
CR - Capacity Building Session 4
Wednesday, March 14, 2012 – 11:30 to 12:30
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Tracy Hackshaw:

Do you think you would exist without ICANN, without ALAC? Would you exist as this group, as this association without ICANN bringing you all together - show of hands – yes or no? How about the “yes” hands? You think you would exist without ICANN? And those who think we would not exist without ICANN as a group, as the ALAC? Alright, so that’s an important question.

Actually it’s a question that I could say that the GAC is currently discussing. As the GAC was an Advisory Committee, you are here to advise ICANN – that’s our position; that’s our role. Some of us are being paid to come here – travel, support and so on. Some of us came on our own due to our own personal interests. But as an Advisory Committee, we are here to advise ICANN. In some ways we are probably the more important – the ACs – than the supporting organizations.

Supporting organizations need ICANN and ICANN needs them because they do the work of ICANN; however, the ACs advise the Board of ICANN - so the ALAC, the SSAC, the RSAC and the GAC. That’s a very important distinction for us to realize that because as we sit here and speak and talk amongst ourselves, and in some cases argue and fight, it’s important for us to understand that our job is not internal; our job is to advise ICANN. It’s part of a shared vision or a shared goal.

Our goal is to make the internet better; make it work; make it a safe place, whatever you think it is. But it’s our job to come here and advise the Board of ICANN to insure that happens. And the GAC again is sort of discussion is happening internally and some of that we need to take seriously and show that we know what we’re doing as opposed to having our internal discussions, internal battles about other issues. Just wanted to make that point.

Just one (inaudible) what the GAC is. The GAC’s key role is to provide advice to ICANN issues of public policy and especially where there may be an intersection between ICANN’s activities and all policies and national laws or international agreements. It’s very important for you to understand that’s what the GAC is. And for everybody in this room whose country is not represented on the GAC in some way – and I’m referring here to some of the Caribbean

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.

countries in particular – I would like to encourage you to get involved, whether it be remotely, whether it be coming to the meetings on your own, whether it be to apply for support where it's available – to come because the discussions in the GAC or certainly in the ALAC – I encourage you to keep coming to the ALAC as well – are becoming very, very heated in terms of what's happening to the internet.

As you know – I'm not sure if it's been discussed in this room – the WCIT meeting is happening in December 2012 and the IT was making some very important decisions for the world with the governments there. It's very important that we sit in this room as ALAC and as the GAC and insure that those decisions that are being made have influence from the people who actually are involved in the internet and involved in what the internet is doing from the IT position and from the other positions and maybe from a different view – from a governmental position which is technical or from a user's or from whoever else the internet affects.

In terms of the GAC, what is the GAC doing and what does its role in terms of ICANN's work and what is the influence of the ALAC? So as I said before, it's an Advisory Committee, right? The GAC provides advice. Carlton, can I ask you – does the ALAC provide advice as well to the GAC – written advice? Written documented advice? Does the Board accept your advice? There's anyone that can speak?

Carlton Samuels:

This is Carlton Samuels. As part of what we do as the At Large Advisory Committee, yes, we do provide advice and we can provide advice and anything to the Board. The Board is not required to accept our advice, however. Straight over the fence and they can say, "Thank you very much, but bugger off."

Tracy Hackshaw:

So let me make that... I'm not sure if I'm making the distinction here. In terms of the GAC – I'm sure you may have heard about this – in the last year the Board... if the GAC gives advice in written form and the Board chooses to reject that advice, the Board must say why. If the GAC does not agree or there's no consensus as of what is happening there, there's a process that happens thereafter in which an attempt at consensus is made. Is that the case with the ALAC at all, by any stretch of the imagination?

Carlton Samuels:

No. Carlton Samuels again. No. All Advisory Committees are equal, but some are more equal than others. They are not required to answer us at all; it is purely in their good sense and purely in their gift to even acknowledge receipt of the advice. That's how it's done at the minute.

Tracy Hackshaw:

Great. So at the risk of... again, I'm not representing the GAC or representing the government of Trinidad/Tobago. I'm going to make a plug now. This is a very important point I think for us as the GAC – not me – but the GAC and the ALAC to start working together, even more closely than we have been in the past.

Now I recall – I'm reasonably new to the process – 2009 I came to my first meeting and I was on the GAC from 2010, so not very long – but I do recall the GAC and ALAC working together very closely on the Joint Applicant Support Program and publishing a statement that actually had a significant effect in making the program become significant in the Board's eyes.

So the Joint Statement of GAC and ALAC at that point which was negotiated with parties behind the scenes, I think was one of the first – I could be wrong – the first real attempts to make the Board listen to what this group is saying and significantly – and for those in this room – for developing countries. And it's very important for those of you who are in this room for developing countries to understand that in the GAC we are outnumbered, although in terms of actual numbers, we are probably more than developed countries or what are perceived to be developed countries.

I'm not exactly sure the reason for that. Again, I'm speaking for myself, but it does appear that the voices of the developing world are not speaking up and if they are speaking up, it's very silent or soft. I would want to encourage the developing countries here to speak up in their own meetings in ALAC obviously, as well as to encourage your government to speak up in the GAC as well.

Much of the things that are happening in the internet and in the ICANN world are directly affecting developing economies whether they know it or don't; whether they like it or not. And those events that are affecting those economies will not be known to those countries unless we make it known.

So from the ALAC perspective, I'd like to encourage you very, very strongly to go out when you go back home to work with your communities, work with your stakeholders, work with your government, work with your GAC representatives where they exist to insure that these issues are raised and are ventilated, whether

it be at your various ICT events, whether it be in the ministries, whether it be in your friends or your users group meetings. Invite your officials; bring them in – maybe not ministers, but certainly bring the policymakers in. The ministers will listen. The ministers generally don't have their own views as far as we can tell unless they're affected by the technocrats.

So bring them into your meetings. Call them together, have a session with them. That is a way that the GAC and ALAC can work outside of ICANN. I think it's very important to understand that – that whether or not we want to talk about coming three times a year to GAC meetings... sorry, ICANN meetings – the work that's really happening as you know, as ALAC is inter-sessionally.

I'm aware that ALAC meets regularly – very regularly – outside of meetings; the GAC does not. The GAC meets inter-sessionally very infrequently. It's very important I think for you to insure that you make a GAC/ALAC connection outside of ICANN and I think that's important to see as in terms of stakeholder building, in terms of capacity building. Because when you come back to the next meeting, it's a joint position that can be presented without it being officially documented.

So in the ALAC room and the GAC room from developing countries' standpoints, we all are saying the same things and not talking across purposes to each other and I think it's very important. Does anybody have any questions or thoughts on that? I wanted this to be more interactive, so can I hear from you on my interpretation and stuff.

Anybody can respond to that please? No. Sounds like a developing country in the GAC room. So can I hear U.S. please? European Union? Australia? Italy? They talk; they talk all the time. Germany? U.S.? Maybe Brazil? Sometimes – see what I'm saying? Need to say something; need to talk. Sala will talk; she's in the back but unfortunately she's not in ALAC.

But the point I'm making is that's... exactly what happened here is exactly what is happening. When there's silence in a room, there's always a gap being filled by other players – remember that. And when you're speaking – I don't know if...I haven't been to an ALAC Committee Board Meeting or whatever it's called here – but if it's similar to the GAC, I don't speak there and when you speak you don't speak loudly and with passion.

You are very lucky. You don't have opposition of the government behind you. You can say pretty much what you want. In the GAC, major difference – you can't or you shouldn't, maybe you shouldn't. I should say that. In the GAC people do say what they want I suspect but their governments back them

because the people at the GAC at least know what they're doing so the governments will back what they say.

In ALAC you have a very good opportunity to say what you want and say what you mean. And again, if your advice is not taken officially or seriously, then I would encourage you very much to work with the GAC. I think from my three years in the – or just about three years – in the ICANN world, it's very important for the constituencies to talk. So the ACs in particular, they need to talk more often and I especially think the GAC and the ALAC need to talk.

The reason why I'm saying that – and please don't shoot the messenger – is that the GAC and the ALAC – hear me out – represent the same people, alright? I don't want to make it sound like a shock, but represent our citizens, our users, our businesses, etc. We represent the internet user community.

Now the governments do it differently obviously – the elected officials and so on – and you as an ALAC represent the users in a different way, but we represent the interests of the same people. It seems to me very logical that the GAC and the ALAC should work together and talk a lot more often.

Seems to me that the Latin American and Caribbean section of the ALAC and the Latin American and Caribbean section of the GAC need to talk more often. Seems to me the Caribbean section and the Caribbean sections talk a lot and so on. Seems to me those things can happen much more often.

So when we come to these sessions, let's say I'm speaking and you're speaking – we're speaking the same language literally; the same discussion; the same thoughts; the same positions and [supers]; same positions and actors; same positions and people, etc.

Right now in the Caribbean I know there's no position on these things. I think it's different in Latin America so I want to encourage as well the Latin American and Caribbean voices to work together, to talk as well. And the GAC it's a challenge because the Latin American voices in the GAC are quite strong when they speak – Brazil, Argentina and sometimes I might hear Uruguay. So Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay are very strong speakers in the GAC. The Caribbean – well, it's only me and (Inaudible), Jamaica – not so much.

So when Latin America speaks, we would like Latin American to speak on behalf of the Caribbean as well. It's good for Latin American/Caribbean to talk; I think it's good for that to happen throughout all aspects of this work that we're doing. Again, I'm speaking from my own personal experience. Any questions, anymore questions that you ask, you bombard me with, anything further to add?

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Hello, Tracy. This is Sergio Salinas Porto for the records. As I was listening to you, you spoke about the GAC and the people forming the GAC and you drew a distinction between states and governments because surely your voice in the GAC is the voice of Trinidad and Tobago and the government has no other choice than to have your voice there so that is the way it should be. So maybe you can explain what you said because I've heard that distinction from other GAC members and that was a sort of red flag in terms of how the GAC functions or operates. Maybe individual voices do not agree with governments? I really didn't get that point.

On the other hand, I agree with you in that we need to have a closer link between states and the civil society. States represent people and we, the organizations here, represent users, and when I say people I speak about people in general. Are you not wearing your headphones? Are you not wearing your headphones?

Okay, as I was saying, states represent a country that is the users, the academia, the companies, universities – all the component of a country. And on the other hand, we represent the internet users in our country. I will go back to my question. Do you make a distinction between GAC members and states or do you represent the states? Thank you.

Tracy Hackshaw:

Excellent question. Jose?

Jose Arcé:

This is Jose. In the interest of time, Tracy, we have some questions but we will address only Sergio's question.

Tracy Hackshaw:

So, Sergio, again, let me rewind. I'm representing my personal opinion of my experience in the GAC, so it's on the record, but please don't quote me on these things, but I'm going to answer your question.

Yes, I do believe that people come to the GAC with their personal experiences, like myself, and some of them do convey those personal experiences, personal views. Because you are representing a country, it will be conveyed that that's the country's position, whether or not that is the country's position or not.

And as I said before, I think I'm going to be very careful, in most cases in the use of the internet in particular, and in some cases in even larger telecom issues, but the internet, the technocrats, the officials who represent governments are, in fact, the voices of government because their views are the views that matter.

I'll make that very clear. In other words, they write the policy; they're the ones who inform the ministers that we should support or not support a position. It could be their personal opinion – could be, but it's their position. In some cases the ministers or the secretaries or whatever else may not differ from that position or have an opinion.

I think you see it in the UN on occasion when in ITUN meetings, the ambassadors represent and they take the positions that are written by a ministry, a policy position. And the GAC is not as official, so when somebody speaks on the spot when asked a question, you will find in many cases that that becomes the government's position on that subject.

While I'm separating the point, it becomes the same thing eventually. In my case, I don't do that. I don't speak unless there's a position and if I have to make a statement, I ask. I go back to head office; ask a question – shall I say something. Because (inaudible) generally is neutral; we take a neutral view on most issues, where some countries take a for or against position.

If you come to a GAC meeting and you see a discussion ongoing, you know, any Board discussions, you will see the for and against. I won't have to tell you who is for and against. You will see it manifest itself across the GAC discussions.

Again, it's very important – and I want to make it clear again – that if you want that GAC member to speak the same language that you are speaking, talk to them – not just here, home. When you go back home, find that GAC representative in that office, have a meeting with that GAC member and talk to them. Say, "I represent country X on the ALAC, on LACRALO and here's our position on this topic. What do you think?"

Talk to them there. You will be very surprised to know that in the GAC, many of them – not all – many of them are neutral. It's neutral. They come into here and they may not say anything or they may say something. So your view may very well become their view. It's a very important political strategy to employ. Speak to your representatives. You may have argument, but the point is they'll come to some kind of consensus.

I think from moving on with ICANN from here to the next year or two and having these sessions that you're having is very important to move on as

LACRALO and as ALAC to have that consensus building outside of ICANN. So the discussions in this room, discussions in that room could be very similar and could have the same objectives and a shared vision. Clock ticked; finished; that's it.

Jose Arcé:

Thank you, Tracy. Now our next speaker is Analissa Roger. She's the CEO of DotGreen, so Analissa, thank you very much for being here.

Analissa Roger:

Hello. Thank you, Jose. Thank you so much for inviting me here to speak. Appreciate it. I'm the founder of DotGreen which is a new TLD applicant and we look forward to Punto Green on the internet as a way to forward sustainability in all reaches of the world.

I'm also the Chairman of the DotGreen Foundation; I'm the Vice Chair of the San Francisco Bay and Silicon Valley Internet Society and in my home region I'm a Women Commissioner in an area called Marin County which is just north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Before I start, I just wanted to say that when I first came to ICANN, which is this great multi-stakeholder governing body, I was welcomed and I learned that I could speak at the mic if I had something to say and if I did that it would be translated into six languages and it would be recorded into the transcript. So there's nothing to worry about for those of you who are considering getting involved. And that's what's great about the multi-stakeholder model of governance here at ICANN is that everybody counts and all the perspectives count.

So one thing I want to say just as we start, I'm not speaking about economies worldwide; I'm speaking about the private sector here at ICANN. So here at ICANN the private sector consists of multi-national corporations; privately owned internet industry companies; local enterprises; small businesses and actually some non-profits that are privately run and privately funded and it may include some non-governmental organizations. Third-parties are also a necessary part of the ICANN model and they're necessary to keep transparency and neutrality here at ICANN and ICANN will actually hire third-parties from the private sector for that purpose.

Volunteerism is a huge part of ICANN. Time is afforded by individuals who are supported by the private sector. Services that are provided to ICANN for audits, economic impact studies, research, benchmark studies – those are all provided

by companies that are in the private sector. Expertise and perspectives come to ICANN from the private sector. And since the internet encompasses all areas of business, lifestyle, people's activities across all borders, ICANN benefits from a multitude of expertise and perspective from all areas of the global economy.

Also sponsorships is an important part of what we get from the private sector as contributions of dollars and funds come from the private sector. Diamond, platinum, gold – all of those levels of sponsorships that are offered for meetings are often but not always from the private sector. And of course, revenue, through the channels where domain names are sold, that provides revenue to ICANN through the companies that engage in the industry.

So this is an interesting slide. Hopefully everybody – all of the newcomers have seen this structure of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and I just wanted to add one interesting piece of information. ICANN itself is actually from the private sector. It is a private corporation incorporated in California and it is not under the control of any one government and that's why all of us have a say here and that's a very important part.

ICANN is also a non-profit organization and it's important to know that governments from around the world can advise and do advise through the GAC which we just heard about in detail and they do that alongside the rest of us multi-stakeholders.

So getting back to where is the private sector here. Most of the private sector influence on this chart will come through the GNSO which is the little green box, but there are aspects of private sector in some of the other areas. Keeping in mind that many of the individual volunteers at ICANN throughout this model come from the private sector from various outside industries, but they have expertise that they bring to the table.

So why is participation important? It's important obviously for all the multi-stakeholders. As far as the private sector – finance reaching their consumers – remember, we're talking about companies and private businesses – marketing that they do on the internet; internal operations and communications – everything that a private company uses the internet for – is integral to their business being successful.

So they need to know how they could be affected and coming to ICANN is the place to find out what policies are coming up, what issues they need to know about and also to support progress. The contributions and the involvement and perspectives offered here at ICANN from everybody, including the private sector, helps everybody around the world as the internet develops.

This slide shows some specific examples of what we might be hearing this week in some of the meetings that members of the private sector could be interested in. So I've just listed some there. I'll go ahead and read them. Privacy; registrar accreditation agreements; consumer trust; the WHOIS discussions that are going on heavily and issues in and around censoring of the internet. All of these issues can affect your business, depending what part of the private sector you're in.

So the stakeholder voices is obviously important. The private sector's voice is an important voice amongst other stakeholders. Issues coming from the private sector or concerns can be brought to ICANN. Sharing and serving business needs amongst others that they meet here at ICANN and with the ICANN Board itself. And listening to others' perspectives I think is a really important thing that happens here at ICANN.

So whichever stakeholder group you're in, coming here and actually listening to the other stakeholders is a very important part of being a part of the ICANN model. And of course, affecting policy - it's true and it's possible to come to the table here at ICANN and affect policy.

And one thing I want to say too is... we'll go to the next slide before I say that. Online tangible use - what I meant for this is businesses... almost every business today uses the internet as part of their business. If they don't have online commerce, they're probably still using the internet internally for communications, for information, banking and so businesses need the internet for the functionality.

So this is a list here on the slides that just sort of reinforces that - economic viability; relevant usefulness; interoperability; internal use in the business itself; security issues; customer access - these are all areas that the private sector needs the internet to survive and it's just another reinforcement as to why coming to ICANN is important for those businesses.

So supporting progress - affecting the policy; introducing your real challenges from what you do on the internet everyday and what your business is facing or from your region is very important. Supporting what works; coming to ICANN and reinforcing that and making sure that that's heard and known and identifying needs are very important reasons the private sector stays involved.

And it's really important and exciting to realize that whichever sector you're from or you're involved in, coming to ICANN together we support the processes here and we all participate and contribute to the forward movement and evolution of the internet that we're all relying on and that's become such an

important part of our lives. So that's my presentation on the private sector. I'm happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

Jose Arcé: Is there any question for Analissa?

Analissa Roger: A very comprehensive presentation then. That's excellent. This last slide is... Oh, do we have a question?

Jose Arcé: Is there any question? Okay, you have the floor.

Male: Thank you very much for your presentation. It was a very clear presentation. The question is how does the private sector feel the intervention of ICANN and the support that eventually might provide for the improvement of the business? I repeat my question. Ready? Okay.

First I would like to thank you for the presentation. It was a very clear presentation. And my question is how does the private sector see from the perspective of a company as it is your case, the intervention of ICANN and the support that the private sector might give to internet for the growth of the business?

Analissa Roger: So I want to make sure I understand it completely. So was your question about how ICANN's... when you say ICANN's intervention... I'm sorry. Are you referring to support that the ICANN model gives to companies?

Male: Yes, how does a company feel, for example, in the case of your company, the intervention of ICANN; the participation of ICANN? Do you feel any kind of support? Do you feel that everything is moving smoothly or do you have any concerns on your part?

Analissa Roger: Yes, I think the overall big support that I feel as coming from the private sector is that there is the opportunity to come to the table here at ICANN to hear the

issues before the policy has been formed and solved; to know what's going on right as it's developing and to know that I have a voice along with other organizations and companies that have similar needs and concerns. I think that's the most valuable piece of ICANN.

Obviously in governments and in regions where we tend to do business, we're more used to getting rules and policies and regulations from the top down. There's processes in some countries where you can vote and you can have some say through representatives and that's excellent. But here at ICANN, it's really great to actually have that more active and immediate involvement.

So I guess to fully answer your question it would almost have to be on an issue by issue basis because certainly in a group of stakeholders this large, there are times when policies will go through or forward that maybe coming from the private sector we don't completely agree with, but that's part of engaging and supporting a multi-stakeholder process. So I think at the end of the day, the payoff and the benefit is greater than the compromises that come along the way.

ICANN is based on consensus too on how they develop policies, so it is often about compromises. But having everybody at the table and being able to discuss I think is very valuable. I hope I answered that for you okay.

One more thing – this last slide are ways to participate and I just put the link up there that we can all find on the website that leads us to the schedule. And then within the schedule, if you're interested in a meeting and you click on that actual meeting, there's ways to get involved if you're not physically located at the ICANN meeting. So even when this meeting moves in three months to Europe, logging onto the ICANN schedule out of your region is worth it because you can still participate online. So there's also a Facebook group for ICANN. Okay, thank you, Jose.

Jose Arcé:

Thank you very much, Analissa. Now our next speaker, Sebastian Bellagamba. It is a pleasure for us to have you here. Thank you very much, Sebastian. He is the Regional Director of ISOC for the Latin American and the Caribbean region.

Sebastian Bellagamba:

Thank you very much, Jose. Good morning to you all. Thank you. How are you? I don't have a presentation. I would like this to be a more interactive dialog. It's a pleasure for me to be here. I would like to say that I am at your disposal. As Jose said I have a position in the internet society, but I would like to share with you my personal experience when it comes to ICANN in general

rather than speaking about my role in the ISOC. And of course, to help you because I have a burden when it comes to ICANN, so I cover a heavy back, to put it somehow and perhaps I may share with you some of the stones that I stepped into when we moved forward.

For those of you who do not know me, I have represented many stakeholders parties. I have been involved with ICANN from the very beginning; I held the representation positions – I represented the non-government of organizations, private sector and so on. So it is difficult to face or to address the participation from the ISOC perspective because we, as an organization, interact with the ICANN more than participating in it. Therefore, I think it is better to speak about a personal perspective and to see how we can deal with this.

My first thought or idea when I was thinking about this presentation was to try to understand why we should participate, why do we have to participate in these stages. And like other technologies, internet is at an early stage when it comes to its maturing. So this is not a latest technology as it is a case of other technologies that we used in our everyday life.

So we are at a point in which we can have great value from our participation. We can get immediate results. Many of the faces that I see I recognize them and perhaps you may have heard about this. Participation is a fundamental factor right now. Our generation – in fact, I do not belong to the younger generations, but I think that sometimes we don't have an awareness of our participation. We created an internet – all of us created an internet – and this is perhaps sometimes we are analyzing Section 5 of a certain handbook and we are losing sight of the main topics and the revolutionary point of our participation - participation in spite of.

This participation has immediate results. We are undergoing a different historical process and this is a process allowing the participation of different stakeholders. I came here from other meetings and then I have to go to other meetings, but it is strange to see the various succession of different stakeholders that gather together to discuss something in common and this is something we shouldn't lose sight of. We have our doors open for participation secondly; we have the doors open for us to participate in the same level and this is something historical.

Sometimes we do not pay attention to this. So please, let's think about this. We have the possibility of creating as an example I might say that we have been talking about Web 2.0. This is not real for me; I think we are in the beta version. Eight years ago, for example, Facebook didn't exist so we are facing reality every day.

So we have this opportunity of being part of a creation of something. If we take society for granted, we are making a mistake. This is something that we are creating on an everyday basis. If we reflect about our participation in these types of organizations, I think we will have a totally different perspective when it comes to our actions.

It is better for us to understand our role. We have a role of creation. This means that we have to have our minds opened so as to accept others. We have to be open to commitment; we need to find intermediate positions, consensus. We have to work moving forward and taking into account the median and long-term period. We have to participate.

I know that to participate, we have many opportunities. Today we're going to speak about ICANN, but we have many other fundamental organizations. Many of you sitting here do not only participate in ICANN. We have a representative of the IETF; we have representatives from the Civil Societies and they participate in different regional and national organizations and also international organizations. We have people working from the Civil Society with our governments; private sector and at a regional level.

There are many levels here involved. In ICANN we can be all together and we discuss about specific issues. I apologize for the short time that I have been present, but we had a very interesting panel about participation in ICANN. Therefore, I think what I want to tell you has to do with a strategic position and the importance of participation.

In this sense it is of vital importance – LACRALO is of vital importance. And from the Civil Society, this is worth mentioning. The opportunity that LACRALO has to generate outreach – and I don't have a translation for this word in Spanish – we might translate it as government but this is not the case. So the possibility of generating outreach towards other organizations related to internet from the RALOs is vital.

And instead of trying to explain to you how to participate, I think that the message is to be able to create awareness and involvement so as to be able to produce outreach. I insist – we are undergoing historical moment; we need participation. Let's keep on participating, involving, committing ourselves and thinking about the long term just to see how internet evolves.

This is a challenge for us as a community. I think it depends on us. This is something that we have. Let's not wait until someone gives this to us. We do not have a father; we ourselves have to make it. Each of the things we achieve are done by us, or achieved by us. If we don't do these things, nobody will do it.

So instead of saying or talking about the involvement of LACRALO in the IPv6 or IPv4 transition, I think we have to take all these views into account. This is just a summary of what I thought when I involve in this adventure that I share with you. To sum up, I would like to talk to you, to share with you your experiences I have being involved for many years, so it is sometimes hard for me to admit that I have been working in ICANN for a long time, but I would like to share experiences and perhaps open the floor for the Q&A session.

Jose Arcé:

Johnny, you have the floor.

Johnny Laureano:

Thank you, Sebastian. This is Johnny speaking. I think that your summary of the significance of the work of LACRALO is wonderful. You mentioned short, medium and long-term strategic views and you mentioned the significance of a designed looking forward. In these days or today we formed a working group that has to draw up a strategic plan for LACRALO. The view, the perspective results in the design of our future. We can dream about a future and that is the starting point for us to build that future.

As you were saying, we are in this building stage so we can build or design one model so that we can convert and flow into the future of the world because if we don't do that, then we are doing the wrong thing. I very carefully listened to you as you said that you had a role in ICANN at different firms, from the Civil Society, from the private sector.

So in order to develop a forward-looking strategic plan I would like to make the most of your presence here, Sebastian, so that you can help us envision that future. Can you please give us this perspective? I will listen to you very attentively if you tell us about this dream or this future that we dream for ICANN.

Sebastian Bellagamba:

Thank you for your question; it is very interesting. In fact, I will disappoint you perhaps because, while I insist on the fundamental strategic significance of thinking in the long term, if you ask me how I see the internet in five years' time, I have no idea. That is my answer because so far, you know, internet keeps surprising me all the time. I think it is impossible to accurately predict what is going to happen.

What we can do is to work. We can work on generating the right conditions so that good things are the result that we reach. The great virtue or the beauty of

the internet is that it has been a fertile ground for innovation, innovation on the whole and innovation is determined by the openness of the internet in many aspects – in the open policy development processes; in the open standards. So we have many phenomena that are open, democratic and collaborative.

This openness enables the possible scenarios so that for the internet to develop this quickly and mainly by means of constant innovation. We have to work on scenarios that will enable us to preserve this openness and innovation. It is unlikely that we can imagine which technology we will have tomorrow, but if we focus our analysis on a specific technology, for example, if you're going to say that internet will be mobile, we would be shutting down the doors for innovation because maybe tomorrow internet is going to be telepathic. This is an absurd example, of course.

So I think we need to go back to the basics and our basics entail preserving the openness of the internet that fosters innovation. I think this is our challenge and there are plenty of attentions against the openness of the internet so there is a lot of work ahead.

Jose Arcé:

Thank you, Sebastian. This is Jose Arcé now speaking. There are many people willing to ask questions but we need to give the floor to our main speaker. We thank you, Sebastian. If we could contact you later on with further questions.

Sebastian Bellagamba:

This is Sebastian now. Yes, of course, by all means.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé now speaking. We now invite Thomas Narten. He's a member of the ICANN Board of Directors and he's the IETF liaison. So thank you for being here today.

Thomas Narten:

Hi, thank you for the introduction. I will speak fairly briefly I think. As has been mentioned before, I am the IETF liaison to the Board. From a personal perspective I have a technical background. I've done a lot of work in the IETF over the years. If you've looked over in that space at all, I've done a lot of work with IPv6 which is what I'm mostly associated with.

I've also done some work over in the RIR Community with the Regional Registries, again with IPv6 Address Policy. And I'm a huge fan of the multi-

stakeholder model because what it's fundamentally about is solving problems in a manner where all the people who have an actual interest or are impacted by the work get together at the same place and come out with a solution that tends to be better than if you're omitting some of the parties.

For example, from a technical perspective, if you develop policies and you forget to ask the people that have to implement them whether it's feasible, you end up with policies that don't work or that don't make sense. The classical example is when you have laws that are passed that say, "You must do X, Y or Z," and it turns out there's actually no way to implement them or implementing them has a number of hidden costs that were not anticipated.

So I was asked to speak sort of about the technical community and let me just start off by saying that the technical community is really a broad group. It is not really one group, even at that. So for example, when I think of the technical community, I break it up into a number of parties.

One of them are the operators or the service providers. So for example, they are people that actually make networks work. You think of the ISPs that connect the networks together, but even when you look more closely, there are different kinds of ISPs. There are ISPs that do wide area networking that connect cities together and then there are enterprise networking people where they wire campuses together. And even though they may be using some of the same protocols, often what their problems are and what they're doing and what their concerns are are very different.

And likewise, you have software implementers that are actually implementing products, implementing protocols; you have software vendors. Some of them write applications that run on iPhones or on Windows platforms and etc. They have a very different perspective than people that are building network hardware products for routers and switches and things like that.

So when you talk about the technical community, you really can't talk about it being just one sort of group because it's really a set of individual sub-groups and whenever you're working on a policy, for example, in ICANN, the group that is impacted may very well be different from one policy to another.

So in terms of organizations, the main one from the standards perspective is the IETF – that's the historical home where the protocols have been developed over the years. If you look at who has invented HTDP and who manages it and who extends it, it's the IETF. They've clearly... the DNS has been developed in the IETF for many, many years. That's where it is still being extended and things are added on to it.

You also have the Regional Registries. They don't do standards, but that's where Address Policy is developed, so you get a different group of people that are there. There is some overlap between people in the RIRs and the IETF and you get operators that also show up at some of the RIR meetings. You get people that are actually building networks - that care about what Address Policy are - will show up there.

And then even if you look at operators themselves, they have their own venues; they have their own sort of operator group; they have their own kind of conferences and mailing lists where they get together. And there's some intersection and overlap between the various groups, but no one group really represents any one particular set of players in general.

So from an ICANN perspective, if you're the technical community, I would have to say there is no single place to participate. What really happens is, first of all, ICANN mostly develops policy and the policy that ICANN is concerned with is mostly around the DNS space, the Domain Name System space.

So from a technical perspective, where the technical community comes in is technology informs the policy debate. If you try to make policy without actually understanding the underlying technology, either what the technology does or what it would be required to do to implement a policy, you'll almost certainly get bad policy – policy that doesn't make sense, that can't be implemented or that is irrelevant.

The example that I've been particularly interested in over the years is in the area of IDNs – Internationalized Domain Names – where there's tremendous need for developing IDN solutions and tremendous desire to implement IDN solutions but from a technical perspective – and I use the term “technical” here fairly broadly – there are issues with IDNs and it's not a matter of just try it out and see what happens because the result could easily be that what gets deployed doesn't work; the user community is very frustrated with their actual experience and there's no way to turn it off or back out of it. And who gets blamed in the end – most likely ICANN because they were the ones that allowed it to happen, whether they're responsible for it or not. So it's a very tricky balance to get right.

How do you participate in the various bodies in the IETF? It's a very loose-knit organization. To participate, all you literally have to do is find a working group that is working on something of interest to you; join the mailing list; read the documents and start commenting on the documents or responding to the thread that are going on.

On the RIR side it's sort of the same. They have their own venues. They all have mailing lists where they discuss policy. You can go read the policies that are proposed; you can comment on them on the mailing list and likewise, they all have face-to-face meetings where if they're in your region or if you can travel, you can go that route. It's similar to what ICANN does; it's just the details are different.

And in terms of what the IETF does, its overall purpose is really just to make the internet work better and that's sort of what its mantra is – it develops standards. Sometimes there's a need for a standard because people want to do something and there is no existing standard that will actually do that; they need to develop a standard.

Other times there is an issue where you need to have people develop sort of best practices and the best practice is not really a standard you can force people to use, but because the best practice itself makes sense and solves problems people have, they will voluntarily implement it or use it in their own environment.

With that let me just sort of pause and ask if there's any general questions. I'm not really sure what people would like to hear or have questions about.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé speaking. Antonio Medina was raising his hand first. Antonio, you have the floor.

Antonio Medina:

Thank you. I am Antonio Medina for the records. I would like to know or to hear from the Latin American and Caribbean regions – I would like to see the level of participation of our region in this type of group.

Thomas Narten:

In groups like the IETF? I don't have numbers directly, but my impression is that the participation from Latin America is relatively low. I think in the IETF primarily is from North America, Europe and increasing Asia Pacific area.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé speaking. Alberto, you may ask a quick question.

Alberto:

This is Alberto speaking. Since you create protocols, do you have private participants involved? Excuse me... private companies.

Thomas Narten:

The IETF model is... it is completely open – anyone can participate, whether it's government; whether it's an individual that has no business interest; whether it's a business that does have an interest – anyone can participate and the participation is on an individual basis. It's not representative; it's not that companies have more weight than individuals – it's really what I would call a meritocracy - that is the ideal. And when I say that it is clearly the case that the people that have the most influence in the IETF are the ones that have been around a while and have proven themselves in terms of their technical knowledge, their ability to solve problems, their ability to bring perspective and find the right balance.

So for example, what vendors do and say is very important in the IETF. At one level what one person says from a vendor may just be sort of one person's vote at one level; on the other hand, when you know that it's for a vendor that has a big marketplace, is important in the market, and you know that they're going to implement something and they're telling you, "We need this because we have customers," that tends to carry a lot more weight than somebody who... say, a researcher who says, "Well, I've been studying this problem for a while; I think it's really interesting and I would like to have a standard."

That tends to carry less weight because from a standard perspective, the question was, "How do you make the internet better," and that means, well, if we develop something, will anybody actually use it. And the only way we know if anybody's gonna actually use it is if you have people standing up and saying, "I need this because I can't do something today because there's a gap," and so you're actually filling a gap.

And the IETF has a long history of getting that wrong. It's very hard to always predict what is needed and what's necessary. And in fact, one of the classic examples is WHOIS. WHOIS is a big interest in this community here. The IETF spent a number of years developing a replacement for WHOIS and nobody cares. It has not been implemented. I should say it has not been deployed. So you can step back and say at some level the entire effort was a waste of time in terms of the ultimate goal of making the internet better because nobody's using it today, or only in very, very limited deployments.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé speaking. Marcelo, you are going to ask the last question.

Marcelo Telez: This is Marcelo Telez for the record. Good morning, Thomas. When you described the technical community, you spoke about organizations, operators and vendors. What about the academia? What is the degree of participation of universities and if universities don't participate, why is this so?

Thomas Narten: The IETF does have a fairly long history of having researchers and academics participate. Participation varies; it's not that high and there are sort of two issues there. On the one hand I think it's absolutely critical that you have academics participating because they're often doing research, they can have insight. The challenge is is that what most academics focus on and what they need to do for their own careers is not really compatible with doing work in the IETF.

And the reason I say that is success in the IETF rarely comes less than two years from when you start. It just takes an incredibly long time, just like it does in ICANN to get anything done and it's partly because there's processes but partly it's really just inherently hard to make things happen quickly when you're working with a community because you can't control all the other volunteers and you can't make them work on your project faster than on their own project.

So that said, it's hard to pull in academics and sometimes the academics have too much of a sort of theoretical approach. I mean that in the sense that they don't understand how the internet actually works; they don't understand what the real constraints are on making changes to the internet protocols, so they can propose things, but you can go talk to an ISP and they'll look at that and say, "That has no future. I'm not interested in that because it's completely incompatible with the way I operate today and the business models that are reality."

On the other hand, we do have some participation from some researchers that have been around a long time and are doing excellent work that is very internet focused in terms of where they do measurements, they are looking at real things that are happening in real networks today that provide incredible insight into what's going on that then filters back into what the working groups need to do.

As an example, in order to do routing protocols, there's a lot of things about the way routing works in the internet with BGP and the interconnections where we really don't fully understand the dynamics. I was at a – was it the last IETF I think or maybe the one before that. Jeff Houston gave sort of one of his standard speeches where he's been doing measurements; he's been looking at the growth of internet tables and he came to a point where he said, "Here's what

we're seeing," and he said, "I have no idea why this is the way it is," and nobody else did either.

And that's an area where research would be extremely helpful because if you don't understand the behavior of a complex system like the internet - that sometimes means you don't really know how to change the standards or what standards are appropriate to make things work better or work differently.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you. We thank Thomas. Thomas, thank you very much. Jose Arcé speaking. We now adjourn. Oh no, we have a question.

Alfredo Lopez:

I have a question. It is my understanding that you will hold an event. This is Alfredo Lopez from Columbia. Alfredo Lopez from Columbia is speaking. So this is Alfredo Lopez from Columbia. It is my understanding that you will be holding an event in Paris, France. Who will be participating and what topics are you going to deal with?

Thomas Narten:

How much time do we have? The reason I asked that is because the IETF meetings we have - they're as large as ICANN meetings. We get 1,200 participants at the face-to-face meetings. In terms of what will be done there, there are I think 160 separate working groups and it's a full week - five solid days - parallel tracks. Usually there are six working groups meeting at exactly the same time. Typically a working group meets for two hours or they can ask for multiple slots in which case they work for four hours.

And they have very focused agendas where the mantra is that you are using the face-to-face meetings only to resolve issues you could not resolve on the mailing list. So the bulk of the work is intended to be done offline, on mailing lists and you come to the plenary meetings so to speak really to make progress in a face-to-face manner when it's necessary and to solidify consensus and so forth.

But in the IETF it really is the case that even though a lot of work does get done at the meetings, a lot of work gets done between meetings on the mailing lists and it's quite possible to participate without ever going to meetings. There's a number of contributors - good, solid contributors of the IETF that are experts in their area that don't come to IETF meetings at all.

Jose Arcé:

Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Thomas. Thank you very much. So we now adjourn the Capacity Building Session for today. Thank you all for being here.

[End of Transcript]