COPENHAGEN – Fellowship Program Morning Session
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 08:30 to 10:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	For the record, it is Wednesday, March 15th. This session is Fellowship Program morning session at 8:30 in Hall A1.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Good morning. Good morning. All is good? You remember our first night, there was a sentence, "I'm tired, alumni kept me out all night is never a good excuse." So, I hope you enjoyed yesterday evening, those who were at [Gem's] party. Those who were not, enjoy it anyway.
	Wow, Wednesday morning. So, only two more days to go, and today, we have several wonderful guests and I would like to introduce our first guest today, Security and Stability Advisory Committee member Suzanne Woolf who is also the liaison to the ICANN Board of Directors.
	So, Suzanne will talk about SSAC, another abbreviation we learned during those days. Suzanne, the floor is yours. Your PowerPoint will be on now.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you, Siranush, very much. I think actually that having been out all night and having it be this late in the week, everybody is tired so I find that an acceptable excuse. I was up a little bit late myself, so I'm hoping you'll bear with me.

I have just a couple of slides.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: They are going up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. While we're trying to get those up, your schedule initially said Patrik Fältström – who's Chair of SSAC – would be with you this morning.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, the updated one is on the screen.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm sorry?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: The updated one already is there, so they have the old one. I gave them, so your name is already in it.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. I actually was a former liaison to the ICANN Board. I stepped aside from that role at the last ICANN meeting, and I'm frankly privileged to be just here as an SSAC member and a contributor to the work of SSAC. I'm fascinated by the technical malfunctions here. The threat to the security and the stability of the morning session. But I can get started with our introductory overview.

SSAC is one of the constellation of Advisory Committees across ICANN, and I know you've seen the community organizational chart that says who goes where and who interacts with whom, but basically, Security and Stability Advisory Committee – there we go, thank you – is one of the several Advisory Committees, and basically, we interact across the entire community with PDPs, with the SOs and ACs.

And we don't end up being involved in everything that comes before the community, but we do get engaged on a variety of issues and processes where there are implications for the technical underpinnings of what ICANN does.

So, who we are. Currently, there are 31 members of SSAC. Technically, we're appointed by the ICANN Board, but there is a membership committee of SSAC that selects the members. The Board basically ratifies those decisions, those selections.

We're chartered to advise the ICANN community and the Board both on matters relating to the security, integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. Which sounds complicated and deeply technical, and sometimes is, but basically we're experts on the technical side of the things that ICANN does.

The expertise of the group, routing and addressing, domain name system operations and security. There are quite a few of us who have experience in registry/registrar businesses, in particular on the technical side, folks who are very active in anti-abuse efforts of various kinds, and work on cybercrime issues, internationalization, Internet services and access providers, and many of us have a lot of experience at this point in this community, so we have a lot of knowledge about ICANN policy and operations.

The mechanism of our advice is we publish documents. I was surprised when I saw that there were 91 of them since 2002, but actually, I went and looked, and we do several per year, and we also work closely with all of these groups. We do a lot of – a

bunch of us are at ICANN meetings and interact with the various work that's going on in the community. So, we do a variety of different kinds of outreach. Next, please. Thank you.

And where we sit sort of in the process, ICANN's mission and core values, we have a role to play in helping ICANN stay within its mission and to do what it needs to do very well, with proper respect for the security and stability on the technical side, the operational side.   So, we help ICANN ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems, preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security and global interoperability of the Internet.

The process we go through is when there's an issue of interest that's brought to us by really anybody, maybe internally generated by members who have seen an issue arise or from other groups that are asking for our input, but the workflow is we form a work party, members, and we also have tremendous staff support for SSAC from ICANN staff.

But there's a process of research on the issue and writing a document, an advisory or a correspondence, and an extensive review and approval cycle, because SSAC documents, by the time they're published, they represent consensus of SSAC.

So, a subgroup with particular expertise will go and work on a document and work on an issue, but when we produce a

document, it also has to be reviewed by all of SSAC so that when a document is published, it's the consensus of the entire group.

And we publish – there's an area on the website that belongs to SSAC and we announce advisories. SSAC does have a liaison to the Board, and part of what we do is make sure that the Board has seen every advisory, whether it's principally addressed to them or to other parts of the community.

So, what happens with our advice? The advice is submitted to the Board, and that's particularly the process when the Board has asked us for input on a particular issue, but this is pretty much what always happens. And the Board is actually committed – has formal commitments to all of the ACs to take advice, to at least review it very carefully and prepare a response.

So, the Board will acknowledge the advice, we'll review it, we'll take whatever time cycle is appropriate, and sometimes it takes a while and sometimes it's very quick. The Board will take formal action on the advice it has gotten from SSAC. The community is actually very respectful. We take our work very seriously, and the community seems to appreciate the input and take it seriously as well.

So, the outcomes of our advice can include – the Board can share that advice with other partiers, with other groups in the

community that are affected. It can become part of a formal policy development process, one of the inputs to policy.

With some of our advice, the thing that has to be done is the ICANN organization has to decide to implement it and to go ahead and do that, and that may take staff time, other resources. Sometimes, there are budgetary concerns, so that process can be fairly complicated.

Or, sometimes the Board says, "Thank you very much SSAC for your advice. We greatly appreciate your input to our thinking and we're going to do something else." And again, the Board takes the advice seriously enough that there will be an explanation as to why they decided to do something else. So, next. One more.

This is sort of the snapshot of what we're currently involved with. We're working on a couple of advisories at the moment. We have small groups on each of these topics: management of the namespace, IDN harmonization – which is there's enough experience at this point with IDNs that we are looking at the different processes that touch on how IDNs are delegated and administered, and trying to provide some overall feedback on how some of those processes are working – rate limiting and central zone data source, administration of that database which provides access to all of the TLD zone files for various interested

parties. Some risk management, risk review on new TLDs. And I'm not part of that work party, so if there are questions about that, I have to take those back and get you an answer later.

There's also an ongoing effort – there are quite a few experts in DNS security in SSAC, and there are workshops at each of the ICANN meetings on DNSSEC for people who are not experts but want to learn, and those are very operational oriented, those are very technical. But that's a regular effort at all of the ICANN meetings, and people seem – there are always new people and there's always a lot of information there.

The Membership Committee works on an open cycle, which means there's not a period of the year or a nominations period or anything like that. They're always willing to consider interested folks for membership in SSAC.

Several recent publications, and those are all available from SSAC.icann.org. The document repository is there, everything is published, and a couple of them were – our technical work on high level topics like the IDN work we're doing, but also some of them are specific comments on public comment periods or for policy development processes. So, our publications are designed to serve a couple of different purposes as input to various things going on in the community.

And we've done a lot of outreach. We've done video, we've done videos as part of introductory materials on ICANN. SSAC members are involved all across the community. There's a Facebook group, and we do workshops at the IGF, because quite a few of our members are – we come to our work with a primarily technical orientation, but quite a few of us are also very experienced and interested on the business and policy side of what ICANN does and what the community is concerned with.

So, that's what I had. That's who we are, and I can take some questions or let people get a few more minutes for coffee.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Suzanne. Claire, the first question, and Afifa, get ready.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Is this on? It's on. Okay. Hi, good morning. My name is Claire Craig. I am from Trinidad and Tobago. I'm a Newcomer and a Fellow. My question, yesterday we had a very stimulating presentation from Rick Lamb, and he spoke to us about ethical hacking as one of the topics. And I wanted to know, when I looked at some of your publications, it talks about responses to comments.

Does your committee do anything like – you know, some of the things he said with the ethical hacking was that you find things that people may not be aware of that can happen in the future. So, do you look at those kinds of things and provide advice or comments on things that are possible on the Internet but which we haven't yet experienced? Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you for that question, I like that. And welcome as a Newcomer. That's actually a fair amount of our work, particularly with policy development processes across the community. We don't have an active component of our work as SSAC. And now I wish I had seen Rick's presentation. I'll have to ask him for the particulars on that. Because what SSAC does does not have an active component of that kind. That's where implementation comes in, that's where maybe the staff or some of the other parties in the community would implement our advice, maybe in that way if that was appropriate.

But a great deal of what we do is try to think through the implications of a proposed policy or action in terms of impact on the security and stability of the systems ICANN is responsible for and the ecosystem overall.

As an example, one of the things we're doing in the IDN work party is people are talking about maybe in the next round of new

gTLDs having some new rules, and basically relaxing some of the rules we had about what IDNs were eligible to be delegated. And the question then becomes, are there security and stability implications for that? There are obviously going to be business and other implications, but what we talk about is, okay, does that change how people use the DNS? Does that change what they can expect from the DNS?

There are some security issues that we have identified early, where for instance with IDNs, it's easy to have names that look like they're the same and not, and it sort of enables – if we're not careful, there's a lot of enabling of certain kinds of attacks, phishing and some of those kinds of threats.

And one of the things we're looking at right now is how are we doing on maintaining a set of rules that doesn't enable that behavior but enables people to get what they need from the DNS. So, that's actually a big part of our orientation in our work, is foreseeing and meeting some of those kinds of challenges.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Afifa?

AFIFA ABBAS: Very good morning. I'm Afifa Abbas from Bangladesh. I'm one of the Fellows and Newcomer. Currently, I'm working as a security

analyst in a telecom operator. So far, my understanding about SSAC, it actually the work they do, it actually affects the entire security of the Internet.

So, as a security analyst, I just don't want to confine myself within the – to ensure the security within my local community only, but in near future I have the strong desire to work and to secure the entire Internet. So, do you have any place in SSAC for Newcomers to contribute? As I was having a conversation with John Crain and he said that to get involved with SSAC, we need to have security expertise like more than 20 years plus. So, after going back, how can I get involved with SSAC? Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you for that question. My friend John Crain was exaggerating a little bit, so I wouldn't be intimidated. He's not a very intimidating person anyway, but first of all, I wouldn't be scared off. I would also want to point out that what ICANN does is very important, and what even frankly we think SSAC does is important and useful, but only a very small piece of what it takes to secure the internet.

So, I wouldn't confine the interest only to ICANN and this community, but certainly within this community, first of all I do encourage – and we can talk afterwards about submitting your

particulars to SSAC. Sorry, I was just distracted here. But there are quite a few different ways.

There are always issues before us. The other thing you can get from talking with some SSAC members is some of them are also active in other groups. Some of the anti-cybercrime and anti-abuse groups are attached to the regional Internet registries and some of those. So, there's actually a variety of ways to get broader involvement, and I would encourage you to consider talking with the Membership Committee about possibly just joining SSAC.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Violet, please.

VIOLET NINGAKUN: Thank you for the very nice presentation. My name is Violet Ningakun. I'm from Papua New Guinea and I'm a first time Fellow. So, my question is – I've got two questions. Do you have any best practices on security and stability? That's one, and the second one is, what outreach programs do you have in less developing countries like the pacific for instance? Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you. I like both of those questions, and I'm realizing that I need to go back to the first question. I'll answer the second one, and then I'll need to hear the first one again.

What SSAC generally does isn't oriented on a particular location or area of the world, but we do work with ICANN staff and other elements of the community on work that may have particular applicability in a particular region. So, I'm not quite sure specifically how the answer your question, except to say that we try to provide input to processes that will be directly involved maybe more in one region of the world than another. In particular, ICANN the organization and At-Large have these very regionally oriented activities and groups, and SSAC will help them out.

I think there's actually some additional outreach that we do that I just realized it wasn't on the slide, which is that sometimes, we get to be a source when someone is needed to present on a particular issue in a regional conference or meeting, or particular context.

So, we're a resource more than having a specific orientation on particular regions of the world, but we do try to be part of the larger efforts, particularly in places – I don't know if John or any of the OCTO guys presented on the work they do. There are

several ICANN staff members who we sometimes help out who spend a great deal of their time.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [We had Richard Lamb.]

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right, Rick spends a lot of his time, and there are several members of the staff that sometimes SSAC members also help out. And now I remember your other question which was on best practices. We do actually write some number of documents that are best practices in particular areas, and I would be happy to go over the document list with you and point out some that you might find interesting.

They tend to be for DNS operators, for network operators. Sometimes for users, although it's very difficult with some of the obscurity of some of the things we work with. It can be very difficult to address users directly, so typically we end up addressing the technical and business folks.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Any other question? Yes, please. Nenad before.

NENAD MARINKOVIC: My question will be something – Nenad Marinkovic from Serbia, I'm fellowship here and I'm also member of EURALO ALS structure and previously working in the national registry of domain names. My question is regarding different domains. We [here] generally group let's say commercial or gTLDs, ccTLDs, new gTLDs and maybe IDNs. Is there a difference regarding security and stability between them? How do you see it from your perspective?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you. The differences – okay, to a technology person, and I have many years of experience with DNS – go ahead.

NENAD MARINKOVIC: I mean in practice.

SUZANNE WOOLF: So, to a technology person, DNS is DNS, and TLDs are TLDs. To the underlying system, they're the same thing. And we have to be aware of that, many of the things we study don't vary. But because they're subject to different policies, the different TLDs

are therefore subject to different – and operators have different incentives and different constraints that come out of those policy differences, and do make an impact on what they can do operationally.

So, the answer to your question is yes and no, but there are actually some very interesting issues that arise, for instance with the difference administratively between a gTLD and a ccTLD. There's no difference on the wire, as we say. There's no difference inside the network, but there is a great deal of difference in some cases administratively and in a business and operational sense. And part of what we do is try to help people think through how those things are balanced.

UCHA SETURI: Okay.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [Jad] also come to the mic, and then next will be [you.]

UCHA SETURI: Okay. Hello, my name is Ucha Seturi, I'm from Georgia, and my question is related with – are SSAC checking ccTLDs security and stability situation using some advisory [guides] and so on, or not?

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm not sure I understood the question.

UCHA SETURI: Okay. The policy of ICANN is implemented in regulations and the Bylaws on ccTLDs, and they have some recommendation from ICANN about the stability and security. Are someone checking how it's implemented? Maybe it's a rule of law or something like that. How it's working in practice.

SUZANNE WOOLF: SSAC does not have a lot of operational capability to do that as SSAC, but there are a number of folks within ICANN and across the community who actually do review how are people doing on implementing best practices, and we'll help them if they want assistance.

There have been – particularly with respect to things like abuse and security vulnerabilities – again, Rick might have talked about this, Rick Lamb from ICANN staff, but there's actually a fair amount of work that they do to assist when it's needed and wanted.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And we'll take last question. Jad, please.

JAD EL CHAM: Good morning. My name is Jad El Cham from Lebanon, and I'm a first time Fellow as well. First of all, thank you for your presentation. During yesterday's presentation with Mr. Rick Lamb, we talked about the DDoS attacks on the DNS. However, what we failed to talk about is that almost 80% of the DDoS attacks today are based on two protocols: DNS and NTP.

So, they are being used as reflectors in these DDoS attacks, and that in part because basically, the DNS is a naïve protocol, the DNS server would reply to any requests. So, I know for a fact that the IETF currently is very invested in creating, if you may, the DNS version 2.0, but I haven't seen in any of these presentation or any group within your working groups, if you like, that is tackling this issue. So, is the ICANN involved in these discussions with the IETF into developing the new standard of DNS, or is the work only focused on the current version of DNS?

SUZANNE WOOLF: I can sort of take off my SSAC hat because I'm one of the people who also does work in the IETF. There are a few of us around here who are active in multiple communities. I haven't seen that people are focused on new protocol so much. So, DNS 2.0 is way ahead in our future.

There is a lot of work that goes on in the IETF context around making DNS and other infrastructure protocols more robust and easier to administer, and more resilient against attacks, and ICANN staff do participate. That is something they spend resources on. The Office of the CTO, there are several very experienced technical people there, and also some of the registries and registrars are active in that space because we do have this common interest in making the protocols work better.

JAD EL CHAM: Excuse me, but is it within the scope of the ICANN, or these ICANN members, or staff are active within the IETF or other technical bodies? For example, if I'm interested in joining one of these workgroups, is there a place for that in the ICANN, or should I be looking mainly at the IETF?

SUZANNE WOOLF: ICANN tends not to do protocol development. That's more the IETF's thing, and you should certainly look into – because protocol development and standards development is not part of what ICANN does directly. That's where they contribute to another – in other bodies, best practices in some of the anti-abuse and security groups, and protocol development in the IETF is frankly something you'll have to look into separately from what you'll find here.

JAD EL CHAM: Alright, thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much, and thank you, Suzanne, for taking this morning time to come talk to us. And yes, please.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Just thank you very much for your time, and I hope you enjoy the rest of the meeting and find it productive and interesting. And good luck.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. And I would like to invite our next speaker, Joanne. Well, while Joanne is taking her seat, I would like to remind everyone that having party whole night is not excuse to be late. So, please respect our speakers who are on time, and please be here with us on time. Okay?

And with that, our next speaker is Joan Kerr. She is the representative of Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency, which is called NPOC. So, yes. Here. And Joan is leading – she's Chair of Membership Committee in NPOC, and she will tell us about what is NPOC and whom they would like to see among their members and how to become a member, and

then we'll have a bit of time for question and answer. Thank you. Joan, the floor is yours.

JOAN KERR:

Great. Thank you. I'm so happy to be here. And usually, we're invited at 7:30 in the morning, so I was quite happy when it was 9:00 for me. And usually, it's not me, but I was always happy that it wasn't me who would come. So, let me first ask a couple of questions.

As Siranush says, I'm Joan Kerr, I'm the Membership Chair. Is anyone here a member of a not-for-profit organization? Oh, hi. I'm the Membership Chair of NPOC. So, hopefully, when I'm done, you will come up and ask how you can become a member. And it's so easy that you'd want to become a member.

So, I'm the Membership Chair, I've been involved with NPOC since 2015 officially. I was asked by the former Chair if I could come in and do one task for NPOC, which was to update and validate the membership database.

I said, "Oh, sure. I can do that." So, the one thing that I want to caution is there is no such thing as one task in ICANN, because you'll end up doing lots of other things because it's so interesting. So, when you come in, do read about it and become aware of it – which is something I didn't do, so it's a caution.

So, NPOC was created about seven years ago. It was created with a very narrow scope, which was to address the operational concerns of not-for-profits. And how we defined that – because there are lots of definitions – in the context of NPOC is this.

And before I say it, I just want to mention a couple of things. We're going through our NCSG, the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group review where we're redoing our Bylaws, and we're also doing our constituency review, so a lot of this information is – I'm going to try to give you sort of what exists and not try to tell you what we're doing because it's going to change a little bit. We're going to broaden our scope, for example.

So, how we define it is, how does a not-for-profit operate within their own organization and their ability to message their members? So for example – and also, how do they protect their domain name? Now, I'm going to give you a really concrete example. I, in 2004, did a little project called WOWEM and this is how I got aware of ICANN.

That project was – WOWEM stood for Women's Open World Empowerment Movement, and men were involved too, they were very helpful. But it was focused on women in the IT sector, and a number of us thought we would do a little project to find out how women were functioning in the IT world, what supports

do they have, what challenges do they face, how are they addressed? [inaudible]

And we thought we would do it for six months. And it was Canada, the U.S. and Peru that partnered on it. Within six months, we had 60 countries participating. It was unbelievable engagement. We also won the Civil Society Award because of the enormous engagement.

Six months later, the registrar stole the name because we had so much traffic to the site, and we woke up – we kept wanting to renew it, and this is where the operational concerns get to. They wouldn't respond. Now, this is 2004, and the next day WOWEM become a fashion site.

You can imagine our surprise. We were doing a project, we didn't know what to do. We weren't experts in that field, so we went out to find out how to resolve this. Well, it took seven years and of course that project died. But what it did was it brought to the forefront some of the issues that not-for-profit organizations on a daily basis face, which is that you have to be on top of your administrative advantage for your domain name.

So, that's an example of some of the things that we try to get to not-for-profits that they – inform them what they can do, how to protect their names, things like that. And it's very valid, and I've been through it.

Have they met NCSG – has come already?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, that's the Not-For-Profit Stakeholder Group. We're under them and they're under the GNSO, and they'll explain that to you when they come. We have an [inaudible] which – anytime I say a name, put your hand up if you know the person's name.

Our Chair is Klaus Stoll. Anybody know Klaus? Okay. The next person is Martin Valent. Yes, good. Pablo Valent. The next person is [Pontole] Good. See, we're getting known. And we have some new members in our committee as well, but I figure that most people would know those.

So, our role is to literally – our existing role is to inform the not-for-profit sector. Like I said, now we're not just informing them, but actually hosting sessions to educate them and to get them involved in the policy development process, because that's actually what ICANN requires us to do. It's not good enough that we inform, we have to actually bring them to participate in the Policy Development Process and educate them how to do that.

We have two seats on the NCSG, the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, and so we're part of the ExCom which helps us to then influence some of the policies in the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

So, that's a really good position that we've attained this year. We do have growing pains, and one of our growing pains is now to look at reenhancing – I'm going to say enhancing our role within the ICANN ecosystem. That's a very quick update of NPOC. Any questions?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. Bertnell, please.

BERTNELL RICHARDS: Good morning to you.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

BERTNELL RICHARDS: Bertnell Richards, Georgetown, Guyana. First time Fellow as well. Yesterday, I attended one of the NCUC sessions.

JOAN KERR: Yes.

BERTNELL RICHARDS: And there was this guy who was talking about the shadow regulation.

JOAN KERR: Yes.

BERTNELL RICHARDS: But my question as it relates to the not-for-profit, how exactly does this shadow regulation – particularly speaking with the .pharmacy TLD – how does such a profit organization fit into the not-for-profit aspect? Thank you.

JOAN KERR: Sure. I was at that session as well, and it was a very good session. That session was to inform us about something that was about to happen and to make us aware, so it's not something that we would particularly address, but the intent was to put the issue on the radar.

And so when the issue comes up – and then it takes time, as Ron says, and I know Ron really well what he said. It will take two to three years before it becomes an actual issue because it's in the industry at the moment, so that when it comes up, we're not

like, "What is this?" We're aware of what it is so that we can then make policies around it.

And then it would come to us, the NCSG particularly, who would then put it into the NCUC and NPOC to give an opinion. That's how that would work.

ASHELL FORDE: Hi, good morning.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

ASHELL FORDE: Thank you for coming to talk to us. My name is Ashell Forde, I'm from Barbados. I'm a first time fellow and an ICANN newcomer.

JOAN KERR: Okay –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [inaudible]

JOAN KERR: Yes.

ASHELL FORDE: Is this better?

JOAN KERR: Yes.

ASHELL FORDE: Okay, so basically, my question to you is, can you walk us through your registration or application process so that we can have a better understanding of it?

JOAN KERR: Sure.

ASHELL FORDE: Thank you.

JOAN KERR: Great, thank you. So again, we're going through changes. Right now, you can go to the npoc.org and there is an application that you can download and fill it out and submit it. In saying that, at the same time, we're doing a pilot project because before today, or before this week, NCUC and NPOC would have separate application. It goes into NCSG, and then we had to approve them separately, and then you become a member.

So now, we're coordinating it so that there's one application process, and so we would send that out and it would be on the website. So, I'm going to talk about the new one because that's where we're going if it all works. Hopefully by Johannesburg, it works.

So you would just go to the NCSG website because we're under them. So, you have to become a member of NCSG before you become a member of NCUC or NPOC. That's the process, that's our Bylaw.

So then you would just fill it out, it goes through the Executive Committee. It asks a series of questions to ensure that you are in fact noncommercial. If we have questions, we send it back to the applicant to ask specific questions. Usually, 99% of the questions are, "How are you noncommercial?"

Sometimes people forget to point out that they are – the way they say it, it sounds like they're for profit. But we send it back and ask them, "Please indicate how are you noncommercial." But other than that, in the application approval process, we look at your name, we visit your LinkedIn site or your website.

If you don't have those and we don't have any more information, it's usually rejected. But most people do have one or both, so that's the process. There is no cost.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Good morning, thank you for your presentation. My name is Hadia Elminiawi. I'm a first time Fellow, and my question is, how do you define the nonprofit organizations that join you?

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, in our context, it's defined as nongovernmental, noncommercial. And you must be registered in your own country as a noncommercial entity. That's how we define it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So being an NGO, that's it? That's sufficient?

JOAN KERR: That's correct. Easy.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Hello.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Alexander Isavnin, first time Fellow. I have a question related mostly to my country. Because now, one of the most operational

issues for not-for-profits in Russia is censorship. And mostly, it is done by DNS operators on DNS recursive resolvers. So, it's done completely, but [inaudible] ICANN track. And that is real operational issue, because government can go order to block something, and it's blocked.

I understand that you could not give me an immediate answer or recommendation, but is this kind of plans to have, well, back pressure to governments via GAC or something to help nonprofits? Which, well, our position is usually nonprofit, to survive as well as [inaudible] forum.

JOAN KERR: Yes, there's no easy answer. And of course, we don't directly address that. However, you were at the ISOC meeting yesterday. That's one way of addressing that issue, because they do believe in free and open Internet. So, I would recommend that you work with them first, and then I think they help to address those issues.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Good morning, Joan.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

MICHAEL OGHIA: My name is Michael Oghia. I'm a first time Fellow, and I'm kind of a strange case because I've been a member of NCSG and NCUC.

JOAN KERR: Welcome to the club.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Oh, thank you. I've been a member of NCSG and NCUC for about a year.

JOAN KERR: Yes, I've seen your name on the – yes.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Yes. And one of the things that I've been struggling with for a while is to kind of understand the designation between NPOC and NCUC. And hearing you speak more about NPOC, especially the story that helped to illustrate how you got into this position ultimately makes a lot more sense, but I'm still a bit confused, I think, about why then the NCUC allows for organizational members.

Because to me then, it would make more sense to put organizational members in NPOC and only users – because it's

the users' constituency – in NCUC. Can you explain this kind of seemingly – this difference?

JOAN KERR: Yes. Okay. So, we have how long? It's something that we've been struggling with, because when NPOC was first created, it was created by the Red Cross, and I'm sure you're aware of all the issues we're having with the Red Cross at the moment. And it was to do – just specifically to do with operational issues, which has made it very difficult, and only for organizations, because NCUC, of course, is individuals and they also educate civil society about NPOC. Which leaves us to that – I keep saying that –very narrow strip of not-for-profit.

So yes, we are trying to – I'm trying to choose my words – we are trying to address it, but of course, you know GNSO has to approve it and the Board has to approve it. We're trying to broaden our spectrum and have a distinction.

Right now, the only distinction we have is that it's organizations.

MICHAEL OGHIA: You know, I think I'm starting to under – I think I'm focusing on the wrong parts of the names. So you're right, operational – I get it – does not necessarily have to indicate anything dealing with rights or privacy or other aspects [inaudible].

JOAN KERR: Correct. Although – see, and here's where the dilemma comes in – although we're part of the NCSG, so we are supposed to comment on those issues, but our mandate is only the operational side, so we're in a double bind constantly.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Yes, I was going to say you're in a catch 22.

JOAN KERR: Yes.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Yes. No, okay. Thank you for that.

JOAN KERR: No worries.

DAVID MORAR: Good morning.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

DAVID MORAR: Thank you for coming, thank you for your presentation. My name is David Morar, originally from Romania but currently living in the United States. Also a first time attendee and first time Fellow.

My question is a bit different. Looking at the GNSO, there are one, two, three, four sort of subgroups, right? And then the NPOC is a sub-subgroup of those subgroups, right? So, my question is, do you feel that since you've been part of NPOC, there was significant representation of NPOC in the Board? Because if I'm not mistaken, GNSO gets two.

JOAN KERR: Yes, and NCUC.

DAVID MORAR: Two seats on the Board, right?

JOAN KERR: Yes.

DAVID MORAR: So, that means that there are so many different groups that I'm assuming are vying for those two positions. Has NPOC been able to sort of have one person or – basically, I'm just asking representationally how you feel.

JOAN KERR: Sure. Well, that's a really great question, because I'm happy to say that we do. YAy. Starting on Friday, we have official representation from Martin. He'll be our – yes.

DAVID MORAR: Awesome.

JOAN KERR: So, yes, and that happened – if you want to hear the story. I'm a storyteller, so… That happened because there was a resignation of one of the Councilors who became a staff person, and so the opportunity, the seat got opened and so the NCSG ExCom had the ability to appoint, so what we did was alternate appointments, which was NCUC up to this meeting and then NPOC to Johannesburg. So, we can finally say we have a seat on the GNSO.

DAVID MORAR: Okay. Thank you very much, but then –

JOAN KERR: Then the elections will come.

DAVID MORAR: Okay.

JOAN KERR: Yes, and then they have to be elected. Different story.

DAVID MORAR: And then has there ever been –

JOAN KERR: Because we can't appoint at that time. That point would be an election.

DAVID MORAR: Of course. But then has there ever been a person from NPOC who went up to the Board?

JOAN KERR: No.

DAVID MORAR: Okay.

JOAN KERR: Not yet.

DAVID MORAR:	[inaudible] Thank you very much.

FIORELLA BELCIU:	Hello.

JOAN KERR:	Hi.

FIORELLA BELCIU:

Fiorella Belciu, first time Fellow, originally from Romania but based in Brussels. The GNSO is quite interesting for me because I'm working for a nonprofit organization. Nevertheless, I'm looking at all the categories and I couldn't help but think that there may be topics that go cross-category, like for instance intellectual property can be of interest also for noncommercial users. I'm pretty sure they all end up tackling in a way or another also data protection or privacy.

So, in terms of themes or topics that are at interesting cross-categories, are there some extra working groups? Or how does that work in practice?

JOAN KERR:

In terms of NPOC, you mean? So, we are now starting to participate in the working groups. We haven't done a very good job at that in the past, so that's something that is high priority

for us that's – our go forward plan is to – I mean, we do have Martin in a working group with the rights protection. [inaudible] is on the policy team for GNSO.

So, there are pieces of it, but in a formal way, we want to encourage our members – not just the ExCom but our members – so our plan is to prepare all of the working groups and public comment links and send it out to our members so that they are aware of how they can participate as well so that it becomes a broader engagement not just the ExCom because that's traditionally what has happened.

So, a part of our welcome letter that we will be sending out too is to identify the working groups and all of the policy issues that are sort of in discussions, because different people are going to be interested in different things. So, we don't want to tell them what they should or shouldn't do, so we said, "Well, we'll list it for them and then they can do it on their own and find out themselves."

But we haven't done a very good job, because we've been very small and developing our membership. But it's growing. We are now at 65 verified members. And I use the word verified, because there are a lot of databases that have double people on it and they sound like they have a lot of members, but they don't.

So when I took on the – just [inaudible] because I'm Membership, so you'll have to bear with me – when I took on the database – you're not going to believe this – we had 230 members on our list. And I went through – I did it myself, because I wanted to be sure. We had one organization that had six projects underneath them, and they listed that as an organization. And it was just a project.

When I first found out, I was like, "What?" Then started to drill through, I'm like, "Oh my God." So, I made sure that the organizations that are listed are actual organizations, not projects. So, we've told everybody that they should be doing that too. So I thank you for your question, but it's something that we're looking toward the future to be involved with, and we'd love for you to be involved.

FIORELLA BELCIU: I'd love that too. Thank you.

JOAN KERR: Yes, great.

UCHA SETURI: Thank you. Hello.

JOAN KERR:	Hi.

UCHA SETURI: Thank you for your presentation. I'm first time Fellow, I'm Ucha Seturi from Georgia, and I'm CEO of the small and the medium enterprise association of my country for the Internet service providers. My question is related – can we be the part of NCSG? Because we are some kind of business association, but my members mostly are in rural areas and they are doing some kind of social business for local communities.

Question: if we attend the big shark business guys, there's no point, because we are not part of this society. We are part of this society. So, my question is – or suggestion is... Thank you.

JOAN KERR: So you're an association?

UCHA SETURI: Yes.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, yes. We've had some issues around associations, because it depends on what you're doing. Is your membership mostly made up of businesspeople, for example? Or are they

mostly made up of not for profits? Do you know, or is it a combination?

UCHA SETURI: [inaudible] just to help our members some kind of advocacy to push, somehow to give them opportunity to be on [inaudible]

JOAN KERR: So it's an association of what?

UCHA SETURI: It's an association of small and medium Internet service providers.

JOAN KERR: Okay, so none of your members are business owners?

UCHA SETURI: My members are business owners, but these guys are too small.

JOAN KERR: So, I'm not going to say you would be rejected, but you would have to provide information on how your association is a not-for-profit.

UCHA SETURI: Yes.

JOAN KERR: What is the noncommercial aspect of your association? Because you have business members.

UCHA SETURI: Okay.

JOAN KERR: So you would have to defend that.

UCHA SETURI: Okay. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi, my name is Bruna. I'm from Brazil.

JOAN KERR: Hi.

BRUNA SANTOS: I'm saying things very calmly because I tend to get this whole part wrong in the question. So, first time Fellow, Newcomer, etc. Yesterday, I have been to both the NCSG meeting and the NCUC

part of constituency [day,] and between the discussions, we have seen some Internet governance part of – so, my question, I meant to ask this to the GAC and to the ALAC, and it's within the whole multistakeholder model, how are these cushions for ensuring that the civil society participations are being made? Because at least from Brazil, if you consider the multistakeholder model, the civil societies not often [listened to,] so they're not often taken into consideration. So, are you trying to think of ways of enhancing this model? Do you acknowledge this disparity between the ICANN [inaudible]?

JOAN KERR: So, I had some difficulty hearing you. So, what exactly is the question? Can you put your mic down a little bit?

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes. Okay. So, [inaudible] this: do you acknowledge a disparity between the civil society and the rest of the ICANN community within the groups?

JOAN KERR: Well, my personal belief is always about collaboration, so yes, we acknowledge it, of course. Civil society I think is at a disadvantage most of the time, but for the record, I am biased because businesses make money so they can pay for a lot of

things. Civil Society is overworked, underpaid. That's my opinion. I'd love to have a debate with anyone who doesn't believe that. I run a not-for-profit, so I know.

But I think what we need to do is not look at the disparity but look at ways of how we can support each other and get the more people that are provided for to see the side of civil society and understand. Because right now, there is conflict [inaudible] civil society wants. Civil society wants this, and civil society – but it's not what we wanted. We want to be involved. We need it to be involved.

We are at a disadvantage because these resources aren't there for us to be involved. When a civil society person puts their time in, it's their own time. A businessperson can be on their – I know for a fact, many businesspeople who come here are on pay. Their bosses say, "You can have three or four days. You're fully paid, expenses are taken care of."

A civil society person still have to go back and do their work that they left a week ago. Am I correct? Yes. So yes, there's a huge disparity, and yes, we are aware of it and yes, we want to fight for it.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes. Okay, just a comment, because I have this government background and civil society was definitely not considered in decision making processes regarding policies.

JOAN KERR: Yes, and you're only at a disadvantage if you're not at the table.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes. That's it. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, sorry, I need to stop the questions. I know there are many, and I think that people can talk to [inaudible] now you know Joan and can go and talk to her. With that, I would like to thank Joan for coming and taking time to talk to our Fellows. Thank you very much.

And with great pleasure, I would like to invite our next speaker here, a representative of At-Large community, the community where I came from, actually, my – dear to my heart. Alan Greenberg, Chair of At-Large, Maureen Hilyard, APRALO member to ALAC, and Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vice Chair of ALAC. And one more great thing to mention, Maureen and Tijani are Fellows. Welcome.

JOAN KERR:	Can I just say one thing? I just want to say one thing. When I started in ICANN, this was the group I started with. So, they're great. So, thank you for having me.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Welcome. Yes, we have big representation from At-Large. So, the floor is yours.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. It's great to be here. This is always one of the more interesting opportunities to talk to people and open my eyes – sorry, not open my eyes but take my focus away from the things that we seem to do day in and day out, and talk to people who have often different perspectives and great insights.
	And as was pointed out, these two people are ex-Fellows. We have several others. It's one of our greatest sources of really hard workers and good workers. So, it's marvelous.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Alan, we don't have the understanding of ex-Fellows. Fellows, once a Fellow always a Fellow. So, we are Fellows, all.

ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies to someone who is still a Fellow, not an ex-Fellow. At-Large is responsible for – and I'll quote the official words we use – representing the interests of Internet users within ICANN.

That's a daunting expression. There are only 3.5 billion of them, and occasionally, people ask, "How do we contact them?" And we say we send them each e-mails once a week and read all the responses. That's a joke.

The real challenge is, how do we do that and how do we pretend we can represent so many different people? And the answer is we do it by having lots of people around the world – not thousands, but a good selection of people from all over – who give us their perspective, and we do our best to integrate those and come up with positions that we hope represent the needs of real users.

It's an interesting challenge, partly because the needs of users are very diverse, and often conflicting. The classic example of a problem in ICANN is the general subject called WHOIS, that is the identification of registrants. When they register a name in some places, their name and address and things like that are displayed.

And that was probably fine 30 years ago when those names and addresses were really people who worked in a university and the address was the university address. Now, often it's an individual,

and we're talking about home addresses and home phone numbers. And that's a clear potential violation – not violation, but there are privacy implications in it.

But we're looking at all aspects of user issues, so not only do we worry about thinking about the privacy of the registrants, we also worry about their users who are continually receiving spam and phishing and malware, and when people within the Internet try to find out who's doing that, WHOIS is one of the resources they use to try to address that.

So, where do we come out? Do we come out on the privacy side? Do we come out on the strict law enforcement side, "We must have access to every bit of information around?" And of course, it's a balancing act. And that's how I characterize a lot of the issues that we look at. There are rarely completely black and white issues. And the fun we have is trying to balance all of those things together.

As Chair, I spend – I won't tell you how many hours a week. I would discourage anyone from starting to get involved. But I spend a lot of time at this, and occasionally, people ask me, "Why?" Surely, I must have something better to do in my life. And the answer is because I and the people around me care.

It's really important that as ICANN addresses policy issues, whether it's WHOIS or something less controversial, that we

really make sure that the voices of users are heard. It's not only you, it's your parents, your grandparents and the person down the street who certainly doesn't care about ICANN. They don't know how to spell it. If you try to explain to them what we do, their eyes would glaze over and you wouldn't get very far.

But what we do impacts them, and we need to make sure that as we go forward in ICANN, users are considered, not only some of the other players in ICANN who generally have a lot more money than we do. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan, for introducing the subject. At-Large, what is At-Large? Alan described a little bit what can be At-Large. I heard –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Can you keep the mic close, Tijani, please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry. I heard a question before we came here about the disparity between civil society and the rest of ICANN. You know, the multi-stakeholder model is based on stakeholders. And in ICANN, the stakeholders are not like the stakeholders in IGF, for

example, which are civil society, governments and private sector.

Here, the stakeholders are the SOs and ACs, means the GNSO for the generic names, ccNSO for the country code names, At-Large for end users, NPOC for example for nonprofit in the GNSO, etc. And civil society in ICANN are spread among several stakeholders. One of them is At-Large. Most of our ALSes are civil society.

So, I don't think we can make it separate like this. I think that any civil society entity can be involved here, can be really involved in ICANN, because they can be for example At-Large, and At-Large have – their mission is to defend the interest of end users, or NPOC or any other constituency in ICANN. So, this is only a remark about the civil society.

So, At-Large is here for two things. The first one is to give advices about the policies made by the Supporting Organizations, and the other issues that may have an interest for end users. And also to make outreach. [This is] the Bylaws of ICANN.

So, At-Large, we do a lot of things. We are organized in regional organizations, and under those regional organizations we have the At-Large structures which are the base, the grassroots of At-Large, if you will. And also, we work as ALAC through working groups.

We have several kinds of working groups. We have the subcommittees which are supposed to make more or less decisions or prepare decisions for the ALAC to take, such as the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, Outreach and Engagement, etc., and also the Appointee Selection Committee, very important one.

We have also standing working groups, such as Capacity Building, IDN Policy, new gTLDs, Public Interest, etc. We have ad hoc working groups, which are groups that finish as soon as the mission they have is over, such as for example the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team, such as also the New Meeting Strategy Working Party, the Review Working Party for this period, etc. We have also taskforce and also we have cross-constituencies working group with the GNSO or with any other constituency in ICANN.

At-Large is mainly to defend the public interest. Why? Because in the multistakeholder model, there are several interests. And in ICANN there are the financial interests, there is the political interest, and there is the public interest. And At-Large is here to defend the public interest.

If At-Large is absent, there would be only the financial interest of the registries, registrars, etc., and there would be only the

political interest of the governments. So, I will let Maureen finish the presentation, if you want. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Tijani. My interest today is to actually make sure that we can actually encourage you as Fellows to jump ship and come on to our side. I think that one of the things that's really important – and I mean you've got our leader, our former leader of the Asia Pacific region, and one of the first things you've got to do is you've got to join your regional organization.

That's the first thing you've got to do. Identify who your leader is, who the organization is for your region, and get involved at that level. And your region is very important, because your region is the – regional contacts are the ones that will introduce you to those sorts of working groups and subcommittees, and all that sort of stuff that Tijani was talking about.

And I'm [inaudible] thinking, probably a lot of you being newbies are probably thinking, "Well, how do we get from there to here?" And I sort of think back to my very first Fellowship meeting which was in Cartagena in 2010, and while I was at that meeting, I actually sort of made contact with a working group that was in the process – it was actually a review of the regions.

Now, so I sort of made contact with those guys and tried to find out about it, and I think I found out more about it in the public forum because the regional issue came up in the public forum. So, that's something else that you must make sure that you go to, because you hear a lot about what's happening within ICANN within the forum.

And I didn't come back for my second fellowship until two years later. But during those two years, I spent the whole two years every month attending a working group meeting, just on the regions. It was still going after I actually became involved. That's how long some of these working groups actually go for, because this was a very involved topic. And there are always topics that are happening that we as At-Large are always contributing to, and they're not just sort of like, "Oh, let's call a committee and we'll discuss something and next week we'll make a decision and send it to the Board." It doesn't happen that way. The topics that we end up talking about are really far reaching issues, and so they're quite involved. But they need your voices. They need you to be part of those discussions.

But one of the things too that was really important about being part of that working group and starting to get myself known within the working group was that I made contact with people who still remain – for me – mentors. They're still very strong in my networks, and that's the same for you. I must admit, it's

really nice to sort of come to a meeting today and to actually know that I know several of you already through the contacts that we've made just coming to this meeting. And it's really great to be able to make those contacts and to hope that ICANN actually help people – just as I was helped – to get into the system.

But it just meant that by the time I came to my second fellowship in Costa Rica in 2012, I hit the ground running. I already knew how working groups worked, I already knew people who were involved, I already knew what other working groups the ALAC and At-Large was involved in, so I was actually able to get more involved in other things.

And I'll tell you, it's just like once you start, it just grows like [inaudible] People will say, "Oh, we've got another group. Would you like to join this one?" And what you have to learn to do is to say no, because you can get swamped. And I still do that today.

But I think too that although I'm sort of talking about your involvement with At-Large in general, one of the things that's really important is, again, going back to your regional organization, keeping in with your region because many of you may join as individual members, but many of you also may already belong to an ALS, an At-Large structure, an organizational part of the At-Large organization anyway.

So, we rely on the ALSes to actually provide a lot of the outreach within your own local communities. And also, within the region itself, when there are regional gatherings and stuff that you can go along and bring your voices from your localities to the region, and from the region it comes back to us. But the whole thing is, find out what's going on, and get involved. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much. Thank you to all three, Alan, Tijani, and Maureen. And I think we'll have 10 minutes' time for Q&A. And there is a queue already, so David, go.

DAVID MORAR: Yes, thank you very much for coming and thank you for your presentations. My name is Daivd Morar, I am a first time Fellow and first time attendee. I actually have two questions: one is sort of about you, and another one is about the organization.

You have already told us how you came to ALAC, but if you would also want to share if you came directly to ALAC or you jumped ship from somewhere else within ICANN? Because it feels like ALAC has such a catchall kind of aspect to it, so I think that would be very interesting to find out if you were also sort of direct path.

And then my second question is representational. When you select your one Board member, do you keep in mind any geographic location? So your next Board member will be from EURALO and the next member will be from a different location? I'm wondering about how you do that. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can I just answer the first one? I'll do the first one and we'll leave it to the leader to do the second one. When I came in – At-Large is such a broad organization, and it's a good one to actually come into first off. In fact, a lot of our individual members will come and find out more about how ICANN runs through At-Large, and then find their own little niche area. And this is where we actually found some people going to NCUC or something like that. So no, I stayed stuck.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We've got a long queue and only 10 minutes left, so I'll be very brief. In terms of how did I get here, a long, complicated path. I didn't jump ship from anywhere else in ICANN, I did go directly into At-Large. But I've got several decades of history involved in Internet stuff, building national, international networks, training people from developing countries to build the Internet in their country. I've worked with the Internet Society

and a whole bunch of things, but my first serious entry into ICANN was directly into At-Large. So, that's…

MAUREEN HILYARD: Board member.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to let Tijani answer how he got there, and then I'll go to the Board member.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Excuse me. Is it your first meeting here in ICANN?

DAVID MORAR: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am impressed. Really, I am impressed, because you already know about our selection of the Director, and –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We had Board members yesterday presenting for our Fellows.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

DAVID MORAR: Thank you, Siranush, for not allowing them to think that I'm super smart.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, about the Director that we select to put on the Board. We have only one Director. So, when you speak about diversity and you have only one member, it is difficult, so we choose the best. We don't take any other consideration. The only consideration is to find the best one to be on the Board for the interest of ICANN, and the one who has more knowledge about our community and who knows exactly what is the interest of our community.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: David, your question was exactly to the point, as Tijani Ben Jemaa was Chair of the Selection Committee for the Board member. So, to the point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that we will have now had three Directors, and they happen to be from three different regions. But I can't say that we – we didn't restrict selection based on that. Tijani, did you just come directly into At-Large, or did you jump ship?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I came directly to At-Large.

DAVID MORAR: So, three for three.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: A true fellowship, Tijani. We were Fellows together in Cairo, me and Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ELIZABETH OREMBO: Next question. Thank you all for coming. I'm Elizabeth Orembo from Kenya ICT Action Network, one of the new members of At-Large and AFRALO. Now, my view of ICANN is that it's a cloud like that with the Board at the center, and as an end user, you touch very many issues. There are very many policy issues that affect

you. One at the At-Large, one at the GNSO, another one as an end user nonprofit, and all that.

So, my question was, if you want to get involved or know what's happening in every process, then which constituency would you advise one to join? Or would you join At-Large, then you keep on snooping into what everyone is doing so that you be at par with their policies that are being made?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure snooping is the right word, although some other parts of ICANN consider it exactly that way, that we really should get out of their business. One of the questions that's often asked is, NCSG or At-Large? And the simple answer is At-Large looks at issues across ICANN, not just the gTLD.

For instance, one of the issues that is very hot on our agenda this week is an issue that has to do with the delegation of IDN of non-Latin script ccTLDs, and that is completely out of scope for the GNSO or for NCSG, and very much in scope for us. So, we cover a much wider area than just the gTLD domains.

So, that's largely the difference between us and the group that is often perceived as the alternative for people who have a user interest. And as I said, we are charged with – we don't have the luxury of taking only one side of a user's issue. We do have to

look at all of the issues, so it ends up being an interesting set of complexities that we have to balance. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Next one.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I add a word? You join the constituency where you have interest. If you are a registry or registrar, you will go to GNSO and that's normal. If you are a ccTLD operator, you will go to the ccNSO. If you are end user, you come to At-Large. This is normal. But if you are nonprofit and noncommercial and a registrant, you can go to the NCUC or to the NPOC or to At-Large.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Hello, I'm Alexander Isavnin from Russian Federation, well, an Internet user and Internet professional. So, I will ask a question which is related to my country. Actually, during this fellowship meeting, there were a lot of questions about outreach. You mentioned that outreach is one of the tasks of ICANN.

Well, as Internet professional, I've realized that ICANN has representativeness of end users just during one of these presentations. You definitely have no – de facto, have no

outreach in Russia. So, the question is, how do you monitor your own outreach?

De facto, again, you have a Russian representative appointed by NomCom at At-Large [community.] But if you ask anyone in Russia, "Who is this guy?" No one tells you that he represents users. Everyone in Russia tells that he's ccTLD guy. You've got a fox in a henhouse. No one in Russia knows existence.

So, I would like to ask you – and my two fellow Fellows – just to improve outreach and set up control. [And have] local representatives. Well, in Russia, it would be via EURALO. Formally, I bet everything is okay. There is a representative organization, but they're completely silent. They just needed to have a career for somebody inside the current structures. So, please, improve your outreach and control how outreach is done by local organizations. Again, no one in Russia knows. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Alexander. Anyone would like to respond?

MAUREEN HILYARD: One of the working groups that we actually have within At-Large is Outreach and Engagement, and we know that it's a big issue. Every regional organization must have its own outreach

strategy. And if we're looking at APRALO for example, we're looking at 77 countries, and trying to do outreach within every single one of those is really difficult.

However, one of the things that we do endeavor to do as much as possible – and really that's being practical, and also because the fact that we are only volunteers, we don't get paid to go – I mean, the funding that ICANN gives actually for outreach is quite minimal. So, we are reliant on certain sections of our region for example to basically try to do outreach within its section.

I'm not quite sure, who is Russia? I mean, which is –

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: There was no question. That was a request to control local. But don't leave this meeting, I would like to talk to you afterwards.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, exactly. That's good, because join the Outreach and Engagement Committee and we'll work on Russia.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Super suggestion. Thank you.

SIMON SOHEL BAROI:	Simon from Bangladesh, a newcomer and fellow. I always like to see Maureen because I feel refreshed to see you in ICANN. Thank you for coming. My question is that, At-Large is already large, and you are the person who is representing 3.5 billion users. And I was really pretty disappointed to understand that only one member is going to the Board from At-Large. Why one? Everybody has two. Why one?
	Are you not disappointing the 3.5 billion users? And also, I want to add that one, the UN has in IGF I've heard that – even wants to connect the next billion. So, next year it will be 4.5 billion. 4.5 billion and one, doesn't match. What is your comment?
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	I'm sorry. Before going to answer, I just would like to clarify, Cristopher Wilson is here from BC. Yes, please come here. We'll take one more question and then BC will come to stage. Yes, of course.
ALAN GREENBERG:	The very simple answer is yes, we only have one compared to two for the other Supporting Organizations. We are the only Advisory Committee that has even one. So we're a step up from where we were a while ago.

To be very blunt, there was a recommendation a number of years ago that we have two Board members. The Board was somewhat divided. Some people said no, we shouldn't have any because Advisory Committees don't have any. They just have liaisons. Some people on the Board said yes they should have two and they came to a compromise. Will that change and will we get two soon also? I hope so.

But the whole concept of multistakeholderism is people tend to disagree with each other. That's why we need them all. If everyone agreed, we just have Maureen doing everything for us. But since we have to come to agreement, sometimes we all don't get exactly what we want. So that's a very pragmatic answer. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: If you don't mind, like with GAC representatives, we requested all those questions Fellows have. They send it to me and I'll send to you for responding. So if that will work, we can just take the last question and move forward.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: Hello. My name is Shiva Upadhyay and I am first time Fellow at ICANN. My question is really very simple. In India, we are trying to – I understand that At-Large has very limited funds. If we try,

like if some organization in India is trying to fund some awareness in outreach program, but lacks in the area of knowledge and expertise on the issues of Internet governance, ICANN knowledge. The people who are in India, most involved in their jobs, they don't have much time to devote to this kind of awareness programs. Is At-Large having any working group or how At-Large can support this kind of initiative? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give it a quick try. That's not a simple question. We could spend the next 20 minutes talking about it and I won't. The short answer is the only way these kind of things spread is by a champion on the ground in an area to help push this out. We don't have money to give to you to help you do that outreach. We are looking at some money that ICANN has access to in the next few years that you might be able to apply for but that's two years out. So I'm not going to make any promises. But the short answer is if you are interested, then you are the person on the ground who will help us do it. Thank you.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: My question like is if someone in India is ready to invest in outreach program, how At-Large can support in terms of knowledge expertise? Like people who are having very good knowledge can travel to my country and teach students at the

universities. Like local students and young engineers about this issue and importance of this issue and their participation.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, this is perfectly possible. The most important thing is that you have activities on the ground. If you need someone from ICANN to teach or to give an intervention during an event, just apply through the speaker's bureau in ICANN. And they can send you to the right person to address the right issue you want to address there.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: Thank you very much.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much and thank you, At-Large and my colleagues and friends for coming here and taking this opportunity to talk with us. Please, if you have questions for At-Large, send them to me and I'll make sure we'll get responses. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Siranush. I'm also going to leave you some business cards. You can give them out and people can also contact me directly as they wish.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Siranush, May I express my impression. I am impressed by your knowledge, by your awareness. Thank you very much. I have to thank Siranush for her work and the whole department. I thank you for your commitment also.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Tijani. We are not lucky to have coaching system in the process when we were Fellows. So these guys are really lucky to get some information in advance before coming to the meeting. With that, thank you very much once again. With great pleasure I would like to introduce you our next speakers.

Beautiful business sector representatives and the Chair of Business Sector. Commercial and Business Users Constituency actually, their official name, but we call them BC, Business Constituency. Chair Christopher Wilson, who came with two colleagues, Jimson and Olawale?

LAWRENCE ROBERTS: Lawrence.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Lawrence. So Lawrence is a member of our Fellowship members. So I once again thank Christopher for coming with alumnis who are now a part of Business Constituency. The floor is yours.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: Thank you very much. My name is Chris Wilson. I am Chair of the Commercial and Business Users Constituency. We use the short hand acronym BC, just the Business Constituency.

A little bit about me, my day job if you will is I work for 21st Century Fox, the media company based in the United States. I work on Internet governance policy issues for that company.

This is my second year as Chair of the BC. It's a diverse group of members. Maybe 60 members now I think approximate, 62 to be exact. We just added one not long ago, recently. Made up of businesses from all over the world, trade associations of course as well. And basically serving, sort of served as the voice for commercial business users of the Internet.

We are one constituency and I think you may heard from – I don't know if they're heard from the other two constituencies yet within the CSG. They've heard from the IPC or the ISP?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, I think so.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: Okay. So we're one of those three constituencies that make up the Commercial Stakeholder Group within the GNSO, so lots of acronyms. I'm sure you're getting used to that. But just see if you can see in that screen the GNSO is part of the multistakeholder community here. We're a small subset of that part of the community.

We're very active in policymaking here at ICANN. We have our Vice Chair for policies. His name is Steve DelBianco. He's been doing this for many years. Very steep in ICANN policy making and therefore we've been very engaged in a variety of funds on various policy development working groups and file various public comments on matters that are put out for comment to the community.

So we take our role very seriously as a voice for business. We think certainly there's – the registries and the registrar side of the GNSO, that's one part of business, if you will. But we are the other part of business that are not part of that world. Representative Sample of Companies is my own company, a media company that cares deeply about how the Internet functions because a great deal of our content, our product, is delivered over the Internet. Hence, we want a safe, secure, reliable Internet for that purpose.

But we have members such as Google and Facebook and others, and then we have small businesses as well. Again, and some small businesses around the world. Lawrence can speak to that of course as can Jimson.

But really, I don't have a formal presentation for you. I always spend more time in doing more time answering questions about the BC. But at the same token I'll quickly turn to Jimson a little bit just for a minute and he can talk a little bit about what we do as far as outreach is concerned. Then Lawrence can speak to his experience as a Fellow and how he ended up arriving at the BC and where the value he sees with the BC. So Jimson, if I can turn to you real quick.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Chris. My name is Jimson Olufuye. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm based in Abuja, Nigeria. I run an IT firm called Contemporary Consulting. We build data centers. We also serve as security scope.

Well, Contemporary Consulting is a member of AFICTA. AFICTA is Africa ICT Alliance. It's an alliance of IT associations and companies currently in 27 African countries and happened to be the Chair. So AFICTA is a member of BC, the Business Constituency of ICANN. We're here because we work on the

Internet and it's an interest that Internet remain stable, secure. So that's why we're here.

Also currently, the Vice Chair for finance and operations of the BC. BC is perhaps the oldest constituency anyway because since ICANN started we've been there. From there we evolved into other constituencies.

There has been low diversity overtime. When we came in, it was about 2% membership because AFICTA happen to be the first in Africa. From that time, based on support from ICANN, from BC's own funds, we were able to grow that to 10% and also across Asia, Africa to 18%. So we are diversifying gradual as you all can see on the top table.

So we take outreach very seriously. Since we are business, we believe there has to be value in whatever you do. So there is some form of membership fee which we are so graciously reduced for members from developing countries. In fact, 70% discount make it very available for small business and big businesses from developing countries, which I think personally is very fair.

We have many medium of getting across website through newsletter made to BC and many other opportunities for wide stakeholder to know what we are doing. So that is about outreach. Large, small businesses are involved. Associations,

LAWRENCE ROBERTS: My name is Lawrence and like you've heard, I'm an alumni of the Fellowship program. My first fellowship in ICANN was ICANN 52. Right now we, are at 58. So it's not so long so to say. But I walked in like some of us here today not knowing anything about ICANN. Not knowing that there was a constituency that exist that's called BC. I had a very different view about what I was walking into.

But the beauty of the Fellowship program which I'll show that we have experience over the last couple of days is that right here where you're sitting like I did some time back, different constituencies came and more or less pitched to what we are doing.

I had an interest in business and decided to explore that further. Another beautiful thing was that I got some very, very good assistance from our fellowship coordinators who are able to refer through e-mails to the BC leadership. All I had to do was to go to the website of the Business Constituency and download the form, filled it out, sent it back to the e-mail address that was on the form. A couple of weeks later, I became a member of the BC.

Like we've heard, there is an incentive for those of us from developing countries where we have to pay just 30% of what the original BC fee is and key in into that enabled participation to be easier. So for those of us who are here, I heard you talking. I was like this guy – you're talking about the NCUC. You don't need to campaign. Please come onboard. We are excited about having.

Business Constituency is a place that accommodates businesses. As long as you're a business, you're a registered business, whether you're small, you're medium, you are a mid-scale enterprise, you're a large corporation, you're a trade association, there is a space. There is a seat on the table for you.

It's not as if I've been a small company sit in and the BC have my view shut down. Rather, I find it interesting that the BC will give a lot of responsibility to you even when it doesn't feel or seem as if you have the answers to all the questions. Between ICANN 52 and 58 where we are right now, I represent the Business Constituency within the GNSO's SCI as an alternate.

Mine is a small company, we've got big companies, but then that's part of fact that I'm a small company. I was given a room to engage. I also have had the privilege or rather I have also the privilege of representing the BC within the GNSO, the whole of BC within the GNSO and the GNSO Review Working Group. That's a lot of responsibility but that again shows that the BC trust

those of us who are from small companies as well as those of us who come from large enterprises.

There is equal room on the table. Whatever policy work is going on, you are encouraged to engage. It's been a very, very exciting place. I love the BC for the fact that it is one active community. There is virtually no policy that comes out that the BC doesn't comment to.

So that justifies the reason why we have to get on those calls every other week and why there's so much activity on the mailing list. You can't get bored. It's an exciting place to be.

I want to encourage those of us here who own a business. Those of us who run a business. Those of us here who are part of a business to engage with us further. It's the best place to be in ICANN. If you really want to do some good work and affect the work of business users globally, the place for you to be is the BC. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much. Any questions? Shiva, please.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: My name is Shiva Upadhyay and I'm the first time Fellow. I really appreciate that you provide 70% discount in membership fee.

But I have one request and suggestion for you. In the new gTLD, the price if very high, very, very high [inaudible] by that at top level. So my suggestion is that you can introduce in a balanced way.

If you can give new gTLD initially to the developing industrial regions at a price of like a very low price, you can give like – currently you are having very big – you can provide initially a discount. And later what you can do, as the number of registration increases, you can charge on 10% or 5%, some of kind of that thing so initially they will not feel impossible to get into the new gTLD market.

LAWRENCE ROBERTS: To be clear, we as the Business Constituency don't have any direct authority with issuing gTLDs on how that market play. That is a broader ICANN issue. However, from a business standpoint, if there is that type of argument to be made, then we would be happy to think about it and talk about it amongst the Business Constituency members. We often comment on ICANN policy with regard to new gTLDs in the marketplace and the impact they have on the marketplace and safeguard, etc. fees that are charged. So we welcome that input from businesses that aren't registries and registrars I should say. We always take

that into consideration when we make our policies discussions and comments.

So I say to you, if you're part of a business or you know others that are you are thinking about joining, they're interested in that type of issue, the BC would be a good place provided they're not registries or registrars. The BC would be a good place to start and you can feed into our policy comments and make all those types of arguments. But just to be clear, the BC itself doesn't have any direct authority within ICANN to dictate fees, etc. and how gTLDs are rolled out. We're just part of that broader community and process that feeds into that but I'll take your point.

SHIVA UPADHYAY: Last thing I want to tell you, because we conducted a roundtable on new gTLD programs in India and we invited business, civil society, so businesses are very comfortable investing that much amount of money like [inaudible], that is a very small money for them. When we reach out to the new people like people from civil society or some [inaudible], that's a lot of money to invest because we have other problems too to address. But if you give a chance to those people and I guess Business Constituencies is having a main role to play in negotiating on this thing with the

ICANN Board whichever body decides about the price or not. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. If I may just quickly add to that, it depends on your business model or what you want to do, there is a kind of a pathway whereby you could be a reseller to start with your business capital and if you – there's a challenge with the new gTLD now, there's some registries that are not doing so well and so you find out that they are unable to pay, so then what happen? But if you get support from ICANN, you use this time and everything. So, you can see that in business, so if you are not doing business well, you find that ICANN can also sustain itself, so it's a chain. So, we need to look at it very well, the pros and cons.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Just a brief comment from remote participant, we have many people following us, Mamadou one of our Fellow alumni saying that glad to have Lawrence and Jimson, and the BC presenting today. We really need to push business on domain name within underserved region above all Africa. I think with your support, more communication and outreach will be done to reach businesspeople to enhance Internet industry. Just a comment. Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA: I'm one of the people that have the interest in the Business Constituency, then I went to one or two meetings in the BC but the issues that were being discussed, there is a startup coming from a developing country, the issues about policy. There's the policy guy from Facebook, policy guy from Amazon. But when startups join the BC, they look for more than like being involved in policy issues like they need some benefits of joining.

I do applaud the issue of [inaudible] the joining fees and all that stuff but couldn't we have an initiative where you can have startups like from developing countries getting to the DNS industry, DNS business, some incubation sort of? Because that when something like that provides value to me as a startup not just contributing to policy. Thank you.

[JIMSON OLUFUYE]: Well, thank you very much Isaac for that. As a startup, you need of course, it's important, you have your model very well. There are a lot of potentials in the developing countries. There's no doubt about that. And, based on your business plan, yes, you've said that, "Let me be part of the ecosystem." So you work on in the good ways to relate with those stuff [inaudible] in the process. So, we can't take it offline because it's a business issue. We can talk more about that.

But BC, those didn't give out funding for startup. No. Your business were all these policymaking to ensure that the Internet remain a place for business, stable and resilient, and that is a much interest to us. My company, as a company that live on the Internet, make business on the Internet, we need to make sure that my client systems remain resolvable and interpretable. So, we can't take that offline.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The inferences I wanted to make was the latter part of what Jimson talked about. For every ICANN on the stand the fact that for every small business, what we're looking at is how to maximize every opportunity to make profits. But we have to understand that the first lane is that the [inaudible] – the medium for which you want to which should building up business on has to be sustainable over the long run to support that business and that is what we do here in ICANN.

The policies we make go a long way to affect how our investments on the long run are guided and the assets and investments we make goes a long way to also ensure that they are secured at the end of the day.

The first thing to do or rather, what we do right here in ICANN and why we have big, small, medium businesses engaging at

ICANN is to ensure that the Internet that walks right now continues to work and continue to support our business model.

There are also different avenues that we create for engagement. A few days ago, I recalled seeing a number of us, the business launch we had, such opportunities within the ICANN ecosystem allows our networking and for you to meet other people who might have interest in what you're doing. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. [Inaudible] next foundation [Armenia] a Newcomer [inaudible]. First of all, thank you much for your presentations here. And, actually, I've visited the mission page of Business Constituency and I found there are interesting statement. So, the members of the Business Constituency user, the Internet to conduct business, does it mean that any company that use the Internet to conduct the business can be a member of Business Constituency and not only technological companies? If yes, that means that in this era of Internet [inaudible], any company can be a part of Business Constituency.

And, the second is a pragmatic equation, how much does it cost to be a member of Business Constituency? Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: I'll answer your first question. I'll turn to Jimson with the numbers for a cost. But yes, it's not – you don't just have to be a technology company to be a member of the BC. Now, to be sure, many of the members are technology companies because it's at the heart of their business if you will.

But we've always – we're opened to any and all businesses who – and as the Internet continues to sort of weave its way into all sorts of business models from – you name the company – the manufacturing companies, etc., they should have an interest in how the Internet functions and then making sure the Internet remains safe, secure, reliable, etc.

So, where we don't turn away members because they're not per se a technology company. It's open to any business user of the Internet. And then, as far as cost, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. So, for the first part equation, so it opens a lot of field for the advertising goals and for the programs to help them to understand the role of the Internet in their business is not just to use the Internet but the role of stability, etc. etc. And for technology [code] companies, we need to have these programs. But for these companies, it is really a new field I guess and new opportunities.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Also, to just elaborate a little more, you do know that in the GNSO, we have the Contracted Party House and we have the Non-Contracted Party House. The Contracted Party House, the registry and registrar, they're also in the business but they are different from what we do. And, in the Non-Contracted Party House, we have the [inaudible] group wherein BC is there, so they use us.

But if you want to be a member, your revenue must not be more than 30% as a registry or registrar. So, that is very important because the revenue will determine where your interest lies basically. So, that distinction is to [inaudible].

Then, consigning fees, there are three categories and they're on the website on [inaudible]. So, you can see the details there, 8,500 for Category 1, large companies, medium 670 euro, Category 3, 383 euros. So, if you're from developing countries out of this category, then you would still get 70% discount.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: We try to keep it, the fees as low as possible, just because we want to have as many members as possible, so we try to find creative ways to get members to join when fees become an issue.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And we'll take the last question, Nenad.

NENAD MARINKOVIC: Good morning. My name is Nenad Marinkovic. I'm from Serbia, first time fellowship and a couple of time with ICANN Meeting. And, I want to ask you if you are organized as a Business Constituency or any other option on the local level in your country or generally my question is, how to motivate technology companies and on what level to support Internet Governance, Internet constituencies, what kind of or how to encourage them and to motivate them to invest the time, money, energy, people to develop Internet Governance from the local level?

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: So, I think if I understood your question correctly, it was how do you get the companies to invest time, energy, resources into –

NENAD MARINKOVIC: Invest time on ICANN level, on top one, the global level but do you invest your time and money on local level in your countries where you develop your business?

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: In local level you said?

NENAD MARINKOVIC: Yes, local level, yup.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: Well, I think – well, I mean, I'll take a stab in answering your question and if I'm wrong, then – or not. I think, well, it depends on the business and the region I guess to some extent but I think we all – the BC supports companies from all over the world in all different levels. I think we try to serve as a voice for the industry and within ICANN and the ICANN Community to draw greater attention to companies especially companies in developing parts of the world who need support and focus.

I mean, we don't have a formal policy of support, if you will, but we work hard to draw attention to that and working through. ICANN is just one opportunity to do so.

Obviously, I think for members that are members of North America and Europe, it's a different – really – not a [inaudible] issue frankly at all for them in terms of developing support at the local level. I think it's more in other parts of the world where that's an ongoing issue.

But I think we as members of the ICANN and the BC, we go out to other parts of the world, other policy discussions, other Internet Governance discussions all over the world and we evangelize for

ICANN and for engagement, and support for small, medium and large businesses all over all the time just as a general way of thinking about it.

So, I don't know if I answered your question directly or not but maybe Jimson can take us now.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, the BC has its structure to the Outreach Committee. We intend to engage with maturing economies and regions. So, Lawrence is a member of the Outreach Committee. I oversee that from the Executive Committee. So, we go out, we do outreaches to local businesses, so we need a champion. So, as we have [inaudible] very good fellowship program, bringing out a champion is for you to go back and mobilize.

Usually, when a company sees the gap in the operation vis-à-vis, the need for them to sustain their business, then they will be part of it. So, somebody need to communicate that. Then, it's fairly since it's a developing economy and maturing economy.

NENAD MARINKOVIC: Okay. I can explain more in details. I was working a national registry domain name in Serbia and it is a non for profit organization, non-government, so you can be a member just based on small money and you can manage the registry.

And, for me, like an executive director of the registry, it was a problem to motivate any of the technology company to participate in registry. They don't have interest. The only small ISPs, small companies participate and some bigger member but for them, it is nothing part in the business. They just – the name of the list of the members, they don't really invest any energy and the people in that process. That is a problem in underdeveloped countries.

How to motivate business side to invest the time, energy and support for Internet Governance and not a multistakeholder [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, a good place to start is – and many of these companies, they have corporate departments, so public affairs. So, you just need to have an outreach with them and explain the situation. This is a maturity process.

CHRISTOPHER WILSON: I'll add, that's an ongoing concern. It's not – I've heard this but I mean, it's always a challenge. I mean, it's easy for me to say that I work for their large corporation. We have resources and time that can devote to sending me and others to ICANN Meetings and participating in multistakeholders forms, etc.

Obviously, for smaller companies, it's not necessarily reasonable to have that. So, to some extent, trade associations can provide the avenue by which small and medium, and midsized companies can engage at ICANN and so why we have some many trade association members of the Business Constituency to sort of service a voice for a broader subset of a community of companies.

But freely admit, it's always a challenge to devote the time and energy, and resources to these issues.

LAWRENCE ROBERTS: Let me add also –

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: You probably can take time to talk with Nenad separately on this because we are already over time and we need our interpreters to take rest before the next session.

Very brief, Evelyn, the last question.

EVELYN NAMARA: All right, I'm Evelyn Namara, I'm a first time fellow. So, I own a technology startup, which is at very early stages of a technology startup and we do technologies for development. So that means that most of my customers are people out in rural villages, and

we work with development companies to make sure that the last mile people get access to simple tools to make their work better.

So, I'm having a really hard time making a decision if the BC is the right place for me or the noncommercial users because most of my customers are people who are at the bottom of the pyramid. What would be the pitch for you for a startup like mine, which is mostly the social benefits of users matter a lot to me but we also make [inaudible], so it's more like a social enterprise. So, I don't where I fit and I want to know what your pitch would be for a technology startup like us.

LAWRENCE ROBERTS: I will pitch the BC not just because I'm in the BC but because within the BC, you would also find companies that have to some extent gone through the same part that you're talking about right now that you can learn from.

Aside from that, the success that you make back home on the project that you're currently working on will be a great value also to other businesses through the policies that we make within the Business Constituency.

So, if you're working with us, networking with the different layers and members that we have within the BC, definitely ton

[inaudible] what should do we need to a great success story, that's their views going down the line infusing into the policy work that we do on an ongoing basis will be a great value to other startups coming behind also. So, I would say the BC is definitely the place for you to look at.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much. And with that, I would like also to thank you, all of you for coming and – yes, our applauses to Business Constituency team. Thank you. And, with that, we close our morning session and we'll see you at 5:00 p.m. in the same room here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]