PRAGUE – Fellowship Morning Meetings
Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Janice Douma Lange: Okay good, so I’m echoing out the room? Good. So I got a lot of sleep last night so I’m feeling really strong for music night. Oh I’m really not feeling the enthusiasm in the room. I feel really good about music night. Wow, tough crowd, tough room. I feel like a really bad comedienne right now. So we’re going to – what? No, no sleeping, no sleeping.

[background conversation]

Janice Douma Lange: You think so? Doing a little watuzi? We are – oh wow, you’ve got us life. Thank you Kashif, everyone in the world can hear me now, thank you for that. So we have several folks today as you can see on the agenda. Mary Wong from the Noncommercial Users Constituency who is running just a little bit late as she said. She will be here to speak about the NCUC which is part of the Noncontracted, meaning have no contract with ICANN, Noncontracted constituency of the GNSO, Generic Names Supporting Organization. So Mary will speak to that.

And then our outgoing CEO Rod Beckstrom will be here to see our Fellows today. And again we have a special place for Rod in our hearts because he has a very special place for Fellowship in his. So we’re very
happy that he could find time to come on his last week. And then we have the ICANN security team along with Bobby Flam who they have been, the security team has been coordinating with since about the Brussels meeting time. And they’re going to talk about ICANN security coordination with global law enforcement as well as cyber security.

So I know that’s a very hot topic for a lot of folks in the room, so feel free, Jeff is very free flowing in his talks, so he’ll be really happy to take your questions as well as the rest of the team. So the other thing tonight is of course music night and all kidding aside, no one is under any obligation to follow me up on the stage. Unless of course you don’t want your spider and starfish book, or if you don’t want me to smile at you for the rest of the week, or I don’t know, maybe I’ll cut off breakfast at the Intercontinental; other than that it’s fine. Do what you wish, it’s all good.

So it’s a lot of fun, it’s a way to let loose after a really long day. In case we don’t have the time at the end since we have the time waiting for Mary, let’s talk about the fact that it is constituency day today. So even when I do the Welcome to ICANN this is a difficult one for me to get anyone’s head wrapped around and to really give them the direction, to give anyone the direction of exactly what to do or where to go. I mentioned this I think on Sunday, but some of the sessions are ongoing from topics from Costa Rica, from topics from Dakar, from topics on their monthly calls and sometimes you feel a little bit as if you’re the late person to the party.

So you have to spend that time on your computer, look up that constituency group, read a bit about them, maybe you can get into their
past monthly notes, everything is transparent. It’s all on the ICANN website when you go into the title called “groups” and then pick the different constituencies and you can look at them. A reminder again, that if it’s not something that you are feeling comfortable with or feel is really getting you where you need to be, just quietly pack your things up and head out. All the electronic monitors will be telling you where the other sessions are, or of course you’ve got your cheat sheet from the newcomers lounge and stuff, so feel free to roam a little bit.

And especially if you just really don’t have any particular bend towards intellectual property, towards the registries and the registrars, towards the NCUC, the GAC, the ccNSO; it’s a good chance to treat it like a wine tasting. So just line all the glasses up and taste a little bit along the way. What I don’t want you to do is to walk out of the conference hall at 11:00 and say “you know this is my day to kind of shopping because there’s really nothing much here for me.” So remember again what we said on Sunday, you’ve come a long way, your employer has invested in you, you have invested in yourself, you’ve committed yourself to being here and to learn everything you can.

So though it may be difficult to get through any single session or a day, there’s a whole ICANN website that you can sit in the room and go in and take some learnings. Remember you’ve learned how to do remote participation. So you can go in, turn the volume off on your computer so that you don’t squeak out or play out what’s going on in another room while you’re in a separate one, and just engage remotely to some other sessions. I don’t want to take any more of Mary’s time up with my chatter, so Mary, good morning and welcome. If you’d like the
handheld, if you’d like to have a sit, it’s up to you. and I’ve already just introduced you more or less, so I’ll let you do it again for yourself.

Mary Wong:

Good morning and thank you Janice, excuse me. I apologize for being slightly late, but I promise I’ll catch up because I know that you’ve been sitting here listening to a lot of different people. I also know that I’m sure everyone that you’ve talked to has said this to you, that ICANN is a very overwhelming experience. There are a few things that we all learn very quickly. One is that you must know all the acronyms, all the abbreviations. And secondly, that you must accept that it’s a very complicated mechanism. So I’m going to come talk to you very briefly about a very small part of this complicated mechanism, but I’d like to leave a few minutes over in case you have questions as well.

I don’t have slides because again you’ve been sitting here listening to a lot of people, watching a lot of slides. So what I will say about the Noncommercial Users Constituency, or the NCUC, is that we are a part of the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization. I think our Chair, Stephane Van Gelder was here to speak with you a couple of days ago. Oh he didn’t? Oh well did somebody come? Okay well that makes it slightly more complicated. There he is, there is our Chair. If you see him in the hallways say “Please why did you not come to the Fellowship meeting?”

Is the chart on this website if you scroll down, somewhere in the middle of the page I think or some page somewhere? I think it might be in the middle of this page, whatever that thing is. Anyway, I’m asking Janice – there you go the multi-stakeholder model. Oh it was on the home page.
And I’m sure all of you have seen this chart and it will be a challenge to be able to reproduce this chart without looking at it over and over again, but I think the biggest challenge but the most rewarding challenge is to get to know people from different parts of this chart.

And I know it’s a little small but it’s on the ICANN website and like I said NCUC is one of the constituencies within the GNSO. The Generic Names Supporting Organization is the body that basically develops all the policy that have to do with generic top level domains. So as you can imagine for the last four years, five years, it seems like a very long time, we have been dealing with the new gTLD program. It came out of the GNSO in 2007. There was a report that recommended the new gTLD program that was adopted by the Board and since then we have been trying to implement it.

And I won’t go into that because that’s a substantive topic. But essentially that is a very good example of what in the GNSO we do. NCUC is basically the only group within the GNSO, well not the only group, I’m sorry. Let me back up one step. In the past, within the GNSO we only had constituencies as you may know. What happened a few years ago is that the GNSO was restructured into two houses – the contracted parties that contain the registries and the registrars; and the noncontracted parties that contain all the old constituencies and at least one new one that you’ll hear from later.

So all the constituencies were then reorganized into what are called stakeholder groups because I think the one thing that you’ll remember also is that ICANN is complicated because it is a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up organization. So within the GNSO the stakeholders are
commercial and noncommercial, contracted and noncontracted, and for the noncommercial stakeholder group there are two constituencies – NCUC, to which I belong or my organization belongs, and NPOC, the Non-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency whose Chair will be coming to speak to you shortly. Oh was he here? Alright, so you’ve met Alain as well.

I think NCUC is very unique in ICANN, not just because it is a noncommercial based group, but it is also unique because we are open to individual membership. What you may have realized from listening to some others is that you have to part of an institution or a corporation or some entity and you may participate as a representative of that entity. But it’s quite rare that within the GNSO that you participate as an individual.

So there are two types of memberships in NCUC – organizational and individual. And our mix of members are actually quite interesting. We have a lot of academics. We have a lot of individual internet users. We have a number of civil society leaders. I think many of you are here partly because you’re interested in matters pertaining to internet governance, and some of you may have participated in the IGF or other forums. Some of you have heard about rumors at least that the International Telecoms Union or the ITU is trying to take over ICANN and the internet. Or that governments are trying to take over the internet and make it a tool of the United Nations.

That is a very interesting topic that is quite hot at the moment. Many of the civil society leaders, and you may have met some of them in the course of this week, are members of NCUC. So NCUC sees itself as the
home for civil society within ICANN. And we feel that it is probably the only place where civil society really have an appropriate home. We’re not registries. We’re not registrars. We’re not intellectual property lawyers, well I am, but I’m an academic intellectual property lawyer. And many of us don’t run businesses. We may be employees of a business, but our interest in the internet are as individual users, as students and as researchers.

So if you’re interested in what we do, and if you feel that you’re heart belongs to civil society, please come to our NCUC meeting today, the schedule is on the ICANN website. And with that I think I would like to take questions if I have a few minutes and if anybody has any questions.

Beran Gillen: Good morning, my name is Beran; I’m from The Gambia. I just wanted to ask, what’s the difference between the contracted and the noncontracted parties.

Mary Wong: Well it’s actually a very simple answer. I’m actually very happy when in ICANN you can give a simple, straight-forward answer. The difference is because if you are a registry, like VeriSign or Afilias or Neustar, and you basically run all the top level domains let’s say – the .coms the .nets the .infos – that makes you a registry. You have a contract with ICANN because there are issues pertaining to security, stability, financial issues. And similarly the registrars, if you are selling domain names that you then put into a registry, like if you’re GoDaddy or eNom or something like that, you too operate under a contract with ICANN, and that’s what
makes them contracted parties. They’re accountable legally under their contract.

For the noncontracted parties like the intellectual property constituency, the business constituency or us, NCUC, we don’t operate under any kind of legal contract of ICANN, we are all here because we care, because we’re interested and we want to participate in the multi-stakeholder model. Does that help? Do you have a follow up?

Beran Gillen: One more question. You’re a noncommercial entity, so does that mean that your users have to work in NGO or something like that to avoid conflict or could they be commercially, working in commercial business or something?

Mary Wong: That’s a great question and thank you, I should have made that clear earlier. If you are an organization or an entity and you want to join NCUC, you have to be a noncommercial entity. Now you could be a nonprofit entity, it doesn’t mean you can’t make money. It doesn’t mean that you survive on grants alone. It doesn’t mean that you’re just an NGO. You could be, for example, I work for a law school and a university. My law school is actually a corporation but is a nonprofit corporation like ICANN, so we qualify.

But we run in the black, we don’t run in the red. So you can’t be a company making money off the internet in the sense of profits and so forth, because then you should probably be in the business constituency. For individual users generally the requirement is that if
you have a domain name registration, it could be your family name it could be an individual registration, it’s very, very easy to satisfy because we feel that we want to have as many different and diverse voices as possible.

I think if I can take the opportunity to add to what I said earlier, if you look at the NCUC membership you’ll see two things. One is that we are the fastest growing membership base, simply because we welcome many individuals and many different types of noncommercial entities. But secondly, in terms of geographical and ethnic diversity, we have the best track record in ICANN for reaching out to different regions, different cultures all around the world, and we’re very proud of that.

Iftikhar Shah: This is Iftikhar from Pakistan. I am representing the government of Pakistan. My question is that it is also done in the GAC and the GAC members, especially the GNSO and ccNSO [to go out] and get the consent of the governments. The same question from you, what about your working group; how do they get the government input?

Mary Wong: So you’re asking specifically how and whether NCUC gets government input and I can say that it’s not different from the rest of ICANN. Has a GAC representative come in? Okay, so you’re going to talk about the Government Advisory Committee or the GAC tomorrow and that...
Iftikhar Shah: Because GAC is representing all the members of the government of the worldwide countries, and it is observed and it is noted that GNSO and ccNSO especially did not get consent from the GAC and they replied to the GAC that as per the ICANN rules it is not our SOPs that it should be vetted any especially PDP from the government. So my question is the same that what about how you get the consent and input from the government.

Mary Wong: So I see that you’ve become very active in ICANN because I can count the number of acronyms that you used, including one called the PDP or the Policy Development Process.

[background conversation]

Mary Wong: Right. And as a GAC member you know exactly what the role of the GAC is. So I don’t need to tell you that and I know that the GAC members are coming to talk tomorrow. What I will say for the benefit of everyone here is that the role of the GAC is different from the role of the GNSO. First of all it’s not just because it’s an advisory committee not a supporting organization, but when the GAC as governments give advice to the ICANN Board it is very formal. And if the ICANN Board chooses not to take GAC advice it has to provide a reason, that’s in the ICANN Bylaws.
Now your question then pertains to when we do policy work within the GNSO what happens with the GAC, right? One thing I will also say is that the GAC does not formally participate in the GNSO or the ccNSO Policy Development Processes or PDPs. The GAC says it cannot because no one member or two members of the GAC can fully represent the full GAC. So it becomes a bit of a problem because, as I think you know from your involvement, a lot of the policies that we develop say within the GNSO may have public interest implications for individual countries or for the GAC as a whole.

Like in the new gTLD program right, you’re opening up the space to so many different types or works and participants there’s a question as to whether some things might be politically problematic for certain countries. So what we do first of all, at working group level, and the working groups can be cross-community, and I think Olivier is going to talk about another group in the community the At-Large and the ALAC, so different people from across the community can participate. The GAC of course is welcome it’s just that they choose not to, not formally.

So we try to get input from the GAC informally. So some working groups the GAC may have members on the working group and they make it very clear that they are not there to represent the GCA but they’re there to provide input. As individual constituencies and stakeholder groups it is also always open to us to go to the GAC or individual GAC countries, and I’ll give you an example from NCUC. One of the topics that is causing quite a lot of excitement within ICANN is the negotiation of the registrar agreement, and you had talked about contracted parties.
And that’s being renegotiated and one issue is that law enforcement agencies are pressing the registrars to change some WHOIS issues. And that raises, for NCUC, a lot of privacy concerns. Who can have access to your registrant data? What kind of data; is it your phone number, is it your address? And we feel very strongly that those have privacy and human rights implications. So what NCUC is doing is trying to engage with individual members of the GAC, but also trying to engage with the Privacy and Data Commissioners of individual countries so that they can provide a perspective and say for example “Well this request is problematic, not just because it raises general concerns, but it’s problematic because it doesn’t comply with the law of the European Union,” for example.

So I hope that answers your question, that there are formal and informal channels to get participation from the GAC.

Iftikhar Shah: Okay thank you.

Maria Dolores: Hello, my name is Maria Dolores. Being a different body from the ALAC and the At-Large community, I wanted to know how do you collaborate, if you work together; you get information from each other. What is your working method?

Mary Wong: I think that’s an excellent question and I think it’s great that Olivier is here. That is actually one of the things that we’re talking about, so I’ll
start and maybe hand it off to you. First of all, the ALAC is like the GAC, an advisory committee. So it has a different role within ICANN from the GNSO and from the constituencies within the GNSO. But we in the noncommercial group feel that we have a lot of very common interests with At-Large and with ALAC. So there are a couple of ways that we’ve tried to do it, and I think we’re going to improve.

One is that each group has a liaison to the other group, so NCSG, my stakeholder group, not just my constituency but my stakeholder group has a liaison to ALAC and similarly they have one to us. They participate on the mailing list. They come to our meetings. We also have very regular meetings and discussions; in fact we had one yesterday between ALAC and the noncommercials.

And obviously when there are issues of common interest, whether it comes from a working group or from the ICANN Board of Directors, we will try to work together for joint statements or to provide input. So it’s not so much formal but informal and there’s a very clear recognition that there’s a lot of overlapping interest.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Mary, you actually said it so eloquently I don’t know if I can add anything to this, apart from just one thing. We often see, as ALAC being able to comment on practically everything taking place in ICANN, we often see silos that each constituency, each part of ICANN just works in their room and doesn’t talk to the people next door who are talking exactly about the same subject. So we really try to promote this cross-community discussion and it takes place in formal meetings, it also takes place during the ICANN meetings, in the
corridors, in the restaurants, pretty much everywhere, even in the evening. Tonight, the music night, I’m sure we’re going to discuss some things.

So it’s a case of really being able to coordinate with each other and it takes place at several levels. But yes, I’ll give the floor back to you Mary.

Mary Wong: Actually I think Janice is going to ask me to yield to you, is that right?

Janice Douma Lange: He’s an unscheduled performer.

Mary Wong: Oh he’s unscheduled, oh. Should I take a couple more questions or is there someone waiting?

[background conversation]

Mary Wong: Why don’t we take two quick questions, please?

Gary Campbell: Gary Campbell from Jamaica, representing the government. If a registrant allows a domain name to expire, I assume that cannot – how is that matter treated, how is he able to regain the domain name if it
expires without being renewed what happens thereafter, how is it treated?

Mary Wong: So your question is if a registrant, say an individual or a corporation or a noncommercial entity, it doesn’t have to be any particular one right, allows a domain name to expire so he or she or it doesn’t renew, what happens. Without going into specifics if the registrar, one of the contracted parties allows that domain to be available to the general public and somebody else registers it. For the most part if that’s fairly legitimate that there’s not much you can do, but also, if you let it expire most registrars will let you renew it. It’s just that if you renew it before the end of the initial term it’s usually easier and some registrars allow you to do it automatically.

So it does vary, but it gets problematic when there are some issues, either fraud or some technical problems that caused that. But if it’s sort of in the general course of business it’s pretty straight-forward.

Leon Ambia: Yes Leon. I’m Leon from Mexico. I’m still wondering, as I was talking to you the day before yesterday, I’m still wondering whether I should be more inclined to join the NCUC or the IPC. I mean I am far more fond of civil society than lawyers, that’s an easy one.

Mary Wong: What about civil society lawyers?
Leon Ambia: Oh that’s my case, that’s my case. So what’s the difference between joining maybe the IPC or NCUC? I think that it’s clear that if you join the NCUC you are for the civil society, and as far as I know the IPC is like the more hard core, IP law side of the constituency. But still, wouldn’t it be important to have a member in the IPC that tries to do something to push the constituency towards the civil society interests?

Mary Wong: That’s a great question and I’ll try to keep it short, although there’s a lot of things we could say. I think what I will do is refer back to some things that Olivier said. That it’s very important in ICANN, and I think this is something that we encourage newcomers to do, do not fall into the trap of being in a silo, only working within your own narrow group; whether it’s a constituency or a stakeholder group or a constituency. That has happened, it’s tempting. Because so many things are going on you tend to just talk to the people you know.

So it has been true, I think I’ll be honest and just say when you work in a silo as has happened, then what might be an issue that could be solved with the help of a different perspective or different community sometimes gets lost. So all you hear is maybe one side of the argument. So let me just say that whether it is a constituency or a stakeholder group or a committee it really is important wherever you belong to reach out to someone else. I will also say that I have very good friends within the IP constituency, the IPC. I work with many of them outside of ICANN on very different issues.

I’ve worked with them when I was in legal practice and I continue to work with them now as an academic because I do trademark law. So
the relationships is the other point. Again, no matter where you are or where you belong, cultivate good relationships, cultivate good communication. So there is informal communication and feedback between the groups, and I think that’s very important. And in the GNSO with the restructuring where everybody is now in a stakeholder group or in a constituency it can get very hard, but many of us keep trying.

The last point that I’ll make is in specific answer to your question, at least I hope, is that one difference between the IPC and the NCUC is that the IPCs mission is narrower in some respects, because the IPC represents intellectual property interests. For the most part those are trademark owners. So you’ll see that a lot of the issues that the IPC raises have to do with trademark protections. For example in the new gTLD program, have to do with whether registrars are in compliance with their contracts with ICANN because they are allowing a lot of cybersquatting to go on within particular domains. Very important issues, but those tend to be the issues of focus.

Whereas for NCUC as a constituency and NCSG as a stakeholder group that houses the constituency, we think that our interests are much broader. Do we care about trademarks; yes we do. But we care about trademarks from both sides. We want rights holders to be protected adequately, but we want there to be balanced protection so that for example you don’t have an overaggressive trademark owner that’s filing all these actions and so you end up stifling freedom of speech, for example. Or something that might be considered a fair use of a trademark is not acknowledged.
But over and above trademark interests we do have a number of other causes and issues that we care about that we bring to ICANN. So I think we have a much broader array of interests including balanced trademark interests. So to that extent, if you go to some of the meetings, I think you’ll see that reflected in the discussion. And like I said, with civil society, our home is in the noncommercial group, but we do try to talk with some of the other constituencies who may have, frankly, more commercial interests that they bring to the table.

Janice Douma Lange:
Mary thank you so much. As usual we could spend a whole other hour with you because of your breadth of knowledge within ICANN. We do need to wrap up. If there are any other question for Mary, and I think there were a couple, you can go through my address or Mary if you don’t mind me sharing, I can share Mary’s email address that you can follow with her and set a time with her this week for a one on one if you’d like to find her to ask a question personally or use her email address to do that.

Mary Wong:
Can I add one more thing?

Janice Douma Lange:
You can add one more thing as long as I can actually ask you to clarify for everyone here Leon’s dilemma. Can someone actually belong to two constituencies at once? And then we’ll wrap this up.
Mary Wong: Okay the answer is yes, with conditions. So again, because we want to encourage participation, there is not a whole lot of structural limitations over how you participate or where you belong. Each stakeholder group and constituency has its own charter and has its own rules for who can be a member, so that’s condition number one. Condition number two is that even if you are a member of two groups, the general rule is you cannot vote in both groups for obvious reasons, because then you can game the system.

So with those two limitations there’s usually not that many other restrictions. I hope that answers the question. And as we said, you are encouraged to come to some of the meetings. I will say that it might get a little technical because people get deep into the issues and as someone coming new you’re like “what’s going on.” But the NCUC and the NCSG as a stakeholder group, therefore NCUC and NPOC, we’re very interested in outreach and having new membership and I think you’ll find that we’re very welcoming.

So if you would like to, not just come to our meetings but think about joining us, please send Janice or me an email. We do want more participation but we also don’t want Fellows to come here, get a bit of a taste and then go off to their own lives and not actually dig in and participate in ICANN. So if there’s anything we can do in the noncommercial side to help you make it easier please, please let me know. We would very much welcome your participation. Thank you all very much.
Janice Douma Lange: Once again Mary, thank you so very much. Have a great day. And I feel like I’m looking back at the lineup, and now I choose the security team. But Olivier, if the security team would like to give you a couple of minutes, I – look at Jeff. Sure.

[background conversation]

Janice Douma Lange: Olivier would you like to have your two minutes in the sun?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Janice, I’ll just introduce myself whilst you load the slides. I’m Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I’m the Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee, which is the part of ICANN that is supposed to bring forward into the ICANN processes the views of the individual internet users out there. So that’s 2.1 billion people – well 2.2 actually, now every time I do this presentation there’s a few more, a few hundred million more that have arrived. And we basically are a part of ICANN that doesn’t actually make the policy; that all takes place in the GNSO. But we are here to comment on things, because we’re an advisory committee we can comment on every single event, anything that basically takes place at ICANN or that is ICANN related.

We have actually also produced comments for things that ICANN was doing outside of ICANN, but it has to be related to domain names, it has to be related to the mandate that ICANN has to run the internet’s unique identifier system, as it’s called. The difference between ALAC
and most other parts of ICANN is that we are actually divided into regions. It’s loading? Okay, excellent. So we’re divided into regions, we have five regions at ICANN and so for each region we have a Regional At-Large Organization. And it is a little difficult to explain without the diagram because I usually point at that point and there’s nothing to point to.

And so the reason why we are divided into five regions – there we go, that’s the multi-stakeholder models. So this is At-Large, we’re one of the advisory committees. There’s also SSAC, RSSAC and there is the GAC of course, the Government Advisory Committee. And the At-Large community has one Director on the Board of Directors. But we have to remember that the people who are on the Board of Directors are supposed to act in ICANNs best interest, not in their own community’s best interest.

But because we have selected that person it is fair to assume that the person has pretty similar views to our views since otherwise we wouldn’t have selected them to go on the Board. So that’s how we fit in the overall ICANN multi-stakeholder model. Okay, do we not have the diagram?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, okay. So picture a map of the world and each region is somehow a little bit separate from the others. So we’ve got the North American Regional At-Large Organization – NARALO; the Latin American and
Caribbean Regional At-Large Organization – oh you’ve also got the brochures here. I didn’t see that they were being distributed so quickly. If some of you don’t have one then we can sort of pass them around or. Anyway, so we’ve got LACRALO; we’ve got EURALO, the European one. We’ve got AFRALO for Africa and APRALO, which is the Asia-Pacific Island and Australia Regional At-Large Organization.

And the reason why we have all of those different Regional At-Large Organizations is that we want to bring as many people in the discussion, as many people in the input, if you want, to the ICANN processes. We want to be able to reach people all around the world. And in order to do that it’s good, it’s better to actually have a process where first things take place at a regional level. One of the main reasons being that the earth is round, so if you do everything at a global level, for some people a conference call will be right in the middle of the night or right in the middle of the working day. So it’s better to have this Regional At-Large Organizations to coordinate these things locally.

Of course on top of that we have a thing called the At-Large Advisory Committee. And that’s the committee of 15 people, which are made up of two people selected by each region and one person for each region of the world selected by the Nominating Committee. I don’t know whether you’ve already had – Vanda tomorrow, okay. So the Nominating Committee is just outside of the ICANN space and they select people and put them in various parts of ICANN in a sort of semi-independent way. So that means three people per region and three times five is 15; that’s the ALAC.
There’s often a misunderstanding between ALAC and At-Large. At-Large is the whole community; ALAC is just the committee itself. And the committee itself selects one Chair, and that’s myself, and selects also a Board Director that is on the ICANN Board. So that’s how we work. As far as policy input is concerned the majority, a significant part of our time is responding to public comments that are being asked in the ICANN model. So basically a public comment comes out, we issue a request for comments from our own community and at some point in time, hopefully within three to five days, someone will say “yes we really have an interest in this,” somebody will be designated to hold the pen.

They will write a first draft with input from the community that will be put on a Wiki. Then there is a comment box underneath that we encourage, we publicize it, we encourage everyone to bring their comment in there. And a few days later, five to ten days later we write a second draft based on the comments that were brought into the comment. And from that point onwards, the second draft, sometimes there’s a third draft – this is all in theory by the way – and then we have a final statement, which then gets voted on by the At-Large Advisory Committee, so that actually ratifies the statement which then gets sent either to the public comment or directly to the Board.

Because we are able to write directly to the Board if we feel very strongly about an issue. We’re able to write to the Chair of the GNSO Council. We’re able to write to pretty much anybody at ICANN if we think that something needs to be done. I just told you this is a theory. In practice it’s a little harder because the world happens to have many languages, so not everyone is very proficient in English, they might take
more time to read. Some parts of the world have less English proficiency so the comments and so on might have to be translated in the local language as well for the input to come in.

But in general, we manage to stick within a 30 day period to bring our input in. And that’s pretty much how it works. We can also make comments totally outside of the public comments. We’re one of the only organizations in ICANN that is able to actually comment at any time on anything. So that’s it. I’m running around most of the time doing ten things in one go, but if you do stop me then I’ll be happy to spend a couple of minutes with you. I’ve seen several of you yesterday and the day before and I’m supposedly quite approachable, although if you do come close to me and I’m running try and move aside so I don’t knock you over. Thanks very much.

Janice Douma Lange: Thank you very much. Not bad, really. Thanks. So great, thank you again very much. If there’s any questions I’ll be sure to gather them and get them sent to you, promise. Siranush, your biggest fan, I know. A fan base, it’s amazing. They follow him everywhere. Gentlemen if you would like to step up here. You can take a walking mic, you can take a seat at the mic, whatever you’re comfortable with. And as we talked this morning, we have with us Patrick Jones and Jeff Moss from the ICANN Security Team.

And of course Bobby sits in front of my breakfast so now I may not get that. And Bobby Flaim has joined us and Bobby said “what would you like me to say” and I said “everything you say is going to be interesting” because this is a hot topic from most of your online applications to learn
more about ICANN security, cyber security and the role of law enforcement, global law enforcement with ICANN.

What I’m going to have these gentlemen do is introduce themselves and tell a little bit about how they got to sit here, got to the place of sitting here in ICANN and the community here at this table; a little bit about the ICANN role in cyber security and law enforcement. And the majority of the time really is about opening up to some questions from you because I know you have them. Gentlemen, Patrick or Jeff if you’d like to start off.

Jeff Moss: Okay, good morning everyone. I’m Jeff Moss the Chief Security Officer for ICANN and it was kind of a long twisted road of how I ended up at ICANN, but I’m here now. That’s all I care about. It’s a fascinating organization. In a previous life I did a lot of computer security conferences and training and there you’re essentially representing security researchers and the community and what people want to do. At ICANN it’s like that but on a much larger scale and you have to accommodate many more people and their interests.

And at ICANN it’s also an interesting organization because in the Security Department there’s areas where we’re very operational, think maybe like operating the L Root, watching over our own internal systems and servers. And then there’s areas where we’re collaborative, where we’re working with other people. Maybe we’re working with law enforcement to help them understand WHOIS policy or how to make sense out of some log file related to ICANN.
And then there’s areas where we’re just purely collaborative; they want us in the room just to get our perspective. And so we’re one of the groups at ICANN that has three different roles and depending upon who we’re talking to and what the subject is we wear different hats. And so it’s usually pretty useful to remind people “okay we’re collaborating,” “oh no wait, we’re operating” and to let people know what your perspective is. So we can go into more depth about that but when you talk about the security team at ICANN and our collaboration with other law enforcement, or there’s another group called the Operational Security Community and those are people that aren’t law enforcement but they operate large chunks of the internet or ISPs or their security researchers.

We participate a lot with the Anti-Phishing Working Group or the Malware Anti-Abuse Group or the Botnet, some of the other groups that chase around Botnets. It just depends on how we interact with them. So we might be a little more larger or a little bit more diverse than you originally thought. I’ll let Patrick talk a little bit more about how that actually happens on a day to day basis.

Patrick Jones:

So I’m Patrick Jones, Senior Director of Security at ICANN. I started at ICANN in 2006 but I’ve really been involved and active in the community since 2000. I’m probably one of the rare staff members who’s jumped around and had different roles. So while I’m in security now, I started out as registry liaison; I’ve been involved in the Nominating Committee, the IDN Fast Track, some involvement in the development of the applicant guidebook – so the collaborative and consulting effort not
only is for the community but also internally too. So that’s one of the unique things about our team is that we do play a hybrid role of where we’re subject matter experts both internally for the organization, but also outward facing with the different aspects of the community.

And from where I am now, that’s one of the things that’s most enjoyable because our team is really a bridge between the technical community, the law enforcement community, the business and noncommercial groups and the other operators. So we’re here to facilitate, collaborate and engage and also listen.

Janice Douma Lange: Bobby would you like to just introduce yourself and how you came to sit with these two fine gentlemen here at the table?

Bobby Flaim: Sure. My name is Bobby Flaim, I work for the FBI in the Operational Technology Division in Quantico, Virginia. I first became involved with ICANN in about 2003 when there was a WHOIS issue, because the WHOIS is a digital tool that the FBI uses and actually all law enforcement uses to begin a lot of its cases. So I realized when I came to ICANN that there were a lot of very rich opportunities to meet a lot of people that were here. Not only the ICANN community but we have the registrars, the registries, started working with the security team here.

A lot of very good people that are more than willing to be helpful, and if you’re working cybercrime the biggest thing is to network and to know as many people as possible in the community so you can easily pick up a phone that will further enhance your investigation. So that’s how I
started here at ICANN and over the years we actually started to have more and more law enforcement that came to ICANN. We have law enforcement right here from Mauritius, my buddy Narayan. We have the United Kingdom here, Canada, Denmark, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Japan, Korea, South Africa – everyone really has been here or has come through the doors at one point or another. And it really is a very collaborative effort, it’s a great networking opportunity.

And we’ve met a lot of other groups or internet organizations through here, such as the Regional Internet Registries which allocate the IP addresses. We started making good friends at the Internet Engineering Task Force, which is the organization that does all the internet protocols and parameters, which obviously is very important to the internet and cyber security. So we’ve met a lot of great people, it’s been extremely beneficial for us; a great network opportunity. ICANN has been very, very nice to us, they host us. We’ve had many meetings here. We’ve worked on what are called the law enforcement recommendations to the GAC, which is the Governmental Advisory Committee.

So it’s been a very, very good opportunity, meeting a lot of great people, and it really has helped our investigations and the work that we do. That’s all I had to say.

Janice Douma Lange: And with that I’ll open for any questions, there’s nothing that can’t be asked.
Iftikhar Shah: This is Iftikhar from Pakistan. Pakistan is in the process of drafting the internet and email security policy. I need your guidelines, what are the key points which should be covered in that internet security policy. The whole committee – who is responsible, who can answer this question.

Jeff Moss: Well I can only speak for ICANN as an organization. When we build our email security policy it’s directly related to our needs. And since we’re such a transparent and open organization we have a very nonrestrictive email security policy. I’m not sure - in your specific case you would adapt is to your needs.

Iftikhar Shah: Actually to provide the security [plan] which can come from the internet especially.

Jeff Moss: So I’m sure I’m not really understanding the question. Are you curious about threats that come through email?

Iftikhar Shah: Actually every government has a policy and we are in the process of drafting the cyber security policy, how we secure our information, our networks...

Jeff Moss: For your country or just for your government?
Iftikhar Shah: For our country.

Jeff Moss: In the United States that’s still a contentious issue. They’re still debating what the role of ISPs versus what – what will be mandated to the ISPs, versus what the ISPs themselves will do, what customers are responsible for. So I don’t think we have a good answer for you because the issue has not been resolved. Sorry if that’s not a very satisfying answer.

Narayan Gangalaramsamy: If I may, I think the question, is it about the law of the country or is it about the policy you are talking about? Because I think if you are looking at national level it is rather the law that you are talking about.

Iftikhar Shah: Actually there are some general guidelines which maybe followed from the developed countries that they are adopting because ICANN is more concerned about the cyber security and they have some sound work on this. In this regard I have some suggestions from this group.

Narayan Gangalaramsamy: So if I may add though, there is a convention on cybercrime that you may also refer to with a press convention that are a lot of projects. So if you do have a computer misuse cybercrime act or something like for
cyber in your country, or even you can just look at that convention also, there are a lot of provisions and this may help. Thank you.

Waqar Azeem: Hello, I am Azeem from Pakistan. I have a question. As an individual, how can we participate in security related issues and activities here at ICANN?

Patrick Jones: So, a really good example is right now our team publishes every year our Fiscal Year Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework. So we’re one of the rare teams that says each year “here are the activities and programs that we’re going to do” and we post it for community comment and consideration. So that’s a document where you in your individual capacity or wherever your organization is if you’re interested in providing feedback on those priorities and programs, maybe you have an idea or a suggestion for us to put more emphasis on one program over another.

Another thing that we have out for public comment through the middle of July is a high level draft statement of ICANNs role and remit in security and stability and resiliency. And this is one of, this comes from recommendation one under the Review Team under the Affirmation of Commitments that just completed their work right before this meeting. And at a high level that says “here’s what we think ICANN’s technical mission is,” “here’s what we think our roles and responsibilities are; what we do and don’t do,” but it’s just a draft. So if you have opinions on that, we really want to hear that.
Bobby Flaim: Another committee that they have here at ICANN is called the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and it’s made up of many members, I think it’s 38 right now, and they address very specific security issues on the internet and cyber. So that’s another good avenue too. It’s called SSAC – the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Waqar Azeem: So anybody can take part in it?

Janice Douma Lange: One of our alumni, Dr. Sarmad Hussein, as you well know from Pakistan is on the SSAC and I think he’s your best link to talk more about that. But you are invited onto that advisory committee as he was, but that just shows exactly that it can happen because he just became part of the ICANN community at the New Delhi meeting in 2008 through the Fellowship Program. So it’s possible and I think we should engage him to talk about that more. And then I’m going to look over to my right and Ali...

Ali AlMeshal: Ali AlMeshal from Bahrain. With regard to the cyber security and cyber law, I don’t know if ICANN are coordinating or cooperating with the other related bodies in that sense. Like, I have attended maybe more than 10 conferences and sessions all with regard to the cyber security and cyber law. The UN are having a number of subcommittees under the UN like the [ODBC], they call it UN ODBC, all of them are looking on
the cyber security, looking onto the cyber law and especially in the Middle East they are looking on developing the law of the internet and the law of the cyber security and the cyber crime, so I don’t know what’s the role of ICANN in all of that.

Jeff Moss: So since ICANN is not a treaty organization and we’re not a sovereign country, we really can’t make law. So we’re not out there actively trying to stop criminals; that’s not what we do. What we try to do though is operate with excellence the key components that we are responsible for; the unique identifiers, in our case, L Root, one of the root operations. So we’ll participate and provide advice if we’re invited into say the OECD conversations and explain to them how the ecosystem works and explain to them who the players are and what their motivations are and what is possible maybe to regulate, and what’s technically impossible or very, very difficult and expensive to regulate.

So, that’s where we’ll act as sort of outside experts. Because you have to remember, we’re representing the whole planet, not just the view of one particular government.

Ali AlMeshal: Like the latest one that I have attended a meeting was under the [UN SIQUA] and they were trying to develop the law for let’s say the Arab region, but all the people who were participating in developing the cyber law are from the legal point of view, they are not from the technical, the expert part of it. So that’s why I’m asking have any
involve in at least as an advisory to these communities and these different bodies.

Patrick Jones: One of the things that we’ve tried to emphasize in conversations where this has come up is that the internet is global and that the implications of restrictions in one area may have unintended consequences in another region. We work quite a lot on providing education and awareness and training around DNSSEC, so encouraging adoption of this protocol that makes the internet more strong and resilient for everyone and reminding either governments or operators that the platform is a global system and it’s not broken down by national boundaries.

Female: My name is (Inaudible). This question may not necessarily only be directed at the team that we have up here, but also to the law enforcement people in the room. Again, the internet is global right, and therefore cybercrime is also global. How do we handle issues cross-border crime? Where somebody hacks into my account from Europe or anywhere else in the world and I’m sitting in Botswana where there’s no real law about cyber crime. How do we handle those issues? And I bank with a South African bank and I’m living in Botswana and the crime happens somewhere out there in space. Thanks.

Bobby Flaim: Well I’ll just talk about what Narayan was talking about before, which is one of the first things is the cybercrime convention, which I think, did you say you’re from South Africa? Botswana, I’m sorry. That is
something where they're trying to set up global norms and global laws on cybercrime. And actually yesterday they actually had the Commonwealth had met and they were talking about adopting very similar type laws. And I think the African Union also has something where they're trying to adopt cyber laws that are kind of global in conformity. So that's one area.

In so far as a global approach to cybercrime and some of the things were doing that's number one. The other thing we're trying to do here is we're trying to work as a global law enforcement community to see if there are changes or recommendations that we can propose that will alleviate the crime or take a more proactive approach to the crime. And also have better attribution to crime so it's easier for us to find criminals. I mentioned the WHOIS before, that's a global tool and that's to fine domain names and IP addresses and so on and so forth.

So that's what we're trying to do. In so far as I think more directly with your question, I think the cybercrime conventions and they met here this week, the Commonwealth, I know the African Union has it. Narayan was talking about the cybercrime convention that originated out of Budapest. I don't know if you want to talk more about that because you've participated in that. Does that answer your question? Are you sure?

Female: It does, thank you.
Siaosi Sovaleni: Siaosi from the Pacific. Just clarification, I think you were saying that ICANN is not there to stop cybercrime, so why are you doing DNSSEC and all that. Isn’t that supposed to stop people or limit people from committing crimes?

Jeff Moss: What I mean is we don’t have authority; we’re not empowered by a nationality to enforce laws.

Siaosi Sovaleni: Right, but what you’re actually doing is to actually try and minimize which is essentially stopping people from committing crimes.

Jeff Moss: Yes so we take another approach. Since we have to represent everybody on the planet we’re spending a lot of – the IETF came up with the DNSSEC standard and now through ICANN through policy we’re trying to implement it and get it adopted as much as possible. And the idea there is make it more difficult for criminals around the world.

Siaosi Sovaleni: Yeah it’s just the statement when you’re saying that you’re not here, it kind of implies that you’re letting criminals run around the internet, which is not the case.

Jeff Moss: Right so we take other approaches to try to make it more difficult for criminals everywhere.
Siaosi Sovaleni: Right. The follow up on is basically on law enforcement. On the transnational nature of cybercrime when your server is like say in the US, there’s going to be issues in terms of jurisdictions when you’re actually trying to get some data from the US. Has that been a discussion point? For example, if I’m somewhere out there in the Pacific and the data that I actually need as evidence on a particular case resides on a server in the US there is going to be some issues with getting access of the data which resides on a server. Has there been some discussion on that? I know it’s been discussed on the Council of Europe conventions and all that kind of stuff, but on the ICANN realm has that been something to be considered...

Bobby Flaim: From the law enforcement perspective here no, we haven’t considered that here because this isn’t an enforcement mechanism. That would be more along the lines of the cybercrime convention because that is a treaty which will bind national governments. Here it’s because it’s an internet governance bottom-up policy making organization, that hasn’t been addressed here. And what we do try to address ad hoc here is something similar to that.

Like I said, when we came up with our law enforcement recommendations where we’re trying to change I guess the environment as opposed to the laws. So that is a way in which we’re approaching it because that is the most appropriate way through ICANN.
Kashif Bahti: There is a question of Fatima Cambronero from Argentina, she is a remote participant. The question is “any comment on the recommendations of the SSR RT.”

Patrick Jones: They’ve completed the report and it’s now in the hands of the Board. I will say...

Janice Douma Lange: Patrick, could I ask you, not many of us know what SSR RT is if you could just back up one minute.

Patrick Jones: So this is the final report of the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team, which is one of the four review team under the Affirmation of Commitments. They completed their report and it had 28 recommendations and thankfully they were very interested in having staff observe and be available to ask questions throughout their effort, their 18 month effort in developing these recommendations. I think all of the recommendations are quite implementable and we’ve already made progress to be proactive about implementing many of the recommendations. So we’ll be providing the Board and the community with our sort of timeline and a dashboard view of how these recommendations will be implemented within ICANN.

The other thing to remember is that these recommendations aren’t just for staff, but it’s for the organization and it’s for how the other
stakeholder groups would be interacting and providing guidance. So they’re recommendations for the community that participates in ICANN, not just for the staff that has to support the community. And that is one of the things that we’re asking the community for input on, this draft statement of role and remit.

Janice Douma Lange: Leon I think you’re next.

Leon Ambia: Yes thank you, Leon from Mexico. Pretty much you’ve answered all the questions I had. So I want to thank you and just one last question. Yesterday I attended a session in which they were asking questions about how to make ICANN relevant and how to push ICANN to a more important position on an influence point of view. Are you reaching out to governments to push best practices and maybe these reports and studies that you are doing for all of us to influence the national laws or go further than just doing these reports and taking them to a global publication site or something like that? Are you trying to push these initiatives to local law to influence local governments?

Patrick Jones: We are available to provide guidance if asked. One of the things that we’ve done, there’s been an effort from ENISA, which is the European Network Information Security Agency, has done cyber exercises and preparedness within the European area and we’ve provided some involvement in the exercise development. We’ve done that within the United States context where there have been participants from Canada,
New Zealand, Australia and other countries. So from a cyber exercise standpoint we’re available to help develop an exercise and make it realistic and practical in how that might have implications on cyber security.

And one of the other areas where we’ve had quite a bit of involvement with the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative, we’re on their steering group. We provided a platform this week and through training, we did a training session at [CarribNOG] in Trinidad just a week or two ago before this meeting. We’ll be doing more training. And we do quite a bit of ccTLD training around DNS operations and preparedness, attack and contingency response efforts. So I think from an ICANN perspective we’re able to help and where different groups reach out to us, we’ve had a number of groups reach out to ask about DNSSEC training, “how can we get a basic understanding of what it means to implement this within our country code and within our region.” So that’s a starting point.

Jeff Moss: And building on that, in the last couple of months I’ve participated in a NATO exercise. I’ve participated with the World Economic Forum where they have a risk group that’s looking at ICT risks and they’re interested in a perspective of global threats to DNS. So we’re participating with the World Economic Forum. So a lot of different groups will come to us. Interpol is another group that we have a pretty close relationship with. They’re getting more and more involved in cybercrime norms, expected norms of behavior and so we’re providing them with advice. So we’ll play with anybody.
Janice Douma Lange: I just want to reinforce that one you’ve got an operating plan out for public comment and so to reinforce the idea that as an individual stakeholder in the ICANN community of which now stepping through the doors registering on Saturday and Sunday you’re now part of this community. And it’s very important, public comment I think is not taken sometimes as seriously as it should be. And this is your opportunity to step in and say this is what’s important to my region. And one of the things that I can say since being with ICANN since 2007, a year behind Patrick I think, is that even in the registry department Patrick has been, for lack of a better word I’m going to say cheerleader, but that’s really not the strong word I should use.

Someone who has stepped up into the ICANN staff and the executive team and said “we need to step out of our comfort zone and get out there and train.” “We need to get out there and be a part of the developing countries.” John Crane also, really pushing that and you need to push that. You need to ask for what you need in the 75 million dollar FY13 Budget. That’s decided now. It’s locked in through the vote on the 23rd. That doesn’t mean you stop commenting on the work of ICANN.

And that means that FY14 you need to make your voice heard now to say “I don’t think there was enough. I think that you should spend more money or more resources.” We benefit from your voice saying what you need in your community, be it training or intersession or whatever. So it’s really important to get into their website. And the other thing you get from that is understanding what it is that we can and cannot
step into. I think a lot of the questions this morning, and I learn every
time, I have to sit here and really listen because I realize that my work at
ICANN doesn’t naturally step into the zone very much and so I’ve got to
sit here and listen and say “wow I really wasn’t aware of what we do
done done.”

And by the Bylaws of ICANN we are constrained into certain things. And
you talk about relevance, I think we’ve become very relevant in the
world of security in my five and a half years here and I commend the
team that’s come in and done it. But we are constrained by Bylaws. It’s
just when people say “why aren’t you doing something about all the
crap that’s going on on the internet”; we don’t do content. And so you
always have to take a look as a new member in the community, study a
bit into this fantastic website that we have; it’s sometimes cumbersome
and you have to drag through a little bit. But look at what we can and
cannot do and then comment on it.

There are certain things the Bylaws aren’t going to allow us to go any
further, but you certainly are allowed to comment and if it’s not being
done it’s only your fault if you haven’t stepped in and stepped up.

Beran Gillen: My name is Beran Gillen. I’m from The Gambia. I just have a suggestion
really. You get a lot of requests on training, I’m thinking maybe a better
or more structured approach would be to actually come from having a,
we usually have these operator groups in a different region – the
AFNOG the Caribbean Operators Group – and during these trainings
that we have, through a two week process you have different African
countries coming together, the last one was held in The Gambia in May and we had 23 different African countries in one sitting.

So that would be a good way of actually getting these trainings done and hitting as many countries as possible. So this should be, I think it’s a bit more structured than dealing on an organization by organization basis or on a request basis.

Patrick Jones: So the Gambia training is a really good example because you may not have known that we did have someone there from ICANN, but that training we don’t say is ICANN training, we say that’s the AFNOG training and we’re just supportive of it.

Beran Gillen: But it’s a possibility because the training is very technical so you could have DNSSEC training squeezed in there somewhere. So it’s really a possibility, something you should look into because the demand is there.

Gary Campbell: Gary Campbell, Jamaica. We all agree, I would assume, that cybercrime is becoming more and more of a concern and more and more countries are trying to put in place measures to mitigate the impact of it. One such measure is the attempt by many countries to create a cert. I’m just wondering, because in Jamaica we are actually attempting to do the same thing, is there a practical role for ICANN being that international community is a rule for ICANN in this.
Patrick Jones: So the question is about certs and ICANN is a member of FIRST, the incidence response, and so we participate in their group and we provide advice to other certs if they have questions generally around DNS operations. And we internally operate our own emergency response team but only for our own operations. So I think there’s a role, it’s more as sort of an observer, but what we do is we pay attention to what a lot of the other certs are doing and what a lot of the operational security community is doing and if we see anything that seems to be affecting DNS, for example, we’re seeing a lot of botnets and malware that’s using these DGAs, these domain generated algorithms, where they’re using pre-computed domain names as a command and control channel for the bots to communicate.

And so what we’ll do is we will maybe do for example, we’ll work with say VeriSign and then they’ll pre-register the DGA domains so the bad guys can’t use them to communicate and then we’ll do price forgiveness essentially to VeriSign so they don’t have to pay us for registering the domains by the botnets. So there are ways in which we can operate.

Beran Gillen: Yeah I just wanted to add to what Gary said, actually again coming back to this AFNOG thing, we actually have a cert training that runs for a whole week. Maybe you should look into the Caribbean NOG, maybe they have something running during their operators group. So again, it comes back to the same thing, maybe we should actually look into having this training during that time because they fall into the same category.
Patrick Jones: Two weeks before this, or 10 days before the ICANN meeting CaribNOG was in Trinidad and we had two ICANN staff members and they did a whole day of DNSSEC training in addition to some DNS basics. So we did have someone at CaribNOG and I know there’s other trainings being planned with future network operator meetings and we definitely want to continue to do that.

Female: I think we all have kind of the same concern regarding if you say that your group is in charge of [maintaining the environment] for implementing law then training is a good start to make that possible, and requesting also ICANN Bylaws and their limits.

Male: Just a general comment, I’m from the law enforcement and I’ve seen that there are a lot of (inaudible) working for, at the end of the day, the police work we are looking for that law enforcement, is when we go to the WHOIS database at least we get information that helps us for investigation. I’m from the investigative part, I’m a technical person also. I’m the law enforcement for long and I’ve seen that through different instances the SSAC, I had a chat with one of the directors for the compliance team also. So we’ve seen at the level of ICANN there are a lot of [instances] working to get things for those registrants to comply with what they have to give as information.
And at the end of the day the low enforcement is looking forward to have this good data when we have to help the population At-Large, I mean internationally.

**Janice Douma Lange:** I think let’s take one more and then we’ll wrap up for the morning.

**Fedor Smirnov:** My name is Fedor Smirnov from Russia. I’m working in the cyber (inaudible) and I have a specific question concerning the critical infrastructure of the internet, just want to hear opinion of our security experts. On one hand we are facing a new gTLD program and the number of TLDs is increasing or viewed increased dramatically. On the other hand we see such things like cyber war as a concept. We see (inaudible), [anonymous] and things like that. What impacts will recent developments have on the critical structure in your opinion? Thank you.

**Jeff Moss:** Are you speaking specifically about the impact on the new gTLDs will be on the infrastructure?

**Fedor Smirnov:** Yes, together with other things that we are facing in the last time. We are seeing increasing activity of [activist] groups that we should take into account if we are thinking about stability of the internet.
Yes. Yes it is a big concern. That’s why we come here, that’s why we’re talking to different people. And I know that ICANN actually did publish a report, I think it was by the RSAC, was it not, the root servers, yeah the scaling because you had DNSSEC, IPv6, the new gTLDs and there was a concern that all of these things that are going on in the internet would have an impact, but they didn’t even consider some of the things that you’re considering, such as the cyberwars and some of the malicious attacks and so on and so forth. And obviously that’s putting a great strain.

And there were some concerns. There was a concern about taking a more measured approach into putting all of these things on the internet to make sure that it would remain robust and resilient. So there are concerns and people are looking at it, and we are concerned, especially with the new gTLDs. We have concerns about the current status of what’s on there already so when you start adding more, more means more problems. And we hope that’s not the case and we’ve worked with ICANN to try to ensure that it wouldn’t happen; more due diligence making sure that people who are going to be new registrars and registries are good people and are going to do the right thing.

And we’ve tried to take those safeguards and we just fingers crossed that does happen and I think ICANN is trying to take a lot of steps to make sure it happens. But we are engaged and looking at that, so yes, it is absolutely a concern and we are trying to take proactive steps to address that.
Janice Douma Lange: At that I’m going to say thank you, great questions around the table. And if you have any other questions for Jeff, Patrick or Bobby pass them through my email and I’ll make sure I get them to the gentlemen here. Also, again as we tell everybody we’re all busy in the hallways but if there is something and you can catch them they will certainly let you know if they’re on their way somewhere and can’t deal with it now to do a face to face. But thank you all very much for coming here this morning, this was excellent.

Mouhamet, I’m going to wrap up this session to let the GAC get started, but if you’d like to introduce yourself in the meantime that would be great. And then everyone we’re going to exit and please get your areas clean for the GAC to be able to step up to the table. And again, thank you very much.

Mouhamet Diop: Thank you Janice. My name is Mouhamet Diop, I’m from Senegal. I’m with the members from the selection committee and I’m running a registrar and one of the questions related to what you have already heard all morning regarding this law enforcement process is a critical issue that you really have to think about how you’re going to sort it out. Because a registrar is an official interface from ICANNs perspective to the registrant in the different area. And the lack of this infrastructure in developing countries is really a blocking point in order to implement the recommendation that has been raised and discussed this whole morning.

So I’m ready to discuss any of this issue that you want to talk to. It’s very hard to go through the process of becoming a registrar and for
people who get interested in becoming a registrar in the region where you are, so feel free to talk to me and we’ll see how we can help to achieve what we want to do.

Janice Douma Lange: Thank you Mouhamet and I wasn’t sure because I turned my back for a minute, Mouhamet is a member of our Fellowship Selection Committee and was a member of the ICANN Board previously and part of the local host committee for Senegal. So anytime you want to tap him for some information. Have a great day everybody, and welcome to the GAC.

[End of Transcript]