JOHANNESBURG – ALAC and Regional Leaders wrap up Part 1
Thursday, June 29, 2017 – 10:30 to 12:00 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the ICANN 59 ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap-Up, Part 1, on 29 June 2017, 10:30 to 12:00 noon, Ballroom 4.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I ask everyone to please take their seats? We'll be starting immediately.

Careful with the bag.

All right, we will get started. This first session this morning is a little bit different. This is officially not an ICANN meeting anymore because our subject is off ICANN subject.

I'll give you a bit of history. During the North American General Assembly that was held a few months ago where Göran was very nice to attend, over lunch one day we were talking about his experiences in Sweden trying to provide connectivity to virtually everybody in the country. Given that although connectivity is not a formal ICANN topic, it's a topic of great interest to an awful lot of our people. Certainly in Africa, it is of great interest.

I suggested that we have a little talk about it and hear some of the experiences in Sweden and to whatever extent they may be

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

applicable or simply interesting. I asked Göran if he would that, and he agreed, so here we are. Turn it over to you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much, Alan, for giving me this opportunity. Of course then, I have to say I speak in a private and personal capacity and nothing I say has anything to do with my job as the presidency over ICANN.

I think it's a pleasure for me to be talking about it. I actually have done work in Africa when it comes to access and access regulation and shared some of the experience we had in Sweden.

What I'm going to do is I'm going to give an overview, and then maybe you can specific questions. Just to give you a background about some of the learnings we've had, I don't know if anyone knows anything about Sweden, but it's actually one of the largest countries in Europe. There are about 10 million people living there. Unfortunately, they don't live all in one place.

You can divide the country into two different parts. One of them is the North and then there's the South. Most people actually live in the south. Very few people, because of the climate, live in the north. If you don't like cold, snow, and very dark winters, it's a very special place.

It also actually brings along some of the problems that we've seen. Just to give you a number, if you look at density per people, if you go away from the cities, we have the same people density in Sweden as the Sahara desert. There is only one country in Europe that has a lower density per square kilometer, and that's Finland. So we are talking about an obstacle.

On the positive side, you may know that Sweden is a fairly well-organized society, and this is important in this one. It's also a very collaborative society. We know that we are very few and nobody cares about us, so the word "consensus" and working together is a part of our DNA because we are so few which means that we have to figure out ways of working together.

This goes back in history for very practical reasons. Sweden was one of the poorest countries in the world about 100 years ago. During the beginning of the 1900s, a quarter of our population left Sweden because of starvation. It was because of famine because one of the things that is different from any other area around the world is that in the Nordic countries you can have one crop per year. If that crop fails, you starve.

That means that we actually had to start working with cooperation because if everybody makes grain and there's a bad grain year, everybody dies. It started with you do grain and

potato, and if there was a bad year, they shared. That is the institutional way Sweden grew up.

We were also not affected by the Second World War. In Sweden, we say that we're so boring that nobody even invaded us. Finland, Denmark, and Norway were invaded, and we were left alone. That's really where Sweden as a manufacturing country started because our industry was not affected by the Second World War as most countries in Europe. That is where this history of Sweden started when we started doing manufacturing and doing things together.

Today, Sweden, as you know, is one of the richest countries in the world. Norway, of course, is much more rich, but we are a rich country. We have a high living standard, and that is also important.

Before I joined this, I was the telecom regulator and postal regulator in Sweden. A little bit depending on how your countries are set up, the regulators have different obligations. My obligation was also to make sure that I provided connectivity to everybody in Sweden, and by regulation, everybody in Sweden. It's not a law. It's a regulation, which is slightly different in my [country], that everybody needs to have access to Internet.

When I left, we had 250 households that didn't have it. We have 4.5 million households roughly in Sweden. In a country where

people are living on mountains with no power and it's very cold. If you've ever experienced cold, you don't know what it is. It's actually quite nice. For the record, I now live in Los Angeles.

Why do I give this background? It is because nothing is born out of nothing. There always has to be something. Before me, back in the '90s, the government decided that we didn't call it Internet Society, we call it if you remember that the information society – very big thing in the '90s. That meant that you actually started talking about getting access to something else other than a telephone line system. You needed to build up systems to get access to something, even if we didn't really define Internet.

What we discovered when I came in at the end of the '90s as a telecom regulator is that the fantastic thing with this, it's a lot of moving parts. These actually consist of such different parts as a shovel and how you distribute licenses for mobile, including working with energy, including working with the fact that there has to be a demand, which leads to [respite].

What we decided to do was to instead of just calling this a telecom regulation thing or calling it an energy plan, we decided actually in a typical Swedish way to work together. In 2010, we decided to do something we call the Swedish Broadband Forum, and that is really what has made a change over the last seven or eight years when it comes to connectivity.

Today, Sweden has the highest speeds in the world, outside Hong Kong and Singapore, because what we've done is we took some decisions and we also decided to carry them out but we decided to do them together. Because up till now, most access has been driven by one party. For instance, your telecom operator goes out and wants to build fiber. Your mobile operator who is often independent from the other telecom operators decides, "I'm going to buy a mobile network." What happens then is you become very ineffective to doing that.

So we tried to figure out [inaudible] on some places you need mobile connectivity, you have to do things there. On other places you also need fiber. We decided early on that copper is not something that we think is going to be very good in the future, and we also decided that satellite had its place.

In 2010, the Swedish government and I as one of the founding members of the Swedish Broadband Forum just sat down and started talking about all the moving parts. When I in my current job talked about this, you have to convince someone that a shovel has something to do with power, actually has something to do with how you distribute spectrum to mobile operators. That notion is very, very different.

Over the years then we added things like you should have a DNSSEC strategy. You should have a strategy for IPv6, which I

might say that we actually failed quite remarkably in Sweden. But we started to get all of those done, just to give you some of those examples that we did, but with a caveat.

The first thing we really encountered was how we get money for this. It wasn't like the Swedish government decided to give me loads of money to finance this. One of the first things we decided to do was to check if there's any demand. And you know what? There wasn't.

Often when I go out and talk to countries – or I used to go out and talk to countries – there's sort of this expectation that there is always a willingness for the end user to pay. But it turns out people are very smart. The only time they want to give their money away is when they can see the benefit out of it. That, I think, is one of those things that we learned: you actually have to sell the concept of access to Internet to get people to be interested in it so they can be willing to share.

Now again, people who live in Sweden have an ability to pay because we have a high level of standard, and I know that's very different than many other countries. But anyway, we took a course of decisions that most investments have to come from the end users. We also convinced the government in the end to provide some money, but most of the money has to come from the end users.

I'm going to give you one small example of what we did. One of the things we did was to do what we call fiber to the village program. The Swedish villages are different from any others in the world because of this cooperation we've always done. They are physically far away from each other, so we usually don't have a village with a lot of houses and a pub and people lurking around. The farms we have are often very far beyond. That turns out to be a positive thing.

I myself and my team actually went out on the rural areas of Sweden and met farmers and other ones and convinced them to borrow us their shovels. We convinced them, and we put some money into it, about 15% of the total cost because 80% of the cost for fiber is actually digging. What happened was that with this program and a lot of villages came together and they decided to have the fiber through several landowners' different property and land. They started digging by themselves and we paid for the fiber, which is nothing to do that.

Right now, Sweden has 73% of all households in Sweden now connected to fiber. About 100% of all multi-dwelling units are now connected to fiber. In the villa environments close to the city, about 50-60% are now connected. And we've done that in seven years. We've done that by people [inaudible] shovel.

This had a funny effect because it also created a demand. Because when you get connected and start using it, you want to use it in other places. Suddenly, the demand for more mobile IP access started because if you're connected at home, you really want that to be happening when you're traveling or walking around as well. So the mobile penetration of Internet access right now is like 130% or something because now people have more than one phone.

But it really started when we convinced people to take a small investment to going out in the villages. You might think that's easy. In any constructive society like this, there are property laws. There are digging rights. There are connection points. But we had to work those through with the broadband forum where we actually sat down with the government's part and handled who had the right to dig.

We also involved the municipalities. We actually convinced the municipalities that it's a good business model for them to build fiber into the cities. Many people think that fiber is just an investment that will never go back. Now today, there are about 280 municipalities in Sweden. About 170 of them today have local fiber networks built by themselves, and most of them are actually making money providing a service to their own members of the municipality. It's actually a small problem

because municipalities are not really allowed to make money out of this. But it has created a very positive environment.

Fixed access fiber through the village program, through municipalities' support has been extremely important. I spend in my job many times convincing municipalities around the world you don't have to go and ask your telecom operator to do this. You can actually do this together. When you're out there with a shovel for anything, when you're out there to do any other utility, just put in a fiber. Every time you dig, put in a fiber. And at one point in time, you're going to connect them. And then you connect into a basement. You don't even need to have any active equipment. You don't have to be a [telecom] operator.

That was also very interesting when that started to happen because often what countries are doing is they go out to the big telecom operators. They give them all the money and go out and build somewhere, and you create a monopoly on fixed [inaudible]. So now in Sweden which is a small country, there are about 450 different operators or ISPs who are owned or any way managed networks. The big telecom operators wouldn't agree that I actually said this was a positive thing because it actually turned down the prices, which has increased the demand.

So mobile then. One of the things that many people don't realize is that one of the exclusive things in the world is spectrum. A mobile phone like this actually uses four or five different bandwidths all the time. Spectrum has gone from something that military listening to radio, looking at television, and some sort of mobile talking to, it was kind of on satellites, it was sort of divided between different parties already. As you may know, this has become one of the biggest cash cows for any country now.

We took [inaudible] decision to talk about who owns spectrum, because spectrum has this fantastic thing of being scarce but existing for all time. The problem was when whatever you believe in – God – created spectrum, not all this spectrum is the same. So I hope to give you a very short explanation how it works.

It's very easy. Higher up in the bands, there is a lot of capacity but the signal doesn't go that far. If you go down in the bands, the pipes get smaller but the signal goes longer. Remember that because that's an important thing.

We took a decision to say like this: every time we distribute spectrum, we set up some criteria for it. We said this is an asset that belongs to the people and whatever we do, the value of that should go back to the people. First thing, we had to increase competition or maintain competition when we give out

spectrum in all the different bands. The second thing, we should use is coverage. If those two things were fulfilled, then we get the money.

Often it's done the other way around. But this was one of the good things as the telecom regulator, it was my decision and not the parliament's, so we did that. You're laughing. I can tell you that the Swedish treasury didn't laugh.

[HOLLY RAICHE]: That's not laughing at you. That's maybe laughing at the government.

GÖRAN MARBY: We are strange. I know that.

So we started using, especially in the so-called 800 band which is the perfect compromise between capacity and how far it goes because it's one of the best bands. That what you usually use for television, which is often traded off. We looked at the map of Sweden and said there are places where it doesn't have coverage. We made sure that the coverage obligation we had mapped where there was less fiber or other types of connectivity. Therefore, we can actually build up in the country where nobody lives.

So today, I think 80% of Sweden as a country is covered with mobile. The rest of them are mostly places like national reservations or stuff. We can't build anything there. And, yes, we have people – our Indian tribes, for instance – actually live in the reservations. That's a big problem, and there we started using satellites as a complement.

If I was asked what advice I would give, you have to sit down and think about this as a joint effort. You have to do this together with all those moving parts, from the farmers to the mobile operators. There's no law and no regulation that can actually make that happen. You have to sit down with people and really make them understand you have to work together. You have to put in the DNSSEC. You have to talk about the IPv6. You have to build a business case for the ISPs to be able to that while maintaining competition.

The only thing I'm trying to say in all of this is that you have to work together. So, in essence, you have to be Swedish.

Thank you very much. I hope you thought it was interesting.

I have a couple of minutes here. Anyone want to raise a question, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We have two. Well, we have many now. First was Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: Yes, I have two short questions. Thank you very much for sharing your experience in Sweden. You talked about the connection in remote areas, and we know we have areas in the world that are very similar – Sahara and mountains. I know that many African countries did put together the universal service to finance the connection of people that are in remote areas. Do we have this type of universal service? I don't know if it worked well or not. Let us know about it.

Second question about sharing the infrastructure between the three. I say three because there are three countries between the operators and the main operator.

The third question: the fiber, is it normal for the operators to have end users pay for the connection? In Morocco, you can use fiber. You pay about $300, and then you pay about $60 a month to have your connection.

Last question regarding in most countries operators competing regulators have a type of monopoly because they agree between one another –

ALAN GREENBERG: … have a chance to answer. How much time do you have?

GÖRAN MARBY: Four minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have four minutes. We have about seven or eight people in the speaker queue. So we can act accordingly, please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Very good questions. No, we didn't have – in many countries you have something called a universal service obligation fund. We didn't have one. Sweden forgot to set one up, to be honest. So we had to find means of money anywhere. We got grants from the government, building on the [inaudible]. For instance, with fiber to village, if the village came up with money, we gave money as well. So they continue doing that. I wouldn't say it's a lot of money.

We also did a telecom regulation, which is interesting. In Europe, you have the opportunity to do something called local loop unbundling. Everybody knows what that, isn't it? It is about that actually, physically is you have a fiber connected to your house, if the owner of that fiber controls your content in real time, you have a real monopoly. It doesn't matter if your neighbor has another fiber owner. The one who controls that fiber to you has a monopoly.

We changed the view of looking at this. We said monopolies exist not because of how the market looks in Sweden. If someone has connected you and you don't have a choice, you have a personal monopoly. So we said end user competition is more important than the aggregated.

We enforced a regulation which was very, very popular by the fiber owners that if you own a fiber, someone else can sell the service. That's local loop unbundling. We actually set the price for one fiber owner who [how they sold], the price, what the fiber owners actually could sell their service to the service provider – now I'm getting technical – just to prevent that the monopolies didn't exist.

But the most important thing with this is that we discovered that the old telecom operators suddenly started to lose because now anyone could build a fiber. It's fairly easy. You have to maintain it. You have to work with it. It's like any other utility. That created a price point.

Yes, end users in Sweden pay for the fiber plus the ISP because that's how we separated them because of this monopoly. The prices are lower, but it's also about demand really. Because if your fiber price goes up too high, it could actually be worthwhile for someone else.

Just before I left, there was a new law also about sharing the actually underlying infrastructure: duct sharing. If someone has placed a duct when they put in the fiber, someone else can actually come in and use that, especially for municipalities that sometimes because they make money out of this often use this duct. We saw a risk that they could create another monopoly in that city, and therefore there was a law saying that now you have to share the ducts as well.

I also proposed that we should have licenses on shovels, but I didn't get that through. I actually did that. Yes, they said the same thing as you do now.

The important thing is that, as you can see, suddenly a lot of different moving parts have to come together and you have to think them through.

Can I take one more question? I'm sorry I don't have more time. I didn't think that it was going to be so interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone know who was first here or who would [not waive it]?

GÖRAN MARBY: It's time for a lady, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Maybe you can answer the question for everybody. Is this written down in English? Because Australia shares so many of the same problems, so many of the same policies. We're muddling through very, very badly, and I'd like a better model. Where can we find the information?

GÖRAN MARBY: Oh, there's loads of them in Swedish.

HOLLY RAICHE: Great.

GÖRAN MARBY: Because of that model we have done, especially the broadband forum, I actually had people who worked for me that spent a lot of time here in Africa talking to governments about the concept of what we call the broadband forum and the cooperation, how we did licenses. Actually, I can speak to my old team and see what's available in English. I know there are some people who are thinking of doing an academic study.

I just want to point something out. Yes, I was for many years in the middle of this one, but I'm not the hero in this one. The real hero of this one is the people who just stood up and said we want better connectivity and did something about it instead of waiting for the government to sort out all problems.

I think I have time for one more. This is much more fun than I have done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Andrei?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah, I'll be short. How would you envision the [new priority] in the spectrum allocation as a dynamic spectrum allocation instead of slicing it into the little pieces and giving it to the operators? What do you think about it? Is it feasible?

GÖRAN MARBY: Phew, this is fun! Sorry. That's not on record, is it? Yeah.

To explain what we're talking about is that when you allocate spectrum today, you do that. In this room here, there's loads of spectrum. Most of it is not used. It could be so that you sold a part of that spectrum to someone who doesn't use it. Therefore,

there are new techniques that have come out that actually have a first right and a second one that can only use the spectrum if it's not used. For me, this makes sense. I don't know what is the explanation.

I decided that in all the licenses we've sold, auctioned out since 2010 that nobody gets exclusive spectrum. So when the new technology comes around, which it hasn't done that yet, someone else can use the spectrum if the first user doesn't use it.

Because one of the things with spectrum is that you give away spectrum for a very long time. When I did the 800 band, we actually did that for 25 years, which means that you lock something up for 25 years. You have to do that because the mobile operators are investing a lot of money and they have to be able to build a business case.

On the other hand, you want to make sure that you have several mobile operators competing with each other and you also know there are going to be a lot of technology changes. Many regulators in countries learned during the so-called "free G" hype that was extremely successful for many countries but often locked the end customer into a particular technology and the world moved on. Most countries or regulators learned not to repeat that mistake.

To answer your question, the first thing you have to do is when you do spectrum policy, you never give out exclusive spectrum. You always have a secondary [use] when that technology comes in. I could spend the rest of this day talking about technology as a secondary [use] and wide spaces and how to go from analog to digital TV and – oh, sure, I love this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did have one question in the chat if Yesim can read it. If you can answer it quickly, then fine.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Alan. Yesim Nazlar from ICANN staff. We have a question on the Adobe Connect from Sivasubramanian. He says, "In a global context, if the world were to move to open spectrum, what would governments lose and gain and what would telecoms lose and gain? How would open spectrum policies reflect in data and voice prices?" Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: The concept of open spectrum won't work technically because when you take up your telephone and make a call, then you're actually using a part of the spectrum. And radio waves actually collide. So that's why you have to carve out special spectrum for specific uses. That's mechanics.

For instance, you have Wi-Fi. You probably have two different Wi-Fi wavelengths here, and they're separated. But if you sit at your home and your neighbor has a Wi-Fi using the same spectrum, you sometimes will see your thing doesn't work because someone else has a stronger signal. So the mechanics of that is totally impossible.

We also have to realize that the reason why we have all of this is because someone took the business risk of making an investment. This costs a lot of money. A simple base station in a connected area when you actually get access to property, energy, and all of those things costs roughly a million dollars. One base station. To cover any region, you need thousands of them. I think in Sweden there are about 25,000 base stations. Some of them you don't see because they're on top of buildings. I'm a nerd, so I see them everywhere. Sometimes they look like a plant or something. But someone has to make that investment, and it's a huge amount of money.

So spectrum is a mechanics. Another thing you have to also remember is that you may think that when I make a call to you, that's always wireless. Actually, what happens is that it's a very short period that is actually wireless. It goes to a base station that mostly go down, with the 4G and 5G, it's going to go into the ground with fiber. So mobile is only mobile to the closest base station and then becomes something else.

I think the big challenge for many operators going forward – and I'm not allowed to say this – is IP. Because here, because of the cost of using a mobile phone here, I'm using FaceTime all the time. Or there are, of course, many other applications you can use. And that is driving the cost down for users.

I should have gone ten minutes ago, but this was the most interesting session I had since I came onboard. Thank you very much for letting me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll be talking about that.

Next, we have a few minutes to start talking about ATLAS III. ATLAS III will be in March 2019.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: Do you want to say what ATLAS is?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do I want to say what ATLAS is? Yes, certainly. ATLAS is the At-Large Summit ("AT" for At, "LA" for Large, "S" for Summit). It is the global GA that we hold approximately once every five years. The first one was in 2009 in Mexico City. The next one was in 2014 in London. And the next one will be in March 2019 in – are we allowed to say at this point? Has it been formally

announced? It is public. In Kobe, Japan. We have many pluses and someone shaking their head no.

One of the questions that has come up is – and we will have to start organizing this soon. It takes a fair amount of work to do this. But that's not today's subject. If you recall in the At-Large Review, among the recommendations were that we bring to meetings the people who are working or good candidates to start working and are the active contributors. That may or may not coincide with the people that we tend to bring to GAs today. That is, one representative per ALS and if we have individual members in the region, we tend to have one individual member representing them all.

The real question I'm asking or starting the discussion on is, do we want to somehow move to a different model where simply being an ALS does not automatically give you a ticket but that we try to select the people based on who will gain more from the exposure or who will be able to contribute more. And that's really the question. I'm opening the queue at this point and I have about six people already. No, you're pointing –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: As long as I am on the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I'm not sure who was first. I think Sebastien was first.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani was first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani was first. If you'd like to keep the queue please, you're managing the queue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. This idea to change the format more or less of the summit, we spoke about before and I couldn't be convinced of it. I understand what is behind it but if we think that some ALSes don't deserve to be brought to the summit, we have to decertify them. We have to go through the criteria for involvement of the ALSes and apply it And make all our ALSes either active or out, and the summit should be for all ALSes. Since you are a member, you have to be treated on the same level. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I asked people to consider as they're answering what if an ALS has three really, really active people or what if we have a good number of individual members who are active? So if you could

just factor that in as you're responding. Who is next on the queue?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. The answer, Alan, is absolutely not. I mean, my first meeting was the Mexico City meeting as a new member, as a completely new ALS. I had to be at the meeting to understand what was going on within ICANN. And it was this experience that led me to do many other things as an active participant. So we have to bring people to the meetings so they can experience it and understand it.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the criteria could well be new ALSes who weren't around the last time. I'm not pushing for this. we're raising a discussion. Next?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Someone handed me a microphone so it must be me. Alan, I kind of want a dollar each way on this because I do believe in meritocracy. And I do think we need to take the opportunity to reward people who are very active and contributing but I certainly see – and I guess because I'm particularly fond of what ATLASes do – the benefit of bringing together and upskilling our ALSes on mass. That said we have yet to have 100% capacity and

we have yet to have at any time all of our ALSes be able to send their one representative even. So let's look at some parts of – and buckets of – and see what can happen, but I do like the meritocracy idea. I think perhaps that shouldn't be coming from an ATLAS budget though. That's probably the best way I could put it. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yesim said I was next. I really want to support Tijani's ideas. I think that is what we need to do and that's something that Glenn and I in NARALO have been doing. Working, trying to figure out, doing some statistical analysis on which ALSes are not active, and then contacting them and figuring out how do we get you active? What is it that you're interested in? And then we decertify the ones that aren't.

That is how we have gotten increased participation in our meetings but also I want to support Garth's idea. At the ATLAS III, I think what was really successful for me at least as that was my first meeting was that my mentor then, Glenn, had organized that all the new ALSes be taking part in some part in ATLAS in the sessions and taking a role.

That way they get to meet more people and they get to be active and see how it's going on. I think that really helps improve people then, performance there and knowledge and then they

can understand the processes. So that when they go back to the ALS they can educate the others and say, “Okay, now I know what it is and this is what we need to do.” And I think that is the most effective way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Please if you can as you're doing it address multiple people for ALS and individual users. Whoever’s next? Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I’m going to speak in French. I don’t like this debate. We have no base. Yesterday, we discovered that there was an ATLAS III. And today we are going to discuss the criteria. We need the paper to know on which base we are going to work and why do we have those two proposals, why are we inventing something new today. So please stop this discussion, Mr. Chair, because it is not useful to have a deep debate.

It is our impression, our first impression it’s a very bad way to manage a topic. Now this topic, okay, now we can think about it, we can produce a paper and work on it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've known there will be an ATLAS round about 2019. We got budget support for it a year and a half ago. This is not the definitive decision point. This is simply a first discussion.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But sorry, when it was put on the agenda, which paper we have to prepare, what is the knowledge of the people around the table about ATLAS I and ATLAS II, about the history of all that? It's really – I am struck with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree with Cheryl on the meritocracy idea especially in ATLAS II we – I am going to speak on behalf of LACRALO. This is not to criticize any other RALO. In our RALO we have had people who attend – who went to London and they don't even go to the ATLAS meetings. They were just on tourism there. So I believe the RALOs have to look at that. It's not only that they were not participating in LACRALO but they didn't even go to the ATLAS II meetings and we paid for their trips, hotels, etc. I think meritocracy is key here. Thank you.

[SEDMUSHAN GAMA]: I don't understand –

ALAN GREENBERG: Give your name please.

[SEDMUSHAN GAMA]: I don't understand really the issue. Anyway, what I think for us in Africa, I think what we are missing and what our aim to is more Internet connection, more content to more citizen, more people. And I think what we are missing in our country is not geniuses but systematization, a change of expertise and no harm.

This is an issue for us so whatever can help, you know, exchanging expertise, no harm views is very important and by bypassing the ALSes. We can have somebody who is just active but at the end it doesn't help you know the Internet. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Remy Nweke, please.

REMY NWEKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Remy Nweke. I work with DigitalSENSE Africa. We've got to the point on the table. First, outside the fact – the points made by Tijani [inaudible] in terms of trying to assess the ALSes and their capacity to be up-to-date with what is happening within the ALAC community. It is also

important that when we are trying to scale down or engage them, we should also look at – because I'm aware in the cost of application accreditation, they usually have contact person and then maybe alternate contact person.

So my suggestion is that we should also try as much as possible to walk with this instead of looking for other expertise somewhere else. Because as much as we are engaging them, we are also good in their capacity on what is going on within the ICANN community and as well as ALAC too. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Ricardo Holmquist please.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I am Ricardo Holmquist. I will speak in Spanish. Alan, I believe that the question you have posed is how do we bring in more people to be added to the people who are already working? But the people who are working are sitting around this table. If an ALS is actively involved, usually the higher position in ALAC or the ICANN, or in the GNSO, they have positions in different areas and they are already having their tickets paid. So they're not going to use that money for the ALSes so the people who are actively involved, usually get their travel allocation paid by somebody.

You saw me nodding my head when you say Kobe. I would love to know Japan. I've never been there, but it's a place which is farthest away for everybody and which is the most expensive for everybody. So if an ALS actually wants to bring in a second or third person to Kobe, it's too expensive for them. So I believe you have chosen the worst venue for ATLAS III Summit because of the distance and because of cost and affordability. Montreal in June might have been a better choice in that sense. I'm not Canadian. I believe Montreal is a really nice city to visit in June. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, we need far more active people than we will ever get in some of the – 2015 ALAC members and 10 regional leaders. So let's not equate those two. In terms of venues, we have little control over the venues and in selecting the venues and which meeting in each year. The meeting planning people look at what venue can handle another 250 people in terms of rooms and other things like that, so it's a complex equation.

Yes, Seun?

YESIM NAZLAR: Seun Ojedeji, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Yes, it's really good to find a way of getting people who are actually active to attend the summit. But I think it should be very, very [inaudible] on them also in the ALSes to use their slots for that. It should be good if there can be certain budgeting that is done separately for those kind of people or not necessarily to say the slot of the ALS should be given to them. So I think we should consider that. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, please.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: I would like to speak in French. My name is Abdeldjalil Bachar from Chad. For me, it's a good idea to support those who are really active. [Hard] to make those that are not very active active. We have to look at performance. ALS performance is very important. We do that in AFRALO.

The local impact is also very important. For most of us, ICANN supported us to come here, but we have to do reports when you go back to our countries. We can have 10 members, 50 members, older members cannot come to the meeting. And for ATLAS III, maybe two members per ALS. But active ALSes that do contribute not only at ALAC but also at the GNSO level and other consistencies. So we need to coach our ALSes and we have to

look into the local impact. This is not touristic trip we're looking for.

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani Ben Jemaa, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note we're about seven minutes away from half hour when we have speakers.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Three points. The first one about tourism. I agree with you but the solution is not to say those people who went on tourism will not come back. It is to say those people who went on tourism have to go out. My main point is criteria. We need criteria for involvement and we need also criteria for participation in the summit. So it is criteria before and after.

Second point – you listen to me? Okay. For multiple persons from same ALS, I agree with you but it shouldn't be done on the expenses of the other ALSes.

The last point, individuals. In my point of view we have to stick to the current policy, the current procedure we are using.

YESIM NAZLAR: Harold Arcos please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you. I'm going to speak in Spanish. I fully agree with what Tijani has just said. I was actually basing a question, Alan. I was about to mention individuals. Based on our original governance mechanisms, it's already been defined and the original assembly in the region is the assembly that can make decisions in the region. And the assembly is represented by the accredited to the ALSes.

And so I think we already have the rules there. Now to raise something in addition to that, this is the criteria that we're going to need to study. That is how are we going to include those who do not have vote accreditations? Individual members do not have vote accreditations but ALSes do and ALSes are a part of the General Assembly.

In the case of LACRALO, individual members do not vote but they do have a voice and they are active. And so those cases require a special consideration. This is my personal opinion because we have not consulted this with all of the region. I cannot speak on behalf of the region. I am speaking in my personal capacity but we do need to exclude the exclusion criteria. We need to be fully inclusive and see who else we're going to add and know who we're going to rule out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have about perhaps two minutes so please gauge the following comments because you're cutting off the future speakers.

YESIM NAZLAR: Satish Babu, please.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. I agree with Tijani, Cheryl, and Sebastien and I would propose that we need a process in place with indicators and criteria that will without defunct ALSes. Stimulate existing ALSes that are not fully active and provide handholding for new ALSes and individual members. Based on their participation in ICANN as well as feeding back information to their communities.

Once this process is done and we have indicators and criteria and we judge them, we should invite all the ALSes and exceptional individuals. So I would like to stress that we have to invite exceptional individuals also as a part of this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have time for any more?

YESIM NAZLAR: I've got four names.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whoever is next on the list then we'll cut it off.

YESIM NAZLAR: Leon Sanchez, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: I want to speak in Spanish. I also agree with what Tijani has said and what Cheryl have said, also Satish was saying. I think, we believe we need to be inclusive and not exclusive. If we are going to think on setting criteria, it is also important that those criteria be set now. I mean the pressure is on us because the lawyer in me is saying that we cannot add retroactive roles, apply retroactive roles to ALSes and tell them how is it that they can access financing to attend an ATLAS Summit. So the pressure is in our side to set those criteria if those criteria need to be set. Today, the rules are clear and I think we also need to see that there is inclusion and not exclusion.

Now Ricardo, in terms of the price, I mean, we did not choose Kobe as a venue, and in terms of price it depends who you ask. Those who live in the Asia-Pacific region do not find it very expensive to reach Kobe – to go to Kobe as it would be for those

of us in the other side of the world. So this is just circumstantial and does not depend on those of us on this table. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I think the interesting first discussion, it won't be the last and I will simply note that as part of the At-Large review, we are submitting proposals to the Board through the operational effect of this committee of what we are going to do to address the issues raised in the review. One of those results certainly based on our comments that we have submitted prior to now is that we will increase strongly our focus on individual members. I don't think we can afford to completely ignore that going forward.

But we're talking two years from now. So I don't think we're you know prejudging things but I think it's an important discussion to have and to figure out how to do. In terms of just to do a reasonable set, we are looking at an estimated 250-280 ALSes and that's the number of travel slots that we're estimating. The chances of increasing that and adding more onto it I would not hold my breath, so just to be realistic.

We've overrun and we haven't had an opportunity for liaison reports. I do ask that people look at the ones that are posted and we'll try to find a few minutes in our second wrap-up session for any really urgent issues that liaisons want to raise.

I'd like to now turn it over to Patrik Fältström from the SSAC to enlighten us on something. I don't know what it is.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much and it's always happy to be here. Patrik Fältström, Chair of SSAC. What I will enlighten you on the activities that we have done recently within SSAC. Next slide please.

I will go through the introductory slides that describes SSAC quite quickly so that we can then explain to you what documents we have published. Because the most interesting part in the meeting with ALAC is normally the questions that we get, so I hope that we'll get about 50 minutes with full questions. Next slide please.

So we are at the moment 35 members appointed by the ICANN Board and we have made 97 publications since 2002. So we have increased the speed of publications which you will see shortly. Next slide please.

What we do is as one of the ACs just like ALAC, we produce our advice. We have the view that our advice, the only weight it has is its quality. People pick them up and reference them if they want to. We do the work internally in SSAC and then after we have finished our work product, we decide whether there is

something to publish or not. Most of our advice are going to ICANN Board, although we are charted to give advice to the ICANN community to the broader ICANN community and otherwise participate in various SSR-related activities in the world. Next please.

We are currently looking at various namespace issues, harmonization regarding internationalized domain names. We are just like you going through organization review both in external and internal review. We are looking at rate limiting issues, not only limited to risk but general rate limiting in the various protocols that are related to the Internet unique identifiers. We have the DNSSEC workshops at every ICANN meeting and then we also have a membership committee that reviews our membership. I will go through the publications later on.

Regarding the outreach, we have some introduction to SSAC and then we have started to – among other things request from ALAC – we have started to do various other kind of outreach and not on the documents. For example, Monday this week I recorded a video that explains a little bit more the latest advice we have related to emoji, and that is something that you can watch and not only sort of read the document because the document might be a little bit sort of detailed and technical-heavy. It might be

more fun to see me singing and dancing – not much dancing but anyways than reading a document.

But anyway, the serious part is that we do understand that for some people it's easier to read a detailed text. For other people, it's easier to just listen to a pod, for other people to participate in a discussion in social media. And what we are trying now to start with is to have a video in the form of an [interview], which might be easier to consume for some other people.

So we are trying to broaden the way we are making our work available. And one way of doing that is by meeting with other groups, for example ALAC, so in this meeting ALAC and ICANN Board are the only two groups we meet. Next slide please. Next. Let's move forward. Next. Next. Here. Okay.

So I now have a couple of slides where I describe in a broad way the latest documents that we have published. And then given a positive experience from previous meetings with ALAC, then we'll open for question and answer to handle these documents. I have many of the other SSAC members in the room, so they can jump forward to a microphone and try to explain them.

But let me give an overview. Document #92 was an input to the CCWG and Accountability Work Stream 2 on Human Rights. And what we basically said was that we think it's important that the scope of the working group stays within the remit of the Mission

and Bylaws of ICANN. SSAC Document #93, there was also a comment on the CCWG Work Stream 2 draft regarding accountability. Next slide please.

#94 was a response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Community Comment 2. So what we did was that we responded to a questionnaire that was developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group.

We just like you and many others have to deal with all of these sort of changes, but we are going to come into the more fun stuff here.

#95, that's a fun one. Advisory on the use of emojis and domain names. The reason why we wrote this document was simply because we've got so many questions and the fact that some ccTLDs do a lot of registration of emojis, domain names with emoji in the second level domain. The advice is relatively easy. We just like ICANN and their policies recommend people to follow the Internet, the standard for Internationalized Domain Names that is defined by the Internet [Engineering] Task Force. And according to that standard emoji cannot be used in domain names. It's that simple.

So the report could be just sort of one line or something. Don't violate the standards developed by the IETF. But we also go

through why we think that decision by the IETF is made and the reasoning behind it. Next slide please.

#96. [inaudible]

It seems to be the case the channels have changed.

ALAN GREENBERG: The channels have changed. If you're not hearing the language you want, look around for the right language.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: So I'm continuing to speak my version of English which is my second language. Still probably better than if I speak Swedish, which is my primary language.

#97. An advisory regarding the centralized zone data service and the registrar operator monthly activity reports. We reviewed the goals of the CCDS program and the standardization was supposed to be the goals were – that it was supposed to be easy reliable operations for participants. And quite often the CCDS have succeeded but there are many corners where we don't think the program lives up to the goals. We give recommendations on improvements of the CCDS program. We think this is pretty important regarding follow up contractual issues with the device contracted parties among other things.

So that's it. Those are the latest reports and now we have 20 minutes for Q&A. I really would like to also have other SSAC members be prepared on answering questions.

Alan, are you running the queue or should I do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesim is running the queue.

YESIM NAZLAR: Leon Sanchez, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Yesim. I have a question for you, Patrik. I saw that in your current where you're holding a working group on WHOIS rate limiting. Can you explain what WHOIS rate limiting?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Jeff, are you here? Please. Can you respond to the question about rate limiting?

JEFF BEDSER: Thank you. Jeff Bedser, SSAC. So the rate limiting issues come about simply about the access to data and applying the volume restrictions on access to data. So rate limiting applies to, for

example, on the WHOIS model or other models where the entity will decide how often the data can be queried. What we were looking at is there's a very wide range of rate limiting issues across the industry where, for example, in some TLDs it might be as few records as three per hour in a total of 10 per day. Others that have no rate limiting and we're trying to get to understanding of how rate limiting is being applied across the board as well as the reasons behind it.

There are some obvious technical reasons. For example, the [inaudible] service attacks gone against an Internet resource like a WHOIS server would take it offline. And there's been a registrar recently that suffered an attack like that. But with the advent of Cloud services and the easability to get a new IP address to run technology on it, the whole battle between applying different rate limits to access to public data is just causing a lot of confusion. And it's escalating war or the more rate limiting could put on for an IP address, the more outside resource that want that data are distributing their address by coming from multiple points. So it's an issue that just seems to be escalating and seems to be very critical to look into how it's being done, why it's being done. And maybe put some structure around the process as all the other WHOIS discussions are happening.

YESIM NAZLAR: Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Patrik, if you feel comfortable answering it, can you give us an update on the difference of opinion between the SSAC and the ccNSO on two character confusingly similar strings?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: What happened around the previous ICANN meeting was that there was the EPSRP Guidelines document was produced by the ccNSO. And we in SSAC released a recommendation to the Board to not approve it.

What has happened since then which is what I would like to describe is that ICANN Board sent a letter with three questions to myself and the Chair of ccNSO with the request that we too, SOs and ACs, should come back with a response that both groups accepted.

Katrina and myself accepted that. I would call it maybe a challenge but resort in a positive way that could also improve the work between the SO and ACs. And also may be come up with a model on how these kind of issues are resolved. We together, Katrina and myself as Chairs, we wrote a statement of work for a work party with members from both ccNSO and SSAC.

We created this small work group with two members from each one of the ccNSO and SSAC, none of these individuals from the leadership of the organizations. We also pointed one support staff from each one of our groups. So we have a group with four individuals and two support staff and they report to me and Katrina. That group has accepted the statement of work and the work party has met once this week and they already have a document that they are editing together. And so everything looks positive to be able to respond to these three questions from the Board, so it actually looks pretty good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Satish Babu, please.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. My question is regarding SSAC 095 on the emoji domains. It appears that there's been a rapid increase in the numbers of emoji domains that are registered despite varying support on different platforms and browsers. Some search engines seem to have provided additional support for emoji domains. And these things seem to work fine in some of them including Google.

Now given the fact that the advisory is against the use of such names, what kind of corrective action can ICANN take in these cases?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much for that question. Well, as the registration of emojis is possible only in domain names and otherwise registration services that are non-contracted parties to ICANN, there is nothing formal that ICANN can do. But what we can do is outreach and explain. This is for example like I did with this video, it's also the case that this is one of the reasons why we, in SSAC, did not only say, "Please adhere to the IETF standard." We also try to explain why we believe that it is important regarding confusability, the fact that you cannot really speak in emoji, so you have a serious accessibility issue. You also have a different kind of sort of modifiers that are tied to an emoji, for example, for skin tone and other kind of things. And also, various different kind of accommodations and it's actually getting more and more complicated given that the Unicode Consortium allow anyone to get an emoji if you just pay $5,000. So they have an interesting funding model for the Unicode character set.

So, I think what the next step is to do more outreach and also talk to, for example, the Open Source community. I'm already the author of the libcurl library that is used all over the place. I

am actually currently having a discussion with him about how to implement that in libcurl, which is kind of easier for him because he was as a Swedish citizen just rejected to travel to the U.S., which is an interesting situation so he got some time left in Sweden instead of going to the U.S. So, he's instead working on these emojis to see on how to handle that in his library. So nothing formal but we can do outreach and try to minimize the risk.

So, let me just be clear that we in SSAC also say that emoji is a great thing to use in text in social messages and elsewhere. And for example, it is perfectly all right to have a link that is clickable where the text and the link includes emojis. We are only talking about the domain name itself, nothing else. We're talking about the protocol identifier and that is what the Unicode Consortium also say, "Emoji and other symbols should not be used in identifiers because the resolution on the use of that is unclear." Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thank you very much. At-Large will be very happy to support the outreach.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Please, you can contact me and we can see what we can do together. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Alberto Soto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Patrik, I'm going to be brief, short and sweet.

Yesterday even though we had a meeting, GSE, LACNIC and LACRALO, I'm sorry I wasn't able to invite you because we had the meeting over a glass of beer.

The point is we have a project regarding the lack of IPv4 addresses in Latin America and the Caribbean. LACRALO is going to work with LACNIC. It's depletion of IPv4 addresses, and I added DNSSEC because we will do a survey that will include all the ISPs in Latin America and the Caribbean universities and the third parties, others. And maybe we'll need your support from DNSSEC. We have also said those who have DNSSEC. Well, we don't know if those are totally aware of the changes in the root key.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: DNSSEC, we have our workshop and it was very well attended which I'm very happy with. It was Monday this week. I think we,

together, with ICANN technology, ICANN's Office of the CTO, we can probably help you with the material, for example, from that workshop and help you use that and reuse that material in your region, and we are happy to try to help with that elsewhere as well.

So, if you contact us, we can probably help you with the contact with both ICANN and ask to see what we can do.

Jim, do you have a comment on that?

JIM GALVIN: I thought [inaudible] to ask about the root key rollover and not being in that context, so I want to refer him to the ICANN staff that deal with that issue specifically. We'll be happy to help you with outreach.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm told the queue was empty.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Oh, nine minutes. We can give it back to you if you want to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'm sure we can find something to talk about but if no one have anything else for Patrik and group –

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Let me do it this way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or we can go onto that dancing part.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: No, while you are asking other people if they have generic questions, let me ask SSAC people as well – they're on the room – whether you would like to say something. And let me start with the SSAC people [inaudible] someone is.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have one now.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sebastien Bachollet, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Patrik.

I would like to know from your point of view, maybe the SSAC point of view, what is the next big things about security we will have to face as end user? I will say within ICANN if you want to

shorten a little bit of the question but it's up to you for the answer.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: I think regarding SSR, it depends a little bit on who you are asking. If you'll start with me personally when people ask me what is the biggest thing, I am mostly concerned because I work with robustness issues and resilience. I would say that there is lots of talk about digitalization of the society, which means development of new applications, things are moving to the Cloud, business evolution, evolution of the society.

But all of those features need a well-working Internet. When one IP address want to send a packet to some other IP address on the network, it should reach its destination. And unfortunately, I do not see as much effort on building your robust and resilient Internet as people are putting energy into building application services on top of the Internet and with the help of Internet. So that is what I personally work with, which I'm worried about.

Other people have sort of different opinion. Regarding on the ICANN side, I would say DNSSEC is still really, really important because DNSSEC is the foundation for all new modern security measures that we have. So deployment of both signing zones and validation of DNSSEC responses, both of them need to happen. And, as part of that package is the change of the root

key on the 11th of October where one important step is the 11th of October this year that we just heard about.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to follow-up if you allow me. Thank you, Patrik.

This question of DNSSEC and I am not technical at all, it's how we as end user - I know that we can write to our ISP – but how we can handle this question? Because today, if my ISP didn't ask me anything about DNSSEC, nothing will happen for me as end user.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: I think both for the depletion of IPv4, the use of IPv6, the beginning of use of DNSSEC, the signing of a private person's domain name with DNSSEC, validation of DNSSEC queries, all of those things are things that the end user from my perspective should not care about. It should just happen because when you buy the Internet access and you're using Internet, all of this should just happen.

So, we are sort of in the gray zone between what an end user need to know and not need to know. So, as a private person, my personal view is that as a private person, you should not care. The ones that must care are, for example, public sector when they do procurement because they are in many countries, the

largest buyer of the Internet access and tools, and they should then include both IPv4 and IPv6 as must requirements when they're procuring Internet access.

Regarding DNSSEC, similar kind of things. And of course, if it is the case that you're an enterprise, then you can either do the signing validation yourself or you should buy the service and use market economy forces to move forward and I think that is unfortunately very much work we have to do.

And, that's also why lots of dedication is targeted towards whoever is providing services to private persons more than private persons themselves because I agree with you, as an individual, there is not much I can do. I get whatever my ISP is serving to me and it's not often I can choose an ISP and swap to another one even though I'm skilled. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, please.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: My name is Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong from ISOC Chad. Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Patrik.

What is the difference between RSSAC and SSAC? And for our ALSes, we do represent the ALSes from our country and in one

word without being technical, can you define SSAC, what is that and what is it important for the end user? Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. SSAC, which is the group that I am the Chair of is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. We are looking at security, stability, and resilience issues related to any of the identifiers that are used in the ICANN ecosystem. Let me express it that way. IP address has domain names, other things that are related to security, stability, and resilience.

RSSAC – the Root Server Advisory Committee – they are looking at technical issues related to the root zone to the root server operations and activities specifically regulated to those functions.

Now, there is of course and overlap or interaction between the two groups and that is also one of the reasons why we in SSAC have liaison to RSSAC, so we are communicating with each other and we are coordinating the work items we have so that we are not dealing with overlapping issues.

So, SSAC – generic SSR issues. RSSAC – the Root Server System specifically.

YESIM NAZLAR: Alberto Soto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Patrik, regarding Sebastien's question, this [inaudible] that I have described, I didn't give you a detailed description but we are going to work especially with the chambers or associations of ISPs in each country, so we are going to reach downward with universities, we will work first on the networks or this through 51 ALSes in 21 countries. So, that's why I said maybe it would be an important workload for you to provide support to us but we are not going to ask the ISP. We don't want end consumers to be concerned about this. We will be doing their job right now.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. I'm happy to… apart from helping you with contact with ICANN, I'm also happy to show you the work that, for example, we have done in Sweden. We have a software that is run every night that updates graphs on information about what ISPs do support DNSSEC and have IPv6, and that software is something that is pretty easy to run on any kind of website.

It is sort of a name and shame issue but to some degree, even though there is some shaming, it's actually really good to give gold stars for the ISPs and the companies that do the right thing.

What registrars do the right thing with DNSSEC? What ISPs do IPv6?

I think it is really, really important in this kind of initiative to congratulate the ones that do the right thing and we have some of that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, thank you very much. We have run out of time unfortunately, but we did manage to use it all. And, again, I thank Patrik and the rest of the SSAC for joining us today.

We reconvene at 1:30 and that meeting is going to be moderately full, so I do ask people to try to be seated at the right time. Any further comments from staff before we leave?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] close the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Close the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: To close the call, how do I close a call?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You say this is the end.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is the end of this meeting. We are adjourned.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Hi, everyone, this is Heidi.

So, the next session in this room will be the At-Large AFRALO ICANN59 activities that runs between 12:15 and 13:15 for AFRALO At-Large Structures. There is a lunch outside for you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]