
DUBLIN – Fellowship Afternoon Sessions
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 17:30 to 19:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Good afternoon. So nice of you to join us. So kind. This afternoon, we have several speakers. I know yesterday was kind of casual Friday for us, zipping around the room with our comments and thoughts.

Today we have representatives from the Nominating Committee. When I describe them, my former Disney peer, Joette and current ICANN peer, who facilitates the work of the Nominating Committee – we call NomCom – she cringes, I think, a little, when I tell her, “It’s like the big recruiting firm for ICANN.” But these are individuals who work extremely hard to find the best of the best from around the world to be engaged in high-level positions in ICANN.

I am not the one to speak of it. I was just taking the time until Stephane came into the room. Aren’t I nice to you? You can wander. You can sit. We offer both. Okay. Well then, I’m going to bump [Sakhir] out of his seat because he’s very happy to do that. You’re welcome. We’ll give you just a minute to – yeah, come on

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

down. Mona, we'll move you to another spot. We're fine. Oh, you can just squeeze to it. Good.

Our second presenters, or chat mates – I shouldn't say presenters, sounds so formal. We're actually very informal here to get information from you and to ask you questions, soaking up the sponge kind of thing. So the second will be our friends from the ICANN staff, Security Stability and Resiliency team. Then we're hoping, depending on how the GAC are doing, we hope to see them at 6:30. They're working very hard in closed doors, so we'll see if we get to see them later.

Stephane, let me turn it over to you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much, Janice. Hi everyone. Pleasure to be here, as always. My name is Stephane Van Gelder. I'm the Nominating Committee chair. Sitting next to me is Hans Petter Holen, the chair elect, who will explain a little bit about those titles and the positions, and the way the NomCom works. I just want to say that it is a pleasure, as always, to try and help you guys as you come in and learn about the ICANN system to do that. And I think it's especially important to be able to discuss the NomCom

because the NomCom is a way into the ICANN environment, or at least leadership positions in that environment that are accessible and open to everybody and anybody.

I'm sure what you've seen throughout your days here is that sometimes there seems to be a very steep learning curve, a high level of learning that you need to do to understand how ICANN works, and to be involved. But the NomCom is a way to bypass that, in a sense, and be able to take up positions.

The NomCom recruits to the board, and that is often not the first choice that anyone coming into the community wants to make because it's such a high profile, high responsibility, steep learning curve-type of position, but it also recruits to ALAC (the At-Large Advisory Committee), the group that represents the users; the GNSO (the Generic Name Supporting Organization), which is the policy-making body for the Generic Name Space; and the ccNSO (the Country-Code Name Supporting Organization), which is a policy-making body for the CC space, the Country Code Space.

The NomCom works on a cycle-basis, a yearly cycle basis. So every single year, a new NomCom is convened. The committee is made up of members of the community that are elected to those

positions. The NomCom then has a task, which is to go out, engage, outreach, recruit, explain what the positions that we are recruiting to involve. And then solicit candidacies, and look through those candidacies' applications, and try and determine which are the best candidates for the job. It's a process that takes, on average just over six months. At the end of those six months, we announce a new slate.

So coming into this meeting, for example, the 2015 NomCom announced a slate of candidates that we worked hard to select throughout the last few months.

That's the basic methodology, I'd say, for what we do at the NomCom level. Perhaps I can turn it over to you, Hans Petter, just to explain the leadership and the way that works, the leadership succession.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yes, thank you, Stephane. The leadership of the NomCom has a chair, Stephane. The board has also elected a chair elect, me, and that's kind of a chair with training wheels. So I am here to advise and assist Stephane, and if I do a good job, the board may appoint me as chair next year.

In addition to that, Stephane gets to pick an Associate chair. He hasn't done so yet, but hopefully he will soon. That means we will have a leadership team of three people. In the past, we have often selected somebody who has experience from the NomCom so that we have some continuity through the leadership over the years, so that each NomCom sets its own procedures, but we have tried the last years – I've been on the NomCom for two years now – to develop and improve on the procedures we used the last year so that we don't have to start from scratch every year.

Anything I should add to that?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Either you or I could talk about the open leadership positions for this year, which you have in front of you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: When we talk about leadership positions, I would actually start with At-Large, which is the outreach part of ICANN, where we want to engage with the community at-large, where we have two seats for two-year terms, this year that we want to fill, one

from Europe, and one for North America. On the ccNSO Council there is one seat for a three-year term that we're looking for, and there are no regional restrictions on that. And on the GNSO Council, there is one seat for a two-year term for a non-voting member.

And then the high profile ICANN Board of Directors, three seats with three-year terms. I don't think we have any regional restrictions this year, so if you know of anybody for any of these positions in your... yeah, so we can't recruit anymore on the board from the Asian-Pacific region because we can have a maximum of five directors from each region, and a minimum of one.

So if you know anyone in your region that you think could be suitable for any of these positions, send them in the direction of noncom.icann.org, and all the information you need to apply, and all of the information about these positions will be found there.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Hans. Before I open it up for questions, let me just end by saying that what we've described is yet another ICANN

process, and you're probably fed up with the complexities of those processes, but underneath all that, it's actually quite simple. You apply. It's an opportunity to train, understand, and participate in ICANN. The application process itself is now pretty efficient. It's been refined over the last few years. There's an online form. Depending on what you apply for, you might get interviewed, or you might get called up for a face-to-face.

But at this stage, I think the important thing is to realize that the NomCom's job is really to seek out non-community veterans i.e., we're not looking for people that could get to these positions from elsewhere in the community.

I'll give you an example of that. The GNSO selects a director, board seat 13 I think is it – no, sorry, two directors, 13 and 14. So if someone came in from that type of community, say someone was a registry, we would not probably select them because they have another way into that position, which is to go through the GNSO.

What we are looking for is people that don't have prior alternate paths to the positions that we're recruiting. We're very much putting the net out there to try and get talent into the ICANN community that probably wouldn't have found its way to our

community by themselves. So it's a message to you guys. It's also a message to your networks, as well.

If you can think of people that you feel would be a fit for these positions, something like ALAC or the ccNSO or the GNSO Council, these are two- or three-year terms. So there is the opportunity to learn. Most people, when they are nominated by the NomCom they just sit there for a minute – well, six months – and just listen before becoming more actively engaged.

There's an opportunity to learn and understand more, and be more involved. Any questions that you have for us? Please.

MANUEL AVINA:

Good afternoon. I am Manuel from Mexico. Could you repeat, please, or at least elaborate a little bit more on what's the purpose of the NomCom. I more or less understood that it's to elect people that won't be able to get the leadership positions through the normal processes of the ACs and SOs; right?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Not exactly. That's one say. The focus that we have is that we'd rather not elect people that could get there in another way. But the purpose of the NomCom is to bring in added expertise into the ICANN mix. The purpose of any nominating committee – a nominating committee is a governance body that is not specific to ICANN. Many boards have nominating committees, and the purpose is to populate whatever body you're nominating to with expertise, with talent that you wouldn't otherwise get if you just wait for people to turn up at the door.

The added complexity of what we're doing is that we'd rather ICANN insiders didn't use the NomCom to get to a position of responsibility in the leadership structure that they could get to otherwise so that we're really giving outsiders, new blood, different experiences an opportunity to shine. Sure.

ALEKSANDAR POPOVIC: What are the most significant criteria for somebody to be promoted to those leadership positions that you just mentioned?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That's an excellent question. Thanks for asking it. The way the NomCom works is by receiving skillsets from each of these four bodies that we recruit to. So the Board, the GNSO Council, ccNSO Council, and At-Large, they send us skillsets at the beginning of each cycle. Those are basically the roadmap of what expertise they need for that specific year.

To give you an example, we may get one year someone applies that has financial expertise, for example, and it may happen that that's what the board has requested for that year. And we may get someone that has diplomatic expertise or experience, and maybe the board doesn't need that that year. That doesn't mean that the person shouldn't reapply the following year because the skillsets might change. And the board might feel that the following year they do need diplomacy rather more than finance.

So basic answer to your questions is that we do not invent the skillsets ourselves. We are given them by the groups. But it's also an opportunity to say that if you apply and it doesn't work the first time, don't despair. Do try again. Any further questions?

MARTIN VALENT: Is there any gender balance in this regard?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I can try to answer that. There is no gender balance requirement in the by-laws. When that is said, the previous two NomComs have actually looked at that as well, but the NomCom's task is to find the very best candidate with the best skillsets. And of course there is always a discussion on whether gender is part of that or not. Personally, I think that if we don't look at gender, we lose out 50% of the population of the world, so of course we need to seek actively to make sure that we have a good diversity of the board members.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Just to add to that, we can only recruit from the people that apply. One of the issues that we found last year – and every year NomComs make recommendations for the next year. So 2015 has made a set of recommendations to 2016. I was chair last year, but that normally doesn't generally happen. Normally there's a change of chair. But we are the 2016 team, and we will be working with the recommendations that we got from 2015.

One of those was that we should try to increase the number of women that apply. So we will try and look at ways to do that, both with outreach, with recruitment, with just making sure that maybe there's an element of discomfort that women feel that they don't – I don't know, they're not comfortable in applying. But what we found last year – I forget the exact numbers, Joette, perhaps you can help me out – was that 12 out of 81 applications in total were women. So it's a very low percentage.

Despite that, I will just mention that we put a woman on the board, and she's a very, very high level candidate. We put a woman on the GNSO Council, equally high level. Put a woman on the ccNSO Council, equally high level. And also to ALAC. So despite that low proportion, we were able to select women as well. But we need more women to come in. Sure.

BABU RAM ARYAL:

At the beginning you said, "We appoint veterans to the board." What is the meaning of veterans? Is it dealing with age or ICANN engagement or engagement in content? Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Sorry, I tend to use words that aren't always clear. It's just a term. What I mean is people that have a long history of being in ICANN, understand it very well, but also have another way in. That's the important thing there is that you can be a veteran... For example, I run a registry. I could apply, if I wasn't on the NomCom, which forbids me from applying for anything, but if I wasn't on the NomCom, I could apply through the NomCom for the ccNSO. And that would be okay, because I have no other way into the ccNSO. So although I've been around ICANN for a long time, I can still use this opportunity to apply to the ccNSO.

What I can't do is apply to the GNSO or to the board. Well, I can, but I probably won't be considered. Because as a registry, I'm part of the GNSO, and I could get elected by the GNSO to the board. So with trying to not put those – when I use the term “veterans” what I mean is I'm an experience ICANN person. I know the other ways in, and I should try and use them and let the NomCom bring in new blood. I'm not new blood.

BONFACE WITABA: Thank you. My name is Bonface Witaba from Kenya. I'm an ICANN returning fellow. Don't you think the funding aspect to attend some of these high-level meetings a limiting factor to, for

instance, countries in the global south? For instance, a NomCom member is supposed to foot their own travel, even if they are going to be reimbursed later?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That's another good question, because it's an obvious point that I hadn't even thought of mentioning because we're so used to working this way. The NomCom members themselves are funded, so they don't have to pay for their way. And the positions that we select to are funded positions. So if you use the NomCom process and you get selected, and you get selected to the GNSO Council, for example, your travel will be covered, your hotel fees will be covered, and you'll have some spending fees for food, etc.

[ALKHANSA MOHAMEDNASR]: Hello, my name [inaudible]. First time fellow. My question is in which part does NomCom involve in ICANN policy development?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: In no way is the NomCom involved in ICANN policy development. Our job is not to do policy at all. Policy is done in the ICANN vernacular. You've probably noticed that when it ends in SO, that's policy. So supporting organizations do policy and advisory committees send advice to the board basically. They are the policy engines. We have nothing to do with it. We are just there to select for those bodies.

ROGERIO DE SOUZA: My name is Rogerio. I'm from Brazil and fellow and first ICANN meeting. How will be NomCom is structured after IANA transition?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Could you repeat that question? I didn't quite get that.

ROGERIO DE SOUZA: How will be – sorry for my English – how will be the NomCom structure after IANA process transition?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: So how the NomCom will be structured after transition?

ROGERIO DE SOUZA: Yes.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Well, as far as I'm aware of, there are no proposals to change the way the NomCom is set up. So the composition of the NomCom is that each of the supporting organizations sends some members to the NomCom. So inside the NomCom all the members are appointed by their supporting organizations, and I have seen no proposal to change that.

The chair and chair elect are appointed by the ICANN Board.

ROGERIO DE SOUZA: Okay. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: And just to add to that, there is in every ICANN structure built in a review process. Last year there was a series of recommendations that came from the board on how the NomCom might be changed. There's a review cycle that's due to start pretty soon on the NomComs, so that may bring changes. There are recurring questions like the matrix, the structure of the NomCom, should that be changed? Are there too many of one representation, and not enough of another? So that may happen.

But your question about the transition, that's actually one that's interesting for us as recruiters because when we come to ask people to, for example, sit on the ICANN Board for the next three years, understanding that there may be a new CEO, and transition may mean that the ICANN Board looks very different in a year's time even, we have to inform those people and make sure they take that into account. So it's added complexity.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Lianna from Armenia. I wonder how many times can a candidate be selected or nominated for some commissions, or to a board. Like we are fellows, we have returning fellows, one time, two

times, three times. What about the board members, how many times they can be nominated? Thank you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: The board term is three years, and we can send them back two times. So three times three years. Nine times. On the NomCom itself, we can be there for two years in a row. And for the other positions, I guess there are different rules for the different SOs.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: So one candidate can be nominated for two times?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Well, you can be nominated as many times as you want, but we can only select and put to the board and put you there three times. The first time and two more.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you very much.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I suppose you all know who Steve Crocker is, right? Yeah. He is a NomCom appointee. And he is now, I believe, on his third term. Yeah. We selected him was it last year, year before? It all blends in now. He came to the NomCom asking to be re-selected for a third time, and he was re-selected. So you can be re-selected.

ELSA SAADE: Elsa Saade. I'm a newcomer as well. I would like to know if there is some kind of accountability mechanism for the board of you give some kind of evaluation for the board, how much of an effect does the NomCom have on the board since you are the ones who would have chosen the people on the board?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That's a very good question. I can start by saying that the NomCom selects eight members of a 16-member board, if you exclude the liaisons and the non-voting people on the board. So obviously, the NomCom is a key part of that process.

So for our own accountability there are strict conditions on being part of the NomCom – conflict of interest, statements of interest, you have to make sure that you explain your affiliation and who you are, who you work for, what you have contacts with, etc. And there is a possibility during the NomCom cycle if someone feels there's a conflict of interest – for example, a simple one might be you know a candidate very well, and because of that, you're not dealing with the process in a detached way. Someone might feel there's something wrong with that and might want to complain, so we have mechanisms in place for that.

I also think that in your question there's something that I think is very important and that the NomCom is at the forefront of, which is reviewing performance. In 2012, the board asked the NomCom leadership to be reviewed by an external firm, so chair and chair elect were reviewed by an external firm, and there's a review analysis that's given at the end of the year, and that is used by the board to determine whether, in the case of the chair elect, the chair elect should be chosen as chair for the next year.

Last cycle, in 2015, I suggested that we may also want to review the associate chair, which is a position that the chair chooses, but is part of the leadership team in the same way. So we did

that for 2015. The previous year, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, my predecessor, introduced the idea that the membership should self-review. So there is also a simpler review process for each NomCom member that goes back to the communities that have selected those members.

The last thing is that we publish all those reviews. So far we are the only body within ICANN to do that. The Board has 360 reviews. They have no commitment to publish. So in our recommendations 2015, one of the things that we suggested was that other bodies in ICANN do what we do and not only review, but publish their reviews.

ELSA SAADE:

If I may follow up on my question, on what standards – I haven't read any of the published reviews, so on what standards are these evaluations done? What would be a factor of success, or a factor of weakness, or what is the most prominent factor in the evaluation?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER:

There is an average score. The external reviews are done by a professional firm that we have to go through. I was looking for a more derogatory term. They are done through, first of all, a

series of questions online, and then a telephone interview. And they're called 360 because every member of the NomCom plus the leadership team gets to be reviewed, plus staff. So Joette, who's helping me out with all the difficult questions, and is the leading staff support for NomCom, and Gia, her colleague, will also get asked about our performance, which is why I'm so nice to her, and you better be nice to her too.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Point taken.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That gets put into a document. There are sections. Each section has a mark. You get an average score. To the average score, there's also a set of comments that come from the telephone conversations. There's the external firm that decides those comments are relevant, those comments will be put up, and they are summaries of the feeling of the people that were involved in the reviews on how that person did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to know if there is some no-competition rules for people who work on the board and is leaving the organization.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: What do you mean – that you’ve been on the board, you’re leaving?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So for example, you were designated in the board, and you leave the board because you resign or your time expires, and then if there is no competition rules for that person. For example, a time when that person can do business in the domain name industry?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Oh, revolving door policy. Not something that NomCom deals with. There is no revolving door policy at the moment. It’s a recurring discussion within the ICANN community, and it’s a good question as well, but it’s not something that we have to contend with at the moment. And it’s not something that the

NomCom would deal with because you're talking about what happens after the term that we've recruited to.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, I understand that but because I think that this is inside the conditions you offer when you contract with people to come to the organization. That's why I was asking. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, it's a good point.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And at that, we're going to have to say thank you because we have our next group here. But if anyone – and I can tell the interest is here – you can write to me, as we say, and I will get those questions compiled and send them to Joette to direct them to the Nominating Committee. So I thank you all very much. It's always a pleasure, and this group is just picking up things like sponges. So thank you.

I am going to pass the mic over to Mr. John Crain, and let him introduce his Security, Stability and Resiliency Team at ICANN. John?

JOHN CRAIN:

Oh, Mr. John Crain. I'm posh now, I must be important or something. So I'm John Crain and I'm going to walk in the middle. I suspect that, Davie, you're going to set up some slides, or are they ready to go.

Okay. I'm John Crain. I'm the chief SSR officer because we, too, have difficulties with security, stability. We actually call it Identifier Systems Security, Stability and Resiliency Group, which is a bit of a mouthful. I'm not going to stay long partially because I have to go somewhere else, and I'm also very sick, so you might hear my voice is a bit croaky.

So sitting in the back, if you guys want to stand up, or do a dance – you too, Rick. We've got Steve Conte in the back, Rick Lamb, and turning his back to you is a gentleman called Dave Piscitello, but that's okay, he's going to come up here and actually talk to you to save my voice.

We're the group inside ICANN that looks at issues around security and stability of the identifier systems, so looking outwards. How many of you went to the newcomers' sessions? Okay. We're not going to bore you with all the details of everything we do because we did that there. So I think we've decided to have a little discussion about something, and I hope you're open to this.

So who knows all the cyber terminology? Cybercrime, cyber warfare, cyber terrorism, cyber toaster, cyber whatever. Mr. Piscitello, you get to be talked to poshly too. Would you like to take over and run us through this, and I'll go and sit down in the back? We can all answer questions at any time after this. I'm going to try and stay around for a little bit.

DAVE PISCITELLO:

I think I recognize some of your faces from Sunday. How many of you heard my talk on Sunday? We decided this year that instead of being repetitive and talking again about what our team does and brag about the fun stuff that we do, that we would actually try to do something a little bit different. This is not an ICANN kind of presentation. Up at the top there, the one that says "Cyber Taxonomy for Fellows" – no, that's not it. That's for

Patrik Faltstrom. He's shorter than me, has longer hair. Way up at the top. There we go.

This is very non-standard. I will disclaim that probably no one outside my team has ever seen this material before, but these are sort of Crazy Dave thinking thoughts. First slide, please.

One of the things I wanted to try to do today was help you navigate through the whole world of what everyone thinks is cybersecurity. Because cybersecurity actually is not what everyone thinks. There are very, very special terms that have to do with cybersecurity, and almost all the terms are derived from a context. If you have ever watched any sort of crime or law show, you know that most of the time investigators are always looking to identify the means, the motive, and the opportunity for criminal activity.

Well, it turns out that these are extremely important when you're trying to distinguish one cyber activity from another. So the means are things like financial means, the ability to actually pay for whatever crime you're actually going to commit. So if you're going to go crack a safe, you can't just walk in and bang on the safe. You have to have tools to actually do that.

Technology is the ability to digitally mediate actions. I'm going to explain what that means in a moment. I'll make certain that you can all get a copy of these slides so you don't have to struggle making pictures. And the intellectual means are the ability to plan the act. Not every crime is committed emotionally or spontaneously. Often, the really, really good crimes involve someone paying very, very close attention to detail so that they can actually commit the crime and walk out with whatever it is they were trying to steal or act.

The other thing about cyber activities is that they're not always all crimes. There are political aims, business aims, financial aims – mostly making money. And in many cases on the internet, an awful lot of our cyber activities happen because people want some sort of notoriety or recognition.

Then finally, there's the opportunity. This is the access to the internet for all digitally mediated crimes. So the internet is really the opportunity or the playing field for every cyber activity. Next slide please.

In my world, cybersecurity has a very, very specific definition. It's a body of practices and measures to protect networks, to protect computers, and to protect our data from any digitally

mediated attack. Very, very specific. This is defense. This is not about everything. Now, if you go to every government, they have cybersecurity plans and they always involve not simply protecting data, but they involve, in some cases, being offensive with some of the things that they're going to involve in their cyber portfolio. Next slide please.

What is a cyber-attack? If you could just hit the spacebar, please. There should be some automation here. There we go.

So a cyber-attack is essentially an online or digitally-mediated attack against a digital or physical world asset or infrastructure. It's very, very simply the opposite of cybersecurity from my perspective. This is people who are trying to penetrate or steal or damage the things that I'm trying to protect as a cybersecurity expert.

Cybercrime, an online activity that has been classified as a crime in a jurisdiction, most specifically. This is one of the reasons why cybercrime is very, very challenging. What one country believes is a cybercrime and has in its body of law, and has penalties for. In the United States we have felony-level penalties of various kinds for cyber and computer crimes. But these are activities that are committed in violation of a law. Not everything is a

cybercrime in every jurisdiction. This is one of the things that we talked about on Sunday. This is one of the things that makes trying to deal with cybercrime so challenging. Next slide please.

Cyber warfare. We need to be very, very careful when we use the word war. We're very, very liberal when we talk about war, and I'm going to explain why.

A war, very specifically, especially in terms of nation states, is one nation state acting against another nation state. It's not a nation state acting against citizens. It's not citizens acting against citizens. The next slide actually has a very, very nice diagram that I pulled off a historian site. I apologize; I don't have the attribution for it, but I will try to find it.

Cyber terrorism, for example, people, especially government representatives, often talk about the war on terrorists. Okay. You can't conduct a war on terrorists. It's not terrorism. Terrorism is specifically civilians acting against civilians. They always do this to personalize conflict. Whether they're trying to create fear or create economic disruption, it is not an act of a nation state against a citizen.

An act of a nation state against a citizen would be oppression. Okay. An act of a civilian against a government would be revolt. An act of a civilian against a foreign government is a guerrilla action. These are all very important terms that we should tease out when we have these dialogs because we conflate things. Next slide, please.

Cyber surveillance. This is digitally-mediated monitoring. We all talk about cyber surveillance. People talk about cybersecurity as the defense against cyber surveillance in many cases. Now next slide.

That went too fast. Can you go back up and flip it through? And just hit the next one. Okay. So what's supposed to appear here is a bunch of things that people actually consider cyber surveillance: the collection of metadata, the collection of pictures of your pony, kitten photos, the collection of anything that you happen to use that identifies a personal asset. Collections of your conversations. And then, as it says at the top there, encrypted stuff that we'll decrypt later. We have the time and talent and technology, but don't tell anyone. It's really important that you forget we shared this. Some folks may get upset because there's an awful lot of controversy about what surveillance is these days.

I have a theory that one of the reasons why most people got caught up in the Snowden revelations is because there was an assumption that this was not happening everywhere. My personal view is that the US actually just simply got caught, and did a very, very bad job of managing the incident, so to speak.

I will be bold and say nation states have been spying on each other for ages, for millennia. It's part of nation states interacting with nation states. There used to be, before there was such a vast volume of digital information to swallow, and when it was very hard to actually manage to do spying – there was actually spy craft. There were people who actually had to learn how to spy, and had to learn how to spy in a very particular way. And there were rules of engagement amongst agencies back in the post-World War II Iron Curtain era, as an example.

What I think happened is that we had suddenly a firehose of information, an ocean of information. No one quite knew what to look for anymore. It wasn't as simple as monitoring for keywords on phone conversations because there was petabytes and petabytes being generated on a daily basis.

So some people panicked and said, “Well, what if we miss something?” And the best idea that somebody could come up

with was, “Let’s collect it all and we’ll store it away, and we’ll figure out what to do with it later.” Well, that’s really sloppy, and somebody’s going to probably figure out at some point what the rules of engagement should be moving forward. Next slide.

Hactivism. Hactivism is slightly different from activism in my view. Most activism, especially I grew up in the 70s, during the Vietnam era, I was actually – I chained myself to a radiator in my university dorm in protest. So I can say that one of the things that distinguishes hactivism from activism is the willingness to be held accountable – and publicly – for what you do.

Hactivists, in many, many cases, are people who really want notoriety, and what they do is they often hide behind an action, but will never disclose themselves. Okay, the Anonymous people, they didn’t want anyone to know who they were, and many of their actions, while in some respect or some perspective, were admirable, I don’t believe that every one of their actions was purely a passionate desire to make change.

I think that the difference between hactivism and activism is actually how committed you are to the cause, and whether or

not you are willing to open yourself up for further scrutiny. Next slide.

Cyber vandalism. I just distinguished this so you can see that you can actually take the word cyber, and you can apply it very, very specifically, even in things that all look the same. Cyber vandalism is different from cyber hacktivism. People might say, “I’ve done this because...” but ultimately, they put their name on it. It’s the end perimeter that they want you to remember as well, because they are looking for the notoriety. Last slide, I believe.

So that was very, very quick, and I wanted to make some time for us to have a conversation. But all those activities have one thing in common. If we go back to the first slide and we look at means, motive and opportunity, you will be able to see and review and say, “Okay, I understand what Dave meant.” Here was the means here. Here was the motive. Here was the opportunity. And if you use that whenever you’re trying to find the right language in a discourse, you will always be the most precise person in the room. Thank you very much for having me.

Questions?

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Abdalonem Galila, first-time fellow. Could we add education crimes to the categories of cybercrimes? At some faculty of computer science, or computer science in general, most of the professors ask the student to hack some application, or to make a new virus to hack some application, or to drop outside.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Okay. So depending on how an educator would present such a course, he might be telling his students to commit felony crimes. So I'm always cautious about those sorts of things. That falls in the realm of hacking, and I don't mean hacking in the popular term, but hacking in the term of learning how things work and break. So there's a whole set of rules of engagement for that that have to do with disclosure, coordinated disclosure, and remedy. So, again, go through what the means and the motive are, and understand where it would fit, and then come up with your own definition.

JOHN CRAIN: Can I add to that answer? Do a search on the term “ethical hacking”. Not just hacking, but ethical hacking. Not all hacking is bad. Like Dave says, it’s all about means, the motive, etc.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: If a student is genius, why not?

JOHN CRAIN: Well, it’s all about the means, etc. So, if he’s hacking a piece of code to learn how the code works, or he is hacking the code and then discussing with the owner of the code about the problems so they can be repaired, then the reason he’s doing it is for good. So hacking is a methodology. It’s not good or bad. It’s how you use it that makes it one or the other.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Let me give you an example. So if I have a genius in my classroom, and that genius discovers a way to get into a healthcare database, and he discloses 5,000 records of people online, is he a genius, or is he a criminal? No, he’s not a genius. Well, he may be a genius – let me rephrase that. He may be a

genius, but he is actually a criminal as well. Right, because he's unethical. He's violated all sorts of norms that we should accept, and we should not just simply forgive because somebody knows how to type Python scripts or do something a little bit more glamorous.

BABU RAM ARYAL:

Hello once again. While defining cybercrime, you said online activity. You basically focused on online activity. But like [inaudible] and unauthorized access to database could be offline as well. And don't you know these crimes are cybercrimes, one. And on second thing, while defining cyberwarfare, you are defining from conventional type of thing, from strictly stated actors.

Now, if a non-state actor attacks state [inaudible] of the state [inaudible] it's just guerrilla, or it's war?

DAVE PISCITELLO:

So, let me answer your first question. Almost every crime, aside from truly street crimes, involve a cyber component now. So I would say that that pretty much answers your question. Yes, all

crimes have both a cyber and physical component. At the very end, it's simply a financial remuneration, as an example.

The second, I use the conventional model. I think one of the reasons why we get into trouble when we don't use the conventional model is because it allows countries to apply certain benefits, like imprisonment and interment that they should not be applying in certain cases. It allows people to not apply the proper due process in certain cases. And I think that that's the convenience that allows – when you say this is a war, we're at war, these people are combatants that fall into the realm of what you would do with a combatant, as opposed to what you would do with somebody who's a civilian in that same circumstance. So I think it's important to make that distinction.

NABIL NENAMAR:

I would like to ask about this software that we download from Google Store, for example. On our smartphones that ask us to accept that the software will access our photos and something like that. How can you classify this behavior?

DAVE PISCITELLO: It's commercial surveillance.

NABIL NENAMAR: Commercial surveillance. This is a new term that you can add to your presentation.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Well, it's cyber surveillance, but yes – it falls under cyber surveillance but it's for a commercial purpose.

NABIL NENAMAR: Who tells us that this is for commercial purpose?

DAVE PISCITELLO: I did.

NABIL NENAMAR: Who knows?

DAVE PISCITELLO:

Oh, are you asking whether you download this and you get informed consent? You have the opportunity for informed consent? Well, actually, you do, by virtue of clicking on the app and understanding the terms of Apple store or whatever app store you're getting them from. But it's a sham. We all know that. And if you're verily careful about your privacy, you probably can't do anything. You can't connect to Facebook. You can't connect to Google. So we all make a very, very big sacrifice in order to be social, in order to be connected.

And most people do not realize exactly how much of a sacrifice they're making because they're getting it for free. I would personally rather pay \$10 a month – and I realize that I can afford to do that – but I would rather pay \$10 a month to be on a Facebook that doesn't keep my personal information and allows me to erase it, than free. But that's not available to me, and it's important for me to be a part of Facebook because of the kind of work that I do.

So what I try to do is be very, very careful about what I post. And so I tell people, make the informed decision. Understand that you're giving your data and you're never going to get it back,

and you can't erase it. And your photos and whatever else you happen to say in Messenger, and you're sharing information about your friends and you didn't even have their consent to do that. So just understand what you're doing when you're in that social media. Elsa, you've been patient.

ELSA SAADE:

Thank you. I'm curious about the jurisdiction part. What are the pillars that are included in this jurisdiction process, and is there a summarized way of the highlights of how it goes? Because I'm sure that registrars and registries are also included in that. And I'm sure that there are so many angles that you have to think of when it comes to jurisdiction and the process after a cyber-attack, or a cyber terrorist.

DAVE PISCITELLO:

Right. So I'll begin with the "I am not an attorney." And I am so thankful that I'm not an attorney. So jurisdiction is essentially what is the providing body of law and the government that presides over the entity?

If Go Daddy is operating as a registrar in the state of Arizona and they're incorporated as a California-Delaware corporation – I can't remember what. So where they are is their presiding court of law. Then you get into where were the data? Where did the attack begin and what parties constituted the body of criminal conspirators?

In many cybercrimes, there's not one jurisdiction. There are five, ten, dozens. It's mind-boggling. In order to actually go and do some sort of successful take-down or apprehension of those kinds of criminals, you have to coordinate all the countries, try to get them all to where you believe you have perpetrators and data and hosted information and attack machines, and sort out who's going to participate? What part of this large conspiracy of people and machines are we going to try to dismantle?

John has had enormous experience in this, as have I. You end up with this large, large set of people involved – many, many courts. And each court has to agree to participate. And there's something called a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty process where you have to get all those ducks in a line in order to, at a particular point in time, do a massive seizure. So, if you look up MLAT (or Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty) that's a good place to start.

JOHN CRAIN: It's not just the jurisdictional complexes. These are actual real operations a lot of the time. So there's also the complexity of timing. So if you've got a lot of paperwork moving around, and a lot of agreements need to be made, and then you have to be very precise about what you want to do, online actions that reach out into the real world where you're trying to deal with criminality are extremely complex. It's something that's all sides of this, law enforcement and registries, registrars, people like us are struggling with. It's really, really hard.

DAVE PISCITELLO: You've had two questions, and there are lots of other people so I'm sorry I'm going to cut you short but let some of the others answer. I'll be happy to stay and talk with you about whatever your other questions are, I promise. Go ahead.

NARINE KHACHATRYAN: There is an opinion that the ability of being invisible can in some way prevent people from acting in a moral way, ultimately

creating a favorable environment for people with malicious intent. What do you think of it?

DAVE PISCITELLO:

Okay. I think that what you're asking me is, do I believe that there is a role for anonymity on the Internet. I do. I think it's incredibly abused, and those people who actually deserve anonymity suffer from the abuse. You have people who abuse children, and bully their peers and cause suicides, and that's reprehensible. You have people who troll everything. That's reprehensible. You know, grow up. My gosh, this is ridiculous. You have this wonderful environment where you can thrive and learn from all other people.

But there are places where you can't openly discuss the kinds of things you might want to discuss because what you feel is a human right is not respected by the country you happen to either be born in or live in at the time.

So it's a very hard problem to solve, and I don't know whether you'll ever have a global agreement on anonymity or not, and I think you'll always have governments that are more interested in suppressing speech than others. I hope we can come up with

something, but I actually do believe that there is a role for anonymity. It's just a very, very hard things to control. Yes.

KINFEMICHEAL DESTA: I have both a question and a comment. The comment is in relation to the distinction that you drew between a cyber-attack and digital surveillance. I personally think that sometimes digital surveillance follows a cyber-attack. I can give an example here. If you recently followed the news, some countries have been using certain server tools, like malware, spyware against individuals situated abroad so that they can access their data. Even the Snowden revelation also disclosed certain US government practices.

DAVE PISCITELLO: I'm glad you brought this up because they are related, not just that an attack is a precursor to surveillance, but surveillance can actually be the precursor to an attack.

We always used to call this in the old hacking days information-gathering. So if you wanted to penetrate a network – and today, still, when we're doing security assessments, you gather as

much public information and as much about the network as you can. You may even, in fact, try to find as much as you can about an organization before you attack it. If you do a network topology map before you go a denial of service attack, you're literally doing some sort of a surveillance before you're doing the attack.

KINFEMICHEAL DESTA: The other thing is in relation to cyber warfare. For example, if you take the Stuxnet case of 2010 when the US and Israel sent those cyber weapons against centrifuges in Iran. That was a one-way attack against Iran. Would that amount to cyberwar? And another example is the Sony attack.

DAVE PISCITELLO: These are really good nuances, and they're not necessarily corner cases but they're hard cases. I think that there are many people who, if you looked at this taxonomy, would say that Stuxnet was an act of war. I think there are other people who would say that it was an act of defense. So throw a cyber defense up here, or a cyber offense. If you go all the way back to the 1950s, and you think of the way that people [inaudible]

engaging with, who has the first strike? Who has the retaliatory strike? And what were the values of being able to do a preemptive first strike?

Stuxnet, if it had been much more sophisticated, could have been a preemptive for a strike. It could have essentially taken out the entire facility. So there are nuances.

JOHN CRAIN:

This lack of clarity around some of these terminologies and the confusion is not something we get involved in, by the way, but we see it all the time.

It's part of the danger, and that's why governments are now starting to talk about these things. If you'd asked me three months ago if the leaders of China and United States would be shaking hands and saying let's not do this, I'd have never believed it. Governments are now aware that this lack of clarity around issues like this, what is and is not warfare.

There's been plenty of cases where something appears to be from a nation state because it's attacking something that looks like infrastructure in a country that has, just like every country,

people that disagree with them. And this lack of clarity is very dangerous. Thankfully, it's not a world we have to deal in. That's high-level politics. And when you see leaders of two of the largest countries in the world coming together and saying, hey we need to be very careful here, you know it's a problem.

DAVE PISCITELLO:

We need to wrap up. One of the benefits of having a dialogue like this – Janice is chasing me off and it's fine. One of benefits of having a dialogue like this is that how many times do you get an opportunity to sit there and talk about this whole kind of taxonomy? People are not being precise, and in some cases, it's creating problems. In some cases it's leading to the confusion. But I also think that the more we have an open dialogue about what these things are and what the boundaries are, the better chance we have in actually creating some boundaries that actually stick.

Thank you very much again. I really appreciate coming here.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

The great pass off.

ANDERS HEKTOR: We have slides, right? Okay. Hi guys. My name is Anders Hektor. I'm with the Swedish Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation. And you are the fellows, I understand. Good to see you here. There's quite a few of you. Have you been here since Monday? Since Sunday, of course.

I represent my country. I work with the government. I'm not political. I'm a civil servant. So when we change government, I still continue. If they tell me to paint with blue, I paint with blue. If they tell me to paint with yellow, I'll paint with yellow. That's how it works.

And then when they have told me how to paint, I come here, and I give the positions that my country has on the different issues when we meet the other countries. So we have a GAC meeting going right now. We're actually in the stages of discussing the communique, which is the sensitive stage. So I asked a colleague to come and get me if it heats up because we're in sort of a tight spot. But I'm happy to be here, and I'm here for 15-20 minutes, or whatever. Next picture.

What is the GAC? I guess you've heard the GAC being mentioned. Perhaps you know some things about it. It's the Governmental Advisory Committee. It's one of the committees, one of the blobs around the board blob, so to speak. So we give advice to the board representing the different country positions. And, we're one element of the multi-stakeholder model, we think the important one – I didn't say most important.

It consists of individual states, and distinct economies as well – national governments and distinct economies. And there are now at this meeting, 155 member states, which is good. So we're increasing all the time. In the UN there are a few more. So not all countries are represented in the GAC, but we're slowly increasing, and it's an outreach work that we're trying to do to get more to come aboard.

Not everybody comes every time, of course. There's about 50 or 60 – it takes a third to have a quorum for the meetings. And there's about 50 or 60 countries being represented. So 155 countries, and 34 observers, which are international organizations. Oh you changed slides. Go ahead.

So we have three meetings a year. We have translation on six UN languages and Portuguese, and this is highly valued. We love our

translators very much. They are very flexible when it comes to running on overtime and such. They never complain. We just hear them toiling on, which is excellent. Thank you.

For our support, we have a GAC Secretariat, and we have people in the ICANN helping us as well. The GAC Secretariat is an independent secretariat. There are a couple of countries that are donating money to fund the secretariat help, and there is a consultancy company helping us. It's fully independent from ICANN. For some countries, it's a sensitive issue for countries to be independent from the GAC. Sensitive issues is sort of a specialty for the GAC. We seem to be very good at finding them, and dealing with them as well.

ICANN is very generous with the travel support. I think there are 20 or 30 or somewhere in between, travel support offered for each meeting, which is very useful, of course.

So we meet at these three meetings every year, the ICANN meetings. Normally we start at lunchtime on the Saturday, and then we work through Wednesday evening or night. We finish the communiqué. After that we have a few extra meetings on the Thursday.

Mondays we have off, so to speak, to take part in other communities' meetings, and the grand opening, and such, and have some working group meetings as well.

Intersessionally, work is also going on on different strands. Not everybody is working intersessionally. But a few, there are a couple of working groups. I actually wrote some down to remember them. I'm not participating myself in any of the working groups. So we have GAC Working Groups, such as A Group working on GAC's working methods, and one working on capacity building. So they will have their own process of not meeting, but having phone conferences and such.

There are also Joint Working Groups with our Cross-Constituency Groups, where the GAC works together with other constituencies, such as ccNSO on different issues that connect between us. And there's a Board GAC Recommendations Working Group as well. And the third class of working groups is a Coordination Working Group, and we have heard those a couple of times this week. One is called ICG. One is called CCWG. I guess you've heard of those. Next slide, please.

So what governs us in our work are the bylaws, the ICANN bylaws, obviously. And they stipulate basically what we are

supposed to do. And then we have GAC Operating Principles, where we define ourselves how we do it. For instance, we say that we are working by agreeing on consensus – on a consensus basis. Consensus is a word in the multi-stakeholder model that appears over and over again, as I’m sure you noticed. Oh, there’s an X here. I’m supposed to stand here. That’s much better.

And it seems every working group or every constituency have their own definitions of consensus. In our group, we say in the operating principles that we work with consensus. We make decisions on consensus based on the UN definition, which means general agreement in the absence of formal objection. Which means really that if one country objects, there is an objection.

So some would say, “Oh, that’s unanimity” but we don’t really see it that way, that it’s unanimity, because there’s always also a requirement with consensus, if we can’t agree, we need to continue working on an issue to find common ground. This is one of the important things with GAC. If it would have voting, for instance, it wouldn’t be called to continue working on a difficult issue, but we would just call it a vote and then it would be finished. But since it’s a need to have consensus, we have to revisit difficult issues over and over again to find a common

ground, or something that everybody can live with. I can come back to consensus later if it's interesting.

We communicate by means of the communique, which is our main vehicle to give advice to the board. It's not only meant for the board, it's meant for the general public as well, for other constituencies.

In the communique we don't only have advice to the board, but we have other pieces of information that we find to be important to convey outside. Thank you.

We have details of the meetings with other constituencies, how the work is progressing in different working groups. We have the advice to the Board, obviously, by consensus, as I said. And, if we cannot reach consensus, it actually happens. There is no consensus, and it's not possible to work any further. It's a final thing. You need to take a position. At that time, there is a proviso that the GAC chair should convey the full range of views to the Board.

So sometimes you can see in a communique – it's not very often, but sometimes you can see it says some countries had this position and some countries had that position. That's what we

call a split advice. It's not very useful, perhaps, for the Board because it's difficult for them to act upon advice like that. But it's still important to convey that the GAC has discussed this issue. It's very sensitive. It's very difficult. And these are the different perspectives that can be taken, and we couldn't reach an agreement. That's also important. Are there any more slides? The last one.

I've had a couple of GAC open forum sessions here at ICANN, and at the IGF. We're not having one this time. I think we're going to have one in Marrakech, which is a high-level group meeting. Oh yeah, I should say that every two or three years, we have what we call a high-level government meeting, which means that we bring our elected persons as well, our bosses, the political bosses. Ministers, state secretariats and such. And they come and they visit the GAC for one day. They participate during a one-day meeting.

This is very important to us because while we can show them what the GAC is doing, because often when we go here and we work with DNS issues, and we come home, they're very technical, and often very difficult to explain to the ministers, to the political leadership how it is significant. So it's important that they take part of the work that is being done here. So that's

important for us to get the resources to continue going here, simply.

Also, we can save some tricky issues, or politically symbolic important issues for the high-level government meetings so they can resolve them at that time when we have the ministers present. So those are important. The Marrakech meeting this winter or spring will be such a high-level meeting. And at that time, we will have an open forum as well. And that's what I was going to say. At these open forums, there are a couple of questions that keep coming up. One is how are the members selected or elected. Do we ever vote? What do we mean by consensus in the GAC? So, does anybody wonder how we are elected? No, you don't wonder that? Okay. I'm joking. Sorry.

We're not selected, really. Since there are countries that are members, a country can put forward a representative in a formal way. So my government put forward my name as the official GAC representative. And then there's an alternate as well. So, I have a colleague from the telecom regulator that joins me at most meetings. And many people do. And if I'm not here, he can take my role as well.

There are situations where countries don't really agree on who is the representative, and those are very interesting actually. There are letters being sent with fancy letterheads and stuff like that, and the chair is scratching his head and wondering who is the true representative here? So it can be a sensitive issue as well.

Do we ever vote? No, we don't. Well, that's not really true actually, because if we are to change our operating principles, that's done by a vote. When we are electing a chair and the co-chair, it's done by a vote – well, acclamation, if everybody agrees, or a vote if there is disagreement. And I already told you about consensus.

So if you have any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My question is about how is the defined the agenda of the GAC?
How is defined the issues to be treated in the GAC meetings?

ANDERS HEKTOR: Good question. So we have agenda-setting telephone conferences. Parts of the agenda will be how shall I say, legacy

items from previous meetings that we just need to continue working on. Some issues are new issues that are imposed on us from work that are being done by the ICANN or other constituencies. It's always possible for anyone to propose an agenda item as well. If someone says, "Okay, we need to shape up our working methods, could we please have a discussion about that?" So there is no reason to say no.

I don't know if any proposal has ever been turned down.

RAUL SOLARES:

I am Raul Solares from Guatemala. Actually, I have two questions. The first question is the following. What does a country have to do in order to be member of the GAC? In Central America, we have an organization that is made up through a protocol passed by the parliament of a country. It's called [inaudible]. It includes the five countries in Central America, plus the Dominican Republic and Panama.

Close review of a list of members of GAC [inaudible] Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic, but not the other Central American countries. So my question is as it has already happened in other organizations, can [inaudible] based organization represent

several countries, or should [inaudible] act as a guest organization? Or can a representative of Central America represent other countries?

And finally – I apologize for taking so long – I have a question about consensus, because I think that it is especially difficult when you’re representing countries where there might be different positions, one or two countries may block the issue at stake. So have you thought of having something different from consensus, such as a majority two-thirds may approve a certain position? Thank you.

ANDERS HEKTOR:

Really challenging questions. On the membership issue, I would say the easy answer is: apply. If you have the support – you need to work at the government or be connected to a government or a government agency. And if you are, and this country is not a member, you can apply to the vice chair – or to the GAC chair. That’s the easy answer.

If we suppose one person that represents a country, can that person also represent another country? I don’t know. That person is working in the government, but not that country’s

government. If there is a letter sent from that government saying that this person is also welcome to represent our country, that would be a new thing, I think. We haven't seen that before. Not that I'm aware of.

The organization, as such, can probably not be a member – perhaps an observer. This takes some qualification because the European Union is a member, and that's – they are a distinct economy, but they're also – and they're representing Sweden, for instance, but the African Union Commission is not a member – or are they? I'm not sure. The Arab League is not a member. So, there are different issues to be considered there. But the main thing is, if a country would have a representative, even if it would be from another country, I would suggest to try that. It would be an interesting first.

On consensus, sometimes there are discussions about changing the consensus that we have. There is very broad support for consensus, I should say. Everybody appreciates the value of being required to work labor with an issue. When there have been stress tests on the GAC with very difficult issues, and there have been perhaps one or a few countries that are objecting and they will not stop objecting, then it has been discussions about maybe we should have a rough consensus, or just full

consensus, and consensus where – some do have that – where you could report a dissent or whatever. In the United Nations, you can say, I disassociate myself from the consensus position, blah, blah, blah.

We are learning, we're struggling, and we are finding the strategies to deal with the role that we have with the consensus. If, for instance, one country doesn't want to let go of an objection, they still know that there is an enormous pressure on this singular country to reach an agreement and to move forward. And they will then have the option – they have several options. As an example, they can make a statement to have it recorded on the transcripts, or even in the minutes that they take another position but they don't want to block the consensus position. So that's the big way of doing it.

There are discussions now with the CCWG where the CCWG has proposed that the GAC should lock our rules to maintain consensus and not ever change to voting. And this has awoken a lot of reaction. Not that countries say, Oh, but we want to go to voting, but the reaction it wakes is that you shouldn't tell us how we reached agreement in stuff we do. So I would say no, there is no support for leaving consensus.

Other questions. This table. You, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What is rough consensus?

ANDERS HEKTOR: Rough consensus, I think IETF, the organization working with standards here, used rough consensus. I asked the chair, Jari Arkko, at one point, and he described it with grunts. It's like when you have a group like this and I'm as a chair, so I'm making a core for consensus. I say okay. We have a proposal. It looks like this. The text is up there. Do we have a consensus for this position? And then we have discussed it perhaps for a couple of hours, and I know you perhaps, you're not happy with it, but you don't want to be the one blocking it. So maybe you would go [grunts]. That's rough consensus.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would like just to add an explanation to this because I'm an IGF fellow. So, in the IGF there is no voting. So this is the main difference between IGF and ICANN. We don't vote on RFGs or

draft. We should go to the rough consensus. If we don't have consensus, we maintain our discussion on the mailing list, and on the next event.

ANDERS HEKTOR: Thank you very much. One more question. You, sir.

NEIL CHECO: Neil Checo from the Dominican Republic. Second-time fellow. I have a question. For a country that recently signed up for the GAC, according to your experience, what would be the best way to handle all the information that comes from the GAC since different topics are involved in that advisory committee? For example, how Sweden has been handling all those work?

ANDERS HEKTOR: I'll tell you a secret: we don't. It's not possible. I don't work full time on ICANN. My colleague, working for the regulator, he's not working full time with this issue either. We have other things in our portfolio. I would guess most do. Some are working full time on this, and not even they are coping. They need to make

selections. But I would say coming to the meetings, trying at best to take part of the preparatory materials, and interacting during the meeting with other countries. That's the learning process. For me, that was the learning process.

There are very many things that I still don't really follow, and that I realize I need to drop that. I can't follow that. If it becomes a crisis and I can see it in the eyes of the other members, okay, then I'll need to deal with it. But it's not really possible to deal with everything. It's overly human. I can take one more question. We have a remote question. Great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This question is from Gabby, and the question is how GAC sees the IANA stewardship transition process – how does GAC see the IANA transition process?

ANDERS HEKTOR: There is a broad support for the transition in the GAC. I can't speak for all the countries, obviously, but I would say there is a broad support for the transition, as such. Most love it. And then the devil is in the details. So the question is how it will play out,

what the alternative will be? Because we think that the multi-stakeholder model is important. I think Fadi said the other day that there are no multi-stakeholder models in plural. It's just called a multi-stakeholder model. It's here. This is what we're doing. This is our multi-stakeholder model.

We're now changing it fundamentally. So we have a balance that is quite nice – or how shall I say? It's a sensitive balance. The matter of who has more power. Nobody should have more power. There should be a balanced power. But everybody is seeking different ways of increasing their influence. Influence is another word for power as well. So we don't want others to increase their power. We don't want to increase our power. At least Sweden are very sensitive about not increasing the influence of states over other stakeholders – at the cost of other stakeholders.

So, we're positive, but we're also very, very carefully looking at how it's playing out. Okay. Thank you so much for listening to me. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you, Anders. That was great. And as usual, if there are other questions, and I knew there were – or there are, please pass them to me. I will get them to our staff member Julia, who works with the GAC, and she'll make sure that those questions get to Anders and get answered.

Thank you to the interpreters. Thank you, Tech Team. We're almost out of Wednesday. Big round of applause for the interpreters and tech team. We're almost there. We're at Thursday, almost. Oh my gosh!

So we need to be on time tomorrow. We, being me, too, as you see me running down the sidewalk trying to get in front of you. This has been a tough go. Fadi will be with us at 7:30, and he needs to leave before 8:00 for a meeting at 8:00 with the ISTAR. So it's going to be limited time. We want to take full advantage. Please recognize that I know what he does. He speaks for about ten minutes, and he opens the floor for questions, and everyone's hand goes up and he can't possibly get to you all. So I am going to ask the alumni to maybe step back to the new folks' questions. If there enough to go around for the new folks, if they have him, I want everyone to respect that if you hear a question similar to yours, step back and realize he's answered it, and let's

just try to get as much out of him as we possibly can, the poor man. But it's a limited time and all that kind of stuff.

So have a good night. I know Nicholas would like to see everyone over at the Ferriman around 8:00, which is across the way, by the Clayton Hotel. It's right next door to it. There's some music. He thinks he might get some music going and get everybody in a great spirit for our almost last night together. So that's about 8:00 tonight at the Ferriman, just across the bridge. And other than that, have a great night, and I'll see you tomorrow morning around 7:15ish. More on the 7:14-side of ish.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]