DURBAN – Fellowship Morning Meetings
Wednesday, July 17, 2013 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Good morning! Gosh, that was so weak for a Wednesday. Good morning!

PARTICIPANTS: Good morning!

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Much better. So this morning we have four members of the community who are coming in to talk with us. I'll let each one of them introduce themselves. It was in our agenda. We have a representative from RSSAC, SSAC, NPOC, and GAC. A prize to everybody who can get those acronyms back to me.

The first thing we're going to do this morning before I turn over to Patrick at my left, we're going to join together with our folks on remote, our fellows on remote, to sing Happy Birthday. We'll have to guess whose birthday it is as we go along – [inaudible]. Happy birthday to you! Happy birthday to you! Happy birthday dear [inaudible]! Happy birthday to you! Woo-hoo! [applause]

Leon, thank you for letting me know. Leon's on the line. So with no further ado, Patrick, I'm going to turn the show over to you.

PATRICK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for being here. As always, it's a pleasure to meet all of you. Thank you, Janice, for all the work you do with the fellows. My name is Patrick Fältström. I'm Chair of the Security & Stability Advisory Committee. This morning I also brought Lars-Johan Liman, who is one of the two co-chairs of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC).

So we were thinking of presenting a little bit what our organization's roles are within the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. We were thinking of opening up for questions. Let me start with the Security & Stability Advisory Committee.

We are, as you understand by the acronym ends with AC, that means that we are an advisory committee. We don't have any policy development process. Instead, we are either responding to questions from, for example, ICANN Board or other parts of the ICANN community, or it might be the case that we ourselves detect something that we think is important for the community to know about and we might write an advice that can include recommendations, and the recommendations can be to anything from the Board to the general community.

The recommendations and the [inaudible] has to be related to our charter which says that we are to advise ICANN Board and the community on security and stability issues related to the Internet domain name and addressing system. So we are not only working with the domain name system and DNS. We also work with IP addresses, routing, and anything else. But we do technical evaluations. If people want to make a business case, that doesn't work. Not our problem.

People might write legal clauses that doesn't make any sense. I don't care. That's someone else's problem. But from a technical standpoint, I do care.

At the moment, the important issues that we're working with has to do with variance, internationalized domain names specifically related to, but not limited to, the Trademark Clearing House. We're looking at namespace [collision] issues. What will the impact be if domain names that will be delegated as top-level domains if they already are in use? Are the implications so large so that the risk can be manageable? Can the risk turn into a manageable risk, or is it something that is really, really, really bad so that one should be extra careful with the delegation? Should delegation be delayed or should [inaudible] the case that some top-level domains should not be delegated at all? That's what we're looking at at the moment, apart from variance.

Then we're doing a lot of other kinds of things like misuse of the Internet, WHOIS services, [inaudible] service attacks. But I think variance and namespace [collisions] as we call it are the issues that I've got the most questions about. So, with that, I'll leave over to Lars-Johan.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here. I welcome this opportunity to talk to you all. I am one of the two co-chairs of the Root Service System Advisory Committee. Our job is much more narrow and more focused than the SSAC task. We look at the root servers, this group of 13 server clusters. These are not 13 machines anymore. There used to be 10 years ago, but now there are 13 groups of machines that are administrated by 12 different organizations, and they are the entry point to the technical

part of the domain name system. When a client wants to look up a name, it might have to start – you can always find your way if you start at the root name server.

They contain a very small database. It's a part of the domain name database, but it only lists the 280, 290, 300 top-level domains. There are roughly 270 ccTLD names for countries and geographic regions, and then roughly 30 generic TLDs.

That system has its own properties, its own ecosystem. I work for Netnod. We operate one of these root name servers and we receive the database from Verisign who generate the data on behalf of the IANA. This entire ecosystem of the database flowing into the servers and the operation and the clients and everything, this is a very critical part of the infrastructure.

Our Advisory Committee, we respond also to requests from the Board, but we also try to look at various aspects of the root server system as a whole to find out if there are risks and problems with the system. And if so, we can also issue recommendations. We don't have any control over the root server operators, but we can issue recommendations. And since the Root Server System Advisory Committee is built up from a group of root server operators – actually, all of them are invited – and a larger group of experts, we know that we're not going to issue recommendations that the root server operators would object to, because they are part of the filtering process when we generate these recommendations.

We traditionally haven't met at the ICANN meetings very much. The group has existed since the very first ICANN meeting and I've been a

member of it since then. But the group of persons that make up the Root Server System Advisory Committee is mostly technical experts who don't usually come to the ICANN meetings, but they've been more inclined to go to the IETF meeting, the [inaudible]. So we've traditionally met at the IETF meetings because that's where people are.

Now, we are trying to reorganize RSSAC. It hasn't been functioning quite well. There has been very slow progress and very little [visibility], and I want to change that. So we are reorganizing. We're recreating a new structure, new processes, and I also want to be more visible and more approachable. So this time there are four members of the RSSAC at this meeting and I hope there will be more in the future. What more should I say?

If you see me in the corridor, come and ask questions. I love questions. That's what I'm here for. I want to tell people what we do. I should mention, what we do right now except for reorganizing, which takes up most of the time right now, we have two things on the table which are that we want to create a set of very basic measurements on the root server system that all root server operators can report, so that we can publicize statistics for how it's going – number of queries per second, load, and so on so people can follow a bit what's going on.

We also are trying to create a new version of every old document that specifies requirements for root service, but it's so old that it's outdated and we need a new one, and we are cooperating with the Internet Architectural Board (IAB) regarding new documents. Questions?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Questions for either. One of the things that I want to mention to these gentlemen and [Alejandra] is I hear a lot this week. Things sound so technical and I don't know how I can fit into something that sounds so technical. I know from previous times, Patrick, you have really stressed the point that you don't need all techies in SSAC. That's really not going to – I mean, it helps to have diversity and I thought maybe that's worth a mention.

PATRICK FALTSTROM: Sure. SSAC at the moment has 39 members, and the reason why the number temporarily is a little bit high is that we have accepted a few new members before some outgoing members have left. So we are approximately 35-38 members of SSAC.

To become a member of SSAC, you apply yourself, and what will happen is you respond to a questionnaire. The first measurements we are doing is to see whether your skillset matches a skillset that SSAC do not have. Just because when SSAC started it was almost only DNS people, we already have people that know DNS.

So the last couple of people that we have taken on board is one person working for law enforcement. There's also [inaudible] fellow. That's one example. We also have one person with legal expertise, specifically in the in-between telecommunication and law enforcement and all the legal surroundings around those kinds of issues like notice and [inaudible] and what actually can be done and not in various legislations around the world. So those are, for example, the two latest persons that we took on board.

We have also got some applications from people which are extremely good – probably the best ones in the world – that were turned down because we already had that kind of skillset. So you're right, Janice. We are looking for people that have the skills that we don't have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. Thank you so much for meeting with us. My question maybe is not kind of easy. Honestly, this is a question that I have had since several years and I guess maybe the answer is at the beginning of several DNS books, but I don't know the answer.

The question is where does the limitation – well, I know there are 13 root servers which are named A, B, C, D, F, etc. [inaudible]. But my question goes, why the 13 limitation? Where does that limitation come from? Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Patrick just whispered in my ear, "Try to explain that without using technical terms." It isn't a very old limitation. Now, the DNS technical standard as it stands is about 20 years old by now. That was a totally different Internet. It was probably about 100,000 times smaller than the current one, and the technology was something totally different.

I will have to use a few technical terms, because it's a technical limitation. The DNS system sends packets across the network. The first one containing a request – a question – regarding some information, and then the server responds with a response.

Depending on the standard, the information in the packet is kind of fit into this package. Back in the old days, they really wanted to save on bandwidth, because a 64 kilobit link, that was the information highway. That was really high speed, and most people were behind very slow modems and so on.

So there is a limitation that says that a DNS packet weren't allowed to bigger than 512 bytes (512 characters, half a kilobyte). That's a stupid limitation in today's Internet, but it's actually there back in the standard and it depends on the internal structure of the DNS packet.

Now, what we did back in 1994 maybe – around that time – we renamed all the root name servers. They used to have their own computer names. The one we operated was called [nic.norgi.net]. Today it's i.root-servers.net. Same IP address, same server system, but we renamed them because we wanted to take advantage of the internal structure in the packet so that we could expand the list. By having the same name roughly, we actually created more free space inside these 512 bytes and we ended up with a list of 13. We cannot get anymore in that packet without violating the technical standard.

Now, since then, the DNS specification has been updated and there is now something called extended DNS, which most clients and servers are more or less able to handle and where you can specify that. The client says you don't have to worry about the old limitation. I can do bigger. I can have 2,000 bytes. Fine, no problem.

We were a bit worried when we started to use IP version 6 and adding these addresses into the packet, but that has kind of [inaudible] because the IP version 4 addresses are still – how should I put it? They

are put in the packet first. So if something goes over the edge, it's the IPv6 addresses.

But if you start to put more servers in the packet, you risk putting too many IP addresses over the edge, and with extended DNS, that's not a problem because they will flow over to the rest of the bigger packet. But there are still a lot of firewalls and other stupid [configurations] out there that says, "Oh, a DNS packet is limited to 512 bytes. If it's any bigger…" which means that we risk the situation that people drop off the Internet because they cannot access the root server because the packets get too big.

That's something that we need to do a rather long and deep investigation of to see how big and bad will the effect be if we went to a larger set of root servers. But it's a rather large undertaking to do that investigation. It hasn't been done yet. It probably should be done and it's kind of on our long-term agenda to look into that. We know that there is a lot of pressure out there for more root servers. I would argue that they're not needed for technical reasons, but I can understand that there are political reasons for wanting that. It's on the long-term agenda, but don't expect an answer next week. It's going to take years before we reach there.

[GLORIANA]: I'm Gloriana from Pakistan. I wanted to ask what are your requirements, or as you said, there are specific skillsets that you [want] diversity on the Advisory Committee. So in the current issues that you're dealing with, what are the preferable skillsets that you are looking for? Thank you.

PATRICK FALTSTROM: This will sound a little bit weird, because I'm the Chair of SSAC, but my answer is I don't know. The reason why I don't know is that we have decided in SSAC to have something we call a work [party] for membership or membership committee. That committee consists of members of SSAC plus our Vice Chair, Jim Galvin.

That membership committee each year decides what kind of skillsets are needed and they have all different kinds of parameters, which by the way, let me say that explicitly, do include geographical diversity and gender balance.

So what they do is they're looking at what kind of skills will be needed within SSAC the next five to ten years, because people are appointed on three-year terms. So they look at what they think will be needed, then they look at what skillset SSAC has today, and then they put a weighting on each one of these skill categories. That is how they are sort of weighting what kind of categories are the most important ones for this year.

So, yes, they have done that for this year. But just because I am not part of that as the Chair of SSAC, I don't know what the current situation is. But in general terms, we do need people outside of the U.S. We need female people. We need non-technical people. So that is in general terms.

But on the other hand, for example, it was more important for us, for one of the people, just as an example, a person from law enforcement. That is a male person. But on the other hand, from outside of the U.S. He's from Africa. So that is one case where after long deliberations it was more important to get someone that actually is employed by law

enforcement than getting a female person. So that is one example where it's much more important to – they made that decision that getting a law enforcement person was a higher criteria.

So how come I am not part of that group? That sounds a little bit strange. First of all, the liaison to the Board, the Vice Chair, and the very few meetings that I am part of, none of us which have formal positions in SSAC are voting members. We are non-voting members. That I am not involved is because if the membership committee decides that a member is no longer accepted as a member of SSAC because they don't fulfill their criteria, they don't have time, etc., if that member is not happy with the membership committee's decision, we have an appeals process that goes to me.

So I, as the Chair, are responsible to ensure that the membership committee is doing their job and following whatever rules SSAC as a whole has [inaudible], and that's the reason why I cannot be part of it because if I'm part of it, I cannot evaluate and say whether they're doing the right thing.

[EDDIE CAYHULA]: Thank you. My name is Eddie Cayhula from Rwanda. I wanted to ask a question about geographical representivity, and you already answered that. I just wanted to know about the stability part. What is the worst thing that you've seen in the past?

[UNIDENTIFIED MALE]: The worst thing in the past? This time of day, it's the lack of coffee.

PATRICK FALTSTROM: I think the worst – the first things that I come to think about are two things. It doesn't mean that they are the worst part because it's still early in the morning. One thing that SSAC started to write about – or wrote about already in 2003 has to do with address spoofing. The ability for people to send IP packets where the source address is the correct source address, but a faked, spoofed source address. We pointed that out in our Report #4 and we are now reaching I think 59 reports.

We still have that problem on the Internet, so we have launched a work [party] that is looking at this again. What we said in that report was that every access provider should filter outgoing packets from their network towards sort of upstream on the Internet, and they must filter and throw away packets that is not originating from address space that the [inaudible] manages. But that is not happening. That's one thing, and that's one of the largest problems regarding denial of service attacks today.

The other thing, to give another example, was it became [a habit] for registries and registrars and DNS hosting providers to have one [inaudible] DNS, and instead of telling the querying client that the domain name they're looking for does not exist, they responded with a response that was a lie.

The most well-known system was the Verisign Site Finder, but that was just because it got so much press. It was a general thing that people started to do and that created large problems because many applications and many services rely on the fact that if you look up a domain name that doesn't exist, you should get the response from the domain name system that says this domain name does not exist.That is

similar to the namespace collision issues that we are looking at at the moment.

Those are, I think, the two most critical issues where the address spoofing issue in BCP 4 is still not taken care of. That's more well-known, by the way, under the name BCP 38, if you've heard that name.

[AARON]: I'm Aaron from Sri Lanka. My question is in terms of security, what are the issues you see in the proposed WHOIS replacement solution [ARDS].

[PATRICK FALTSTROM]: I think at the moment we and SSAC has just launched a work [party] that will look at the [AWG's] recommendations. So we don't know yet. But we have, on the other hand, written a number of documents related to WHOIS where we point out in technical terms requirements and needs that the community has already expressed.

For example, access control. If it is the case that you want to give diverse access to the WHOIS data where law enforcement gets some kind of access, trademark holders might get another kind of access, users would like to have another access, you have privacy issues, etc.

So what we have been talking about has to do with the problem of technical implement a secure and safe security measures around that data. So for example, data that is hidden because of privacy reasons actually do not leak. It must also be the case that in certain legislations, it cannot use data that is related to personal information in whatever way you want over the Internet. That must be resolved.

We also have pointed out that another technical problem that exists has to do with internationalization. Should a name of an individual be translated, transliterated, or just presented as it is?

For example, even though I work with internationalized domain names and that was one of the standards written, so I do understand how the characters work in Chinese and Arabic and Swedish, but I cannot read Chinese and Arabic. So even though I sort of understand how it works, if I see something Arabic, it still doesn't make any sense to me.

So then the question is if I, for example, look up a domain name for one of you when I get your name in Arabic, should I get an Arabic? Should that be translated to my language or should it be transliterated so I might be able to pronounce it still without even knowing what it is, without knowing that it is a name, etc.? There are a lot of issues there that need to be worked on.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Paul, hold on one sec. we do have a remote question, and then right to you. So Lars, from Ahmed in Pakistan, "How many servers have shifted to IPv6 and will it change the root infrastructure after implementation of IPv6?"

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. The root server system consists of 13 IP addresses and each of these addresses can be served by many servers by using a few tricks on the Internet that we started to use ten years ago.

If you look at the various letters – the various IP addresses – I don't know off the top of my head exactly how many do IPv6, but it's definitely most of them and I would say that [inaudible] brings up the pace, going to refer to you to excellent…

So it seems to be all except two. You can go to the webpage www.root-servers.org and you will see for each letter where they have servers located, which IP address they have and which IPv6 they maybe have. All except three seem to have IPv6 access.

Now, that doesn't mean that they have IPv6 access from all the sites where they are located, and the table there should give you an indication of that. It's actually pretty good. The root [zone] has served our IPv6 well, but we only see a fraction of the queries coming over IPv6. It's still a very strong majority of IPv4 queries. I've seen more than 97% is [inaudible] IPv4.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'm having an "ooh-ahh" moment here on Patrick's computer screen. I took that address myself, so I'll send it around as I did just in the Adobe Connect room. Paul?

PAUL MUCHENE: Okay, thank you. My name is Paul Muchene. I'm from Kenya. I have two questions and either of the Chairs can answer them. The first one concerns mainly how you actually [reach] recommendations on the roots and how you actually convince maybe the keepers of the 13 root servers on recommendations. Do you follow a similar format in ITF

whereby you actually reach consensus, and if there's no consensus, how do you resolve conflicts?

And the second one basically is a technical one. It is on BCP38, which you just mentioned. In the light of the attacks that happened to Spamhaus and the [inaudible], do you see how whether BCP38 will be greatly adopted or widely adopted? Thank you.

[LARS-JOHAN LIMAN]: Okay. So I'll go first. Now, you ask about the process, how we reach consensus and issue recommendations. One of the big problems with the RSSAC is that there has been no such process document. For 15 years, it has existed without process documents. So we are right now writing new documents, so it's very much in the shaping phase where we try to find out how shall we do that.

One of the things I'm doing here is to walk around talking to other working groups, other advisory committees, getting information on how do they do it – which systems seems to work, which would work in our environment. We're actually trying to shape that right now. So the answer is, as Patrick said before, I don't know yet. But come back at the next meeting and I hope I will have a good answer for you. That also will be published on RSSAC's web pages. Was there a different part? The next part was for you.

PATRICK FALSTROM: So inside SSAC, we use an ITF-like consensus based process where I, as the Chair of SSAC, do decide when we have consensus on the document. So the [inaudible]. The work party works with the document

until they have consensus. The work party [leader] decides when the work party has consensus. The document is passed to SSAC for a last call that is at least one week. For example, the document on variance, the last call ends at 5:00 p.m. local time here in Durban today. And that's why I sort of keep my laptop up here, to see what's happening. So I hope that we reach consensus.

So for SSAC as a whole, I decide upon consensus. If we don't have consensus, we have two tools that can be used. First of all, any SSAC member can say that they recuse themselves from the discussion on the specific topic area. That's one thing that can happen.

The second thing that can happen is that an SSAC member objects to the document, and they can either be just plain objections together with a text that explains why the objection exists. All of the information about both recuse and objection with potentially the objection itself [inaudible] SSAC added to the document itself.

So when you read an SSAC document, you see what people participated in the work party, and if there was anyone recusing and if there were objections.

That said, we have very, very few documents – I think maybe three or four out of 57 – which do have objections or people that recused themselves. So one can say that to almost all documents we reach consensus.

Regarding BCP38, unfortunately we have not seen any uptake. One thing that we in SSAC do believe, though – there are slight differences between BCP38 and [SSC document #4] that we wrote. The difference is

that we talk in [SAC4] about not that every ISP should do filtering, because that is in some cases for multi-homed ISPs that have multiple [inaudible] relationships, very difficult to implement. So BCP38 is operationally very complicated, and also have a high risk if it is the case that it's configured wrongly.

What we talk about in [SAC4] is source edge filtering, which means that it's on the edge of the Internet, as close to people's computers and as close to enterprises as possible. That's where you should do the filtering. So in [SAC4], we do acknowledge that doing that kind of source filtering in the core of the Internet is operationally difficult, and that's why you see us in SSAC, we refer to our document [SAC4], but it's slightly easier to implement than BCP38. But in general terms, for most people, it doesn't matter. There's no difference between the two.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I know we have two more questions. Our next speaker from the GAC has a meeting at 8:30. So if we could just quickly – I'm going to go boom, boom and out we go.

MWENDWA KIVUVA: Hello, good morning. My name is Kivuva from Kenya. I'm a fellow. I have a technical question. In light of the attacks that happened on the Iranian nuclear plant [inaudible] exploit probably on backdoors that are either on hardware or software. I'm wondering the hardware or the [inaudible] servers that are used on the root, do you have mechanisms to ensure that [inaudible] do not exist either on the hardware side or on the software side?

Another question. I get hundreds of e-mails that actually say that they're [inaudible] from me. The good thing is that Google sends them to the junk mail. I have so many [inaudible] complain. They're wondering what's the big deal. Where are all these e-mails coming from? I always wonder how to handle them.

I have one other question on how U.S. government has total control of the root. A good example is the [inaudible] of wikileaks.com, which was strange because to give them undue publicity, and actually they cloned. They had so much clones of the Wiki leaks. Can we have total independence of the root? Thank you.

[PATRICK FALSTROM]: That was a lot of questions. Quick answers on this, in some order. You can never protect yourself from [inaudible] exploits. You have to ensure – and this is a common responsibility for everyone on the Internet to ensure that software and hardware is updated. So there's nothing special that can be done there. I'll let [Johan] explain for the root server operators more specifically.

The second thing you asked had to do with independence of the root servers and you talked about take down wikileaks.com. [inaudible] that question because that has nothing to do with the root servers. The request for take-down that arrived to the registry is something that we, to some degree, have some issues with in all legislations in the world because wherever you operate a registry or registrar, you do that under a specific jurisdiction. That operation, just because it happens under that jurisdiction, must follow what every kind of court decision and

decisions by law enforcement within that area. So that is nothing strange.

What you are concerned about I think is that a decision within one jurisdiction have impact on communication in another jurisdiction, and that's specifically complicated when the two jurisdictions are not overlapping one to one.

So we have written from SSAC a document that talks about blocking access to services with help of DNS. I don't remember the number of the document from the top of my head, but I encourage you to read it because it talks about just like I hear you say between the lines – that using the DNS to stop access to its service, which is the intent of law enforcement is no very effective, and that is the [inaudible] from us in SSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Regarding your question on hardware and software for the root servers, there are 12 different organizations that operate root servers. This may sound [inaudible]. We cooperate as little as possible.

The reason for doing that – we of course cooperate when it comes to operations and we are very strict about providing a correct service and an identical service, regardless of which root server you happen to be talking to. But we want to be diverse, because we see a strength in diversity. We shouldn't have exactly the same procedures. We shouldn't have exactly the same hardware. We shouldn't have exactly the same software.

I barely know what the other guys are running. From time to time, we walk around the room and report what we're using. But if it's only very broad terms. I could of course get into what Netnod does to ensure this, and of course we have procedures. We do all the installations ourselves. We don't do any installations remote in the other sites and we try to use as secure systems as we can. We have, I would say, very experienced operations staff. None of them have run network computers for less than ten years, and many are involved in developing standards in working in the software community [inaudible].

But the strength is really in the diversity. If it would be the case that Netnod would be targeting with some kind of attack, the same type of attack would not work for Verisign. It would not work for ICANN because they have totally different systems. And we see that as a very strong strength in the resilience, in the system. So that's the answer I can give right now.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you. I want to say thank you so much for kick-starting RRSAC again and joining us here at the Fellowship. So you can see there's a lot of interest and we welcome you back again when we're in Buenos Aires, along with Patrick. So thank you both very much. Carol, if you'd like to [inaudible] a question. I want to be able to get Tracy. Tracy, if you want to slide over, I'll get your slide set hooked up. Tracy Hackshaw, Vice Chair of the GAC and Fellowship alumni.

I'm pretty much a newbie on the MAC. I know you can't tell, I'm so good at it. Go ahead, Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Good morning, everyone. Hello. Are you all awake? Some people aren't awake. All right. My name is Tracy Hackshaw. I'm a Fellowship alumni, as Janice said. I am a three-time alumni. My last fellowship was in Cartagena in Columbia in 2010.

So since then I've been a member of the GAC and I was elected Vice Chair, I believe it was in Toronto. My first Vice Chair meeting actually is in this meeting, so it took about two meetings to do the mentoring and so on and so forth, and now it's my first meeting as Vice Chair. It's been an interesting journey.

I started in ICANN in 2009 in Sydney. I met Janice there. We had a lot of fun. Then I did Seoul thereafter, and then Cartagena in 2010. So for those who are on their first-time journey, look forward to some interesting times. Maybe one day you'll be able to find your space in the various committees and in an executive position. Then you can speak about your Fellowship journey as well and inspire people coming up.

How many of you have seen this book, this nice orange Participating in ICANN book? [inaudible]. Yes? Yeah, fantastic book. Page 11. Go to page 11. Page 11 exactly has everything I need to see. So if you have this book – or you don't have it, get it. It's very important. It's Beginning's Guide to Participating in ICANN. I imagine there will be a soft copy somewhere in the ICANN website, I assume. Yeah.

So I'm a member of the Governmental Advisory Committee. I represent my country – Trinidad and Tobago. The government of Trinidad and Tobago. As you can see on that slide on the board there – I've got to move quickly because of time issues – we are an independent committee of ICANN comprising now 129 member governments as of I

believe this week. So it's getting pretty large [inaudible] and I think 200 countries in the world. So we're getting up to that maximum level of countries in the GAC.

I believe at this meeting, there are approximately 70-80 member countries in the GAC meeting. This is the GAC room, and it's pretty big as you can see. And it's getting bigger and bigger every time we have a meeting. The table is getting longer and we [inaudible] anybody anymore. But we're trying to work on that.

In the GAC, there also are members of what we'll call inter-governmental organizations such as the OECD, WIPO, INTERPOL, and so on. [inaudible] in the GAC.

So in the GAC room we have government members and inter-government members that discuss various issues, and that's become very important recently, because on the one hand, the New gTLD process; and the other hand, because of cyber security and cyber crime issues that governments are working together on and trying to resolve. And the inter-governmental organizations tend to play an interesting role in that.

Now, what is the role of the GAC? In the orange book and on the slide, you'll see that we are an Advisory Committee (an AC), and I believe you may have heard ALAC already. Yes. It's an advisory body as opposed to an SO, a Supporting Organization. Our job is to provide advice to the Board of ICANN. That's our job. We come to meet to provide advice.

What's interesting and important is that the GAC advices guided by some bylaws [inaudible]. So I'll just read it out. The GAC bylaws are very, I would say, unique. So let's read carefully here:

"The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies." So that's normal advice.

This is very important though. "In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice (i.e. to reject the advice), it shall so inform the committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. The Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try in good faith in a timely and efficient manner to find a mutually-acceptable solution."

Then, "If no such solution can be found, the ICANN Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee advice was not followed, and such statement shall be without prejudice to the rights and obligations of the Governmental Advisory Committee members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities."

Now, it's a very important statement that's being made there, because as increasingly being understood and felt through the ICANN community, individual governments are able to represent the interests individually as well as within the GAC. In the GAC, what we do is we sit around the table like this exact table and we try to arrive at what [inaudible] consensus.

What does that mean? We sit around the table and don't vote. We don't vote on anything. We try to achieve consensus. So we discuss amicably mostly the issues that are at hand, and then attempt to reach consensus [inaudible].

So that consensus normally comes in the way of a communique that you see at the end of a meeting, but in the last few meetings, we've been doing something called consensus objections, and those consensus objections are to the applications for New gTLDs. So what you are seeing emerging is – I wouldn't call it a vote. It's a non-vote where the table decides whether to issue an objection. If one member of the committee – one member of the committee – decides to object to the objection, then there's no consensus.

So for those familiar with the .patagonia and .amazon and all those other issues, you may be familiar with what would've happened in Beijing where there was only one consensus objection. I think there were two. One major one, which was with .africa. There's another one, I can't recall it at this point. There were two objections issues, but the remainder did not receive consensus objection.

What that meant is that governments can individually take action on their own, whether that be within the GAC still or outside of the GAC to pursue their interest.

So it's very important to understand that governmental issues are treated very seriously by governments, and we are using the GAC as a method of a means to work with a multi-stakeholder model.

However, governments are interested in public policy issues and public interest issues, so they're also looking to pursue that directly with their interests.

Now, in terms of issues like cyber security, cyber crime, security & stability of the roots, IDNs and so on, you generally find there's no contention or arguments, no major problems running with the GAC advice. On occasion, you find some consensus issues emerging. What you would see is that the Board and the GAC tends to work those issues out before advice is issued.

So for yesterday's meeting that you would've seen, which seemed pretty benign, it was issues that were being worked out between the Board and the GAC. So [inaudible] discussions that [might have been] yesterday, behind the scenes in the corridors, discussions between the Chair, the Vice Chairs, member governments on issues like – you would've heard yesterday sharing discussions on confusing strings and strings that are basically plural and singular, things like that, and the issues that some GAC members have and the board may respond, "Well, we don't understand and we will discuss."

So in the public session, you'll see that. And in the private environments, in the corridors, you'll see significant discussions that are being held either in sub-committee or privately with Board members directly. Can you roll the other slide up? Thank you.

So as I said, the GAC advice can take various forms. I'd like to direct you to the GAC website. So it's gac.icann.org. We have a GAC Register of Advice now. For those who are interested, and [inaudible] of you are, there's a very, very large archive now of all of the GAC advice that has

been issues from I believe 2002 onwards where the issues [related to] IDNs and when they first came out – before they even came out. GAC principles and new gTLDs in 2007, even before 2013 which we're discussing today. Issues on root server, .xxx which you may have heard about. All those things are addressed in a series of GAC advice that's registered now and archived for everybody to look at and to track.

The site is open for everybody to look at. I don't think people use that site often enough to understand what the GAC is about and what they're trying to achieve.

As well, you understand from that site how to become a GAC member. So how many of you are from governments here in the Fellowship program? Anybody from government? Do you know your GAC member? Good. Anyone else from government? Do you know your GAC member? Okay, good. Yes? Okay, excellent. It's very important to know your GAC representative.

My last point I'm going to make before questions is that I would like to encourage each of you in your home countries to, one, find your GAC representative and express your ideas, express what you're trying to do, express what you are interested in to your GAC representative. You'll be very surprised, as many of you may have seen last night, that your GAC reps are people just like you. They're just people who want to have a good time and they're human beings. So they're not people sitting in a room with ties and jackets. They're people.

So they would like to hear from you as to exactly what you think about the Internet and issues related to the Internet. They are representing governments. Governments represent people, believe it or not. In most

cases, they're voted in by the people. Not everyone, but they're voted in by the citizens of the country and they attempt to represent the interests of that country and the people.

So just like the At-Large Advisory Committee and the NCUC and everybody who represents users and stakeholders, the government represents stakeholders and users. And some may say they represent everyone, depending on the point of view.

So please find your GAC rep. Get involved in your home country. All the reps' names are on the website. All their e-mail addresses are there, believe it or not. You can e-mail them. It's public information. You'll be surprised. They probably will respond and interact with you.

If not, attend the GAC meeting. There's an open meeting right after this. I don't know want to attend that with the ALAC. Ask and speak to them during the break. "I'm from Pakistan. I'm from Costa Rica. I'm from [inaudible]. Here's my issue that I wanted to raise with you." They may very well want to raise that in the GAC meetings, and you'll be surprised that they are looking for issues to raise themselves because some members come to meetings and are listening and trying to understand what's going on themselves. So having you raise issues with them is very important. All right. So I think for my time, that's sufficient introduction. If there are any questions, I'm leaving in about, I think, ten minutes. Seven minutes.

KADIAN DAVIS: Good morning. I'm Kadian Davis from the Fellowship Jamaica. One concern I have primary to Jamaica is even though we have a GAC

representative, it seems as if the government in Jamaica is not fully aware of the importance of ICANN, or they're aware of ICANN but not the relevance to the country. So how would you recommend that the GAC representative try to create that awareness in terms of ICANN' importance in nation development as it relates to the Internet?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Okay. I think that's a common problem in many of the developing countries, where the ICANN model is not well-known or well-understood. In most developing countries – well, a lot of them – the Caribbean, Africa, Pacific as well, the ITU is generally seen as the body to deal with Internet issues or issues of that nature.

The reason for that is primarily that the ITU funds many of the projects in the region. So the governments and the government representatives only understand what the ITU is about. In Jamaica, Gary Campbell, who is your representative now, was a Fellow. So it's very important that you work with someone like Gary in Jamaica to get the word out. You can use your ISOC chapter information. I believe there's one in Jamaica.

It's good in cases of countries where there are ISOC chapters as well to lobby through those types of user groups – [inaudible] user groups and so on – to ensure the government understands that the Internet is not only about telecoms, not only about the switching of what ITU does. It's about governance issues, about stakeholder issues, about user issues.

So it's very important I think to make sure that is known, but it's difficult on your own I understand. So work with your user groups and your community to lobby and make representation, to have meetings, invite

your government reps to meetings, have them join the user group if they can and you'll be surprised that might change the model slightly.

In developing countries, I think that's the way to do it. It's very difficult to have a meeting, suit up and go and meet with these people. But invite them to your meetings and they might be easier to work with.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you. My name is Farzaneh Badiei. I'm a Fellow from Iran. I have three questions. So the countries that are a member of GAC, are they UN members or they have other criteria to choose their members?

And how often do the Board members don't endorse GAC suggestions? That, I would be interested to know that. And I don't know the New gTLD process. I always wondered why the governments discuss this and why they need to have proof. And if it's public interest, do the civil society and other stakeholder groups have a say for the new gTLD applications or is it only the governments that decide on this or object to it? Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Okay. So the first question is easy. It's in the bylaws, quickly. "Membership in the GAC shall be open to all national governments. Membership shall be also to Distinct Economies as recognized in international fora and multi-national governmental organizations and treaty organizations on invitation of the GAC chair."

To cut a long story short, it's pretty much what the UN system looks like. So as the UN recognizes a nation, so the GAC will. So if it's on the

UN list, you can be represented in the GAC. It's as simple as that. It doesn't currently equal the UN, obviously, but it's close.

In terms of – just repeat your second question.

FARZANEH BADIEI: So the Board members, how often they don't endorse GAC suggestions. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Okay. The official stat is 10% of the time. [inaudible]. Yeah. So in terms of the New gTLD Program, I don't think it's fair to say that the governments are somehow only involved in the new gTLD program. As you had [inaudible], everybody's discussing it. What happens is that the governments seem to have a unique role in terms of they can object at any time and for any reason. Well, not at any time. They can object for any reason, not at any time because the time is coming [inaudible] close that period.

The reason why it's there is because public policy interests can affect many people and there are international laws that governments look at. Let's assume that ICANN may not look at every law in the world. So as an example, in Macedonia, [inaudible] there's maybe a law that prohibits some of use of a name that is up for approval by ICANN. Unless Macedonia raises that, ICANN would not know. That's why governments can intervene and say, well, that word or that string is not acceptable in our country so we would like to issue an objection to that string.

It's very challenging I think to understand why governments have that disposition, but it's necessary to understand that laws in your countries prevail over ICANN rules, if you see what I'm getting at. Because you can't work with – let's assume there was a religious term that is offensive to another country that a U.S. commissioner may decide "I want to use that" and it offends another country. You just can't not talk to that country. So that's the issue I think that's at hand here.

So that's why governments seem to have a deeper role than other interest, but it really is not because – in the case of .amazon recently, much of the [inaudible] was not done by governments. It was done by civil society and by the users in Patagonia and in Brazil and in Peru. So a lot of governments did have a say. They were supported and [inaudible] by their own citizens to protest. I think that is lost [inaudible] that governments didn't just decide that they wanted to protest. Their citizens said, "I don't want .patagonia or .amazon to be delegated to another jurisdiction," and so on. It's a bit of a balance in how we look at it in that way.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: So I'm going to call it for Tracy because he does need to get to this meeting as Vice Chair on time. But if you'd like to walk out with him, you can. Walk out. Just like we tell you, grab them while you can and ask the question as we continue to move forward with our friends from NPOC. They're a not-for-profit organization constituency. Tracy, thank you very much.

Just a reminder, we're kind of slipping on my laptop. I see a lot of backs. I've been kind of dealing with it all morning, but could we kind of get the

laptops down again? Nasty looks aside. Thanks, guys. Focus on at-hand. Thank you. Paul, that's you too. Laptop down, baby. I want to see your face.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Good morning. My name is Marie-Laure Lemineur. I'm chair of NPOC. I don't know whether there's any representative from Latin-America. How are you? And welcome to ICANN. You might want to introduce yourself first, and then Klaus and then I can start my introductory remarks.

RUDI VANSNICK: Good morning. I'm Rudi Vansnick. I'm the Chair of the Policy Committee of NPOC and I have already ten years standing in the ICANN world. Previously you found me back in the At-Large Advisory Committee. I was one of the members that set up the At-Large in 2003, and in 2007 I was one of the founding members of EURALO Regional At-Large. You probably know already about it.

I'm not going to speak in all the languages I speak, because they're not translated for that language over there. But I will come back to what I have to say later on. I'm passing to my colleague, Klaus.

KLAUS STOLL: Yeah. My name's Klaus Stoll. I'm the program officer for NPOC. In private life, I'm the executive director of the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation. Some 11 or 12 years ago, I stumbled into an ICANN meeting in Europe. I caught some very, very nasty virus, which I

couldn't get rid of until now. I'm just simply an ICANN enthusiast nut or whatever you want to call it, quite simply because I think it's one of the best forms of practiced governments around the world. Believe me, as somebody who's working very closely with UN and a lot of other [governance forums], you are actually present in one of – if not the – best one.

Whatever anybody wants to tell you what problems ICANN has and does it work, what is broken, what is not broken, this is here one of the best places to be. Thank you to all that you are here. Thank you.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: I haven't prepared a formal presentation because I think it's much interesting to share some thoughts with you in an informal way. Hello. I can see some familiar faces over there. Bonjour, bonjour! For the record, I don't want to show off with the languages. I'm just trying to be warm and nice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And she is.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Ah, thank you. As I said, we represent NPOC. If you tell me that it's not a sexy name, I will agree with you. It's Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns. It doesn't really give an idea of what we're doing, but basically what we do is represent the interest of not-for-profits within ICANN [inaudible].

We work under the NCSG umbrella. I guess you have been explained the difference. Under the NCSG, we have NCUC and you have NPOC. So we actually are members of NGOs ranging from small NGOs from big NGOs from all over the world, which means that if one of you belonged to an NGO and is interested in joining, we would be more than welcome to have you on board.

We are quite a baby constituency. We were created not that long ago. We are like the recent group that has been created within ICANN, which means that we need new blood on. We need new people, like highly-motivated people, on board [inaudible] committee to Internet governance and DNS issues.

What I wanted to give you is some examples of issues that we're dealing with to give you a practical idea of what we're doing on a day-to-day basis. For example, within the ICANN and the DNS sector, there is an issue related to the WHOIS database. I don't know whether you're familiar with it. Maybe some of you. So the whole WHOIS issue that has been going on within ICANN for many, many years, much before I joined in – because I'm quite new; I've been here not even a year I think, almost a year – has linked to some privacy issues, data protection issues.

So this is very dear to the hearts of obviously NGOs and specialized in the field of freedom of expression, human rights protection, because you know, unfortunately, some NGO members are facing very difficult situations in some countries.

So having public data – private data – what we consider as private data of names and contact details displayed publicly with unlimited access to

everyone, it's in our view, quite complex. It's not a good thing. So within ICANN, we are working in a Working Group – sorry, participating to a Working Group – trying to suggest that there is a need to be careful with these kinds of issues and to make people aware that you have to introduce the notion that you have to protect the privacy of registrants and these are issues that are very important to some of our members.

Other issues that are important to us are the protection of the names of the NGOs, the domain names. You can come across problems that have faced some NGOs when there is a disaster in some countries. Some charities, what they do is try to collect money online and some bad guys try to use the names on the websites and pretend they are the NGO and they collect money and it's obviously a fake organization.

So all these are the aspects we are dealing with inside ICANN. How do we do this? I just talked about the what, but there is the how. How do we do this? There are many ways of participating within the organization. I'm sure you now get that it's very complex. There are many parallel processes. So we do participate in working groups. That's one way. There is a call for expression of interest for the members of the community, any community.

So if it's an issue of interest to our community, we decide within the Executive Committee, we want to address this issue. So who is going to go? Depending on the experience and expertise of our executive members. Or we can choose to post public comments, because that's another way of doing it. Sometimes you don't have the time, because all this is volunteer work. So sometimes you don't have the time to participate to a working group because that implies every week, almost

every week, a phone call, being one or two hours online. The readings in between the phone calls. It's not only being online, but you have to do the homework if you want to be serious about it. Of course you don't have to do the whole thing. I mean, you can participate passively, which is not a bad thing either. It's just that you want to be informed, but not necessarily contribute because for some reason it is important to you for your work or professional interest.

Or you're very active. Some people get very, very active and passionate about it, so they do contribute a lot and do a lot of reading and comments. You can choose that you don't have the time, but you have the interest. So you write the policy statements. We can do it either within NPOC and post a comment as NPOC or we can join our NCUC colleagues and decide that we are going to post a comment as NCSG. That's another option, you see.

Or you can also lobby in the corridors. I'm using the word "lobbying" in a good sense, because it can sound [inaudible]. Yeah. In a positive sense, you can go and talk to someone from another constituency and say, "I'm worried about this and that. Can we work on this together? What are your views? Do you share our concerns? What are you doing about it?" "We're planning to do this and that." That's how we're working.

We also organize workshops on particular issues that we think are very important. For example, in the previous ICANN meeting in China in Beijing, we did a workshop on the role of youth within the DNS. We also organized a workshop on the impact of the .ngo on civil society. I don't know if you're aware, but there is a new extension that is coming, which

is .ngo.ong. This is going to be a new option in the market, so we invited different experts from private sector – a lawyer, a member of civil society – each from their perspective to share with us how they see the introduction of the .ngo and how it would impact civil society.

For example, in this context, there is a particular issue that is the new .ngo registry has to define how it is going to register legitimate NGO. Before they give the .ngo to an organization, they have to make sure that it is a legitimate NGO. Those of you who are involved with NGOs know that there are all kinds of NGOs all over the world – fake ones and legitimate ones. That's a very important and interesting aspect.

What else? We have actually today in the afternoon a workshop on the project that is very important. It's called i-INFORM Alliance. My colleague, Klaus, is going to say a few words about it. If you may, Klaus. Thank you.

KLAUS STOLL: Marie-Laure just talked about the absolutely boring side of ICANN. This is what we are doing, this is why we're coming here, this why I'm sitting here since five days, why I'm having a wonderful air-conditioning cold and I'm trying to die slowly but carefully. But there is a not-so-secret but not-often-said but also very vibrant and important part in ICANN going on.

Let me start with something very fundamental. When ICANN started, when these conferences started, there were a few people knowing about the Internet and a few people who were affected by the Internet. Now the situation is completely changed.

There are just a relatively few people sitting here and doing Internet governance, but everybody outside there is affected. The problem is here if we don't manage to bridge that gap, there is no reason to claim legitimacy or to claim anything from both sides. This is why NPOC created something which is called the i- INFORM Alliance. The i-INFORM Alliance is nothing else than an alliance of stakeholders in Internet governance process with the goal of – it's basically, now come all the buzz words here. Democratization of Internet, meeting translations that everybody actually knows how Internet governance is affecting them and how it works.

What we are trying to do is get different groups together. And we are not doing another organization. We deliberately said we don't want to be another organization. We don't want to have another governance structure. We don't want to have another talk-shop. No. The time for talking is over.

What we are going to do is work together, and how do we reach, basically, as somebody said – but it sounds a little bit strange for me – how do we reach the masses?

We decided on implementing three kinds of action. One is called gTLD4D – gTLDs for Development. Look with all the wonderful gTLD programs. There are more opportunities than you could ever imagine for creating a positive impact in all kinds of development from economic to agriculture and whatever you think.

We are in Africa. You should have been in Beijing, and before Beijing, the conferences, "Why are there only four gTLDs applied from Africa?" and so on. Do you know, the answer is very simple. You've got the

money and you've got the time to spend on a new gTLD if you don't have a business plan, if you don't know how you get your money back. I think there's a lot of people running around in Africa with $2 or $3 million to spend on a gTLD. So what's needed is a business plan.

These business plans exist. They are there. It's called community-based gTLDs. Our friends from [Asia] are running them since years. We have a lot of experience in Latin-America with these. This can easily be translated to Africa.

So one of the things we are doing is quite simply trying to promote the idea of community-based gTLDs and help them to implement. It's not about talking about community-based gTLDs. It's about making them work.

Quickly, the second area which we are implementing is quite simply the outreach to the general public. In practical terms, what we are talking about is, for example, no more process. No more things you have to collect at ICANN. No more things you have to go to, a webpage to find out, what ccGTLD is. But I think the majority from you watch CNN, watch [inaudible], watch the BBC and click online. How about having small programs – 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 7 minutes – explaining in words everybody can understand how Internet governance works and how to get involved. That's all. No more, no less. Just let people know actually what's going [inaudible]. I'm just getting indicated about time.

The other one is quite simply it's nice to talk what we are calling i-INFORM Connect. It's nice to talk about multi-sector partnership. But it doesn't mean when you talk about it that it works. Multi-sector

partnerships needs to be based on win-win situations. Anybody on the table needs to get up the table with something positive for him.

One of the things we are working on is in the area of Internet governance to create win-win situations. If you want to know more about this, I've got some papers here. But all the much, much better is at 2:00 we've got one hour, hour-and-a-half session about that. If you want to know more and have a lot of questions, please come by. There is space. Thank you.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: I'm sorry. Just a couple of minutes to pass on the mic to my colleague, Rudi, because Rudi is our policy Chair as well as treasurer. He's got the power because he's the one who watches the money. On the policy side, maybe he wanted to say a couple of words about policy issues just to give you a broad idea of what we're doing.

RUDI VARSNICK: Yeah. I will be short. I don't want to take you too long and get you asleep again. As I said, it's about ten years that I'm walking around in ICANN. I spent eight years in At-Large doing a lot of advice. At a certain point, I thought, well, it's good to give advice but if nobody uses it, what's the sense of it?

So I decided to change the umbrella, and I'm not leaving the At-Large world because I love that world. I'm still engaged with them. And especially as I'm also a Board of Trustees member in Internet society, I have to be there because most of our chapters are also in the At-Large

and I see my friend, Tijani, sitting. He knows about it. He is one of our colleagues from the At-Large.

Coming back to the point I want to make is I decided a few months ago after Klaus and Marie-Laure were pulling my arms and legs, I decided to jump into the policy world. I think it's important that if we really want to obtain something to be done that we take up advice at an earlier stage. We don't have to wait until advice goes up to the Board and comes back down into the policy world.

My objectives are to build a bridge between advisories and the policy teams and trigger interesting, valuable advice very early and work with that advice already in the policy world so that when advice goes up to the board, the policy as [rudimental] as it can be would also pop up together in parallel so that the Board has no excuse to say, "Yeah, well, first policy and then we will see." When we listen carefully to what the CEO, Fadi Chehadé, has been saying, he wants ICANN to move faster. Well, I have short legs. I can move fast. And you can ask my colleagues in At-Large. I can go very fast. And I want to find among you colleagues for NPOC to join us and do really good policy at the earliest stage possible. Keep your ears open, your eyes open, and don't shut up your mouth. We need you to speak up too.

So I hope to see you at the next meeting joining us whenever you can. We're open. So I hope to see you.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Thank you, Rudi. Our website is www.npoc.org. You're welcome to have a look at it. I don't know whether you have any questions. [inaudible]

will have time for questions if there is any, or comments. If not, thank you very much. It has been a pleasure talking to you and we hope we'll be seeing you around. Thank you very much. Have a good day. At the workshop we're having this afternoon is at 2:00, Hall 3D. Thank you.

RUDI VARSNICK: Just follow all the people that will go over there.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you very much. So we're going to just run over some of the ideas for today for you to go to, and then give the room back to the Government Advisory Committee. Up here I have at 5:00 is the Domain Name Association and CEO Taskforce Updates in Hall 1B. We were invited to that. It's a great place to network and engage. It's a very different session. We haven't had something like this before as we're trying to generate more interest from our business community.

To the next, looking this morning, the DNS and IPv6 workshops have started the DNS first. Security & Stability Update right now in Hall 6. Then we do have competing – so you do have to take a look again at your priorities of what you want to do face-to-face knowing that everything else is being recorded on transcript and translated, and will be available within several weeks of this ICANN meeting. Focus on what you would like to interact with the community with physically and you'll be able to pick up the other sessions via recording and transcript.

The Online Learning Initiative I am part of but I will not be angry if you don't show up, but it is a new initiative that Fadi and Nora Abusitta, we're trying to start to do a better job outreach and learning for our

new community especially. Then Africa Untethered, the Era of Digital Africa in Hall 1A.

Everybody, the ICANN booth is here. I'm here for you all day. Focus. Find what you feel you're interested in. If that doesn't work, either come talk to me, one of the alumni, but stay engaged. Don't leave until the gala. Buses are available from here and the hotels to and from the gala. Don't miss it. Fantastic.

Have a wonderful day.

[END OF AUDIO]