
BUENOS AIRES – Fellowship Morning Meeting
Wednesday, June 24, 2015 – 06:45 to 09:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: ...Started to publish work as the Public Report, and the two most recent ones are... One is actually still sitting in... No, that's not right. Ours is published, the RSSAC 001, which is a document that...

[Fellowship Morning 6-24-15 Lib C PART 2]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I should also mention that there is a distinction between the root server operators and RSSAC. RSSAC is an Advisory Body of ICANN. it produces advice, it generates output. It is not a way to mandate the root server operators to do something, because the root server operators operate without formal contracts with ICANN. It's a very old system. It's based on old agreements from up to possibly 30 years ago. It's been working well, it continues to work well. We are very dedicated to make sure we provide extremely good service as well as we can, all over the globe.

But if you want to reach the root server operators and have a dialogue with them, there is a webpage for the root server operators, which is separate from RSSAC. It's www.root-servers.org. It will be included in the slide set I will give to Janice to distribute between you. That's a page where you can see a map of the world, where all the installations

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

of root servers are marked, and you can also get the contact information for all the root server operators and get in touch with us, and we are happy to engage, we are happy to talk to you. We want to have information from the Internet, because that's how we know whether we are providing a good service or not.

I intend to stop there. Are there any questions?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: If I could? I do have one from the remote that's been waiting. Liman, if I could do this, from [Amrita]: "The operations and management of root servers has always been a concern for sovereigns. There are concerns the system is not transparent. Is the RSSAC taking some initiative to remove the myths surrounding the root servers?"

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. That is a question that always comes up. We are worried about this myth concept. We don't want to be a secret cabal in any way. We want your questions, we want to be able to answer them. One of the work items that's been proposed and that we are looking at launching a Work Party for in the Caucus is to try to find ways to provide more and better information about the root server system - easier to access, easier to understand easier to find, and hopefully be better at reaching out to people on how the system works and so on.

When it comes to sovereigns, it is in most cases a smaller problem than you might perceive. That said, several of the root server operators are quite open to help installing new server installations in countries and

places where there is no server today. Do contact the root server operators. This is also part of the information development we hope to undertake, to make it easier to see which root server operators can help you with this service, and how you can contact them, and what the requirements are for hosting a root server and so on. Yes, we are working on that. We hope to improve in the future. Please send us guidance on how we can improve on this. I'll let Janice handle the queue.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'm going to go with Kim, because she did have a question from the previous. On a time perspective, Kim I think is the only question we're going to be able to take. Liman, I think you're on your way to a meeting, so any other questions I can take, and I can email them to you, if that's okay?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Absolutely. Again, please do stop me in the corridor. I have meetings all day today, but tomorrow I have no meetings at all. I will be wandering the corridors like a ghost here. Please stop me and do ask your questions. I'm most happy to talk to you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Perfect. Kim?

KIM [HENDY]: HI. Kim [Hendy]. I was just wondering how many root servers are there? Who manages them? The operators in themselves, but as a body or something?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, it's each server operator, 12 organizations, they have a number of hosts deployed. Most of them have spread them all over the world. I think there are one or two exceptions that don't have multiple server installations. But each organization of these 12 operates their own subset of servers. We use a routing trick called Anycast. I'll use my own organization as an example. NetNode operates 1 root, and we have installations in roughly 55 places across the globe. All these servers have the same IP address. That's not supposed to work, but actually it does, and I'm happy to explain the technical details of why it works, but not here and now.

We manage 55 of the total number, and the total number is something like 350, deployed in many countries over the world, but each organization handles its own subsets, and they are not divided by region. We have servers in New Zealand, in India, in Japan, in Africa and South America, and so do the other operators. Even if our entire system would go out of service because we made a huge fuck up somewhere, or if we go bankrupt, there are still 11 other organizations that provide worldwide service. So you wouldn't even notice if we went out of business. You couldn't even see that, possibly, unless you were specifically looking at very specific technical details.

In total, over 300. We are looking at deploying more. Other server operators are also looking at deploying more, so there is not a direct limitation in how many servers in total we can deploy. It's more difficult to add more organizations that operate a service. That's a problem we'll have to address some time in the future.

KIM [HENDY]: Is there a body that brings them together? Do you meet and talk?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, there is a coordination body. It's not a body. We do coordinate, I should put it that way, because there is no organization for the root server operators. We are 12 organizations, but we coordinate closely on technical matters, and we meet three times per year. We do meet during the IETF Meetings because again these are technical people that typically attend the IETFs. We have very good discussions to ensure we provide the same service to all of you from all our servers. That said, we are very different organizations and that's good.

Our motto between the root server operators is, "Diversity is good." If we provide different types of services, that actually creates a more stable system. I'm afraid I'll have to say thank you at this moment, because we're meeting with another group so we have to run. Thank you very much. Again, do contact me and I'll send my presentation slides to Janice. [applause]

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We'll get those questions sent to you. I know there are quite a few. Please email me the questions that you had and I'll copy you on my email to Liman, so he can address you back directly. Now I'd like to move forward and introduce the Chair for the country code Naming Supporting Organization, the ccNSO, Byron Holland. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi. Good morning everybody. Thank you for welcoming me to your group. My name is Byron Holland. My day job, if you will, is as President and CEO of the Canadian Internet REGistration Authority. We are the organization that runs the Canadian top-level ccTLD, .ca. We are a full functioning registry, so we run all the DNS infrastructure that supports .ca as well as the registry itself, and we're also very involved in the Internet governance world, which is how I ended up being here in my role in ICANN, as Chair of the ccNSO, or the country code Name Supporting Organization.

Let me say, if I say something that is unclear, or you have a question, please feel free to ask as I'm speaking. We don't have to wait until the end. We are a community that has a lot of acronyms and very specialized bodies, so if any are unclear to you, please feel free to ask. The ccNSO is one of the few supporting organizations in the ICANN community, and we represent all the cc operators, like .ca. We're like .uk or like .br for Brazil.

IN the world, there are approximately 250 country and territory codes. AS you likely know, there are about 193 countries at the UN, so the difference between 193 and 250 is roughly the various territories in the

world. Of the 193 countries, 155 are Members of the ccNSO. The ccNSO is a voluntary group where we make voluntary financial contributions. Any cc manager can join the ccNSO and make a financial contribution based on their capacity to pay. We make those financial contributions directly to ICANN.

The ccNSO is a little unique in that we do do policy work, but nowhere near what a body like the GNSO does. We, in the cc community, are not contracted parties. That is a very key differentiator between us and the gTLD operators, and typically the folks in the GNSO. That is, in a sense, part of our historical legacy. Cc operators in their country are bound by national law, national jurisdictions, and we are typically the reflection of our national Internet communities.

Because we are subject primarily or exclusively to national jurisdiction, national legislation, and there are elements of sovereignty associated with a cc, we cannot be bound by essentially a corporate agreement with a foreign corporation, ICANN. So we are significant participants in the ICANN community, but for those basic reasons we are not a contracted party - none of us are contracted parties to ICANN. That is a key thing to remember when it comes to the ccNSO. The other thing about the ccNSO is that we don't do many specific policy development processes.

That is also as a result of the fact that we are bound by our own international legislation and national Internet environments. There are very few global policies that would apply to all cc's in the world. In fact, there are very few. One of them would be around

internationalized domain names. That's something all cc's could support, but quite frankly even if we had a common issue, we would typically have a unique flavor based on our given country. Yes, you have a question?

NAVEED:

Sorry to intervene. My name is Naveed, I'm from Pakistan. I just want to know your take on the difference between a ccTLD being owned by a state and by a private owner, and what impact do you see it can create? We have ccTLDs we own by state, as an ALS, compared to being run by somebody who's not part of the state. I just wanted to know the difference it can create eventually?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sure. That's a great question, and that's one of the other reasons why it's difficult, if not impossible, for us to have many common policies, and another one of the nuances of why we can't be contracted to a company. Essentially that is cc operators or cc managers typically have a company or corporation governance structure that is unique to the needs of that country, of that Internet community. For instance, in Canada the Internet community got together, and that included civil society, private sector, the industry, governments and other actors, and came together in the late 1990s to decide how best Canadian Internet users would be served when it came to the cc.

In our case, a private, not-for-profit corporation was set up, that was a special corporation just to run the .ca. We have a very diverse

multistakeholder board and governance overlay. That's how Canada decided to do it - private, not-for-profit corporation. As you just said, there are many others. Certainly some are run by the governments, out of some government department. Some are run by universities. Very few, but there are several that are private, for-profit corporations.

So there's a wide variety of different governance structures, as well as business models. Until very recently, Argentina in fact gave away domains - charged nothing for Argentinian citizens to get a .ar. They have relatively recently changed that policy and now charge, but the point is there are also very different business models for running cc's. In terms of what are the differences, I would say clearly a cc that's run out of a government department, completely controlled by government, is going to be a very different kind of cc than one like mine, which is really a private sector oriented one that's extremely responsive to our customers, because we eat what we kill.

If we don't sell domain names, we don't earn money to run the DNS infrastructure, the registry, et cetera. I would say just on the pure customer service side there is probably a difference there. Our ability to create policy internally depends to a great degree on what the Internet community in Canada wants. We do survey research, we have open comment periods. There are many different ways that we get Canadian input into issues where we're going to develop a policy. If you're a government-oriented cc you may do that, but you also have the power just to enact policy.

So there are various flavors. In terms of the ccNSO, we also have two constituency days, which are Tuesday and Wednesday of every week. As I mentioned, we don't develop a lot of policy. PDPs tend to be infrequent and large-scale. Much of what we do is share and exchange best practice, at a technical level, at an operational level, at a business level. Most of us all have registrars in-country, so we also share and exchange best practice or war stories about dealing with our registrars. Often the ccNSO Meetings are more about an exchange of expertise, and an exchange of knowledge.

Because we don't compete with each other, it tends to be a very collegial environment where the willingness to share and exchange experiences is very high. That's very helpful in the community, because as operators we are constantly subject to various threats. All day, every day, my registry is under attack, and for my colleagues around the world, it's the same for them. Because we don't compete, we tend to be much more open with each other about what's happening, and therefore the ability to exchange expertise and knowledge is very high. That's another one of the significant values of the ccNSO for the Members, the 155 Members.

Within ICANN, we are a very active SO. We have a number of Working Groups that are in flight or ongoing at any given time. One of them that has developed over time, in much of the community - inside the ccNSO but outside - pay close attention to and follow, is something called the Strategic and Operational Plan Working Group. That Working Group is a ccNSO Working Group that follows the ICANN strategic planning process and Annual Operating Plan and Budget.

As the saying goes, if you really want to understand what an organization is doing, follow the money, because that in a sense gives you a very clear idea of where the organization is focusing its attention. Our what we call the SOP Working Group does a very detailed independent analysis of the ICANN budget and the ICANN Strategic Plan. It's done so for about five years, so has a longitudinal track record and history of doing that, and has been able to also make comment now on trends over time that we see.

The other thing that I think is interesting about the ccNSO, about something like the SOP, is that most of us in that community come as CEOs of organizations or leaders of an organization. So we run our own companies, and that inherently provides a perspective on how ICANN is run. The Members of the SOP are typically all CEOs of organizations and bring that lens and that insight to examining ICANN's budgets, operating plans, resource allocation. I'd say we're quite an independent, neutral group. We don't have an axe to grind.

We're two things: we don't have a contract and we don't do policy with ICANN, so we're very independent. We're not here trying to get something or trying to push a particular view or perspective. That allows us to be, as a community, quite independent and neutral regarding what ICANN is doing - how they're spending their money, what their budget looks like. We're also not afraid to be a critic of it. Again, we bring a lens to what ICANN is doing that I think is unique, and we have been very strongly critical over the years on certain issues.

The good news is ICANN is most definitely getting better. We've seen significant improvements over the last five years. But there's still work to be done. That's an example of one of the types of things that happens inside the ccNSO, but is followed and watched by all the other communities, because we tend to make that submission and other communities will follow on from that. In fact, even ICANN itself, who was somewhat resistant to this process five years ago, now invites us in, asks us for suggestions on how they can improve, they provide feedback on our inputs.

So the overall relationship, the overall behavior and the overall standards and quality of where ICANN is going, from a strategy, operating plan and budget has improved dramatically over the past five years. That's the kind of contribution that we can make, we the ccNSO, given our unique status inside ICANN, and given the folks who are typically the ccNSO Members. So that I think hopefully provides a broad overview of the ccNSO and the types of things we do. Of course, the critical issues for us right now are what's happening with the IANA transition as well as the accountability track.

The IANA transition is particularly important to our community. I would go so far as to say it's almost an existential issue for cc managers, because IANA in essence is our number one supplier. They provide the most important resource for us, and that's essentially access to the root. How cc's come into being, how they're delegated to a particular manager, how they're re-delegated to somebody else if that should happen, or how one would be retired... If a country ceases to exist, what happens to that country code?

If you look at what was Czechoslovakia and now it's two countries, how do you create a new country code? That's one issue itself. Then if a government or private operator or one of those governance structures I've talked about, if the Internet community in a country, however that's decided, says, "We need to move the operations from one operator," - say in Canada, the Internet community said, "We don't like CIRA anymore, they're not behaving right. We need to move the operations to some other provider," how does that actually happen? Who gets to say that? What are the checks and balances?

That's at the essence of what we, as the cc manager does. All of that happens inside IANA. There's an operational part, and there's a policy part. But in a sense it has a significant impact on the destiny of a country code manager. So what happens in the stewardship transition is of critical importance to us. Let me bring you back to something else I said - we don't have contracts with ICANN. So the essence of what we do is being changed, and the oversight and backstop method we've known for all time, the US Government, is pulling out.

If we don't have contracts with ICANN, how can we be assured that the IANA functions will continue to happen at the very high quality level they do today, and that nothing bad can happen to us as cc managers from a delegation/re-delegation standpoint? We pay very, very close attention to the IANA stewardship transition issue. We were one of the chartering organizations for the CWG, the Cross Community Working Group on IANA stewardship transition. One of the Co Chairs is a cc manager, and we are very, very active in that space.

The one thing I can also say is while my community has not voted to approve it yet, if you're interested we have all-day meetings today on it, and we have our Council Meeting at 17:00 today where we will vote on whether to support the proposal or not. I feel optimistic about it, but I may be the Chair of the ccNSO but I am only one Member of 155. My vote has no more power than the other 154 Members. We will see, but I do feel optimistic about our support on it. That's a critical issue for us right now.

The other one of course is the work of the CCWG on Accountability, which we are also very deeply involved in, also a chartering organization, and also one of the Co Chairs is a country code Member. Please?

KIM [HENDY]:

In the new model, or maybe it's not decided and you can't say it, but would the ccNSO look at having them contracted with the new ICANN - with the new ICANN, with the IANA functions? Or is that not...?

BYRON HOLLAND:

No. We tend to guard our position and essentially our sovereignty very strongly, and because of some of those different governance models, some are operated by governments. Governments inherently are not going to enter into a contract with a foreign corporation, so it makes it impossible for us, as a cc community, to do contracts as a policy. There are a couple of cc operators who have contracts, but in essence

they're trying to unwind them over time and move to the kind of arrangement that most of us have, which is an informal arrangement.

We may have an exchange of letters or some document that says we acknowledge each other, but that's about it. Sir?

SPEAKER: Do your or your Members have any impact yet on the New gTLD Program? My name is [unclear 00:30:52], sorry. I'm from Argentina.

BYRON HOLLAND: Some of our Members are involved in gTLDs in different ways, usually as what we would call back-end operators or service providers for registries, but there's only a small handful, a few of them. So generally speaking, we as cc operators have not made any comment on gTLDs, and certainly as the ccNSO, we have remained silent on gTLDs because we don't feel it's our place to comment on that side of the house.

SPEAKER: Maybe I didn't ask that well. What I was asking is on the amount of domains registered. Are they reducing, or...?

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, sorry, I misunderstood your question. Almost all legacy ccTLD managers, and gTLDs actually, are experiencing significant declines in growth rates. Again, I'll use my ccTLD, but mine is a common story. In 2010 the growth rate of .ca was 18 per cent. Today we'll be lucky if this

year we are at five per cent, and we are one of the top five fastest growing registries in the world, at five per cent. A lot of the bigger ones you may know - Germany, .de, .uk, .nl, the Netherlands -some of the biggest ones, they're at zero, or what we would call a technical crossover where growth hits zero or below. So most of the legacy registries are at zero, approaching zero, or headed to zero.

When I look at essentially the growth curve over time, the whole industry, not just cc operators, the whole industry will cross over. GTLDs will do it roughly in 2017. CcTLDs will do it roughly in 2018, and of course it depends which one you're talking about, but as an industry the legacy operators will go to zero growth in 2017, 2018. Canada, because we're one of the fastest-growing ones, I might push it out to 2019, 2020, before we go to zero, but I can see the future, and that's what the future is for us.

In part it's maturation of the industry. It's been a very fast-growth industry for 15 years, and like any industry that grows very quickly and is new, it levels off. So part of it is strictly a maturation issue, and part of it is it's been the same group of players for all time, and now you're introducing hundreds of new suppliers, or 1,000 new suppliers. Inherently that impacts the rest of us, and we can feel it dramatically, and that is the kind of number that we're talking about. 2010, 18 per cent growth. Today, five per cent, tomorrow zero.

WANDA:

Wanda, Dominican Republic in the Caribbean. I was asking myself if the territory domains will be related with a country code. TLDs for

example in my country, Dominicana is usually the name we use to refer to our country, but we can also use “Quisqueya”, as anybody knows that is almost the same. Will the country code .do be the one that is in charge of any territory, specifically to my country? Or can anybody request in this new gTLD request for a territory country code domain?

BYRON HOLLAND:

The rules are on country codes. What exactly the country code is is very specific. It's based off the UN list, so you can't just make one up that... Even if it's in common use as a phrase or identifier, if it's not on the UN country and territory list, it's not a country code, period. Typically the way it works for a country code is the delegation of authority to operate a country code flows through the government of the land, and then the government delegates the authority to operate it to whoever the operator is, whoever the manager is.

How those relationships happen is different in every country. Sometimes the government is stronger, more active, sometimes almost no involvement. But at the end of the day, with very rare exception, delegation of authority to operate a country code flows through the government that then picks a way to run it. No, there are no cc's except what's on the list from the UN, and they're always two-letter.

That's why to the right of the dot, if it's two letters it's a country code, period. That's why generics are all three-letters or more. Nobody gets a two-letter except cc operators, and the cc only comes from the UN list. That's it, or at least that's the way it is today. Sir?

SPEAKER: [unclear]. Is there any country in the world without a cc domain name? A country code? If there are any, why?

BYRON HOLLAND: Let me be clear. Every country has a country code assigned to it. Whether they choose to operationalize it or run a registry, that's different. Some countries don't for various reasons - typically if they're in significant turmoil or at war, they don't spend their time running registries. So there are definitely some countries in the world where their country code doesn't have a presence. But every country gets one. What they do with it, that's up to the country. Last question.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We need to get other speakers up as well.

SPEAKER: [unclear 00:38:30] from Brazil. I just wanted to know, you said that every country gets a code, what they do with it... What happens when you have, for example, two cases: countries that change - for example Yugoslavia is no longer Yugoslavia -, and codes that end up not meaning really a country, like .co, and others that may be used for other purposes such as commercialization, like .tk. Could you comment on that?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sure. When a country dissolves or ceases to be, like Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia, there is a process loosely defined. It's something we're working on, because a process isn't just clear, or the policy isn't as clear as it should be. We as a cc community have done a lot of work in this space, but countries that cease to be have their country codes retired. This is tied to that UN list. Any cc where the country ceases to exist, the UN country code is reserved for 50 years. It can never be used again for 50 years, in the global ecosystem, outside the Internet.

Right now inside the Internet, we don't actually have a time on that. We've figured roughly ten years, but there is not specific policy on that, and that's one of the things that we're developing. We're asking ourselves why should it be any different than what the UN time is, when it's suspended from any further use. So a cc of a country that ceases to be is retired, and right now it could come back after about ten years, but the policy isn't clear. That's what happens on that front.

When countries come into being, like the Czech Republic in this instance, the UN provides a new global country code, and that's what we use, and we go through a process through IANA where the code is delegated and put in the root. That's roughly what happens there. In terms of some cc operators who've chosen to be more commercial, that's their choice. Because cc's are responsive to their national environments, not some greater authority like ICANN, we respond to what our countries ask of us. In some cases they decide to make it about generating revenue, and in some cases it's there for other reasons.

Again, that goes back to cc managers don't typically comment on the way other cc's elect to operate themselves, because that's for the country to decide. I shouldn't be commenting on the way Iran runs their registry, just the same as I probably wouldn't take a lot of advice from Iran on how I run my registry. That's a dynamic inside the ccNSO. With that, I'll have to go.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you so much. We could do this for hours on end, I know that we could. So thank you so very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Have a great day.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Now we'd like to welcome two of our own. Serena and Jesus will be talking to us about the GAC, the Government Advisory Committee.

JESUS RIVERA: Good morning dear colleagues. I'm going to talk to you today in Spanish, evidently, and I assume that you are already bored this morning and tired. I regret that we have to end your day with government business, but please pay attention to this because Janice, in the final exam we'll have tomorrow, she'll definitely ask a question regarding the GAC. Let us introduce this graph. You all need to know this information because it's something that allows to have a better

outlook and to get to know this very complex world of the multistakeholder model in ICANN.

I didn't introduce myself. My name is Jesus Rivera. I'm from Venezuela. I currently work at the Telecommunications Regulator Entity that is dependent on the Ministry where the ccTLD .ve is also present. In these ICANN Meetings, my colleagues and I monitor both the GAC and the issues that Byron Holland has just explained, from the ccNSO. We monitor this because we have the responsibility of managing and controlling the .ve domains.

When Janice talked to Serena and me about being present here to talk about the GAC, we felt happy because usually those who stand here are people who are representatives of the community - they are community leaders. So we accepted the challenge, and our idea is to provide you with some messages of what the GAC is, and why it is that ICANN needs a Governmental Advisory Committee. Why is it that governments are present in these meetings?

Aside from the technical community there is the need that governments be present here. ICANN is not the only entity at the world level dealing with Internet issues. There are other organizations. There is the International Communication Union - this is a UN agency - that also deals with Internet policy issues. There is an inner relation now. Last year in 2014 there was a plenipotentiary ITU Meeting, which created a lot of resolutions related to the different organizations in Internet governance for joint work.

So there is an interaction between governments here in ICANN and public policy created at other agencies, such as the ITU, other organizations, WIPO - and so what we do here at the GAC is we meet three times a year, together with ICANN Meetings at the same time, and at each meeting we hold meetings. We start on Saturday afternoons to discuss issues related to different public policies and public policy design in the domain name system.

You should take some notes on this, because we may ask about this at the exam. This is something I asked yesterday, but this is updated every meeting. There are 152 Member States at the GAC. The number of representatives - they do not always attend one meeting a year - but many of you here probably wonder if their government is a Member of the GAC. You can access that information on the GAC webpage. Let me remind you that I sent all of you a summary with the relevant issues concerning the GAC.

So what does the GAC generate at the ICANN level? We make recommendations or provide advice to send these to the ICANN Board. This is where you see the GAC. What we do is we make recommendations and send them to the ICANN Board. Then the Board will review all those issues, and they can approve the recommendations, or if there are any other issues, this can be sent back to the GAC for further discussion in case there is no consensus. The GAC works by consensus.

Countries meet through the different works, they submit different issues in the agenda, and then this is decided by consensus. There is

no individual opposition of any government. Now, as for the meetings, how can you become a Member of the GAC? You just send a letter to the Chair of the GAC. The current Chair is from Switzerland, Mr Thomas Schneider. The Chair lasts for two years. He has a two-year term. We have five Vice Chairs. This is another question that I'm sure will appear in tomorrow's exam. There is one Chair and five Vice Chairs.

Vice Chairs usually have a term for one year. They can be re-elected. The current Vice Chairs are Argentina, if I'm not mistaken, Spain, Namibia, Turkey, and the other one is... It's Spain, right? Those are the Vice Chairs. It may be a little boring. Please raise your hands, those of you who've entered at least one GAC Meeting this week. Okay. That's important, because it's the only way, aside from standing here and speaking, for you to see if you are interested or if there's someone from your government that will allow you to interact.

The idea of following up is to engage and participate. We create a lot of documents. Now I'm going to give the floor to Serena so that she can refer to some of the issues now being dealt with on the GAC Agenda. There is basically the governments, usually telecom regulators, ministries, foreign affairs ministries, aside from some other relevant agencies from each government. They're all appointed to participate in the meeting.

I provided you with a link a few days ago, or you can just access the ICANN website, where you can see for each country we list the representative. So you can get to know who, or which agency from your country, is involved. There usually is a main delegate and an

alternate delegate that is involved in the meetings. By the end of each meeting we create or draft a special communication that is the result of all the resolutions. It just shows all the issues in the Agenda and their results.

There are also joint meetings. The GAC meets with the ccNSO, and with the different committees, because there are relevant issues that may be interesting for everybody. We hold meetings with the different communities such as the ccNSO, the ASO and the GNSO, and we also hold meetings together with the ICANN Board. Serena, do you want to say something in addition to this? Please?

SERENA:

Good morning everyone. Again, my name is Serena [unclear 00:52:47]. I work for the Romanian Parliament. I am on the GAC, as a representative of my country, but I'm also a Fellow. Jesus has given you a quite comprehensive overview of what GAC is doing, so I will try to keep things short and leave room for questions. Just two things I want to clarify. First, I got a very good question this morning from someone in this room about GAC and what exactly we are doing, and there is one thing we actually need to clarify.

GAC is not an inter-governmental organization in the strict sense of the word. We only provide advice to the GAC Board on issues related to what ICANN is doing. We are not discussing things that governments are doing in their countries. We do not do recommendations for governments, we do not do treaties, or this kind of thing. We are not

UN, we are not WIPO, we are not those organizations. Whatever we do is only related to providing advice to the Board.

About this advice, as Jesus mentioned, the advice sent by the GAC to the Board is not compulsory. The Board can decide not to follow that advice, and in that instance it needs to enter into discussions with the GAC to try to find a common position. This has happened before, for example during the discussions on the New gTLD Program. We called them outstanding problems between the GAC and the Board. There was a special meeting when the Board met the GAC. It was in Brussels, in 2011, for I think three days, when we were actually discussing those things and we tried to come up with a common position.

These things happen. The Board is not always following the GAC advice as the GAC is providing it. One example I'm going to give you, again related to the New gTLD Program, is as you know there have been some applications for some strings like .bank, .pharmacy and .lawyers, and these represent regulated sectors in some country. For example, if you are a bank, you necessarily have to have some authorizations and this kind of thing in your country.

What happens if we have .bank as an open registry? How is this affecting consumer trust, fraud and these kinds of things? This was one issue that the GAC was trying to provide advice on, and one advice we were having was for registries to ask for registrants to provide credentials - to actually demonstrate that the person registering a domain name under .bank is actually a bank. Our request was for the registry to do this verification.

Now, this advice went to the Board, and the Board decided this would complicate things for the registry and it would somehow be very difficult - let's not say impossible - because of matters of jurisdictions and this kind of thing. The Board decided to make another suggestion based on the advice of the GAC, and this was in terms of the registrar... I hope you know the difference between registry, registrar and registrant? Should I try to... Okay, so I'm not going there.

The proposal again from the Board was for the registrar to ask the registrant, just to give a declaration at the moment of registration that they have the credentials, and then create a mechanism for complaints, but not actually verify those credentials. Again, this is an instance of the Board taking advice from the GAC and trying to change it in a way that the Board sees fit. Now we're still discussing about these issues and whether they are okay or not from a governmental perspective. This is just for you to see that whatever GAC is saying is not set in stone, and it can be further discussed.

I think I will stop here, because we are close to finishing. But please ask us questions now, or find us around. We have a full GAC Day today. We also meet tomorrow in the morning. We are downstairs. Feel free to ask us or approach us at any time.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We are going to take two questions and then we're going to wrap up. The next session does need to start a conference call, which takes time. Let's start.

ISRAEL: Hi. I'm Israel from Mexico, but I'll speak in Spanish. Considering that the GAC recommendations and advice is not always taken by the Board based on the number of votes, sometimes with no explanation based on the number of votes at the Board, have you seen that this has an impact on governments' participation at the GAC, considering this lack of what we may call lack of relationship with what happens in other organizations, such as the International Labor Organization? Do you think this may prevent countries from participation, or may discourage them from participating?

JESUS RIVERA: No. In general terms this does not happen. We cannot say that there is discouragement, because first of all you have to be present. There is an increased presence. We see the curve. It's a growing curve; if you consider the number of participants, the number of countries. The [ALO 00:58:29] will turn 150 years and there are 193 Member States. At the GAC there are 152, so if you have a look at the curve it's a growing curve.

I personally think - I cannot talk on behalf of all countries - but I think that it is no concern as to the fact that if the ICANN Board does not take the GAC's advice, that will discourage countries from participating. The goal is participation. The trend is participation, and we see there is an increase in the number of participants. I have met colleagues here, I've participated in a lot of things - in the Telecommunication Union, because I'm a telecommunication engineer, and I've seen

regulatory issues, telecommunication issues, and I've seen lots of things from the ITU who are now participating here. I personally think there is more participation.

[MIGUELE NASTRADA]: [00:59:46] from NIC Argentina. I have two brief questions. Number one, are you dealing with .fk or .gs? Then are you the first Venezuelan participant?

JESUS RIVERA: As for the second question, we started participating last year. We joined the GAC very recently. We joined the GAC in ICANN 50 in London. That's when we officially joined the GAC. A colleague of mine sometimes replaces me and we continuously follow up on things. Maybe Serena can answer the other part of your question. While we're here to help you today, at any time, just take our questions into account in your final exam.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: It's really [unclear 01:00:55] when we are seeing our Fellows moving up, as they have been in the community, and I really appreciate and respect Serena and Jesus. Thank you so very much. Y'all have a great day. Get on out.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]