
COPENHAGEN – Fellowship Program Daily Wrap-up
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [Who's] going for ISOC at ICANN event or ISOC Chapter? Okay, good.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. But for those who don't know, starting from 8:30 until midnight there will be GEMS, so-called. Let me check the name with our abbreviations – Global Equal Multistakeholder and. This is the band where our community representatives are playing. So if you want to join, it will be in Soho Restaurant somewhere in the city center. So you just do search and come there for nice music, dancing, and those who can play on any musical instrument can join the band just on spot. There is a bus. There is a metro line right nearby AC Bella so you can easily find it.

My tech friends, my tech supporters, can you also upgrade me to the presenter in the Adobe? Thank you.

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.

Ladies and gentlemen, take your seats.

We have today a very interesting session and we have a very interesting guest coming to us – Lars-Johan Liman – who is a representative of Root Server System Advisory Committee which is called RSSAC. But it's better to say Root Server System Advisory Committee. And Lars will be talking about their activities. We'll just have brief five to ten minutes' presentation from your side, Lars, and then we'll go to Q&A session for 20 minutes.

And at 5:30 we are expecting incoming Board member who is an ICANN Fellow which I am very proud off – León Felipe Sánchez – who will be talking with us about IANA Transition. And the last 30 minutes we'll be having two current Board members coming to us and talking about what does it mean to be a Board member.

So Lars, the floor is yours.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I'm very happy to be here. I've been to several of these Fellows sessions over the years, and it's actually the most interesting and inspiring sessions I go to. The rest of them are just boring stuff. I'm also very glad that you've stopped having these sessions at 8:00 in the morning. I am not very good at 8:00 in the morning.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We had this time at 6:00 a.m. Don't worry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I am here to talk to you about the Root Server System Advisory Committee or RSSAC, and I am the previous co-Chair. We have two co-Chairs. I am one of the previous co-Chairs of RSSAC and, I'd like to just introduce what RSSAC is and a little of what we do. From experience, we probably will end up somewhere trying to explain how the root server system works as well but let's at least start with this committee.

I will read from a sheet the role as it says in ICANN Bylaws: "The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity, of the Internet's root server system."

That is a very narrow scope. The scope of RSSAC is very, very narrow compared to what most other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have, so we really, really focus on the operation of the root server system to make sure that it's stable, secure, and just keeps on working. That's the main target.

The root server operators do the day-to-day work on the various parts. The root server system as a whole, you can see it as a

cloud service where the various parts of the cloud are provided by various operators, and this Advisory Committee is kind of a glue between the ICANN system and the root server operators.

We try to look at things where there has to be policy regarding the root server operations. So we don't meddle with policy for domain names at all. We couldn't care less who gets to own which domain name or which top level domain goes to which registry. Not our problem. Someone else's problem. And I'm so happy that we don't need to deal with lawyers and all that crap. We deal with the operation of the root server and if there is a pointer that points to that registry for this domain name, so be it. That's fine. So no domain name policy but we do work with things where there are general issues regarding the root server system – the technical system.

We're a fairly small group. We are probably the smallest committee in ICANN. There are 12 organizations that operate parts of this cloud, so 12 organizations that are root server operators, and the committee consists of one representative from each of these operators. So there are 12 members there and each of these members also have a – what is the term...a second – so if I can't go to the meeting my back-up person will kick in. But they're all invited to all meetings so that's 24 people.

Then we have liaisons connecting to various other bodies. So we have outgoing liaisons where we send the person to the Board. We have an outgoing liaison to the Nominating Committee. We have outgoing liaisons to the two new small committees that were created in the IANA Transition project, so there is now the Customer Standing Committee (CSC) which has kind of an auditing function for the IANA Operations. I happen to be the liaison for that group, and we also have a liaison to the RZERC which is the Root Zone Evaluation...something...which is a group that focuses on technical changes to the root zone.

Adding a new domain name to the root zone is not a technical change. That is just an addition, everyday work. But if we want to make a major change to the system, if we want to add IP Version 6 or we want to add DNSSEC or we want to roll the root key or something, these are major events that fundamentally change the root system, then the RZERC will be there to evaluate and have an opinion on that.

And then we have incoming liaisons from the various groups like the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, we have one person from there. We have from the Internet Architecture Board on the IETF side of things. We have one from the Root Zone Maintainer, the ones who generate the root zone. And we have one from the IANA or the PTI. So I think that's actually the gang.

Current things on our table – we have recently actually created a history. We are currently working very hard with trying to approach a problem which is very infected and problematic and that is the fact that there is no procedure to replace a root name server operator. No one knows how to do that. It just doesn't exist. So those of us who do the work, we will have to continue until we find a way. We don't even know how to define this procedure. So that's what we're trying to work with. We are trying to look at the evolution and the development of the root server system.

That is going to take a very long time because these are very sensitive questions on the larger Internet, so it's not going to happen next week. I would say rather four or five years ahead of us in time and maybe we can come up with something together. And that will not only be RSSAC who produces that. The final result is something that will have to involve the entire Internet community in some way. We just don't know how yet but we're working on that.

That's one thing. But in order to start that work we realized that we need to understand what we have today. Can we define the root server system today in a good way and how did we get here? What's the history of the system? So we have produced a rather long document that describes the history of the root server system and that's actually rather interesting. I learned

that Steve Crocker, the Chairman of the Board, he read the document and said, “That was interesting,” and said, “We should do that for ICANN,” so he started the initiative to document the history of ICANN based on the root server history document.

So that’s one thing. We also work a lot with statistics and trend analysis. We want, for instance, to know if the system starts to show sign of stress. This comes actually back to an old investigation made in 2009 in preparation for the new gTLD program where we suddenly start to see a lot of new top level domains. Up until 2010 or so there were only a few new top level domains per year. Now we see several per week. That’s a totally different scale and a totally different acceleration of number of top level domains and we don’t really know how that’s going to affect the root server system.

We are quite confident that’ll it be quite okay, but we want the changes to be gradual so that we can follow and monitor and check that everything works okay. Any sudden changes are probably worse because it’s harder to adjust the system if you have sudden changes going up and down. So that message was conveyed to the Board and they took it. So that’s one of the reasons that we have this gradual change, but we also need it to implement more monitoring so that we can check the system

and see if it's starting to crack here, there are problems, there are delays, there are what have you.

I'm glad to report that we have seen absolutely nothing of that. So it's just as we expected. Things are working quite well. But RSSAC helps out to be a discussion group where we can discuss which types of statistics we are going to collect and how we are going to collect them, and how we are going to store them and make them available to researchers and so on. So that's one focus area for RSSAC.

We also are starting to look at defining what root server operations actually means – which parts do you need to put together to create a root server operator, which technical parts and later on organizational parts do you need to put together to create a good and well-functioning root server operator? And we've started with the easy part. So we've already written a document regarding the key technical elements of potential root server operators. That was the easy part. So we've written a document regarding that.

When we [write documents] – as we are a very small organization we don't really have the man power to do a lot of research and write long documents so we ask for help and we do that by having something we call the “caucus,” which is a group

of Subject Matter Experts who help us with their expertise and their labor as well to write documents.

What we do when we identify an area where we need research and documentation, we ask the members of the caucus to form a work team and we give them a starting point, a request: “This is what we would like you to look at and work with, and this is what we would like you to produce in terms of documentation,” and so on. And that work party then produces a report or a document that goes through the formal committee and [gets stamped] and then published.

So the caucus is a very important part of RSSAC. That’s where all the work happens, and that’s where the really interesting discussions happen when these documents are developed and research is carried out.

The caucus is a fairly big group. I think it’s around 80 people or something. Since they are mostly technical people we don’t have meetings at ICANN meetings very often. These people are used to working remotely and have telephone conferences and e-mail exchanges and so on, so caucus meetings happen maybe once or twice per year only and more often at the IETF meetings because that’s where all the geeks go anyhow. So that’s where we meet more often.

But maybe once a year I think we have caucus meetings here at the ICANN meetings as well. And I'm sorry to say I can't really remember when the next one is. I know the next caucus meeting is going to happen in Chicago in two weeks' time because that's an IETF, but after that I don't remember when the next one is.

Should you be interested in helping us – and we need all types of expertise there, not only DNS geeks, registry people, researchers, what have you – please come and talk to me. We have a Membership Committee that looks at applications for membership to the RSSAC Caucus, and so far we have not turned down any application that I'm aware of.

Shall I pause there? Questions? Ideas? Bring it on.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: I think we already have the queue. Shiva, Dan, I'll put your names and Bertnell.

Okay. Shiva, start.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: I have a very simple question to ask. As new gTLD servers handles a lot of queries every day, and how is it different from the root servers? And my second question is, what challenges

are root servers operators facing after the introduction of new gTLD? And does the caucus publish Annual Reports every year?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Let me see. I have a very short memory. Root server operator facing challenges with gTLDs – the only thing that we are, I wouldn't say afraid of, but the only thing that we keep an eye on is actually the size of the zone. And to root server operators there is no difference whatsoever between a ccTLD and a gTLD. They are just entries in the database. Behind that and in the ICANN circus there are lots of policy differences and what have you, but when it lands in the root name server it's the same stuff. The only change that we see as an effect of the new gTLD system, that we have a lot of new delegations and they [tickle in] much more quickly than they did before. So it grows faster. The zone size grows faster.

From that, we haven't really seen any effects. The traffic to the root server system is constantly growing but I cannot say that we've seen a sharp [knee] or sharp bend in the curve, so it's a gradual increase and, to be honest, right now I have no worries about adding more gTLDs. As I've stated before, adding 1,000 is no problem. Adding 10,000 is no problem. A hundred thousand, we probably need to check the system. A million? It will work but now I want to keep an eye on it. So that's where we are.

There will probably be shifting patterns in traffic but as the new gTLDs grow gradually, having a new gTLD doesn't mean that it has 100,000 clients or customers immediately, so the growth is gradual and that is good. That's how we like to keep it.

Sorry. There was one more question at least.

SHIVA UPADHYAY:

Caucus publish its Annual Reports every year?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

No. The caucus does not publish any regular reports. It only publishes reports on request from us, so we request help with some subject, research, or just thinking, or whatever, but it produces reports as a result of a request from the RSSAC.

I should mention that there's another way to get things in there, and that is that the caucus members identify something that they would like to work on and bring that to RSSAC and say, "Hey, have you thought of this? We really need to work on this here." That's also a way in.

BERTNELL RICHARDS:

Good afternoon. Bertnell Richards, Georgetown, Guyana. First time Fellow. I'm an Applied Statistics student so whenever I hear a person speaking about giving information it makes me very

excited, and at this point I have three questions. My first question is, what type of data do you make available to research students, particularly in terms of Applied Statistics students? That's my first question. My second question is, what procedure would the research student be required to follow for this data to be released? And the third question, would the research, would part of it be subject to the organization that's releasing the statistics? Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I'll try to answer as best I can. I understand what you're asking. First, what data do we release? RSSAC has produced a document called, "RSSAC002." It specifies a number of counters that the root server operators are expected to count and collect and make public. And there is a web page. It's called www.root-servers.org. On that web page at the bottom there are the various letters for the various operators, and if you click on that there will be a button that you can click to get access to these RSSAC002 counters. So that's one thing. That's totally open and free just to download.

There is more data. Every year the root server operators collect queries and store them. So all the DNS queries that come in that we respond to, we save the queries that come in and we store them and we collect for 48 hours. And all the root servers do this

at the same time so we can see and compare the data. And then we upload the data to a central storage facility where it's released to researchers typically who can look at the packets and do lots of number crunching on that.

Now, to have access to that data you have to make a bit of an agreement with something called DNS-OARC which stands for the Operations Analysis and Research Center, if I remember correctly – DNS-OARC – you can Google for that. And to get access to the data I guess you have to sign some kind of lightweight non-disclosure agreement so that you promise not to give it away to anyone because that data contains a bit of integrity-sensitive information because it's in the entire packet. So you can see which IP address asked for which data and that's sometimes sensitive.

But it's not a big wall. It's a rather small thing, I think. So do contact DNS-OARC if you want those numbers as well. And that happens once per year. So you have large chunks of data from, say...what is it...March every year – klonk-klonk-klonk – for 48 hours.

And there have been a few extra of these collections. We call them DITLs – Day in the Life of the Internet (DITL) – a few extra collections around the time of when DNSSEC was deployed, for instance, in the root zone five or six years ago and a few other

major events we've done these collections of various data. And subject to non-disclosure agreement, yes a bit for that data as I mentioned, but I think it's a small thing. I haven't tried myself, but do talk to them. They are reasonable people.

AFIFA ABBAS:

Hi. I'm Afifa from Bangladesh. First time Fellow so I got the chance to attend the RSSAC Public Meeting and thank you so much for your assistance after that session. Thank you so much.

My question is that I'm very much interested in the caucus. So I have seen that already 85 committee members are there [are the members]. So is there any limitation that only 100 or 150 can be? And for how many duration those members are elected?

And the second question I have that you said that every statistics that are going through root server operation are normal. So if you find any abnormality, usually on which procedure you approach towards that? Is there any model do you follow?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

First on the caucus, there is no limit on the number of members, at least not currently. There is also no time limit. We've talked about maybe circulating. We see that there are some members that are totally inactive and don't produce and don't participate, so maybe we thought that we could get some more fresh blood

instead. So we're looking at possibly changing that but right now we don't have any limits on that.

Procedures for seeing abnormalities – it depends entirely on what's going on. The root server system is under attack regularly. It happens if not every day so at least every other day. Most of it are attacks of the same type so we don't see anything to do. So I would guess that we only react when we see something that is new – either it's an attack on an entirely new scale. It's ten times bigger than the last one – or now they're doing an attack in a totally different way than they did before. That would be something that makes us react.

The root server operators – now I'm backing off from RSSAC. This is not RSSAC – going to the root server operators. Since I happen to be one, I know how that works as well. The root server operators is actually a group of very dedicated engineers and most of us have very long experience. I started to work with our root name server back in 1992 so I celebrated 25 years with it just the other week.

We also have worked with [us] a very long time and we know each other quite well. So my fellow root server operators, they have my telephone number down to my bedside. We have our own collaboration tools in form of we have our own lock-down Jabber servers. We have phone bridges. We have lots of

communication equipment so that we can get hold of each other quickly when something happens. We also do crisis exercises regularly where someone invents, “Let’s suppose that this happened. How would you react?” And then we make an exercise out of that.

So the process would be, if we see something that really is alarming, that we’ll use the system we have which calls every phone number in our phone book which means that my cell phone will go off, my telephone will go off at home and scare my wife, my telephone will go off in my office, and so for another five people with us, and another five people with Verisign, and another five people [inaudible]. So there will be a very big alarm broadcast, so to speak, and then we will have a phone conference and discuss and find out what we need to do about this. So there are mechanisms in place to react very quickly if things happen.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Isaac. Mauricio.

ISAAC MAPOSA: I wanted to ask, how do you deal with top level domains that are not dedicated in the root zone, like that are used for the Dark Web like .onion and [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Actually those are not present in the root zone. You have to make a separation – and this is actually difficult – you have to make a separation between the DNS system on the public Internet and the domain name space. You can have domain names that are not present in the DNS, and it means that for a normal Internet user they are not accessible. They are invisible. You can't use them. But if you have a special software that looks for this name before it talks to the DNS, "Oh, that was an 'onion' one. Ah, I need to treat that special," then you can have a system that can use those names without having to rely on the DNS underneath.

So not all domain names used are actually in the DNS system. The vast majority are in there, but there are a few that are not and that are treated by software that recognize these names and do something special with them and know that, "This is not in the DNS. I don't need to talk to the DNS about this name."

Such names are – you gave the example .onion. There's .local. There are a few others that you will see, but the vast majority are normal names.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We'll take two short questions from Mauricio and Alastair. And then we'll go to another speaker. He's already here.

MAURICIO OVIEDO CALDERON: Mauricio from Costa Rica. Thank you for the excellent presentation. Given that one of the upcoming major events on the root will be the KSK rollover on DNSSEC, my question is what are the main challenges that the RSSAC identified with this KSK rollover and how can the community collaborate to create more awareness of the process that's going to be? Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Actually a very good question. As you may know, the DNSSEC key – the key that's used to sign the root zone – the Key Signing Key will be changed later this year and that is a rather major event. It's extra sensitive because they're going to change the size of the key, if I remember correctly. Or was that the zone key? I think they are.

Anyhow, this is a first. This is the first time in the history of the world that we change the key in the root zone – the key that signs the key set. This means that we will have to publish two of these keys for a while. We will continue to publish the old key and we will add the new key in addition to that one so that you can go from one key to the next key and continue. And then

eventually a year later or so the old key will be removed. But during that year we will have two keys.

That means that when you ask for the key set for the root – when you send the DNS query for the key set – you will have a response which is much larger than it used to be during that time. It'll be larger and then a year from now it will go back to the normal size again. And that's something that we need to keep an eye on because larger responses means larger packets, and it could happen that a lot of clients cannot handle the bigger packets so they will say, "Oops. That was too big for me. I will have to ask again," hopefully using another method, maybe just ask again not realizing that it will get exactly the same answer again so it will be too big again.

So we can either have looping system when they just ask and ask and ask and ask, or they will change from something called UDP when you just send the packet to TCP where you do a lot of hand shaking to establish a stream of packets, and that's a much more expensive computer – expensive in the computer way – a much more expensive transaction so that's going to put a lot more load on our servers. So these are challenges that we are experimenting. We are trying to figure out how the client systems will work and how our server systems will react to that. So that's it.

Sorry, you had a second question which was quicker.

MAURICIO OVIEDO CALDERON: How can the community collaborate to create awareness?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please spread the word. Do talk to the [ICANN] Office of the CTO – the OCTO. They have a lot of promotion materials and they are happy – and I mean happy – if you spread the word about that and you can pop onto their web pages and so on. So do talk to the OCTO about spreading that word. They will be most happy to talk to you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Who is OCTO?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Office of the ICANN Chief Technical Officer.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Excellent. Thank you.

And the last question?

ALASTAIR STRACHAN: Hi. Alastair Strachan, first time Fellow based in Amsterdam. It may be a bit of a dumb question, but as an operator you mentioned Verisign. [I know] Verisign, RIPE NCC. Obviously Verisign is a company. RIPE NCC is not-for-profit. Is all of it financed by ICANN or is there multiple financial routes to keep this up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Very good question and if the root server operators have any motto, the motto is, “Diversity is good.” So the organizations are quite diverse. I work for a non-profit. You mentioned the RIPE NCC is a non-profit. We have two universities. We have two military organizations. We have a number of private companies. So these all are very different types of organizations, and each and every root server operator has their own financial model for how to provide funds for the service. I know how it works for Netnod. I have no idea how the military guys fund theirs. But they have their system at least. So it varies and that’s good.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Lars. Thank you very much for coming and taking these 30 minutes to talk to our Fellows. And thank you for responding to the questions. We have also the link to your site in our PowerPoint which I shared with our Fellows. So if there will

be more questions, feel free to stop Lars in the corridors and ask a question. And just say, “I am a Fellow.” That’s it.

Thank you, Lars.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you for having me here. You don’t have to say that you’re a Fellow. I am happy to talk to anyone actually.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: But if they say “Fellow,” that will be for sure.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is actually true.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much. Thank you, and with great pleasure I would like to introduce our next speaker, León. He was here.

León, please take a seat.

León was selected from NomCom two years ago, yeah?

LEON SANCHEZ: I think it’s going to be four [already].

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Four. Okay. León will talk about himself.

León, the floor is yours.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Siranush. My name is León Felipe Sánchez and I am a Mexican attorney, specialize in IP – in Intellectual Property – and my journey through ICANN has been not only interesting but rewarding and also fast. My first time as a Fellow was back in 2012 in Prague. I applied for the Fellowship Program and I got accepted, and then I began my journey with the Fellowship and the Fellows family back in 2012.

After attending Prague, then I applied again for the meeting in Beijing and I got my second Fellow meeting in Beijing. And, as you might already know, the best way in which you can begin to be involved in the ICANN environment is, of course, through the Fellowship Program and now the NextGen Program because literally you're taken by the hand and walked through the different organizations and structures that form this organization.

And, as Siranush just said, if you go with anyone and you say, "I'm a Fellow," everyone will literally open the doors and be happy to speak to you and guide you and answer to as many questions as they are allowed in between breaks because

everybody's very busy here. So sometimes we have less time than that we would like to dedicate to the Fellows, but it's always good and rewarding to speak to you.

After that, I had my third and last Fellow application filed to Buenos Aires. And in the meantime, the NomCom made this call for applications and I applied. I applied to a position in the ALAC – that is the At-Large Advisory Committee – representing the users from Latin America. Since I am from Mexico, my country belongs geographically to the Latin American and Caribbean region.

So there was this seat that was going to be vacated and I had attended a couple of NomCom meetings to begin to know how the process worked. And one of the things that I can tell you is that the NomCom looks for people that are not only knowledgeable of ICANN or the domain name system, but also that are independent and that have no ties to the rest of the community.

I remember that in my first meeting with the NomCom I asked the Chair who was in that year I think it was Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I asked her whether not belonging to any constituency was a factor that would actually give me less opportunity of being a successful applicant. And she replied, “no,” that it's actually a good thing. So if you don't have these ties, you actually

increment your chances of having a successful application. So if you are a first-time Fellow or if you're a second-time Fellow or even a third-time Fellow, don't feel pressured to fit into any constituency or to try to join any constituency.

Another thing that I can tell you is that being an Intellectual Property lawyer by training, and of course having this passion for Intellectual Property, the first place which I approached in ICANN was the IPC – that is the Intellectual Property Constituency – because it felt so natural to me to try to belong to this constituency. But then again, it's not that I didn't like the IPC, but it's just that I felt that I fit better in the At-Large Advisory Committee since I also have advocated for users' rights and users' causes in my country and in my region.

So what appeared to be a failure from the point of view that I thought that I would belonging to the IPC, it turned not to be so because I found my place in another constituency which, of course, was more aligned with my interests and my concerns at that specific point in life. So what I'm trying to tell you here is if you feel like you belong in some place and then you end realizing that you really don't belong there, not because of any negative feelings or whatever but because it's not what it really appeals, it doesn't have any appeal to you to make you engage with that community, don't worry about it. You'll find your place in ICANN or the place will find you. Thank you.

So I continued my journey once I got appointed by the NomCom in the ALAC, and right in my very first meeting as an ALAC member I began drafting policy. And this is what we do. The way in which we contribute to the ICANN Mission and to the community is by getting involved with the working groups, by drafting policy, by doing this volunteer work that we all do in these meetings and across the whole year.

Because one thing that I also think it's important to get to know is that, while we have these face-to-face meetings, most of the work is not done in the face-to-face meetings. Face-to-face meetings are useful because here is where we can meet each other, we can get to know each other, and if there are some things that haven't been actually working as we expected this is the place where we can sit and have a chat – a formal chat or an informal chat – and try to make things work. So yes, face-to-face meetings are very important but, as I said, most of the work is not done on face-to-face meetings but rather in the remote calls that are held through the different working groups maybe weekly, biweekly, whatever the schedule of that working group is.

The message here is don't have your eye just on the face-to-face meeting. Keep an eye on the working group and the agenda of that working group and get involved and try to attend as many

calls and meetings remotely as you can because that'll help you follow the thread of the discussion.

Because one of the things that I found challenging at the beginning and I am certain that you will be familiar with this feeling, is that when you come to the ICANN community as a newcomer or even as an experienced or as a long-time comer to these meetings, you find yourself in this world in which information is flowing so fast and you don't have a clue what they're talking about with these acronyms and these discussions and everybody seems to know each other because they do know each other, and that sometimes can be challenging.

So if you don't follow the discussion through not only the face-to-face meeting but, as I said, through the remote calls or the remote meetings, then you will continue to be challenged to actually participate and contribute in a meaningful way.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

León, if I can interfere – for the last two years you were co-Chair for the IANA Transition Working Group so can you tell us about what is it and how it started and where are we going, so it will bring us to the main topic? But thank you for invaluable suggestions for our newcomers. So let's go and touch on this IANA Transition topic because we have only 20 minutes left.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you.

After this work that I had done in the ALAC, then I got trusted with being appointed the co-Chair of the CCWG by the ALAC. What this means is that –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: What is CCWG?

LEON SANCHEZ: The CCWG – that is the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN’s Accountability. As you may be aware, there was this Transition process in which the contract between the NTIA – that is the National Telecommunications and Information Agency – from the U.S. government ceased to have effect. There was a contract in which this office of the United States government had committed or engaged with ICANN to carry some of the most important functions in the Internet, and the only thing that the government used to have was this stewardship from this function. So whenever these functions were performed, there was one last tick that had to be put in place and that was the tick from the U.S. government.

So the U.S. government expressed its will to end this contract in order to handle this stewardship to the Internet community, however you want to define the Internet community. And then it conveyed or put ICANN in charge of leading this process of having the Transition done and as a result of this task that they put in the hands of ICANN, ICANN formed different sub-groups that would need to form a proposal for the U.S. government to evaluate and then finally decide whether this Transition was to take place or not.

One of these groups was the CWG which is the IANA Transition Cross Community Working Group, and as the work of this group developed, some people saw the need of actually having to enhance ICANN's accountability because historically you have the U.S. government behind the most critical transactions performed by ICANN. And with the cease or with the expiration of this contract then there wouldn't be anyone who would be able to keep a leash, to say it in some way, on ICANN should at some point ICANN would turn rogue or want to do something that would destabilize the Internet or the domain name system.

So there was a second group which is this CCWG on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability that was formed, and that is the group that I had the privilege to co-Chair and we are actually continuing our work. So we divided our work in two phases, the first phase being having to build that strategy that would allow

the Transition to happen. We thought of measures that were essential for the Transition to happen and we also identified some other subjects that, not only for complexity but for time available, wouldn't be not only not essential to the Transition but it would take more time to develop a proposal on how to enhance those issues.

So this way we divided, as I said, our work in two phases, the first being Work Stream 1 which are those proposals that needed to be in place by the Transition, and Work Stream 2 which were those proposals that didn't depend on the Transition but still need to be worked out.

So what we're doing now is essentially to continue this work on this second phase, and we are developing, for example, a Framework of Interpretation on how Human Rights should be applied to the functions or to the Mission to the limited Mission and scope that ICANN has in its Bylaws. We are also having some discussions on diversity, how to better provide diversity to our community so we can have, of course, as many people participating in their own language or remotely with a gender balance, etc. So we're looking into that as well.

We are looking on how we can achieve SO and AC Accountability, meaning the Supporting Organizations and the Advisory Committees, to be accountable but to whom, for

example? So what we're discussing now is that each SO and AC should be transparent and open to everyone, but accountable to their own communities. So this means that the ALAC should be accountable to the Internet users, the GNSO should be accountable to the different constituents that form the GNSO, and so on, so forth. So that is another thing that we're discussing.

We're also discussing the staff accountability. To whom should staff be accountable in case there is any controversy between the community and staff or maybe between staff and the Board? And we're also discussing the new role that we think that the Ombudsman could carry after this Transition has taken place.

So as you see, we have a lot of subjects and topics being discussed and which are not trivial. They're not minor subjects to ICANN's Mission. So if you feel like you have an interest in any of these working groups, I definitely encourage you to join any of the mailing lists. If you don't have the information I will make sure that Siranush has this information handy and that it can distribute this information to you so you can subscribe to any of the mailing lists that are discussing the different topics and, of course, feel free to join any of the calls and any of the meetings in which we are continue to develop this Framework that will enable us to enhance ICANN's accountability.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And we already have questions coming up. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi. I am Bruna, first-time Fellow from Brazil. I would like to know if you're allowed to make a comment on the lawsuit that was filed by some U.S. states regarding the contracts held by them with the NTIA, the interference that they told the NTIA was doing.

LEON SANCHEZ: What I can tell you about it is the public information that's widely known. There were several states that were in this agreement that this contract was coming to an end so at the last hour when the Transition was about to take place, they filed a lawsuit trying to achieve an injunction so that the IANA Transition would be delayed. But in the end, the judge that actually reviewed the case dismissed the case because they found that they had no grounds to actually get the injunction and then this lawsuit was completely dismissed and that is what I can tell you because that's what I know.

BRUNA SANTOS: Okay. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Claire?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thank you. My name is Claire Craig. I am from Trinidad and Tobago. I am a newcomer to ICANN as well as a Fellow. Before I ask my question, you are currently on the Board or you are going to the Board?

LEON SANCHEZ: I am currently a member of the ALAC but I have been elected by the At-Large community to have a seat on the Board and I will be seating in the Board by November this year.

CLAIRE CRAIG: All right. So that eliminates [one question].

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: As you have heard also today in the morning that ASO was telling that they are sending two people to the Board. So each constituency, each community here, is sending a member to the Board and Seat 15 is ALAC seat. So At-Large end users are sending one representative to the Board. Rinalia who will come after León, she is outgoing. She was the At-Large seat, taken Seat 15 three years ago. She will be outgoing and León will be

the incoming one. And during the general meeting which is the last one in the course of the year which will be ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, Rinalia will step out, León will step in, for another three years. This is the process.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

My question, though, is thank you so much for sharing your journey into the whole ICANN family. You said you came in as an outsider through the NomCom procedure. I would like you to share with us what – you would have had expectations – what two things would you say you, one, was a positive that you experienced coming into the position more or less just straight out of the Fellowship Program and not being integrated in ICANN? And the second part is, what was a challenge that you experienced as a result of not being an insider?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. I've been a very lucky guy. A lot of people have helped me. Since my beginnings as a Fellow, as I said, they took me by the hand and showed me the way to get involved in ICANN. I can say that for me the most positive thing that I've had through my journey in ICANN is the community itself because the community has been very kind to me and they have literally helped me in every task that I have performed. So for me the most positive thing is the community itself. I am talking about

the ICANN-wide community because I have had people helping me from across different constituencies so it's not only the ALAC, it's also from other constituencies.

And challenging – I can tell you that challenging can be trying to contribute meaningfully when you don't have all the knowledge and background that your counterparts in the table already have. So that can be challenging. But don't get discouraged because I heard someone here saying this might be a dumb question. There are no dumb questions, believe me. So if you have a question, ask it. And I can assure you that many people will be willing to answer your questions and many people will also be willing to sit with you and explain to you in detail about your question. So don't get discouraged if you feel like you don't have something to contribute meaningfully to the discussion at that point. As many say, watch and learn. Keep your eyes and keep your ears open and wait until you feel comfortable contributing to the community.

You might find some people that are very vocal and that might at some point make you feel like you don't know what you're talking about. Again, don't get discouraged. It happens. And it will continue to happen. But don't get discouraged.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: But if you want to learn, just point out that person, try to catch him in the corridor, and talk to him privately, and you'll get a lot.

So I have in the line Shuyi and Israel.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Hello. In your opinion, what's the main difference between ALAC and NCUC from a final user perspective? I've been asked about that difference for some [who have] Fellows so I'd like to know your opinion about that.

LEON SANCHEZ: I think that the main difference could be how each of the different groups approach different issues. So the At-Large community addresses and tries to contribute to issues from a wider perspective, I think, than the NCUC. The NCUC is the Non-Commercial Users Constituency which is grounded within the GNSO, and they make wonderful contributions to the debate from the point of view of the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

What we do at the ALAC is to analyze the policy that is coming from the GNSO which has, of course, the feedback from the NCUC and also the feedback from the ALAC because at a second layer, having the different RALOs participate in the different working groups, we also feed into the [process] of the policy.

And once that policy is shaped, then we go through that policy and provide the advice that we feel could be useful for the Board to better implement the policy that's coming from the GNSO or the ccNSO.

So the main difference, as I said, is the way in which each of the groups approach the different topics that are being discussed.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Thank you.

SHUYI GUO: Hi. I'm Shuyi. I'm from China and a first-time new Fellow here. Actually my main focus is on policy so I'm a little bit interested about the PTI. As you know, it is now taken ahold the charge of the IANA functions but like how to ensure the accountability of its operations and who is going to oversee its responsibilities, and I will like to if you want can share more about the PTI's procedures. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Shuyi. I'm not an expert on the structure of the PTI although, of course, I am familiar with it. But what I can tell you is that the PTI has built in many mechanisms for accountability. One of them is the Customer Standing

Committee. This Customer Standing Committee is in charge of reviewing the performance of the PTI and, of course, should that performance not be optimal then they have the means to actually, for example, remove [directors] from the PTI or take other measures. They could eventually have the IANA functions removed from the PTI and taking it to another body, so I think that is like the worst case scenario which an accountability measure would have this kind of consequence.

That's what I can tell you about the PTI. As I said, I am not an expert on the PTI structure but I am aware that they do have these accountability measures and at a certain point that they would trigger a procedure like this one.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So we have [Clemente] and Evelyn, and we'll close the –

EVELYN NAMARA: Hi. I'm Evelyn Namara and a first-time ICANN Fellow –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Claudio.

EVELYN NAMARA: Yeah. So I just want some clarification on the Board structure. In the morning when the ASO team presented, they said that their

seat is specifically eight and was it eight or nine, or nine and ten? So I want to know how many seats are there and who is on which, what number, and are they really specific numbers for each of the different committees? That's still confusing for me.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Evelyn, we'll be having two Board members right after.

EVELYN NAMARA: Okay.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So your question will be actual to be raised again, and as León is incoming, he may not be giving...so he knows, of course, but those who are in the Board may give you a better response.

EVELYN NAMARA: Alright. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: That question will be useful for me as well. But I can tell you, I don't know the Board seat numbers as well but I do know that the Board has 15 voting members and five liaisons so there is a total of 20 seats in the Board and, as Siranush pointed, we will have Lito who has already arrived and Rinalia, which are expert

Board members by now and they will be able to provide us with a better answer to that.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And Claudio, the last question to León.

CLAUDIO LUCENA: Thank you very much, Siranush. Cláudio Lucena, Paraíba State University from Brazil. León, I would like to thank you very much for the participation and for sharing it with us, building on what Claire said, because not because of your personal path in the organization but also very interesting but because of the way you addressed our concern to make meaningful contributions. That's very difficult for us.

I've heard the same question. I always think that this line of, "This is not a dumb question," is just a line. Turns out it's not. Israel just made here the same question the tenth time and I heard the tenth different answer, and each time it helps build something different for us who are coming.

I'm following groups on Accountability and Jurisdiction, but the reaction I think I share with my Fellows is looking at a train that's passing by, a beautiful train, taken to a wonderful destination, just it's passing 150 miles an hour. And then the idea is hopping

in and trying to contribute. So your idea of making a meaningful contribution is very important to us.

And on that basis I'd like to ask you, complementing our Fellows] question, on the process that you follow on the IANA Transition, do you think that all potential, foreseeable, problems are treated in accountability issue or do you see any vulnerability that might rise stemming from that process that we have not given the necessary attention yet? Thank you very much again.

LEON SANCHEZ:

No, thank you for your kind words and I can assure you that a lot of people invested a lot of time in designing these accountability measures. Of course, as any system, they are not perfect. They can be dynamic and there may come a time in which we will need to review these accountability measures. It would be stupid from my side to say that we have foreseen or tried to prevent all possible situations because that is not humanly possible. But I can assure you that as far as I can tell the system is very solid, and we have taken great care in designing it to avoid as many possibilities of gaming the system as possible. But, of course, as I said, it's not a perfect system so at some point it might need a review.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: With this, I would like to thank León and congratulate you once again for taking this step and with great pleasure introduce our two guests from the Board, from current Board, our two current Board members Rinalia Abdul Rahim who is from Asia Pacific and now sit in the Board from ALAC, Seat #15, and an alumni Fellowship member, Lito Ibarra from Latin America. So please welcome. The floor is yours. Tell us about what is to be a Board member and how to get there.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Hello, everyone. I love ICANN Fellows. Thank you. I hear that they love it, too. The thing is at every ICANN meeting when I first started I noted that ICANN Fellows are very special and they are given very special treatment, and it is with great hope that ICANN wishes that from here you graduate to being part of the ICANN community and actually contribute to the work.

In terms of what does it take to be a Board member, there are some qualifications. You need some corporate governance experience and what that means is not necessarily in the for-profit sector but in the non-profit, that's fine as well. And that's important at the Board level. Beyond that, subject matter expertise across the board is appreciated and, of course, when you come into ICANN you have to be prepared to work really hard, to read a lot of documents, and to move really, really fast.

Sometimes when you move too fast it's not the best decision-making but you have to do the best that you can with what you have.

I think that when you are here you'll be really inspired by the Mission of ICANN and the place that ICANN has in terms of the Internet ecosystem and sustaining Internet globally. But also ICANN is just one small player in the whole field, and I think that we need to have an understanding of those other organizations. And if you are interested to branch out, you could also get to know the other organizations.

My friend Lito here is a great friend of the Regional Internet Registries – so the numbers community – and he also manages a ccTLD – the country code Top Level Domain – for his country. So these are areas that you can go into. It's not just ICANN here, but beyond that in terms of sister organizations.

Lito?

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Rinalia, and thank you all for inviting us to this session. I would like to start saying that I'm also a Fellow. I have the honor of being the first Fellow in the Board. So that I think counts for something.

As Rinalia said, my background is from the technical side. I started with the Internet in my country running the ccTLD and also got involved in the IP addresses – the numbering community – and I’m happy and honored to be part of the Board of LACNIC. If you remember, LACNIC is one of the five RIRs in the world that handles the IP addresses – Ipv4 and IPv6 and ASN.

When I was appointed to the Board by the NomCom, I’m one of the eight – we will go into the numbers a little bit later – I’m one of the eight Board members that are appointed by the NomCom – the Nominating Committee. Our periods are for three years, all of us, except liaisons that they can stay longer, but most of us our periods are for three years and we can be reappointed or reselected, re-elected, depending on the constituency that promotes or appoints you.

I was saying I was a Fellow twice and I already knew about names and numbers, as I said before. But there is a lot [more] in ICANN, as you probably know by now, that each one of the groups and constituencies that get together at ICANN meetings, they all have their interests, their objectives, their expectations, their projects, their vision, about what is Internet, what ICANN should be doing for and in favor of a better Internet in the whole world.

And I think we all are part of that because besides coming to ICANN or staying in touch and staying engaged with ICANN in different areas that we can select from, I think we have the Mission, we have the obligation, in our countries, in our regions, to foster or to develop more the Internet access, the good usage of Internet, to work in the purpose of having this marvelous tool as a means for development of our countries, mainly in underdeveloped countries.

That is, I think, one of our takeaways from every Fellow opportunity that we get to attend to an ICANN meeting and to be an Ambassador when we go back to our countries to get more people engaged, more of our friends, let them know what is ICANN about, what is its role in the Internet, and we'll try to fulfill that and to accomplish that.

From when I was a Fellow I think that this coaching model in the Fellow Program has been a huge progress. We are all progressing and making steps forward in all areas of ICANN, so that is a good thing because we all can contribute to new ideas, to new ways of improving what we do. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Questions?

Yes. Jelena, then Claire, then Anju.

JELENA OZEGOVIC: Stupid question alert. It's about your responsibility. You said that as a member of the Board you're also managing the ccTLD registry. How do you have time for everything? I thought that members of the Board is a full-time position. That's the only thing you do. Isn't the responsibility and everything you do too much besides the regular work you have?

LITO IBARRA: Thank you for the question. I can say that I try to organize the time in a proper way. Thanks to Internet, I never stop working because I can still do my homework from here or from anywhere that I am at some point.

But it's true, there's a lot of time demanding from the side of the ICANN Board. I don't know if you know, we have at least six face-to-face meetings in the year. The three ICANN general meetings and three what we have a workshop for ourselves in some part of the organization, some officers from the organization, and we try to advance all our topics in those areas.

But we also have teleconference. We have committees. We have working groups. And we have to deal with all of the documents that come about. If the ones here like me that English is not our first language, it's another layer of difficulty. But anyway, it's a

matter of organizing and giving the respective time to everything. And I have a family. I have three children and two grandchildren. So I have to take care of that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'd like to answer that question as well. The simple answer is that it's a sacrifice. You are not expected to do this full time and you are expected to have your own life and your own job, but the requirement of being effective as a Board member means that you spend a lot of time on it. Otherwise you won't be effective. And I think that almost everyone in the ICANN ecosystem tends to overwork. When you're on the Internet you're on the Internet almost all the time, and I think it's important that we try to exercise some discipline in balance but then we'd have to figure out how to be effective in that regard. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [You know the turn]. Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Hi. Good evening. My name is Claire Craig. I'm a newcomer as well as a Fellow, and I'm from Trinidad and Tobago. My question is – and I had asked León part of the question before which was, what was something positive that he experienced on the Board and what was something challenging? The third part of the

question was, how do you remain independent? There is a perception that when you become part of a Board it's easy for you to be part of the hood and to just go along with the rest of the team. How do you remain concrete with your independent ideas? Both of you, I would like to hear your perspectives on it, please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I will answer the last question and I'll let Lito answer all the rest. How do we maintain independence? It's through exercise of individual judgement. If you are appointed by a Supporting Organization or an Advisory Committee into the Board, there is pressure that you be supportive of your group's position, but I think that once you're appointed to the ICANN Board it is your duty to exercise independent judgement. And when you do not do that, your Board colleagues can see your partiality and that will affect your effectiveness in the Board. Thanks.

LITO IBARRA: I'll just go briefly [with] that second part. I would like to say also that I'm from El Salvador, which is a very small country in Central America and I was, as I said before, involved in both numbers and ccTLDs so I was already part of the ccNSO and also part of the, in some way, ASO, because I am part of one of the

RIRs. But since I was appointed by the NomCom, I see myself as not representing any of those.

It's good for me to know about what they do and I'm learning – because you are always learning – about what the other constituencies do. But besides staying with a clear mind and clear focus and trying to be consistent with what you do, what you think, I think another key element is continue to engage with the community, continue to listen to your friends, your new friends, your old friends, that are part of the community that work here within ICANN environment or in your country, in your region, about the issues they have. So that gives you a wide spectrum that you can bring to the Board. And especially like in our case, we are from different regions in the world and we have different needs, different views, so it's important that we bring that to the table in the Board. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: León, please?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, I want to add something quick. The lawyer in me has to speak. The Bylaws actually mandate and they establish a duty to Board members to act in their own personal capacity in the best interests of the corporation or the organization. So it expressly

states that you have to act in the best interest of the organization and that you should not act in representation of either the people that elected you or your employer or any other business situations that could put you in conflict of interest. So it is mandated also by the Bylaws that you need to stay independent.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'd like to add to the point that León made about conflicts of interest, and how the Board deals with it it is that if you are a Board member and you find that the Board is about to deliberate on a topic where you have a conflict, there is an obligation that you declare your interest and that you abstain from participating either in the discussion and definitely not in the decision-making. So whether or not you participate in the discussion is at the discretion of the whole Board. They can decide whether or not they want to hear your point of view or they can decide that this is too much of a conflict, it puts the organization or the operation at risk, please step out of the room while we discuss this or when we make the decision on that. So that's very important. It's taken very seriously at ICANN. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Anju?

ALPEREN EKEN: May I ask a follow-up question?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Who was that?

ALPEREN EKEN: Hello. It is Alperen from Turkey. I am also a Fellow and a newcomer. You said that Board members must work for the best interest of ICANN. In that sense, in the Board the people are knowledgeable having experience either in Internet or in corporate governance or in both. Sometimes it is hard in multistakeholder model to reach to an end solution. In that sense, does ICANN Board have a tendency to solve problems itself like apart from multistakeholder model?

LITO IBARRA: I wouldn't say we do that. We ourselves are multistakeholder because we come from different sectors, different areas, or we have the knowledge by having worked in some of the sectors so we can act like a mini multistakeholder body. As for how do we proceed in that? We discuss a lot. Maybe sometimes more than too much. That takes us very long times sometimes. It depends on the subject. We also have the fortune of having many of very

well-qualified officers – lawyers, technicians, engineers, and some other expertise – not only within the Board but in the ICANN organization. So with all of those elements, we finally take decisions and we usually do that by consensus. It's very rare that we take an actual vote. We try to convince and to reach consensus by discussing and talking among ourselves.

ALPEREN EKEN:

Actually what I meant was, apart from the policy coming from stakeholder groups, do you have the capacity to produce a policy?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

The ICANN Board is of the position that it is not the body that is best equipped to make policy. In the past there may have been cases where the Board was in a position to do that. The Board that we have right now is of the view that we do not make policy. If there is a problem with policy recommendations that come from Supporting Organizations, we would push it back to them and say, "There is a problem with this policy. Fix it." Okay? Thanks.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

Anju please. Finally.

ANJU MANGAL:

Finally. My name is Anju and I am from Fiji and I'm one of the Fellows. My question is, I've got two questions actually but very quick ones. Does the Board allow Fellowships like to be attached to learn from you, one?

Two is, how much power do you guys have in terms of dealing with the multistakeholder approach, for example, looking at the different regions how many people should be part of the different constituencies, the different groups?

And also in terms of multistakeholder approach, I did ask around about this – what are your views in terms of whether it's working or not? Be honest. Because you're Board members you will see what's happening, what's not happening, so I think it's important for us to know. Sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. From my point of view there are some things may be working and some things may not be working, so maybe it would be good to know from you as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

I love the idea of Board Fellowship.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think that was not two questions. That was more than two questions. The first question about, I think it relates to, are Board members allowed to have interns follow, and I think there is no such policy. Probably [will] not allow to because some of the issues that we deal with are confidential in nature. However, we are encouraged to mentor each other, especially if we have new Board members coming in, then a more seasoned Board member would be assigned to mentor the newer one.

In terms of the multistakeholder – your second question was, is there a number that is optimal to populate the constituencies and stakeholder groups? In the Bylaws, certain numbers are fixed. For example, the ALAC is a group of 15 members. The ccNSO council I think is about the same figure. The GNSO Council also has a fixed figure.

But in terms of the members of their community itself, there is no limit to it and that is actually good because ICANN is meant to be an open system. You don't expect people who come in can be effective all at the same time. They all have a learning curve. Some people become effective at a certain time, others at a later time, and so you need an open system to allow for continuity. And it is a challenge to be available and effective all the time. You really don't want to get old in this organization.

The last question where you asked for honesty on, does the multistakeholder model work? Sometimes it works, sometimes it fails. When it fails is when you do not reach consensus. One of the examples where it did succeed is the Transition of the IANA Stewardship where ICANN became an independent organization. Compromises had to be reached but we managed it. Your turn.

LITO IBARRA:

I will take one of the questions and link it to one of the answers León was giving when we arrived about the Transition and Accountability process. By definition, if you get into a multistakeholder model discussion and you decide that that is the model you want to take to solve or to get to decisions and conclusions, by definition there will be happy persons at the end and – let me rephrase that – nobody will be happy at the end because everybody has to give, to decline to their ambitions or to their original objectives in order to get a middle point for everybody. So that is one of the things that I think is good and bad from the multistakeholder model. If you have one single [president] that gives the orders, everything goes faster but it's not with the acquaintance of the rest of the community.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I just wanted to apologize because I have to run to another meeting and I just want to say that if you would like to talk to me further, at the ICANN Wrap-Up Cocktail after the Public Board Meeting on Thursday I will make myself available to talk to you if you wanted. Is that question [for me?]

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Rinalia, thank you very much and please make sure you talk to Rinalia after that. Thank you, Rinalia, for coming but we have the privilege of keeping our Fellows with us more. So for maximum 10 minutes for our interpreters just to know.

LEON SANCHEZ: Can I just say something?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, please León.

LEON SANCHEZ: Just to add to what Lito was saying. Some define consensus as the art of having everybody equally unhappy.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Liz, your question was to Rinalia only or you can ask your question to boys as well?

ELIZABETH OREMBO: Most of it was to Rinalia because – like 70% – because she relates to us as women. Now, for the record I’m Liz Orembo from Kenya ICT Action Network but not asking on behalf of it. Now, I know the community works very hard and it’s one good example of multistakeholderism and moving work to places where we want to get to. Even in churches we have politics. So my question is, how do you get to the Board? How do you play your politics within the multistakeholder community to get into the Board? And to Rinalia or any other person in the leadership, how different is it as a woman?

LITO IBARRA: I will start with the last one. The issue of diversity is a hot topic everywhere within the ICANN community. As you may know, there’s a working group in Work Stream 2 – the second phase of Accountability in Transition – that is devoted to diversity. I’m part of that group as a liaison from the Board so I know we have been struggling around, for instance, stating a specific number of diversity by gender, by geographical, skills, age, disability, and some other issues that we look at at diversity. But it’s very hard to establish a fixed number because in the case of the Board – and your question, how did you get to the Board – you have to have certain skills, certain experience, as Rinalia was saying, and

that is good from a woman or a man. That doesn't matter. It's just that you want to apply for a board you have to have these skills and competencies.

In principle, there is no discrimination but at the end what we have seen and we hope it changes, there are more male applicants than female applicants but we certainly are trying to work that. I do in my country, I try to work for having more women involved in areas such as the technical ones, although it's not needed here because you can be a lawyer, a politician, or something else, not only a technician to participate.

And as to how do you make your politics? I think if you have a good record, you participate, you're engaged, you give your free time, like she said, we're expected to work a lot but also to be very efficient in what you do. So if you do that, you are more close to getting into the Board.

[ELIZABETH OREMBO]: I will follow you privately for a private chat just for you to tell me what elements do you think you have for people to have elected you as a Board member.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: There was a question earlier, Lito, the structure of Board. So what are the seats, those 15 seats? Who is sending, which

constituency is sending a Board member? How the system is working there?

LITO IBARRA:

Okay. There are 20 seats in total. The numbers doesn't really matter, the position. They use that because that is the way they are written in the Bylaws but at the end, it's not important if you are position one or seven or whatever. But the eight Board members come from the NomCom, two come from ASO – the numbers community, the Address Supporting Organization – two come from the GNSO – the Generic Names – two come from the ccNSO – the country code – that is how many?

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS: Fourteen.

LITO IBARRA:

Okay. Then one from At-Large – currently it's Rinalia. León is taking that place, that seat number. And there are four liaisons – from the IETF, from the GAC, from [RSSAC and SSAC], and finally the CEO and President of the Board is part of the Board also. So that's interesting we have a President and CEO who is Göran Marby at the moment, and we also have a Chair of the Board who is Steve Crocker now, and a Vice Chair of the Board who is

Cherine Chalaby. So those are the leadership roles in the structure of the ICANN Board.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Lito. If you must know the number of the seats, we have [found it] here, and Seats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, as Lito said, are for the Nominating Committee so those are seats that are supposed to be filled by the NomCom. Then we have the Regional Internet Registries with Seats 9 and 10, which are the ASO. Then the ccTLD registries with 11 and 12. Then the GNSO with 13 and 14. And the At-Large Advisory Committee with Seat 15. And then we have the liaisons which are the GAC, the RSSAC, and the SSAC. And, as Lito said, the President and CEO and the Internet Engineering Task Force with four others.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Alastair and the last question Alexander and then we are done.

ALASTAIR STRACHAN: Alastair Strachan, first-time Fellow from Amsterdam. I find it a bit strange that there's only one At-Large seat because the end users are pretty much the most important people in the – well, actually I'm not going to go with that now – but they're very important in the Internet and I find it strange the fact the people

who represent the end users' needs only has one seat and all the other ones have two. Was that just a Bylaw thing? Why is that?

LITO IBARRA:

This is just my thinking about that because I wasn't there [when] the original Bylaws were written and this was carried from the original Bylaws. But I [would] suspect that since ICANN is devoted to the names, numbers, and protocols, that it made sense at least at the time that those organization had two seats each [and] as a general rule, Advisory Committees have one seat, [being] that a liaison or a voting member such as At-Large and so on. So that would be my guess. I wasn't there at the beginning.

LEON SANCHEZ:

I wasn't there either but the history that I know is pretty much the same as Lito. In the beginning there were no At-Large members in the Board. There were only liaisons. And afterwards after the first review then it was recommended that one seat should be occupied by the Internet users and there was also this suggestion that there should be the need to have two seats but that recommendation didn't pass so we only have one seat.

And we are going through a review process right now – the second review process of the At-Large community – and so far

the recommendations from the review team also point to not having a second seat. So the reasons may be diverse, of course, but this is what the committee has achieved so far, to have only one seat even though, as you say, it might be one of the most meaningful communities to actually be represented in the Board.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Alexander – just brief. Thank you.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: I try to be brief. First of all I would like to [thank] Board members for coming here and for my Fellows and colleagues I would like to mention that from yesterday's session I like only one answer. It was an answer to the question about the issues, the main, issue, because actually the answer was much more interesting and saying what actually Board does, what are the problems it solves, and actually for stakeholders [it shows that] the Board works, [I bet the answer and question] were rehearsed.

So but I have a question for you as a technical representative [and as] a follow-up of my yesterday's question, how Board ensures diversity of technical infrastructure and now independence from one jurisdiction, from maybe strange decisions and executive orders, are there any [works running

ordered] by Boards or are you watching something? I was talking about technical Plan B for jurisdiction and technical infrastructure.

LITO IBARRA: We have the root server system which is widespread – well, not so widely spread in the world but we know there are some instances – and there’s the RSSAC – the Root Server System Advisory Committee – and also the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Because both data centers with KSKs are in the United States, so that’s maybe [a main problem].

LITO IBARRA: That’s part of the history. I haven’t seen any initiative to try to –

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: [Diverse]. To try to [diverse] it.

LITO IBARRA: Yes. To try to move or to have this more widespread. So that’s an accident of history because it was raised there and I don’t see if we are going to see that in the near future.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Tomorrow [will be] [SSAC]. We will ask them.

LITO IBARRA: Excuse me?

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Tomorrow Security Advisory Council comes here. We will ask [why do they like] both data centers to be in the United States.

LITO IBARRA: Yes. That's a valid question

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Thank you very much.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much and thank you Lito and León, for coming. It was a real pleasure having you with us in real time so thank you very much. And I would like to thank everyone for staying so late today, but I hope that you will enjoy evening with visiting several parties. But don't forget about being here tomorrow at 8:30 so we have another full day tomorrow with you.

Thank you very much. Have a nice evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]