go. If you want we can continue without interpreters, because they have to go to another meeting. What you think? Shall we continue?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Hi, I'm Salanieta; I'm from Fiji. I just have two questions. The first one if there were four key issues particularly at this ICANN meeting, what they be for GAC?

And the second one is what is the official or the unofficial GAC position in terms of the recent Indian, Brazilian and South African inter-governmental proposal in relation to enhanced – in relation to

improvements on the enhanced cooperation of internet governance and so forth? Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that question as well. In terms of the four key issues, I think most of the GAC's work at this meeting is focused on the internal workings of the GAC in relation to the new gTLD program we have committed to create a mechanism for us to advise on controversial and sensitive strings. And so we are wanting to be clear about defining consensus in the community, and we are wanting to ensure that we have an understanding among colleagues as to how the procedure will work.

There will be an opportunity for GAC members, governments to signal to the organization early in the process if they see some sort of potential difficulty, and the hope is that could be possibly addressed by the applicant, or if not then it's an early signal for the applicant and for the community as well that there could be an issue, that there may be some sort of sensitivity associate with a particular string or application. So that is quite a large area of work.

I mentioned earlier some of the other issues that we're also working on, and I think they're also priorities for us, but I would refer to that one specifically. The GAC does not have a view on the proposal that you referenced that was the India, Brazil, South Africa proposal. The role of the committee is to provide advice on

domain name system policy issues.   So it's quite a focus throughout the committee.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Thank you. Just from coming from that in terms of GAC not having a view and also your earlier response in terms of the issues, sorry –

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Slow down and speak a little –

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Slow down, okay, just thank you very much for your response.   Just very quickly also in terms of the issues of representatives of GAC, for example the ratio in terms of say Asia-Pacific, Europe, European governments and African governments, just percentage wise.

Heather Dryden: I don't have a percentage handy, but there is participation from all regions and we're always wanting to increase participation from regions like Africa and Latin America and the Asia-Pacific region as well.

Male: Thank you very much. Yesterday, Ann-Rachel was addressing the house on the composition of the GAC, she mentioned about five

countries in Africa that have a representation – government reps in GAC, and discovered that Nigeria was not mentioned. But I am aware that there is one, Mary Uduma who is the Director of the Nigerian Communications Commission, and she's also the President of the Nigerian Internet Registration Organization in that body. And I just asked one of the Directors, who is a (inaudible) fellow here yesterday, and she said she is there as a member of GAC.

Well my question is, is she there as a government representative? And then what is the procedure or processes adopted by ICANN to have county code representatives in GAC?

Heather Dryden: Thank you, I wouldn't comment on any specific representative or GAC member, but governments identify their interest in joining the GAC and they do that formally, in a lesser usually from the relevant Minister or authority and they designate their representative to the GAC. And so that's not a decision that's made by the GAC, that's up to the GAC member to make. Ordinarily GAC members are public officials and that is certain generally the case, and as I say ordinarily that is the nature of representation in the committee.

Male: So it is open to any country to write and indicate interest to belong to GAC, is that what you're saying?

Heather Dryden: Absolutely, yes.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Dave Kissoondoyal for the record. Has the GAC taken action or is taking any action to ensure that they are more governments represented in GAC?

Heather Dryden: Yes, we do do our utmost to carry out outreach efforts. There are staff at ICANN that also assist in raising awareness and informing about the work of ICANN and of course that includes the committee. I also will invite governments to join if they show an interest so we're always looking at ways to encourage that participation. I mentioned earlier that there is travel funding, for example. And so that is funding that is not entirely used. So there is room there to increase participation that way.

In addition we have talked about having a high level meeting for governments on the margins of an ICANN meeting, and we may try to do this next year and that would be an opportunity I think to invite senior officials to join the meeting and to discuss issues that are of interest relevant to them in relation to ICANN and the domain name system.

EN

Male: Thank you, can I continue please? I want to know if there is some characteristic to the duration to the term of the delegate from the country?   Like you know in some countries, we used to have change in policy of government, and my understanding is that the representative of the country is sent by the country. Like if I'm a country, can I send somebody; and this month later, I send another later, okay I want to change this person? Or we have a change of government, and then the new government say that okay, this is the new representative? Because I can imagine that can have a big effect of the continuity for that country. So what is the process, somebody can be there for ten years? I just want to understand.

Heather Dryden: That is entirely the decision of the government.

Male: Thank you.

[Applause]

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much; it's been a pleasure talking to you today.

Male: Thank you very much. Fatimata Seye Sylla (speaking French).

Fatimata Seye Sylla: I will start with the last announcement. So there is an announcement that the opening ceremony will be chaired by the President of Senegal, President [Wad]. So it will be from 11:30 to 12:30. So please go there earlier, much earlier if you want to find a seat and if you want to assist. I don't think they will allow people to come in you know when you arrive late. So please go there earlier. And you have to stay until you know the President leaves, all right.

And the first announcement he made was about the capacity building transition for this afternoon in the same room at 4:00 p.m. So please be on time, it will be at 4:00 p.m. in this room, from four to six. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]