
HYDERABAD – Public Forum 1
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 17:00 to 18:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, ICANN board chairman, Dr. Stephen Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN57 public forum. This is pretty much of an open mic session where all of you, as well as those monitoring the online stream, can ask questions of the board.

The public forum is intended as your opportunity to interact in a very unfiltered way directly with the board.

Those of you who have been coming know that the public forum has evolved over the years, and at ICANN 55 in Marrakech we began a new format in accordance with recommendations of the community and specifically the meetings strategy working group.

We now have two public forums. Today's will run about 90 minutes, and then we'll have another one on Tuesday which will run about two hours.

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.

I've told you what the public forum is. Now let me tell you what it is not.

Not intended to be a replacement for public comments that ICANN seeks on various issues and policies. If you want to weigh in on a specific issue that is up for public comment, we invite you to use our online system.

It is the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from appropriate committees, supporting organizations, and staff members.

So with that, let me turn things over to my colleague, Asha Hemrajani, who will give you an overview of the agenda for this specific public forum.

Asha?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Steve.

Before I detail the agenda for this session, allow me to make a few remarks in Hindi. Since Hindi is not one of the United Nations languages, what I say will not be simultaneously translated but projected on the screen.

[Speaking in Hindi]

[Applause]

Now allow me to lay out what will happen in this session.

Those of you who were in the Marrakech meeting may recall that in the first public forum, we heard brief five-minute reports from representatives of each of the advisory committees and the supporting organizations. We got some favorable community response to that, and so we will be doing the same thing during this session.

The AC/SO representatives are seated at both ends of this table. Ah, at one end of this table. Hello.

Additionally, we will hear from each of the AC/SO representatives.

My colleague, Bruce Tonkin, will also do a five-minute report on the board's priorities for this meeting.

Following Bruce's remarks, we will then use the remaining time in this session to take your questions and comments.

As Steve mentioned, while both questions and comments will be accepted, we prefer to take your questions.

We will attempt to find answers to any questions we cannot answer, and we'll address those at the second public forum on Tuesday.

Allow me at this point to show you the standards of behavior which you'll see projected on the screen.

The bottom line is that we request that you be respectful to all the speakers during this session.

With that, I will hand it over to my esteemed colleague, Kuo-Wei Wu, who will explain how we will field today's questions. Kuo-Wei?

KUO-WEI WU:

Thanks, Asha. You know, this is my last meeting as ICANN board, so they give me the privilege to start something.

I think, first of all, in here there is two microphones but I only see one there. Where is the second one?

Okay. And when you are ready, you can queue up for your questions.

And remote participants, you know, you can participate and also ask questions through the Adobe chatroom or email to engage@icann.org.

And the public forum producer, Brad White -- where is Brad is? Okay. Over there (indicating).

And he sit here in the front and of course he will read your question out.

In the past, we do have remote video hub. People could, you know, ask their questions. And that is no joke. We are not doing this in these sessions because the equipment that we need for those hubs was delayed when a cargo ship carrying the equipment is on fire over there in Germany.

So when you are asking the questions, the board facilitator will then decide who might be best for your answer and we also have the opinion to direct your question to, you know, one of the AC or SO leader.

Now the rules covering this session. Similar like the past, when you speak, please remember three things. Speak slowly, clearly -- not like my voice -- and give your name and also who you represent for.

In order for the board to hear from as many as possible, everyone remember there is two opportunities to speak. Your first comment will be limited for two minutes. A countdown timer -- and I think you will see it later -- will be used. And the board response will be also in two minutes.

If you have a follow-up questions, again you have a limit for two minutes. And also, the same as to the board member.

Now, let's begin the AC/SO briefing with the first presenter. I think that should be Alan Greenberg from ALAC. Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Kuo-Wei.

The At-Large community is charged with representing the interests of end users within ICANN. Now, that's a bit of a challenge. There's about 3 1/2 billion of them. And on occasion people ask us do we send email to every one of them and read the answers, and the question is of course yes, we do.

No, seriously, the real challenge is how do we do that.

The physical embodiment of at-large is a somewhat complex structure. The ALAC is the part within -- that actually operates within ICANN as the advisory committee representing the users.

We are regionally organized and we have regional at-large organizations -- RALOs -- in each of the five ICANN regions, and each of the RALOs has a very imaginative name, "At-large Structures," ALSs.

Currently there's 211 of them in 95 countries.

So it's a complex structure, it's multilevel, it's large, and the real question is: How do we make it work?

Well, there are challenges. Around the world, lots of people are interested in the Internet. That's clear. There are a lot fewer who are interested in ICANN and what we do.

If you take someone who is English speaking, technically knowledgeable, well educated, and show them some of the stuff we take about here, their eyes will roll up into their heads and they -- it has very little meaning.

When you add into that the fact that many of the people we're dealing with do not have English as a first language, and in many cases do not speak English at all, it's an interesting challenge and it's one that we have lots of fun working with.

Now, we understand the issues and we are -- you know, we've put in place lots of processes in terms of education and capacity building to make sure that the people we're dealing with in the remote areas actually have some idea of what we're talking about and can give us feedback. It's a work in progress. It's -- it's not an easy thing.

Sorry.

The kinds of topics that we look at -- and we were asked to list three of them and -- two or three, and that's not really possible. There's just too many areas that we cover because we span all of ICANN.

Certainly accountability these days is something that's important. ICANN policy affects every one of the 3 1/2 billion Internet users, and it's essential that policy is set in ways that

those users' needs, and not only those of the domain industry or other people who are involved in ICANN, are really considered. And to ensure that that happens, ICANN has to be open, transparent, and diverse, and so transparency and accountability is very important to us, because it's the lifeblood which allows us to participate within ICANN.

A lot of what ICANN does is gTLD, global top-level domains, and we are involved in most of that. We're looking at the issues related to the first round. We're looking at how gTLDs may be released in the future. And of course another topic is the WHOIS.

WHOIS is a very critical area for us because in addition -- you know, the rules set for WHOIS govern privacy, to what extent are we going to reveal information about users publicly, and at the same time WHOIS is used by law enforcement and other groups to control malicious activity.

So users have an interest in both, and balancing the two is going to be critical, so we're a very active player in those areas.

We're proud of the fact that we are in 95 countries right now, but there's a few more countries left, and one of our jobs is to try to spread the network and to make sure that we're covered in all regions so we can fairly represent them.

And of course overcoming the barriers I talked about before to make sure that people can really engage and affect what we do within ICANN.

Thank you.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Alan. Our next presenter from the AC/SO community will be Thomas Schneider from the GAC. Thomas?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes.

Hello and good afternoon everybody. My name is Thomas Schneider. I'm currently the chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee, and the Governmental Advisory Committee is consisting of currently 170 members and around 35 observers, so we're getting larger and larger and it's quite a challenge to manage this.

The Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC, is part of the multistakeholder model of ICANN. We are here to support ICANN in fulfilling its mission that I won't repeat because I guess you all know it. We are supporting ICANN in living up to its core values as they are named in the bylaws. In particular, let me just refer to Core Value 2, which says, "Seeking and supporting broad,

informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making to ensure that the bottom-up multistakeholder policy development process is used to assert in the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent."

We have a specific role in ICANN which is according to the bylaws that the governmental advisory should consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN's policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues.

And according to the bylaws, ICANN should duly take into account this public policy advice.

The way that the GAC has traditionally understood this role is to give advice on a rather general policy level and leave the details of how to implement to ICANN.

This is also in line with the agreement achieved at the U.N. World Summit on the Information Society in Tunis in 2005 that basically says that the governments have a role with regard to public policy and international law aspects related to Internet governance, but that they should not enter into day-to-day

operational and technical matters that do not have public policy implications.

So these are in private hands here in ICANN.

Governments usually work in a completely different environment with a quite different culture of communicating and of formulating issues.

Working here in this multistakeholder model in ICANN is not only interesting and fascinating, but it also poses a challenge for us as governmental representatives but also for the rest of the community to merely understand each other, understand our messages, our concerns, our issues. So we have all been working hard in the past years to better understand each other and we will have to and we will continue to do so.

The governments are also trying to engage as early as possible in all stages and relevant aspects of ICANN's work. Although we note that this is a challenge, given the workload and the complexity and the amazing amount of processes and subprocesses and subprocesses of subprocesses, in particular for smaller governments, for smaller countries or less resourced countries that struggle to even cope with finding out or knowing what is going on.

I would like to end with saying that we support the IANA transition and the new accountability mechanisms and we are currently trying to figure out how to contribute to serving the public interest in these new structures among all the other work.

Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you, Thomas.

We will now hear from Tripti Sinha, co-chair of the Root-Server System Advisory Committee.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you.

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Tripti Sinha, co-chair of the Root-Server System Advisory Committee along with Brad Verd, my colleague. A few quick words on what the RSSAC is.

We are an advisory committee to the board and to the ICANN community and advise on matters related to the root server system. And we're comprised of a very well-defined group: the 12 operators who operate the root server system, as well as the root zone administrator and IANA functions operator. Root zone maintainer now, since post-IANA transition.

So our charter really is to issue advice, and the way we issue advice is we're approached by the board and others with questions that we need to answer, and we also issue advice in the form of information that we would like to share with the community.

So we've been asked to present what have been our high-priority items, and for the last year, our primary focus has been on three top topics: Accountability, continuity, and evolution.

These are three questions that have been asked consistently of the RSSAC over the past many years, and we decided to put our entire focus on this and we did so using the modality of workshops.

So we held our first workshop about a year and a half -- year -- 13 months ago now, and the focus is essentially to look at evolution and ask the questions of who are we accountable to and how do we ensure continuity of service and what does our future look like.

The future of the root server system is what I'm referring to.

So we embarked upon three workshops. We've had three workshops thus far. September 2015, followed by one in May 2016, and we recently concluded another in October 2016.

So we went down the path of inquiring as to what is -- what does evolution look like. And in doing so we decided to understand the future we must understand how we got here first. So we went into the past and looked into this history of what the root server system -- how it began, how it evolved, and what it looks like today, and what's expected in the future. Along the way we have been answering questions related to accountability and continuity. We've produced a total of seven documents that speak to the result thus far, and I would like to urge you to go to our website and look at the documents that we've produced thus far. The first is the history document, a very good read, if you would like to understand the history. It goes right back to the early days of how the root server system evolved. And it was a flat file to respond to inquiries. And today it's this very massive, complex system. I urge -- we just approved it. It should be available soon, and I urge you to take a look at it.

We've come out with what we call a client-side reliability statement which essentially says that we, the root server operators, are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace and do so without modifying any of the data which is signed by using DNSSEC. Once again, this statement is available on our website.

Another statement that we came out with recently was the impact on the unavailability of DNS root services should one of

the root server systems go offline. We've done some good studies on available data, and we've concluded in the nature of how the system is architected, it is fairly resilient and has suffered continuous uninterrupted service since its inception.

And we could highlight three criteria that help us do that. One is that it's a highly redundant system. It is Anycasted globally. It has an inbuilt caching function which further addresses the ability to stay resilient, to stay up at all times. And also the ability of the DNS protocol which allows you to go from if one particular server is not responding to you, you go to yet another. And since we are Anycasted in the manner that we are, the service is, indeed, very resilient. But we continue to keep our eye on this resilience because the world has changed and there are many, many threats out there that continue to come our way.

And we also released a statement on the key technical elements of what potential root server operators look like. So today there are 12 of us. And, you know, we don't know what the future holds for us. But it would be good to start to document what potential future operators look like. So we recently approved, just yesterday, indeed, this document which is, again, available and I urge you to read that as well.

All the reports that we have published are available and we just concluded our workshop two weeks ago, the third workshop. And I'd like to say a few words about what we've done in that workshop.

So we took the approach of elevating ourselves to looking at the work we do from a 50,000-foot abstracted layer and understanding what is it that we do and -- what are these different concepts that come together. And we call it mind mapping. So we are taking the approach of simply sequestering ourselves in a room for three days and we mind map. And we put together functions and ideas and concepts of what we do and where we're headed.

So I'd like to stress on the key points that we've been discussing recently. We started off by creating what we're calling a lexicon. We realized in our discussions that we didn't speak the same language, so we've put together a set of words just so that we understand what the other is saying.

So that will soon also be made public. And then we put together what we call the 50,000-foot mind map on what we think we do and what we believe we do and where we're headed. And then we went down discussing empowerment and enablement. Who is it that we enable? Who do we empower? And we are putting together an enablement chain.

Then we looked into our finances and how do we fund this massive global massive infrastructure? What are the different funding models that are in place today? And how critical it is to continue to ensure that this service is, indeed, funded.

Then we went on to the topic of designation and removal. At some point, would it be appropriate for servers -- server operators to be replaced, to be removed? How do we identify them? These are very much concept questions that we're answering today.

Then the question of accountability: Who are we accountable to, and what are we accountable for? We are putting together a similar chain of accountability and what comes under this topic of accountability. And one of them is to be audited against a set of requirements.

Another topic was technical elements. What are the technical elements that define such operators, and how should we hold them against those technical requirements?

Then we went on to discuss how does this root server community interact with each other? What are the different modalities that exist today, and what should it look like in the future? And we concluded our discussions with topics on RSSAC and transparency and how transparent we can be to the community.

So I'd like to say that we've made tremendous progress. We have many, many miles to go before we sleep. However, we have obtained critical mass. And we understand that there is good work to be done. And at some point, when our work is completed, we will issue advice on this work.

We also invite you -- I'd like to conclude by inviting you to two meetings that we have on Sunday, one at 1:45 p.m. till 3:00 p.m. It's the RSSAC public session. It's in room G.01/2 in the center. And we have another meeting at 3:15 to 4:45. It's called the RSSAC caucus meeting. The caucus is a very important body that we work with in partnership. It is a body of experts of DNS and security professionals. Thank you very much for your time.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you, Tripti.

Next we will hear from Patrik Faltstrom, the chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. So the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, we are to advise the community and the board on

matters relating to the security and the integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

So in doing so, we have -- we do our work basically like RSSAC and the other advisory committees. So we issue advice. And if the advice is good, whoever we are talking with advice will implement it. That's how we measure our success. We are not requiring anyone formally to listen or implement our advice with the difference from ICANN board that -- that there is this requirement for the ICANN board to take your advice into account. But that doesn't mean they have to follow our advice.

As part of that work, we have together with ICANN board the last couple of years been working on an advice tracker where it is -- by which it is easier for ICANN board and the community to follow the current status of the various advice that the advisory committees have issued.

So we in SSAC has agreed to be one of the test objects for the current evolution of a tracking system. And we see very positive progress there and would like to thank everyone participation in that work because it's actually going really well. Not done yet but it's going well.

So what we have done lately since the last meeting is to issue a couple of reports. The one with the lowest number is Number 83. And in that one, we commented on the proposed

amendments to the New gTLD Registry Agreement. And in plain English, what we found was that due to some wording in the proposed amendment, it might have -- it would be possible to interpret it as if the question of what we normally call dotless domain names was something that was sort of unclear or that the policy has changed.

We in SSAC went back and revisited our advice on dotless domains and didn't see any reason to change that. So we proposed some amendments and some slight changed text to make it clear that the situation has not changed.

The next one we issued was SAC84 where we looked at the EPSRP recommendation -- EPSRP definition and their charter. And what we found was that the three, four SSR reasons, very important principles, were missing: The conservation principle, the inclusion principle, and the stability principle. And one of the things that we have understood since we released that report is that there is some misunderstanding of what we actually are talking about there. So there's quite a lot of work between the various communities and constituencies to understand from our perspective the difference between the need for the inclusion of these kind of evaluation and any kind of evaluation process and to compare the result of those evaluations. And we in SSAC do not involve in actually doing the risk calculations. What we are doing is that we are looking at

and ensuring that the risk calculations are part of evaluation process.

And then just a few weeks ago, or even last week, we released Number 85, 86, and 87 which are sort of placeholders and pointers to the working groups in the new gTLD -- in the new gTLD round process to basically signal to the work parties, working groups, that we are ready and we're prepared to answer any kind of questions or issues coming up in those.

Regarding what we are currently doing, we are -- you have heard the words about namespaces quite a lot. And one of the things that we're doing at the moment is we're looking at the fact that we not only in the ICANN community but also other communities use the same namespace. We here are using it for DNS. Other parties are using it for other things. And what we have been looking at is the implications of collisions in the namespace that might lead ambiguity when applications and users are using these names. We hope to be able to actually release a report quite -- in the near time.

The other thing we are looking at is a specific investigation of the various processes related to internationalized domain names in ICANN where we are -- where we are looking into whether, first of all, there are any differences in the policy regarding internationalized domain names in the various processes in

ICANN. And if there is any differences, do the fact that there is differences impact the security and stability of the -- of the Domain Name System.

We also would like to invite you to our public meeting which is on Tuesday, the 8th, between 3:15 and 4:15 in Hall 5. Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you, Patrik. Our next presenter is Alan Barrett, an executive council member with the Number Resource Organization.

Alan?

ALAN BARRETT:

Thank you. So the Number Resource Organization is an unincorporated body that represents the five regional Internet registries. And viewed from the ICANN side, we serve as the ASO, the Address Support Organization. So we have an MOU between the NRO and ICANN which says that the NRO will fulfill the roles and responsibilities of the ASO. So you can think of these two terms as synonyms. Viewed from the RIR side, we call it the NRO. And viewed from the ICANN side, we call it the ASO.

The five regional Internet registries are responsible for distributing I.P. addresses and autonomous system numbers,

what we call number resources, in five regions around the world. And our relationship with ICANN is governed by two documents. We have an MOU which talks about the policy development process. And we do things like appointing people to the ICANN board and to other ICANN committees and things.

And the second relationship is the IANA functions contract. We recently went through the IANA transition. And as part of that, the RIRs have signed a contract, which we call a service level agreement with ICANN. And in terms of that SLA, now the RIRs are receiving the IANA number services functions under a contract with ICANN which, in turn, subcontracted to PTI.

And that's going almost exactly as it used to go under the previous contract with the NTIA. So we're very happy that the IANA transition has worked out. And there's been no disruption whatsoever to our services. And that's great. I'd like to congratulate the ICANN board and staff and everybody who worked on all these proposals for the past two years.

Now, you don't hear very much from the ASO during ICANN meetings. And that's because our policy work is done elsewhere. The five RIRs each have two major policy discussion meetings every year. And some of them also have additional smaller meetings. These meetings are open to anybody who wants to attend, and there is also remote participation.

So the RIRs have -- between the five of them are currently discussing or about to implement 22 different policy proposals. In some regions, there are only one or two. In some regions, there might be six or seven. But altogether across the five regions, we have 22 policy proposals on the table right now.

And these deal with several topics. The three topics which each have multiple proposals are dealing with the running out of the IPv4 address space; transfers where address space allocated to one organization can be transferred to another organization. And, also, there's some proposals dealing with simplification, like changing the language in which the policies are written to make things simpler, removing provisions which are obsolete in the light of recent development.

So I'd like to remind people who don't already know this that I.P. Version 4 has only 4 billion addresses and not all of them are usable for ordinary purposes. Whereas, the world has a population much higher than that. It's around 7 billion. So clearly IPv4 is not enough. We need to deploy I.P. version 6. And a lot of the RIRs work on education and evangelism, if I may call it that, to encourage people to deploy I.P. version 6.

In terms of the ICANN bylaws, the board -- the ICANN board has to ensure that SOs are reviewed every five years. And in terms of the MOU between the RIRs and ICANN, the NRO will organize

that review for the Address Support Organization. And it's been five years now since our last review in 2011. And the NRO, or the ASO, whichever you care to see it as, will soon be issuing a call for proposals for organizations who are interested in carrying out that review.

Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you, Alan. Our next presenter is Katrina Sataki, who is the Chair of the ccNSO, the Country Code Names Supporting Organization.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, everyone. And before I start my update, may I ask those of you who represent ccTLDs or country code top-level domains or deep in heart feel that they represent ccTLDs to raise your hand. Okay. Thank you very much. Quite a few. Glad that you're all here.

Actually, there are 249 Latin ccTLDs and more than 30 IDN ccTLDs out there. And some domains are big and some are really small. But as wise people say, size does not matter. And I come from Latvia, and I think -- country code -- ccTLD .LV. And I

think it would be fair to say that the number of people living in the country is roughly the same you could meet during 50 minutes' walk on the streets of Hyderabad during a busy Saturday afternoon.

But I think together all ccTLDs manage more than 112 domain names -- 112 million domain names. Sorry. Forgot a very important word here.

Yes, as Brad already introduced me, I'm Katrina Sataki, the chair of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization. And this is a body created for and by Country Code Top Level Domain managers.

It has been stressed already several times that -- this is the first meeting post-transition. So the question is how we at the CC -- have we done our homework and are we ready for the challenges? That's something I will try to answer during my update today.

Since our last update a year ago, we've added -- welcomed a few more members, and currently there are 161 member in the ccNSO. And this is a very conservative number because some ccTLD managers operate two or even more ccTLDs. But even those who are not members, they are very active and they are always welcome to participate in the work of ICANN, and they do participate in this work.

Actually today we started our sessions with a tech day and we'll continue with two ccNSO members days, and that's tomorrow and Monday. But despite the name, the name ccNSO members meeting, all ccTLDs are always welcome to participate in the meeting and contribute to the work of the ccNSO.

It may seem unbelievable for such a diverse group, and let me assure you that ccTLDs constitute a really diverse group of people. But if you put all these people into one room, you don't even have to lock them. They stay in the room for two days and they discuss issues, and in the end they love each other even more, which might be surprising. So, therefore, I will ask those ccTLDs in the room to smile and agree and at least now pretend that yes, we love each other, because we do.

So what is this one thing that keeps us together? So no matter how we're organized, no matter how big, small we are or any other structure, any other way we're made, we have one common goal, and it's every ccTLD serves its local Internet community. And each of us ensures that its local policies and practices are respected. And what makes us strong, what makes us believe that we are ready to face challenges post-transition, we know that we are different and we accept that we are different. Furthermore, we're willing to learn from each other and support each other while acknowledging our difference.

Since the announcement of the IANA transition, the ccNSO has been working hard paving the ccNSO accountability highway and ensuring stability and accountability of the IANA naming functions in the post-transition world. I believe that these accomplishments are examples of our strength that I was talking about. And I would also like to use this opportunity to congratulate our fellows from the GNSO with their wise decision to select Becky Burr to the ICANN board. That's an excellent choice. The ccNSO has known Becky for -- for years, and she's one of those people who -- well, with not only the creation of ICANN but also the creation of the ccNSO. And we have benefited from her experience and from her wise advice over time, and, you know, that Becky is an extraordinary dedicated and hard-working member of the community. So she has tirelessly served on the ccNSO council for many years, and now it's quite natural that she moves to the board and makes sure that everything is in order there as well.

So Hyderabad is known as the city of pearls. And in some cultures, pearls are a symbol of wisdom. And so let's make sure that we all work with mutual respect and wisdom. So have a successful meeting. Thank you.

[Applause]

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Katrina. Our final presenter from the SOs is James Bladel, the chair of the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Brad. I'm James Bladel, and welcome to Hyderabad where Saturday strangely feels like a Monday. You won't be surprised to hear me say that the GNSO is very busy here in ICANN 57. We currently have ten active Policy Development Processes in various stages of the PDP life cycle. But for this slide deck I'd like to focus on four that are active here in Hyderabad.

First up we have the next generation registration directory services, which is affectionately known as RDS. This is a PDP that is looking to define the requirements for -- and the purposes for collecting and maintaining registration data and providing access to that data. The group is also taking into account the always changing privacy landscape and looking at safeguards for protecting that contact data. And it's doing so using the guidance of the Expert Working Group that was -- that made recommendations back in 2014.

The PDP is being asked by the GNSO to step back and take a holistic look at registration data and ask two specific questions, what are the fundamental requirements for -- for gTLD

registration data and is there a new policy required to meet those requirements.

Next up is the PDP on new gTLD subsequent rounds, and using the previous rounds of gTLDs as a baseline, this group is examining what changes, clarifications, amendments, or modifications would be needed in order to allow subsequent rounds to proceed. This group will issue policy recommendations that would modify the original policy and also offer implementation guidance for those next rounds.

The third one is the review of RPMs in all generic top-level domains. This group is being conducted in two phases. The first phase will examine those rights protection mechanisms that exist in new gTLDs, specifically the URS and the trademark clearinghouse, and understand whether or not those -- those rights protection mechanisms were effective. And then it will move, at some point I believe in the next year, will move into phase 2 which is an examination of the UDRP. And this is the first examination of the UDRP since it was adopted in 1999. And then finally, we have another open PDP which is the IGO-INGO access to curative rights, which is a very lengthy way of saying can the existing rights protection mechanisms like the UDRP and URS be used to meet the needs of IGOs and INGOs in protecting their names online.

Finally, we in the GNSO are taking a look at our role in the post-IANA transition ICANN and the empowered community, and we are examining the revised bylaws and how we would implement them in our bylaws and in our operating procedures.

We have an open council meeting on Monday, as you can see there, in hall 6 at 1:45. I invite everyone to attend, and really to attend and join any of these PDP working groups. The GNSO conducts its work by volunteers. We're dependent upon the contributions of volunteers in order to get this work done, and if you can't find something on that list that's interesting in new gTLDs, rights protection, or WHOIS, then you might want to ask yourself if you're in the right line of work because I think those are some of the hottest topics under discussion at any given ICANN meeting. But I would encourage anyone in the community who's interested in these to get involved and join the work of the GNSO. Thank you. And I guess the next -- next up is Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you, James. So I've been asked to give a bit of an update on the board's priorities this week. James mentioned that -- you said it felt like a Monday. I think for the board it feels like a Thursday. We've already been meeting for three days. And back

in September we had a couple of days in Brussels where the board met and was considering various issues.

To give you a bit of a feel for what the board has been working on or the topics that are important to the board, this includes the implementation of the new bylaws, the consideration of recent independent review panel findings and also how we take those findings into account in improvements in our reconsideration processes on the board.

We've been discussing the goals of our international engagement officers and how we can make those more effective going forward. We've been working on establishing a good relationship with the new CEO. This includes establishing clear roles and responsibilities for decision-making and also setting clear goals. We've been starting to look a bit further forward as part of the next iteration of our strategic planning process, and we've been looking at strategic issues such as ensuring that our processes for policy development and implementation are efficient, looking at changes in the marketplace for Internet identifiers such as domain names and IP addresses, looking at security risks that are related to ICANN services, looking at evolving practices and laws that relate to human rights, privacy, and law enforcement.

We look -- now for the remaining period while the board is here we're mostly going to be attending the various meetings that have been scheduled with parts of the community, and this is one of them. And we look forward to receiving feedback and actively listening to what members of the community have to say to us.

I'd like to close by focusing on the topic of feedback and really encourage people, when they give feedback, to give constructive feedback. Now, this is constructive feedback, you know, certainly the board always welcomes feedback, but there's a lot of feedback that goes on in this community. People provide feedback to the staff members of the ICANN organization and there's a large number here. And they support both the policy development work but also implement the policies that you set, and absolutely they welcome feedback. But please focus on providing that feedback constructively.

Likewise, we have hundreds of volunteers here, and volunteers give feedback to each other, both through the policy development process but also to the leadership of the volunteer groups. Again, providing constructive feedback in an environment where people can welcome that feedback is important to encouraging more volunteers. If the feedback is too harsh or not presented in a fair and civil manner, you'll lose volunteers. And the Compensation Committee met with the

ombudsman this week and found that the most common complaint the ombudsman receives is complaints about other community members. So volunteers complaining about how they've been treated by other volunteers. And again, this is something that we're starting to look at, and you'll see the board just passed a resolution today with a draft code of conduct around harassment procedures. But it's just something that we're conscious of, and we really encourage the community to be conscious of this as well.

So with that, I will finish.

BRAD WHITE: We'll now take questions from the floor. Ram Mohan will be the first board facilitator. Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much. May I ask folks to line up at the microphone so we can begin listening to your questions and issues. Also, a reminder, today's public forum is scheduled, this - this part of the question/answer part is scheduled for 30 minutes. But there will be a second public forum on Tuesday at 11:00 a.m., which will run for two hours. So if we run out of time today to ask questions and make comments, there will be another opportunity on Tuesday.

Before I welcome the first participant to come to the microphone, I wanted to take an opportunity to share some of my own thoughts about this ICANN meeting. And I wanted to share my thoughts in my mother tongue, Tamil. Since it's -- again, you will see that on the screen.

[Speaking in Tamil]

Thank you. And we will start with you.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you very much. My name is Barbara Wanner. I'm with the U.S. Council for International Business. We are a member of the ICANN business constituency.

USCIB, as we call ourselves, actively contributed to the community's review of the IANA transition and ICANN accountability proposals and we enthusiastically endorsed the 10 March transition proposal and were very pleased that the transition proceeded on the 1st of October.

We remain unchanged in our view that this community-developed plan will best ensure the continued stability, security, and resilience of the DNS system, as well as fundamental openness of the Internet, all of which will provide the necessary conditions for continued business innovation, economic growth, and societal benefits. The ICANN community deserves to

congratulate itself for the tireless, committed, and cooperative spirit that ultimately bore fruit in this accomplishment.

During this morning's opening ceremonies, speaker after speaker reaffirmed the importance of the multistakeholder process in producing this ground-breaking plan for ICANN.

Mr. Marby, in particular, very eloquently referred to this as a peace project of the world. USCIB cannot agree more with this description, and we feel that through the opportunity provided by ICANN's public forums, we must underscore this to a listening global community, which includes many actors and entities who urge bringing DNS management and governance of the Internet more broadly under the control of a government or governmental entity at a time when the efficacy of the multistakeholder model faces challenges in various organizations.

We think it is important and appropriate for the ICANN community to shine a light on the viability and success of the bottom-up multistakeholder process in developing a complex, yet solid, framework that will continue to --

[Timer sounds]

-- ensure proper stewardship. So I would simply ask the board to keep inclusion and transparency uppermost in mind as we

navigate some uncharted territory because this, indeed, will set ICANN apart as a viable multistakeholder entity, in contrast from many organizations internationally that are competing to assume authority in the Internet governance space. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Barbara.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Kristina Rosette, Amazon registry, but I'm asking my questions in a personal capacity.

There has been some discussion about the possibility that the board will be taking up a resolution at this meeting that will have the objective of ending, at least in the board's view, the long-running saga of the release of two-character letter-letter ASCII combinations, so my questions are: One, is this true? And two, if it is, in its current form, what will this resolution implement?

RAM MOHAN: Chris, would you like to take it or someone else?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I actually think Steve should, probably. Steve, take it.

STEVE CROCKER: The -- I don't know whether this is good news or bad news for you, but the answer is no, we're not going to get there just yet. We recognize that this is an ongoing and somewhat -- more than somewhat -- thorny problem. We're quite concerned about it and it's got our full attention, but it's one of those situations in which we want to be very careful about what we do, as opposed to very quick. And I recognize that it doesn't feel very quick to anybody, but we considered taking some strong action and said, "Well, let's -- let's make sure we study this." So it's high on our list. We're working on it pretty hard, actually. But I do not expect that we're going to cut through that Gordian knot this week.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thank you for the clarification.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Chris? Please come ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Okay. My name is Sivasubramanian. I'm from the Internet Society India Chennai chapter.

One of the most sensitive issues in Internet governance pertains to how data is being handled, and ICANN handles quite a lot of sensitive user data by way of registrant data.

We have a present system of collecting, storing, and accessing registrant data, and if we go beyond the present style of collecting data and borrow a concept from the banking sector which has a method of collecting data in credit card transactions that the data -- the sensitive data does not go to everybody but only to the bank, if we could borrow that concept and try to implement a system whereby ICANN will run the most sensitive and the most private part of the registrant data combined with a system whereby layers of access is granted to the registry -- the registry service provider, registrar, and reseller, then we'll have a global system of securely and fairly handling registrant data.

I've also raised this on a mailing list about a month ago on LDAP access.

I would request the board to take a look at it and examine this in a more perfect way. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Siva, for this question.

Instead of a response from the board, may I actually ask James Bladel if you wanted to provide a first response to it, because it feels like there's some policy-oriented issues here.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Ram. And actually, what you've described is at the heart and soul of some of the work that's currently ongoing in the next-generation registry data -- registration data system, the RDS PDP that we currently have ongoing, and those are the questions of providing safeguards for contact data and providing perhaps -- examining whether or not gated access or differing access levels for differing purposes would be appropriate. And all of that is -- is at the heart and soul of that work, and so I would encourage you to perhaps take a look at that group and -- and contribute your thoughts to that group. We could use more -- more contributions like that.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, James. And for the prior question from Kristina, Steve, you have a clarification?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Kristina, I have to apologize. I managed to confuse myself in listening to you and really was focused in my mind about a different problem entirely which is the IGOs, and that's where we've been spending a lot of time.

The short answer to your question is exactly the opposite of what I gave you.

We do have that under control, we think, and there will be a resolution, and so I -- I apologize, my face is red, and nothing to do but get to it quickly.

So appreciate the opportunity to correct the record here.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Please.

Oh, there is a question from the online area, so let me pass it back to you, Brad.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Ram. We have a question from Thomas McBride of Toronto.

ICANN recently released a report detailing the amounts paid to the CEO and ICANN directors for their service on the board, as well as travel expenses. The amounts varied greatly, both in total travel costs and how those costs were covered.

The report also stated that directors not only traveled to ICANN-related meetings, but requested to attend other meetings at ICANN's expense. Who determines which extracurricular trips are approved and what are the criteria used when determining whether to fund those trips? Are directors required to follow the community guidelines other paid travelers are required to when it comes to class of travel and accommodations?

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you for this very tough question.

Steve, I think this is why you are our chair.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER:

I have been making a habit of trying to explore the maximum amount of travel in all classes of -- and spend as much money in order to provide cover for my fellow board travelers.

I'm not serious, actually, about that.

We -- we do actually do a fair amount of travel. It varies enormously, partly by availability of the time that we have, and interest.

Some of the people on the -- on the board actually have day jobs and others are either retired or have time on their hands.

There's a -- the serious part of it is a balance between the active engagement of board members, who put a huge amount of time and energy and personal commitment into doing the very best job we can, and a lot of that involves outreach, versus having a degree of discipline about it all.

It's a question we take seriously. We review our travel policies periodically. We're in the process right now of taking another look at where that balance is and seeing how that compares to the budget.

There's also, of course, a huge difference in the cost of travel for different people. We have people who live in Australia, for example, where you can't go anywhere without spending a lot of money versus living in Europe where you can go quite a few places for fairly little money.

So it's a question that we look at, actually, quite a bit.

The publication that you're looking at is one that's required for us to publish. It is an aggregate of -- and it covers a period of time that's trailing by quite a bit. So it's not the best document to look at for up-to-date information --

[Timer sounds]

-- and we don't have a specific document that would do that, but it is a topic that we watch very closely, and happy to be held accountable to it. Yeah.

CHERINE CHALABY:

I just want to just give a little bit more granularity.

There are basically four types of occasions when an ICANN board is required to travel.

One is to the ICANN meetings.

Second, we have also three retreats a year between the ICANN meetings where the board members travel to those retreats.

The third category is when the ICANN organization, led by the CEO, requests that a board member attends as part of a delegation with a very specific role. Either speak at a meeting or be part of a panel or a variety of reasons.

And finally, the fourth category is when a board member is directly invited by either the community or a forum or an event also for a very specific role, and in that case, they need approval for this to take place. So those are the four types of categories where we look very carefully before agreeing whether a board member should travel or not to these locations. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. We'll take your question, sir.

MUBASHIR HASSAN: Hi. Good evening. This is Mubashir from Pakistan. I'm an ICANN fellow. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to come here.

My question is directly related to RSSAC. I just want to know what actually are the constraints or implications you are facing to figure out what actually number of root zones you are -- you require.

Do you require a lesser number of root zones or you can have some more root zones?

And, is there any regulatory authority or you are going to have a regulatory body to govern or to control?

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much. Another very good question, and I'm so glad we have Tripti here.

TRIPTI SINHA: So once again, if you could repeat your question. There were two questions, I believe. One was how are you determining --

If you could just repeat.

MUBASHIR HASSAN: Yeah. The constraints or implications you are facing to figure out the number of root zones required to run the Internet of the whole world.

TRIPTI SINHA: I think you mean root servers, correct?

MUBASHIR HASSAN: Yeah. Exactly.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. And the second question?

MUBASHIR HASSAN: The second question is about the regulatory body or authority that can control or manage these root zones.

TRIPTI SINHA: The root servers.

Okay. So as I said, we're in the very early stages of what we're calling mind-mapping this model of what it should look like going forward. So one problem that we're looking to -- one question that we would like to answer is: What is -- what is the --

the kind of infrastructure we would like globally dispersed to be able to offer a very highly reliable service.

So we're going away from actually looking at, well, how many letters do you need and so forth. We're coming from the angle of what's the level of latency or how quickly should a response time be. It's an extremely complicated question to answer because of the nature of the system and how it's constructed. And what lives between a query -- when the query is released and gets to the root server, in between there's a whole bunch of infrastructure that is sometimes beyond our control.

So it's a very difficult question to answer as to what is the right level of infrastructure that should be out there, but we are modeling it. It's -- and once we have some better results, we will share that with you.

And in terms of -- you said regulatory bodies?

MUBASHIR HASSAN: The authority that can actually govern it or --

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah. So as I said earlier, we are looking at first who we are accountable to, and we're putting together an accountability chain, and from that, we will issue advice on how -- what should

happen and how this should be governed. There should be a body that is -- a function, rather, a function that audits the operators against service level -- service expectations and technical elements and so forth.

So these are not easy questions to answer, but we're doing the work and we -- we continue to inform the community in the form of reports and ultimately we will issue advice.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much.

I will now hand this over to Rinalia to continue with the public forum.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ram. I'm Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

Let's proceed to the next speaker.

ARSHAD MOHAMMED: Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak here at public forum. I'm Arshad. I'm 19. I represent end users/academia. I was recently part of India's School on Internet Governance where several of you board members here spoke. I can't tell you how much I learned about Internet governance processes there.

My question is if you can conduct or support such outreach and engagement programs more and more frequently and not just annually. I think that these activities will involve more and more people in IG processes and make IG more and more diverse and global.

And I also want to give a big shout-out to the board here for choosing Hyderabad as a venue. Thank you.

[Applause]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Arshad. Excellent question.

Any responses from the board?

Yes, Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. I was very excited to see the -- the first Indian School of Internet Governance start up, Satish Babu and the Internet Society team that got that together. I thought it was a great idea. There have been other Internet school of governances elsewhere, but I agree with you. I think in India, not only do we need to do it more frequently but we have to start thinking about making sure that the materials and the curriculum is in multiple languages, as well, because there is a large population

that is coming on line and in many ways it's not only for the people who are the users of the Internet, but it's also for the policymakers to have a good understanding about not only governance on the Internet but governance off the Internet.

ARSHAD MOHAMMED: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Wait a minute, Arshad. My colleague Asha would also like to respond.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: I just want to say very briefly, thank you for your comments. It means a lot. It was my pleasure to be a part of the Indian School of Internet Governance.

As Ram mentioned, it was our first one and I hope there will be many more and lots of young people like you who come and listen and learn and participate. So thank you so much.

ARSHAD MOHAMMED: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I believe we have a remote question. Brad?

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Robert Guerra. He's a member of the SSAC but is asking this question in his individual capacity as an Internet user in North America.

Social media is now where many Internet users discuss, engage, and interact with each other. According to estimates, the number of social media users has reached 1.96 billion and is expected to grow to 2.5 billion by 2018.

Are the users on social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Weibo able to participate in at-large directly? If not, does the board envision ways that could happen in the future?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Brad. I would like to pass this question to Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not a social media expert. We do use Twitter, Facebook, and a number of other -- of social media platforms. I'm not quite sure what the questioner means by "participate in." It's certainly a communication mechanism we use. But we also use a number of other platforms to do our actual work; and that ranges from email, the ICANNWiki Google Docs and a

number of other things. And, of course, we use extensively teleconferencing which is our main vehicle for work between ICANN meetings. I hope that answers the question. I'm not sure it does.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan.

Is there a member of staff, of ICANN organization, who can answer the question on social media at this point? Otherwise, we can come back to that during public forum 2 with answers. No?

Okay. So next, please.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. My name is Mary Uduma from Africa, particularly from Nigeria. First I want to congratulate the board and the community for the transition that has happened. Thank you, everybody, that worked so hard to make it happen. I know that people devoted time and energy to it.

But I want to draw the attention of the board to the new gTLD issue that is sensitive to my region, and that is the two-letter character string and geo names. We have been preaching and asking our government and our regional communities to be part

of ICANN. And we discovered that the more we talk about it, the more -- the less interested they are because they do not understand the activities that go on in ICANN. They don't understand why their string should be given to another person to sell. And for that reason, I need -- I need the board to take note of this and to also see that the fact that the GDD is asking for us to see whether there is a mitigation for our string or similarity of our string doesn't give the right signals to our region.

So our governments are not very, very comfortable with the fact that the geo names are being released to business people to market. So it is important that we know that since now ICANN is accountable to the community, our governments in my region in particular would want to see that they are carried out - (timer sounds) -- and they understand the activities of ICANN. And they are not ready to release the two-letter character to anybody. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mary, for your feedback. We appreciate you raising our awareness on the topic.

Next, please.

ZUAN ZHANG: Hello. I'm lucky to be the last-to-second one. And my name is Zuan, and I'm asking a question for Mr. Chairman Alan Greenberg on behalf of my friends. Several of my friends want to join ALAC. But -- sorry. But there are several issues about your system. Sorry. And we found that only NARALO and EURALO accept individual members. So would you open and expedite your process of accepting individual members? Very appreciate you set up a time line. Thanks very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Zuan.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Good question.

I can't give you the time line because I don't personally have it. The Asia-Pacific region is looking at individual members. ALAC considers it a very high priority item, and I know the people working on it in the Asia-Pacific region consider it a high-priority item.

It's a complex issue for a number of reasons, but I would hope -- you know, personally I would hope within a few months we will have an answer and a methodology. I'm not in a position to

guarantee that right now. But if we get some contact information from you, we'll try to get back to you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan.

Next speaker, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good afternoon. My name is Jonathan Robinson. Afternoon, Rinalia, Steve, Goran, respected members of the ICANN board. I'm speaking to you here on behalf of Afilias. However, the issue is such that I would say the same on my personal capacity as a long-term community member and someone who has worked within this sector for essentially 20 years.

Our issue is with the auction of .WEB which, as you know, took place in July 2016. And the winning bidder was an applicant known as Nu Dot Co. However, shortly after the auction concluded VeriSign disclosed to the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, not ICANN, that it had incurred a material financial commitment in the region of 130 million U.S. dollars.

It was subsequently announced that this commitment was to fund Nu Dot Co's bid for .WEB and that VeriSign anticipated the future assignment of .WEB with ICANN's consent.

This behavior within an ICANN process raises serious concerns as I have no doubt you'll agree. It appears to be a direct violation of both the letter and spirit of the applicant guidebook. It occurred without transparency and with the support of the dominant market operator of gTLDs. And, moreover, it occurred in the resolution of a contention set for the most desirable new gTLD.

You are, of course, aware that ICANN's new gTLD guidebook is a rule book developed by this community. ICANN has a longstanding commitment to competition in domain names. And ICANN has a hard one and recently gained independent status.

You are a credible, independent-minded, and respected board who recognized the enhanced scrutiny that goes with the post-transition environment. Indeed, this may well be the first test of your resolve in this new environment. You have the opportunity to deal with the situation by firmly applying your own rules and your own ICANN bylaw-enshrined -- (timer sounds) -- core value to introduce and promote competition in domain names. We strongly urge you to do so. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Jonathan.

Chris Disspain will respond.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Rinalia. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan, I know that you won't be expecting us to respond to what you said. Just wanted to say thank you for coming to the microphone and saying what you said, which we've heard. And I know you are not expecting a formal response. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Chris. Thank you, members of the ICANN board.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I believe there is an online remote question. Brad?

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Jothan Frakes. He is the CEO of ICANN-accredited registrar PLISK. My question is the same as Kristina Rosette's. And I appreciate that Dr. Crocker clarified that the two-character matter is being addressed and wish to hear the second portion of Kristina Rosette's question addressed, which

is to share the substance of the resolution in its current form with this audience.

STEVE CROCKER:

Right. Thanks for the question. I appreciate the interest.

This isn't the right place, and we're not quite ready to put the exact text up. So stand by. We will have -- we will present this at the board meeting, publicly open board meeting, on Tuesday. What day is today? Today is Saturday, right? So this is only a couple days away. Hang tight. You'll see.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Steve.

That brings us to the end of the question and answer session. I will now pass it back to Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Rinalia.

Thanks to everybody, particularly the advisory committee and supporting organization representatives and everyone else who participated in this session. We will have the next -- second part of the public forum on Tuesday in this room at 11:00 a.m. And in reference to what I just said, it will be after the public board

meeting. So by that time the answer to that question will be fully out.

Finally, I would like to remind you about the gala which will be at the nearby HITEX Hall 3 at 7:00 p.m. Tickets are available at the NIXI both in the registration area. I'm told this is a short walk. Or if you prefer, there will be buses to the gala beginning at 6:30, which is now. Transportation back to the hotels will begin at 9:00 p.m. and run every 30 minutes until 11:00 p.m. Hope to see you all there. Thank you all for coming to the public forum and to ICANN57.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]