
ABU DHABI – Fellowship Daily Session
Thursday, November 2, 2017 – 11:45 to 13:45 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to Fellowship Daily Session. Actually, this is our last Daily Session. Tomorrow, we have our wrap up with ICANN CEO and some Board members coming and visiting us. And I hope that everyone also took their lunchboxes prior to coming here.

So, without further ado, I would like to introduce our first guest, first speaker for today's session. He is the representative of Intellectual Property Constituency, which we call IPC. You've probably already heard this new abbreviation in ICANN world. Brian is an incoming Chair for IPC and he will serve for another two years, the term. Yeah. Two years. So, please welcome Brian for today's sessions.

And Brian, the floor is yours. Just talk about your community, what you do – 5-10 minutes – and then we'll give the chance our Fellows to ask questions.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Thank you so much. Welcome. I'm excited to be able to speak to all of you. Again, I'm Brian Winterfeldt. I'm an intellectual

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.

property attorney. I actually recently started my own law firm called Winterfeldt IP Group. My practice focuses on trademarks and the Internet, and I've been involved in the Intellectual Property Constituency as a volunteer since 2005 – so a couple of years now. I've been regularly attending ICANN meetings since 2009.

Prior to being elected Chair of the Intellectual Property Constituency, I also served on the GNSO Council for four years as one of the two counselors that represent IP interests in the GNSO.

The GNSO is the policy-making part of ICANN. You can see the slide that's on the screen right now. You'll see that there's different parts of the GNSO. It is divided into two houses. We have the Contracted Party House. That is the registries and the registrars. It's called the Contracted Party House because, literally, they have contracts with ICANN to either run registry businesses or registrar businesses.

And then there's the Non-contracted Party House, and that's divided into the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

Inside the CSG are three constituencies. So, on the commercial side there's the business constituency. There's the ISPCP, which represents ISP interests – so companies like Verizon are there.

And then the third constituency is the Intellectual Property Constituency.

Our job when we are sitting at the Council Table which makes policy for all new gTLDs and old and legacy gTLDs is to make sure that the interests of intellectual property owners are brought forward and incorporated into the policies as the Council is creating them.

We are hoping to talk to you today to educate you a little bit about who the IPC is and what our key issues are. And as mentioned, we'll definitely be here to answer questions afterwards. Our hope is that some of you will become interested in the IPC and join us. Some of the priorities of the IPC are to bring forward the IP interests. Those include trademark, copyright, and other intellectual property rights that are affected in the DNS.

In addition, we have a very strong consumer protection focus. We're really thinking about Internet users. A lot of the work that we do involves being concerned about enforcement, going after bad actors in the space, and really making sure that the Internet user is protected and that there's mechanisms in place to locate and go after bad actors in the arena – for example, people who register a domain name which, maybe, incorporates a brand or a trademark and then sets up some kind of phishing or fraud

scheme or mimics the Website, for example, of a legitimate business and uses that to extract personal information or financial details or defraud Internet users.

So, one of our goals is to always make sure that there are mechanisms in place to identify who's behind the domain name, if someone's infringing, and to have a way to essentially go after them, stop what they're doing, recover the domain name, and put it into the hands of the rightful trademark owner where it should belong.

There are a number of hot topics for the Intellectual Property Constituency that's going on right now in ICANN. One of the main topics is the RPMs, or Right Protection Mechanisms. Is anyone familiar with RPMs? Okay. I see a few hands. So, there is -

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: We usually try to avoid any abbreviations, so if you use them, try to open them for our newcomers.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Absolutely, yes. RPM stands for Rights Protection Mechanisms, so I'll just say Rights Protection Mechanisms. I won't say RPMs. We love acronyms at ICANN, which I know all of you are probably already very frustrated about. I will try and not use them and just explain things as they are.

The Rights Protection Mechanisms have a rich history at ICANN. One of the first ones that were introduced was the – it's another acronym – UDRP, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Process. Is anyone familiar with the Uniform Dispute Resolution Process, or UDRP? A couple hands.

So, that was one of the first Right Protection Mechanisms that were put in place. It is and still continues to be administered by WIPO. It's essentially an arbitration or administrative proceeding where you can file with WIPO or another one of the certified providers for the UDRP, and you are able to use it to recover a domain name that incorporates someone's trademark rights.

For example, if someone goes out and registers, say, Coca-Cola – but with maybe two Ls in the Cola part instead of one – and registers that name and starts using it again for something bad, the UDRP is something that you can file and recover that domain name.

There's actually two remedies that you can get under the UDRP. One is transfer of the domain name. The other is cancellation of the domain name. It's up to the complainant who's filing it to determine whether they would like to get the domain name back which, frankly, most people do because they want to regain the traffic that's going to that Website – gain control of it and hang on to it. Sometimes, people just want to cancel it,

though. But either way, it's a way to go after someone who has registered a domain name that incorporates a trademark. That goes back to the late '90s.

There are new Rights Protection Mechanisms that were introduced as part of the new gTLD program. Anyone familiar with the new gTLD program when I say that? Do you know what that is? Okay, great. So, that's the program that was rolled out several years ago that allowed people to apply for dot-something in the Internet. It took many years to develop the new gTLD program. It's the first time that ICANN offered the opportunity for parties to register, basically, dot-anything with a few limitations.

The Rights Protection Mechanisms – the new ones – were created as part of this program when policy was being developed with the Generic Names Services Organization Council to create the program. The Intellectual Property Constituency that I represent was there to advocate to make sure that there were additional tools besides the UDRP to make sure that we could go after bad actors in this space. So, there were additional RPMs developed.

Now, there's a review ongoing at ICANN to look at all of these RPMs, or Rights Protection Mechanisms, and evaluate whether they're working well, if there's any changes we need to make to

them. So, that's a working group that's going on that obviously is highly of interest to the IPC. We helped develop these Rights Protection Mechanisms. We want to make sure that they stay in place and that they remain strong so that we can go after bad actors.

Another issue that is a very high priority for IP owners, there are a number of issues going on around WHOIS, around data privacy and protection rights. There are new regulations that are going into effect in the spring in Europe, which could impact the ability for us to access WHOIS records.

WHOIS records are the records for each domain name that's registered that tells you who's registered it, where they're located, how to get in touch with them. It includes their email address, their phone number. It tells you who their technical contact is.

There is a possibility, depending on how we reconcile the existing WHOIS system with these new European regulations, that there could be – instead of an open system for determining who's registered a domain name – there could be a closed system and you may have to go through special hoops to be certified in order to have access to this data.

As IP owners, it's very important that we know who's registered a domain name, particularly when someone is doing something

bad. We want to be able to know who's registered a domain name and who's behind an infringing domain name or a Website that is very harmful. So, this is a very important issue that's going on right now.

We want to make sure that when ICANN is figuring out how to be compliant with the data protection rules in Europe, that there's still accessibility to this important information and, in fact, I just walked out of a session that's dedicated to this topic that's ongoing right now.

Another important topic for the Intellectual Property Constituency are the Subsequent Procedures Groups. So, we mentioned the new gTLD program. That's was the opportunity for people to apply for their own generic top-level domain name. As a result of that program, we went from 23 generic top-level domain names – including the ones that you're very familiar with like .com and .net and .org – and we ended up with hundreds of new ones that include geographic names like .lasvegas or .newyork; generic terms like .pizza; and also brand names like .cartier or .citi, for Citibank.

So, there are all these new gTLDs this program rolled out. It was an open and close window to apply for these. There were over 1,000 new gTLDs that have come into the marketplace. The community is starting to think about subsequent rounds – so

around of new gTLDs. This could be another open and close window. It could be a rolling period.

It's still very much conceptual, but before there can be a next round, there are a number of studies that are taking place to look at the first round of new gTLDs to determine where there might be issues and how we can maybe improve the program so we could kind of take stock of lessons learned from round one before we go into a next round. So, there's a number of groups that are ongoing that are looking at different aspects of the new gTLD program. And that's something that the IPC's looking at very carefully. Again, we're very interested in what those next rounds might look like – who's going to be able to participate; what's the cost going to be; what are the Rights Protection Mechanisms going to be that are going to be included for those new gTLDs. So, that's a very important issue that we're very involved in.

And the last key issue that I would highlight for the Intellectual Property Constituency is the work that is going on around geographic terms. There's a lot of debate that's going on at this meeting. One of the big topics – I don't know if you all were able to participate in the session where there was a discussion with the Government Advisory Committee, which is the part of the ICANN community that represents all the governments of the world, or many of the governments of the world. There's, I think,

over 150 governments now represented at the Government Advisory Committee.

They had a whole discussion with, actually, the applicants for .amazon. Amazon – I'm sure many of you are familiar with the online retail store – applied for .amazon. They followed the rules that were laid out in the guidebook for the new gTLD program. There were geographic terms that were specifically reserved. Some were off the table for applicants. Some required the permission of governments.

.amazon did not appear in any of those lists, but after they made their application for .amazon, there's a number of governments in the world through the Government Advisory Committee that had objections to Amazon obtaining their application for .amazon. That's based on rights that they feel that they have in the region that's included in their country. One of the main governments involved is Brazil, but there are other governments, as well.

So, it's sparked a very big debate here at ICANN about the intersection of geographic rights in names: how that's going to gel with the new gTLD program; what is the power, essentially, of the governments to come forward with objection.

The intellectual property community is watching this very closely. One of the concerns we have is that in this case, we had

a business who has a very strong brand that has registrations in the very countries that are objecting. They followed the rules and there's some concern about having a program where we very carefully lay out the rules and then having a business move forward and participate in the program, and then have a roadblock put in the place of them moving forward with their application that's so critical to their business.

It's a very hot issue right now, and that's something that we're following very closely. And there's a lot of discussions going on at ICANN at this very meeting that's really important.

So, that is sort of who we are. Those are sort of, at a very high level, some of the issues that we're very engaged in at this meeting. As you probably already know, things don't necessarily happen super faster here. There are lots and lots of meetings that are all happening at the same time. It's really hard to keep track of what's happening. At the same time, things actually move very slowly, and so the topics that are very hot for this meeting will be probably mostly the hot topics in the next month in Puerto Rico.

So, even though it feels very overwhelming, it will actually become more familiar to you as you're here more. You will start seeing themes. You'll notice that these things will carry throughout. And frankly, these hot topics at this meeting will be

hot topics in Puerto Rico, and they'll also probably be hot topics at ICANN 62 after that.

So, again, it's not as overwhelming as it seems. Once you're here more and you learn more, you'll start seeing patterns and trends and you'll start understanding a lot of these things.

So, that's a little about who we are. If you want to learn more about the IPC, you can go to our Website at ipconstituency.org. There's a lot of information there about how you can sign up. You can sign up as an organization or you can sign up as an individual member. IPC is looking at developing a student category, so if you're not an individual – if you don't want to join as an individual or corporate, if you're a student, we're looking to put something together to give you an opportunity to join as a student.

I am definitely open to any questions that you have, and the IPC welcomes the opportunity to engage with you and look forward to hopefully seeing you – not just at this meeting, but hopefully at future meetings, as well.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: Thanks, Brian. Thanks for the interesting introduction. And I have already a queue here, so we'll start with Bruna. Can we have two mics here? Moveable? Do we have here, mics? Oh.

Yeah. Over there. Thank you. Can someone help to put on those mics? Oh, working. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS:

So, who's the one in line? Just going to give this to the next person. So, hi. Sorry. I'm Bruna – a second-time Fellow; also a coach. I just wanted to ask you just a quick question because I have been following the subsequent procedures of the working group. We talk a lot with regards to brands and stuff, this confusion between names and domain names in which some people, they actually – at the Word Track 5 right now, which just starting people want to try to get a hold of it, of the whole like GeoNames and avoid the clash between brand and geographical locations and stuff. So, on the .amazon stuff, really, I just got really confused. When the Amazon wants to get a domain and it, at the same time, proposes should buy the .amazonia, .amazonica – it's quite similar. Don't you think there would be, like, give some harm to the brand at some point or not? I mean, it's quite confusing. Sorry.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT:

That's a great question. There's actually a lot encapsulated, I think, in your question. There's a few different issues I think wrapped up in that. I think one of the issues with .amazon is that they've been on a very long journey. This company, again,

followed the applicant guidebook. The applicant guidebook that laid out the rules for the new gTLD program was hundreds of pages. It went through, I think, like at least five or six iterations, if not more, where each iteration was open to public comment. All parts of the ICANN community had an opportunity to weigh in.

So, these rules were not sort of quickly thrown together. They were very painstakingly laid out over a period of a number of years. I think policy development process for the new gTLD program went on from 2008 until 2012 when the applicant guidebook was made final.

So, these rules that Amazon followed were very carefully negotiated by the community. And the Government Advisory Committee which represents the governments of the world that we talked about had an opportunity to weigh in and had an opportunity to include the word “Amazon” on one of those lists potentially, if that was something that they felt like they needed to reserve and was very important for their community.

So, I think the concern is – and the challenge that we have – is that Amazon followed the rules. The geographic terms were addressed in the program. There were ones that were specifically reserved and forbidden. There are terms that you couldn't apply for. And then there were terms where you had to

get the permission of a particular government or region in order to apply.

What's significant is that "Amazon" was not on any of those lists. So, put yourself in the shoes of the applicant, the company Amazon. You get your applicant guidebook. You frankly hire a team of people to help you put this application together. You read the entire guidebook from beginning to end – that's hundreds of pages long. You follow all the rules, and here you are in 2017 still trying to get your application completed for a term that you applied for legitimately that obviously is very critical to their business and for which they have registrations in all of the countries that are objecting.

So, it's a very difficult situation, I think, for the company. I definitely am sympathetic, as well, to the governments and I understand where they have concerns that they're coming forward with.

The other thing that's important for the Government Advisory Committee is that they're tasked with bringing the interests of the governments forward, but they have kind of a specific lane that they're supposed to stay in. So, the Government Advisory Committee's job is –

They are an advisory committee, which means they are not a policy-making body to ICANN. Their job is to bring information to

the ICANN Board, to the GNSO, to inform us about national and international law. So, these rights that they're asserting are not really specifically codified in international law or domestic law.

And it's something that people are bringing forward and it can be a little bit concerning because if the Government Advisory Committee is able to go outside of international law and outside of treaties and outside of national law and can just decide, "Whatever we want, we're going to get," that's potentially very problematic and it could have implications outside of even GeoNames and in other areas, as well. So, there is a big balancing act that's going on, and it is a very difficult issue.

I did actually write an article for a publication called "The World Trademark Review" that will be coming out, I think, this month that will kind of unpack the Amazon dilemma and kind of what's ongoing.

The other piece you asked about was the proposal that was made to the Government Advisory Committee by Amazon, which included the offer by Amazon to apply for, I think, three different strings and provide support – and support could be money; support could be helping them with the applications. It could be both, but the idea is that Amazon – the term "Amazon" is actually not used in those jurisdictions. There are these other

terms that are actually the indigenous languages and the ones that are used in the region that's involved.

And so what Amazon, I think, is very much trying to do is try and address the concerns of the governments and say, "We don't want you to feel left out. We don't want people in the Amazon region to feel like they are not represented on the Internet. You let us have .amazon, which we've applied for and we followed the rules, and we're going to help you get these get other three. So you have three other options that you can use besides .amazon to help represent your regions and that you're very concerned about."

So, it's an attempt to make a compromise that addresses the concerns of the governments and still allows Amazon to move forward with their application.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: We have only seven minutes left, so please, follow up. You can then take the time outside of this room. So, let's give chance to other, as well. Laurin, please. And come closer to the mic. The next one will be Tomslin. And I hope that will have chance to go for three more, but not sure.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: I'll talk fast.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Third ICANN meeting, first time Fellow. Quick question regarding what’s happening with WHOIS and GDPR. What are essentially the scenarios you’re looking at in your group, how things will work out in the future?

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Sure. The issues around WHOIS and the implementation of the European data privacy rules that are going into effect in the spring, again, are one of the top issues for the IPC. The Intellectual Property Constituency and other people in the community are concerned that if we can’t figure out a way to reconcile the WHOIS system with the obligations that are being imposed by the European governments, that WHOIS could literally go dark. I think that’s like a worst-case scenario. I don’t think people believe that’s going to happen. That would, obviously, really hinder the ability of intellectual property owners and consumer advocates to go after bad actors, and it can create a lot of hurdles.

I think what’s much more likely to happen than it entirely going dark is some kind of tiered access system, I think, is what we’re looking at. And there would be a way for people who are involved in consumer advocacy and the enforcement of intellectual property rights to obtain a certification to show that they are acting on behalf of rights owners or to be advocates for

consumers. Once they obtain that certification, they would have access to the WHOIS records.

So, I think people are concerned about it going completely dark. That would be incredibly problematic for law enforcement and for IP owners. I think we're much more likely to look at it at some kind of solution that will allow access for law enforcement, allow access for consumer advocates and IP owners.

What that's going to look like and how that's actually implemented is, I think, what we're very concerned about. We want to make sure it's done in a way that is cost-effective and scalable, and something that will really work. So that's why IP owners are really engaged on an issue to make sure we find a solution that will help us be compliant with the data privacy concerns, while at the same time allowing us to be able to do our jobs to protect consumers.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: Thanks. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: You mentioned UDRP. I won't be able to explain that. And you mentioned another term, "bad actors." So, in my attempt to understand what the definition of bad actors, I'll ask a question. Within the used case, you mentioned on an actor registering a domain that mimics Coca-Cola, say, with double Ls. Do you

consider it an IP violation just because they use it for a bad purpose or just any purpose? Whether it was good or bad.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: So, the idea of UDRP is to go after bad actors, and so it doesn't mean that if you register a domain name that includes part or in whole a registered trademark, that it necessarily is a bad thing. There are legitimate reasons why people might be registering terms. Trademark rights are very complicated. They're tied to geographies. They're tied to specific goods and services.

So the idea of UDRP is not to go after anybody that registers a domain name that includes a trademark that can be registering [around the world], but it's for someone does not have a right or legitimate interest in registering that trademark, and where they are using it in a way that is harming the brand owner or harming Internet users. So, it is specifically for bad actors. It's not just to go after anybody that registers something that includes a brand. It's when there's really bad activity and it's really meant to focus on that.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: Thank you. Buddha next. We can go for two more. Come here.

BUDDHADEB HALDER: I have a question. Has ICANN conducted any research on the consequences of GDPR?

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Could you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

BUDDHADEB HALDER: Has ICANN conducted any research on the consequences of GDPR?

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: There's actually a lot of research that's been done right now. ICANN has commissioned their own law firm to answer a certain series of questions. The Intellectual Property Constituency actually hired their own law firm to also do a study. Unfortunately, these different studies are coming up with different interpretations of how to be compliant and how to follow the rules. So, that's part of the debate that's going on right now – trying to figure out what the legal requirements are; how we can be compliant.

Some of the issues revolve around who's really responsible for holding the data. Is it ICANN? Is it the contracted parties? So, there are a lot of legal issues that we're trying to work through. And again, there are differences of opinion from different law

firms. So that's a lot of the work that's going on right now – trying to piece through and figure out the right interpretation and how we can come up with a solution that will be workable to be both compliant with the rules and allow WHOIS access to the folks that need it.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: And just last intervention, Catalina. Short. Here is the mic, please. I know that we have Eduardo, Victor, and Valeriia to raise another question, but we, unfortunately, have no time. So you may follow up with Brian probably after the session if you can find a couple of minutes for them.

CATALINA REYES VILLEGAS: Hi. My name is Catalina and I just wanted to ask you. Yesterday I was at the GeoNames Working Track 5 meeting, and I noticed that there is like big differences on how intellectual property is treated within the different countries. So, I wanted to know what's the participation of the Intellectual Property Constituency within that working track, and how are you going to ensure that all of that is respected – all those differences?

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: That's a great question. The work is just getting started for that group. There are representatives from the Intellectual Property

Constituency that are going to be there. I think a lot of the role that we see for us is to try and educate. And, I think some of the issues that come out around the GeoNames sometimes revolve around people not understanding the law.

We are going to try and work closely with other people in the working group, but also with members of other parts of the community to try and educate them about rights around geographic names and really help them understand what rights they have under national law, international law, and treaties. And again, some of the notions that people put forward sometimes are not based on those things, and so we're trying as Intellectual Property Constituency to remind people that there are legal frameworks and structures that we should be trying to work with that.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN:

Thank you, Brian, and just a round of applause for Brian for his time to come to us. Thank you very much. And there isn't a lot of interest and raised interest for your community, so I hope that many Fellows will come to your sessions and will be involved in your community. So please, whenever you have anything to share with them, feel free to share with me and I'll make sure they are aware of this. Thank you for your time.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: My pleasure. Thank you so much for having me.

SIRANUSH VADANYAN: Thank you. And with great pleasure [and our pleasure] pleasure, I would like to introduce our next speaker, who is representative of Registry Stakeholder Group. Actually, Paul Diaz is Chair of Registry Stakeholder Group. And you see RYSG in our chart over there. Paul will tell us a bit about what they are doing – what are the main priorities – and then, again, as usual, we’ll have 15 minutes for Q&A. So without further ado, Paul, the floor is yours.

PAUL DIAZ: Thank you, Siranush, and welcome, everyone. As noted, my name is Paul Diaz. I work for Public Interest Registry – the .org and .ngo registry operator. Also, the elected chair of the Stakeholder group. I have have been part of the leadership team for registries for a while now. I previously worked at Network Solutions, so I’ve also been on the registrar side.

As the diagram shows, combined registries, registrars – we make up the Contracted Parties House in the GNSO. My colleague Brian representing Intellectual Property Interest, part of the Commercial Stakeholder Group. Somewhat ironically, commercial and noncommercial users are lumped together in

the Non-contracted Party House. That's the way the GNSO is currently structured.

I heard Brian talking about GDPR. I just came from a session of GDPR. That's an awfully dense subject. I'm not sure what the Fellows – if this is something that you want to explore further. I'm happy to talk about just about anything.

Very pleased to see that my colleague, Stephane Van Gelder is joining. Stephane probably has broader and more interesting experiences that he'd like to share with you all, so give him a moment to get set up. But let me just immediately turn the floor.

Are there things that you've heard earlier or throughout the week – questions, concerns you have that I might be able to address? I'm happy to just completely open the floor to the group. Anybody? Not at the moment.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We may think from Stephane, as well. Welcome, Stephane, who is actually Vice Chair of this group. He deals with policy stuff there. And please let us know what important policies are you discussing and how our Fellows can be involved there.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Siranush. Thanks, Paul. Hi, everyone. Sorry I'm late. I've just come in from very important policy development or policy session for us, which is the GDPR – the European law that's

coming in now that I'm sure you've heard lots about this week during the different sessions that you attended.

And obviously, for registries and registrars, this is extremely important. It's actually important for everybody that uses the Internet. On the one hand, there is the notion of the protection of private data. And on the other, there are notions such as law enforcement, business, contractual compliance, etc., etc.

So, in many ways, that session embodies the current type, the conversations that are happening at ICANN and why ICANN is an experiment because it remains a governance experiment is so important. I've spoken to the Fellows in the past as Nominating Committee Chair, and coming to you today as Vice Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group really, to me, is an embodiment of the many possibilities that the ICANN model offers to participate in a conversation that the whole world really wants to be having about how to access, use, and work the Internet.

I don't mean work professionally. I mean work through whatever activities that you are involved in, in your lives. My positions as a volunteer either through the NomCom or through a registry, which is an ICANN contracted party, is still one that I can get involved in as a private citizen, and that is really unique. If you look at other governance structures around the world such as the UN, for example, there is no possibility. I mean, there's no

possibility to even get in the room, let alone take part in these discussions; let alone try and influence or at least participate in policy-making.

And yet, the questions that we're dealing with here at ICANN, to me – and I'm sure to many of you in this room – are just as important today; maybe even more important because the Internet is a great unifier of differences as far as the human race is concerned, both in terms of culture, financial means, access to education, access to information.

So, all these notions, all these debates and the possibility of being involved as a private individual such as myself and such as yourselves, is why we're, I think, why we should be here; why, certainly, I've been here for the last, god, 14 years I think now; and why I continue to get involved. So, I hope that gives you an overview of the type of passion that we put into this process, and I'm sure we gets lots of interesting questions from you as – I mean, these sessions are always ones where we get actually very pointed and pertinent questions. I look forward to those. Thanks very much.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Stephane. And we already have the first question. Mohit, please. Come closer. Mic is over there.

MOHIT BATRA: Hello. Good afternoon. Mohit Batra from India, for the record. My question to the gentleman here is about the security framework for the distributors, the Spec 11 Security Framework. So, could you please let us know about what is the current stage of this framework of being developed?

PAUL DIAZ: I can begin to answer it. The security framework is an initiative that was started by the GAC's Public Safety Working Group request for information. We created a sub-team within the Registry Stakeholder Group. I think there was Registrar participation, as well, and my understanding is that the framework has been completed. It's certainly been presented to the community for comment. We've moved through that. So I believe here at in Abu Dhabi, it was briefed to the GAC – back to the GAC.

My understanding of the framework is that it is a compilation of existing practices that are taken as best practices. They're not requirements. Okay? So, anything that an operator is doing, they are free to go beyond those terms. And those terms are seen as guidance, but not requirement, for everybody else.

It was a long, negotiated process – a lot of back and forth that stretched well over a year to get there. Kudos to staff for providing that kind of intermediary role just to help them keep and go along, but not steering the conversations in any direction. So, ultimately, a positive, good example of how this community can work. Disparate groups can come together, recognize common ground, and put out a product that everybody's comfortable with.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, please. Come closer to mic. Jay, you are the next. [Fatima], please, mic is over here. Yeah. And please introduce yourselves.

[FATIMA]: This is Fatima from Turkey. I'm first-time Fellow. My question is about right protection mechanism about WHOIS. Do you send your reports to registrar or registry to raise awareness about such issue? Or one should have to be in the group from local or regional community?

PAUL DIAZ: So, just to be clear about the question. These are inaccuracy reports or reported allegations of some sort of abuse. Which reports in particular are you referring to?

[FATIMA]: About policy – policy reports.

PAUL DIAZ: Policy and WHOIS. That was my misunderstanding. I heard you say WHOIS at the beginning, and there is a mechanism to report inaccuracies or abuse that you can tie back to WHOIS. But the policy, I'm sorry, I'm not understanding which report you have in mind.

[FATIMA]: Actually, I'm interested in about the right protection mechanism about this issue.

PAUL DIAZ: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Sure.]

PAUL DIAZ: Thanks.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: If you're asking about – as a registrant, the right protection mechanism for WHOIS, is that correct? We just want to make sure we understood your question correctly. Yes? Yeah.

So, there is a mechanism. You mentioned reports, and registries and registrars have contractual obligations to make WHOIS, I guess, data dumps, you could say, to an escrow agent, which is part of the contract that we have with ICANN. So, that means that we make regular transfers of data to that escrow agent, and the data remains available in case registry systems fail.

That does not cover rights protection. The right protection mechanisms themselves are handled by a different policy, which is one that was evolved through the GNSO. I see you have a slide up there on the GNSO, so I presume that was explained to you earlier on under GNSO policy development.

So, if, for example, a major corporation feels that its rights have been abused by a domain name registration, there are mechanisms in place to allow that corporation to defend those rights and take or require action to be taken in light of that domain name registration. So one of those mechanisms prior to new gTLDs was called and remains the UDRP, Uniform Dispute Resolution Procedure. There are now new mechanisms under the new gTLD. I'm not completely sure that's your question, but I'm hoping that is.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Jay.

JAY PAUDYAL: Hello. This is Jay from India. I'm first-time Fellow. I have a small concern about WHOIS database. I book domain name for my own businesses and I get spam on my registrant [team] IDs, right? And if I get any domain name right now, I can get spam within five minutes. And I can start getting telephone calls within five minutes, but telemarketing calls. People ask if you want to develop any Website or you want to render our services to you. Right?

I know that WHOIS data is publicly available. My concern is, like, they are getting so fast. I don't know what kind of bot or what kind of synchronization technology they [inaudible]. If I book any domain right now, they will get my all-profile access within minute and they'll start bombarding with spams and telephone calls.

I'm getting telephone calls in Abu Dhabi, too. So, if I search "WHOIS database on sell", people are selling WHOIS database from \$100 to \$6,000. I can see proper ads in Google AdWords and in Facebook. Can we have any mechanism to stop at least sponsored ads?

And my second question is – and I know we can apply privacy protection for domain name, but I want my name there. I want my address there because I have that. Right.

And my second question is, does ICANN enforce ccTLD to have privacy protection policy? These are my two questions and concerns. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: So, I'll get the second one and let Paul take the first. The ccTLD community has no contractual obligations to ICANN. Participation in ICANN is voluntarily, and ICANN has no enforcement capability on ccTLDs. ccTLD is considered a national resource and, therefore, resource of that country's government or authority, so ICANN cannot impose contracts on it. So, the answer to your question is no. And on to the WHOIS abuse and email or telephone abuse through WHOIS. Paul.

PAUL DIAZ: I'll take a swipe at it, and I'm glad you stayed because I would have a question back to you before I respond. Why do you want to have your personal contact information in the WHOIS database?

JAY PAUDYAL: Because I have that, and I want people can contact me for any business dealings. That's why. And if I protect my domain with privacy, people might think I'm alien and I might be doing some fraud over Internet. That's why I want to give my proper information in WHOIS.

PAUL DIAZ: Understood, and good answer. The challenge for the community that we have is that the uses, the proper uses of WHOIS – there's a range of views. And right now – my colleague from the IPC was talking about this GDPR – the view of the European Union is that your personal contact information should be private. Even if you want, you personally want, there are opt-in mechanisms, but as an individual, the expectation, the default setting is that they will make that private.

That's what we're struggling with as a community. How do we update the current WHOIS system? And GDPR involves a lot more than just WHOIS. That seems to get lost, and please understand if you find it a difficult and confusing issue already, it's far more complex in terms of the operations that the registries and registrars have in order to be compliant with that law.

But coming back to the WHOIS, you already recognize you have the option of using privacy proxy. Some say that's a path

forward with the GDPR challenge, as well. Most likely, it's not. It's not that simple. But for yourself, in your case, when you've opted in, you would like to use that database with your clear information.

So, how do we work around the whomever – some third parties – that are harvesting that information, spamming you, and calling you and all the rest? That's a very difficult question because as a data processor like ourselves, as a registry operator, we publish the Thick WHOIS. All that information we gather from the registrars are the authoritative source, then.

We put up a disclaimer that the use of the database is not to include things like data mining, harvesting, etc. Enforcing that is a near impossibility for us because whomever is taking advantage of that information to subsequently spam you or anything else – for us to find them and prosecute is an administratively impossible task.

And so we're back to the original question. What is the debate across the industry? What is the appropriate use of the WHOIS database? And while nobody's arguing for spammers – please, don't get me wrong – there are a variety reasons why folks would say that that information, the system as it exists, should remain. Others want it – some want it abolished completely, so

even if you opted in, they wouldn't have it published. It's a very complex issue and, unfortunately, there's no easy answers.

JAY PAUDYAL:

Actually, my concern is, if somebody's sending me 100 emails daily, that is fine for me. Because to pick up phone call, I have to do some physical activities. So, sometimes I get 50 to 60 calls a day. Right? This is one thing. Can we have some mechanism or some policy to stop those paid ads on Google, on Facebook, like, "We are selling WHOIS database for this much amount"? Can we have these kind of like things in place?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER:

Obviously, you're not expecting an answer from us now, I hope. But I think the conversation is extremely interesting and goes back to what I was saying earlier on. You're asking a question as a domain user, so a real use case. You register a domain. You get a deluge of spam. You get people calling you in Abu Dhabi. And that puts up your charges and annoys you. Something, which as Paul has described, we've been struggling as a community with for years.

All I can say is, once again, what I said earlier. These are policy development questions, and ICANN does allow for you as an individual to participate in that debate and put forward your

concerns and try and get them addressed. It doesn't mean you'll always get those concerns addressed, but putting –

What you're saying now is valuable information for people who will tell you that WHOIS should continue as it is today. It should be completely open. Everyone's personal data should be up there – including the name of your dog – and there's nothing wrong with that. I'm just trying to take this back to ICANN itself because my understanding of what you're doing here is trying to learn about ICANN as a governance mechanism.

And that conversation – you can have that conversation here. You can go in those rooms and try and push that agenda so the people understand your situation, which is no longer tenable.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Laurin, and then Dina. And we have only five minutes left before going to another speaker.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just to follow up on this. I'm registered on a few things. Also, I've been seeing a variety of things. And I'm noticing when I do this in Europe, I'm fine. When I go to [Nadcom], whatever, I burn an email address every time. I also burned a personal one because they made a mistake and they actually used the personal one

that I used to communicate with them, and they didn't use the other one for the domain.

And I'm just saying, why didn't you talk a bit more to the European providers? Because they seem to be able to deal with it. I did not have a problem in years.

PAUL DIAZ:

And to be clear, when you say the European ones, you mean the ccTLD which, I can assure you, that's not just a European advantage. Any cc anywhere, the rules are set. As Stephane said, they're a national resource, so they're set at the national level. And most jurisdictions have strong privacy protection and, therefore, you don't get the spam and whatnot to those addresses.

The very interesting use case is the speaker before who says he deliberately wants to be seen in the public WHOIS database as a form of contact. And to Stephane's point, please get involved because as an individual user, that is not often the use case that you hear promoted within the ICANN community. Usually, individual users want their privacy protected, and so that's part of the policy development process – figuring out how do we find a path forward that serves all interests.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Dina?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: [inaudible]

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, of course.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Just to add one thing to what Paul said. You mentioned European companies being more easy to deal with than .com, .net. Just to be clear, .com and .net are European companies, as well, in that they have European offices and they operate in Europe under European law. So, I don't think it's a question of nationality or headquarter of companies. I think it's a question of, as Paul was describing, [gTLD] or ccTLD stipulations and contractual obligations and national and international law. And any Verisign, for example, operator of .com, will be subject to European law and will be subject to the GDPR once it comes in.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Dina, please.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Hi, everyone. Speaking on behalf of NCUC now and I want to come back to the framework for registry operator to respond to security threats. And as someone who wrote the public comment on that, I have two short questions. So, do you think the scope is enough, and framework is just a suggestion, not regulation?

And finally, could you say a couple of words, perhaps your personal opinion, on responsible disclosure? Thank you.

PAUL DIAZ: Okay. I think I got the first part. Please stay close because the second one, I'm not sure. If we're going back to the security framework, the scope was approached, debated currently. Yeah. That was a consensus opinion and whatnot. It's not the final word. It's not to say that there cannot be further discussions to go in new directions and whatnot. The body of work that was agreed to originally is completed, presented, and follow-on questions are certainly possible.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: So, you see it as useful in the future, yes?

PAUL DIAZ: And very useful as the process by which it was created because, again, it demonstrates this consensus, bottom-up process does work. There were concerns from certain quarters; the responsible parties got together. There we are. We have an output. It takes a while, but we do have an output.

The second question, though, I wasn't very clear what you're asking.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Within the original draft of the framework, the responsible disclosure of threats was missing and was proposed to be included. Do you see that as an important step in addressing the future possible misuse and abuse?

PAUL DIAZ: Okay. Now I understand. The challenge, and I think it's an instance – specific example: when you say responsible disclosure of threats, what is responsible and what are the threats? There was an agreement in the group that was working on defining the scope of those issues. That can certainly be revisited and become the part of the next iteration of that effort to define clearly and come up with recommendations or guidance. But I believe they were trying to keep the scope at a

manageable level so they could get a product out. We can always come back to the additional follow-on questions.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Yes. The original proposal was to identify the person who is disclosing the threat and track them down and possibly, if needed, carry out action against them – as opposed to responsible disclosure and having good will [diverts] people disclosing the security threats. I think that's very important.

PAUL DIAZ: Okay.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Dina. And we'll take last question. Destiny, please. Sonia, I know you also want to ask question but probably we'll need to go to the next.

DESTINY TCHEHOALI: Hi, everyone. I'm from Canada, Quebec. Regarding the DNS abuse [inaudible] resolution procedure, could you give us an example of a situation where you had been under pressure to conceal a domain name in order to avoid sanction – to be [sanctioned] by ICANN?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: It's a good question. Just to be clear and repeat that back to you, asking if we've been put under pressure to take down domains by ICANN itself. Correct? We've certainly been put under pressure by others, but ICANN just pressures us to enforce our contracts with them. That does not include take down for content, so ICANN is not a content regulator.

There's nothing in the contract that says we should take down, based on content, beyond what's legally enforceable – what we have to do to comply with laws, both national and international.

So, I don't think it's a question of pressure. There is a compliance team at ICANN that will, yes, talk to registries and say, "This domain name appears to be in breach of your contract." And if we get a compliance notice, we have to respond explaining the context, explaining what we found in terms of the domain name registration history and why that domain name seems to be infringing, and what we plan to do about it in terms of remedy.

Does that answer your question? Yeah.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. With that, I would like to thank you both, Paul and Stephane, for coming here and for your time. Our applauses to presenters. Thank you. I know maybe there will be some follow-

up questions, so if you have also any information you would like to share with Fellows, send me the links and me the information. I would be more than happy to follow up with that. Thank you.

And with that, I would like to invite our next presenter for today. We have chair of ccNSO (Country Code Supporting Name Organization) Katrina Sataki. Katrina, welcome.

Thank you, Katrina, for your time. I know you have very tough discussions during this ICANN, but thanks for your time being here. So we'll go 5-10 minutes to introduce what you are doing in ccNSO – how many members you have, what is the structure. And then we'll go for Q&A.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Siranush. Hello, everyone. It's great to be here with you, as always, during ICANN meetings. So, briefly, about the ccNSO. ccNSO, as you can see, stands for Country Code Name Supporting Organization. This is a body within ICANN's structure created by and for country code top-level domains or ccTLDs.

The work of the ccNSO is organized by the ccNSO Council, consisting of 18 councilors. Of course, everything is done for the members, and currently, we have 162 members. So, any ccTLD operator, any ccTLD can become a member of ccNSO.

You don't have to be a member of the ccNSO to participate in the work of the ccNSO. So any ccTLD, they can participate in our working groups. We have several working groups. One of the most – actually, I think I'll mention three most active working groups. One is SOP Working Group, or Strategic and Operational Planning. It used to be a working group. Now it has been promoted to a committee because they have grown up and now they do their work for almost 10 years, I think, now. But now they have been promoted to this status of committee. They've been given different powers. For example, submit rejection petition to the ccNSO Council – or rejection petition that is one of the new powers that we have under new bylaws as decisional participant.

I think you are already familiar with the concept of empowered community within ICANN. So, this working group, or now committee, they review and work with all the documents produced by ICANN and – not all documents, but the budget and strategic and operational plans. They review these documents and they provide feedback on these documents. They're all experts in this field of working – doing the similar job for their ccTLD, so they have experience and they can give some value to organization.

That's one working group. Another working group, also very active, is Program Meeting Working Group. They work on setting

up agenda for our ccNSO members meetings during ICANN meetings – our face-to-face meetings.

Another one, also very active working group, is Guidelines Review Committee. We review our internal guidelines, internal procedures. We try to keep them up to date to ensure that we have some institutional memory of how we run things. That's because we want to be transparent and accountable to our community, and we want them to make sure that everything happens as it should be. Yeah, well that's really very brief intro on the daily work.

Then, of course, we work on policies. We're not as active in creating running policy development process as, for example, GNSO. They really were experienced in PDPs. We launched our, I think, third PDP a couple of months ago. That PDP is working on the policy for retirement of ccTLDs. Countries come and go. New countries are formed. Old countries are dissolving, and so on. So, if there's no more country using a particular ccTLD, then this ccTLD must be retired and this, our Policy Development Process Working Group, they now work on setting, defining the policies for this work.

Basically, those are the hottest things on our plate and that's what we do. Of course, we many, many other things, but probably I will not bore you with details and we can start.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thanks, Katrina. Yes. We'll start with Bruna over there. We have Michael over here, so if you can come up to those mics.

Yes. Before we do that, we have Elena here and she has some ccNSO onboarding documents. So, if you're interested, just raise your hand and you will get a copy.

KATRINA SATAKI: Actually, we would like to add here that ccNSO is one of the active parts of providing the onboarding information to the newcomers. And our Fellowship alumni who are part of ccNSO – Jelena, and with Alejandra from Guatemala – so they prepared this document. And you all took, I hope, the online course, which was shared with you a couple of weeks ago on ccNSO. So these are the documents which help you to understand more. And thank you, Jelena, for this. If you have something to add, please.

JELENA OZEGOVIC: Just a short add. For the people who haven't been able to see the ICANN course, you can go to icann.learn.org and just Google or search "ccNSO". You will find the course. Now, I have only 16 examples of these, so I do apologize in front for not having it for everybody. Let me see hands who want it. Okay. I will start from [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Those who really want it.

JELENA OZEGOVIC: Like really, really want it and really need it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Not those who will take and throw it after getting out of this room.

JELENA OZEGOVIC: Please, come on. We've been writing these [inaudible] be kind. I'm going to start from these and do apologize in front for not having it for everybody. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi, Katrina. How are you? I'm Bruna. I'd like to make just a quick question with regards to ccTLDs governance model. I know that you guys, although you talk about like country codes, you are also Multistakeholder because every single country code has a different governance model. You can have ones being handled by academia and also government and stuff.

So I'd like to know if you have an ideal stakeholder who would be –

If you could elect one stakeholder to be like the best, wouldn't you have a ccTLD? – tricky question, sorry. And how also how would this stakeholder help in the community with regards to capacity building and getting involved and giving back to the community, as well.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, personally, I think that no stakeholder should be considered better than any other. But you're absolutely right, and we usually point out that, in the case of ccTLDs, one size does not fit all. We're really very different. Probably, I'll answer the question from different perspective.

My background is in computer science. Then, at some point, I decided to have law – to take, really, serious studies in law. It was really difficult for me because I could not understand why people cannot agree on one legal model because, well, if we start talking about complex number theory, we don't have one theory in one country and another theory in another country. So, two plus two is four all around the world.

So, for me, it was really difficult to understand why people cannot agree on one legal system. And then I realized that history and development in each country, they differ. And probably societies in countries different; traditions differ. So,

you cannot come and force some legal model on a society in a particular country.

That is, perhaps, why we also can apply this idea to ccTLDs. You cannot just come and say, “Well, you have to do it this way,” because maybe society is not ready or they believe that they need to do something differently. So you cannot just come and say, “This is the right model.” It may be right for you, but it may be not the right model for your neighbor.

So you have to be really sensitive about that, and I think that we at the ccNSO, we have this found. We’re not trying to enforce anything, and if we talk about ccTLDs, they also –

You know, we have these five ICANN regions and in four of the regions, there are regional organizations. And ccTLDs come together in their regions and they discuss their problems. They share their views; they share their experience. And this is a very good place where they can learn and see if the model that has been applied in one ccTLD can – probably, they can try apply something similar in their country.

Of course, there are some beliefs about best practice – how this should be run to make sure that local Internet community benefits from their ccTLD. But again, not say that it is possible to enforce anything – and I don’t think that one particular

stakeholder should be considered. But again, in different countries, this notion can be different.

BRUNA SANTOS: Just a follow-up. I just made this question because in Brazil, even though our ccTLD is being handled by a multistakeholder body, the government has been trying to take it. So, we are going through sort of a change, or at least an attempt. [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. I think you're right. And again, I'll share my experience. I couldn't understand why governments are so eager to regulate something. But at the same time, if you try to look from the government side, when people have problems they go and complain to the government and they say, "Do something." So that's why the government also is in position that they feel obliged that they have to do something. And if there are many complaints, then the government just really needs to step in.

So, I wouldn't blame governments for being active players in a multistakeholder model in the country. I think that's actually something that really needs to be done. But of course, we also have to – they also have to understand that things, the way Internet works, how to make sure that it gets better and better.

For example, you cannot say encryption should not be allowed because it will break the way the Internet works. It will break many things. So, government also needs to listen to experts; needs to listen to community. So even though they may be responsible for whatever setup is in their country, they're responsible, of course, for their citizens.

But at the same time, they should listen and try to engage professionals, engage users, engage anyone who is willing to share their position to make things better. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Caleb and then Catalina.

CALEB OLUMUYIWEA OGUNDELE: Quick question. Now, I understand that the ccNSO is for the country code, right? Which also brings into question the fact that there should be a jurisdiction, some form of policy on that. So, earlier this morning, I asked the question still on the GDPR, but I didn't get really a clear answer on that. So, I was looking at it that good if the Country Code Supporting Organization has a way of influencing whatever policy that is going to be made based on jurisdiction because I believe that country codes are really based on jurisdiction, geographical jurisdiction.

And so if there's a way, let's say, for example, in my country I'm not supposed to be bound by whatever regulation is holding in Europe because they have a GDPR. But then we know that we have Europeans that also invest in the Nigerian economy, but then they are now supposed to [inaudible] invest in my country and they probably have a domain. They are supposed to be bound by the data protection regulations in my own country. So, my question now is, does the ccNSO have a way of putting the –

I'm trying to look for a way to pose that question, put it in a way such that there is a jurisdiction kind of policy that they can come up with that certain countries will have [one] affected by the GDPR should continue with their –

If they want to use the WHOIS in an open way they want to, they should and expose data. And if they don't want to, they shouldn't be bound by because my fear, actually, is that the compliance – what do they call it? the compliance fine – noncompliance fine is really going to –

It's hard on my own kind of economy that is probably, if you have to multiply 300 times \$20 million fine, it's going to be high. Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Well, I feel honored that you believe I can answer a question about GDPR. It is a very complicated issue, so I will not touch the issue of GDPR itself. I will go to your question about the ccNSO and jurisdiction.

So, first of all, you're absolutely right. Every ccTLD operates in their own jurisdiction and they have to follow local laws. There's no question about that.

Then if we talk about ccNSO, ccNSO does not work – does not issue any laws or something. It's a policy for ccTLD operators, but we cannot interfere with laws. The law still is the law and we cannot say, "Oh, this law does not apply to you." If it does apply, so it does apply.

We can talk about some policy, as I mentioned, on the retirement of ccTLDs, for example. We can talk about policy of – I don't know, something, how to run Anycast network, for example. I'm not saying that we're doing it, but I'm just giving really example. But we cannot say that you can forget or ignore this law or that law. It just doesn't work that way.

I don't know if I understood your question correctly.

CALEB OLUMUYIWEA OGUNDELE: The fact that I understand to some extent anyway.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, because if we go into details on the GDPR, it's going to take some long time.

CALEB OLUMUYIWEA OGUNDELE: Okay. For time [inaudible], we could have a discussion later.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Catalina, please.

CATALINA REYES VILLEGAS: Hi. In the past two days, I had the pleasure of being here in the room for a couple of times, and I noticed two things. One, that you actually don't have translation in your room, and you're the one group that has all the countries' representatives.

And the other thing is that I saw that there's a lot of diversity on the operators of the ccTLDs – ones that are governments; the other ones are private companies; the other one multistakeholder representatives. And you actually managed to

work pretty good, and I wanted to know if you give input on how your model works on the gTLD group.

KATRINA SATAKI:

That is a good question. Thank you. Well, first of all, translation. Yes – or rather, no, we don't have a translation. We've had some requests and we did research, and that costs an arm and a leg. So we, as a ccNSO, we don't have any funds for that. We do not ask for any membership fees, so for us, it is, we cannot – let's say, we cannot afford any translation. And probably, that is why we can work together very well.

Yes, most of the people in the room, they are non-native speakers. And some are probably too shy to express their – I'm not, as you can guess, I'm not a native speaker myself. But nevertheless, we try to speak, we try to understand each other. And I think the best thing why we can work together is that we do not compete with each other. And that's why probably whatever advice we give to gTLDs, it's not going to work, because they do compete with each other. And that makes a lot of difference in this world.

We're really, in our community, we share with each other without any worries and we care about each other because that's the way we feel. So, we're sharing and caring. Thank you.

VICTOR JAVIER BECERRA RAMOS: Good afternoon. My name is Victor from Venezuela. I just wanted to ask a question regarding the domain .ve in Venezuela. That domain is controlled by the government, by the National Commission of Telecommunications. Well, we have kind of a very chaotic situation with the government. It is kind of a dictatorship and they regulate this. And every Website they have that they do not like, they immediately shut it down.

So, civil society has to get domains outside the country, which you need to have dollars to buy them and we do not have access to dollars, so it is like we are cornered in this situation. So, what can civil society do in this case when the government has the control of this domain?

Is there any way that we can register a complaint to someone or to unite and to have this discussion here about this policy, how we can change it?

KATRINA SATAKI: Change the government.

VICTOR JAVIER BECERRA RAMOS: Okay.

[laughter]

KATRINA SATAKI: That's the only sound advice I can give you but because otherwise –

Nobody, again, as I said, nobody can come to the country and say, "Your model is wrong. You have to change it." This is really internal matter. So, I can go and say, of course, but I can be just as well ignored. It's really not – nobody has authority over a country. Therefore, nobody has authority over ccTLD.

VICTOR JAVIER BECERRA RAMOS: Okay, thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Destiny and Peterking. And then we'll close.

DESTINY TCHEHOUALI: I would like to know how do you treat the question, the issue of .cat the domain name regarding the situation in Catalonia with the independence of Catalonia?

KATRINA SATAKI: We don't have to treat anything unless there is a country code assigned to a country or territory. So, it is ISO list of codes and those –

ICANN never decides whether a country or a territory is entitled to a ccTLD. They just look on the code. If there is a code assigned to a territory or a country, then it can be made into a – delegated as a ccTLD.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Peterking.

DESTINY TCHEHOUALI: [inaudible] U.N.?

KATRINA SATAKI: On ISO? Well, it's more difficult than that but, yeah. In the root of the thing, yes, there's United Nations currently. One of the committees. I don't really remember the name, but if you're interested you can talk to Jaap and he will gladly tell you everything about codes. He's the most knowledgeable person about codes. Jaap knows everything about codes – how they are created, how they are – really. Two-letter codes, three-letter codes, numerical codes – any codes, he will tell you.

But, yes, at the end of the day, it is United Nations.

PETERKING QUAYE:

I am an ICANN Fellow, and I'm the IG Ambassador for Liberia. My question is about domain. I'm experiencing something that is new to me. Is there a legislation or a regulation by, I don't know, maybe a body that restricts registration of domain in [para-regions]. For example, if a company is in Liberia or maybe in Nigeria and then maybe, because of certain benchmarks they want to set up, they hire a company in America to build a Website, is there a regulation that is a community that can restrict that if you're in Nigeria and you have a company, you should be a Website for local company? I just want to get a clarification on that.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, short answer, no. There's no regulation. Longer answer, again, it's up to the country or up to the country code manager to set up the rules for who can register domain name under a particular top-level domain name. So, really, up to the country. And yes, I've heard that in some cases, some governments require that if you have a domain name registered in a local ccTLD, then you also have to have your name servers or your Web server in the particular country. But that is really a local policy.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And Abdeldjalil, we can take one more and then that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can I give just a short info? Everybody who is interested to hear about ISO 3166, there will be a working group on retirement of ccTLDs here at Capital Suite 7 or 6. Let me just check. It's Capital Suite 6, so you can join us there.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: They can't come now, but they will join later. Thank you. Abdeldjalil.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: It is Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong from Chad. So, thank you so much. So, my question is that you have some [inaudible] even that you do in some countries. So, do you have some [inaudible] to do in countries to join the ccNSO?

For example, in Chad, [inaudible] Chad is now member of this council, and my strategy is that why not work with AfTLD in Africa – for example, African top-level domain organization, to work with them – and with ICANN Africa also to bring more African countries to join the ccNSO.

I see that in GAC there are many African countries, but in ccNSO, I don't see. Because in our country before, the ccTLD is managed

by national company. But after that, there are some law gives the power to the regulator. After the regulator, they create new agency of ICT development. But until now, we are working to do the transition. So is that possible, without transition, my country can join ccNSO?

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm not sure I understood – without transition. You mean currently there is a process of transfer?

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Yeah, transfer – inter transfer, yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, if there are any outstanding issues regarding this transfer, then we have to wait when it's resolved. If I understood your situation correctly.

But if we speak about African ccTLDs, they do participate in the work of ccNSO, and some of them are pretty active. And if we talk about regional organizations, so there is, as you know, African top-level domain association (AfTLD), and they also try to reach out and be very active and very engaging.

By the way, there's Jaap, who knows everything about country codes. Not only country codes – all possible codes.

Jaap, sorry. I sold you to Fellows.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Hello, Jaap. Nice to see you. And a very short intervention, Kemel. Please.

KEMEL ZAIDAN MALUF: Hello. First-time fellow from Brazil. I just want to come back to the question that Victor said because your answer was like – I didn't like it, sorry. Because, if that's not the right place to discuss those topics, why that is? Are you sure that there's no thing that you can do about such a thing? Can you at least make some pressure on the government on not trying to make some type of punishment or, I don't know, make some pressure on the government by not taking taking Websites for political reasons.

KATRINA SATAKI: You mean me, personally?

KEMEL ZAIDAN MALUF: No.

KATRINA SATAKI: I'd love to do that.

KEMEL ZAIDAN MALUF: The ICANN.

KATRINA SATAKI: To be honest, I really would like to do that. ICANN cannot do that. ICANN has no authority to do that. Maybe United Nations, but even they, I think, have – [might in the] Security Council or whatever they have – but I am not sure they would ever deal with takedown of Websites.

You may not like my response, nevertheless, that's the only one I can give you. No. We do not have authority to punish, pressure, or anything with government of any foreign country in the world.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Katrina, thank you very much, and thank you for your time. Applauses to our speaker and thank you.

And we have our last presenters here. So, I would like to introduce Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Chair – outgoing Chair – Patrik Fältström, and the incoming Chair, Rod Rasmussen, if I'm right in pronunciation. So, please, the floor is yours.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. So, the SSAC is a – oh, really nice slide. I like that one, yeah.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: That's the only slide we have, actually.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Excellent. Yeah. We did send over three or four other slides, as well that will be sent to you [afterwards this week] so you can read what I'm going to say now.

So, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee gives advice just like the advisory committees. We don't create policy. We consist today of 37 members, which are appointed by ICANN Board. Our charter says that we are advising the ICANN community, and specifically the Board, on matters related to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. And that is also more or less exactly what ICANN itself has as its mission, to make sure that names and addresses and identifiers are handled in a stable and secure way.

We have made 98 publications since 2002 when we were created. The important thing to note for you is that we are working with the various topics. We are currently working with seven, eight different things. Just because we work on something, doesn't mean that we release a report, and just

because we release a report, it doesn't have to be a recommendation to anyone to actually do anything.

If it is the case that we give recommendations to someone – for example, the ICANN Board – that organization can still, just like all advice from the advisory committees, can choose to ignore them. ICANN Board is a little bit special because if it is the case that they choose a different path, they must explain why and recall that the ICANN Board, compared to anyone else we give recommendations to, have to take our advice into account.

So, luckily, for both the Board and us, we have created such good advice – so, so far, the ICANN Board has almost implemented all of our advice.

At the moment, we are looking at name spaces use and name collisions, which is the risk that, for example, very, very similar domain names are registered or are in use over the Internet so that it increases the risk for the end user to end up on the wrong Website and there end up phishing or stealing the credentials or credit card numbers and whatnot.

We are looking at internationalized domain names and the various policies that are created and have been created within ICANN. We are, just like everyone else, involved in the review of our own processes.

We looked at the WHOIS protocol and the WHOIS systems in the world, and that is something we have been doing on and off. At the moment, we look at the issues with rate limiting the WHOIS services and what impact that has on security and stability, and the ability for law enforcement and others – including private sector, that need access to WHOIS data to fight crime and other kind of bad behavior – what kind of implications that has.

We also have just started to look at Internet of Things and what that implies, and what that might change and impact on policy and how identifiers are in use – both domain names, IP addresses, and other kind of identifiers.

The latest publications we have are related to, for example, the centralized zone data service that ICANN is providing where we have come up with some recommendations on how to improve that. And that includes, also, the registry operators monthly activity reports that we from SSAC think could be a little bit better.

We're also commenting on various other kinds of activities within ICANN, including CCWG Accountability work and also the, of course, the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS review (SSR 2).

The 25th of May, we also issued an advisory on the use of emojis in domain names, so we are looking at all different kind of things all over the policy.

I, unfortunately, have a meeting that starts at 1:30, so I need to leave the room, but I just would like to –

So I'm going to hand over to the incoming Chair of SSAC, Rod, as you just heard, to answer all your questions. So, I brought up lots of issues and then I just leave to Rod to answer the questions.

But what I would like to say is that I've been to these Fellows meetings for all my seven years and I really, really like to work together with the Fellows. And thank you, everyone, that has stopped me in the corridors to everything from just chatting to have a coffee to whatever. I am only stepping down as Chair. I will continue to be a member of SSAC, which means that I will have even more time to interact with all of you. So thank you very much, and I'll now hand over to Rod.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Happy to hear that you are staying with us and, yes, Patrik is one of the great friends of this program. So we are happy you took this at least your 5 and 10 minutes of your time to come here,

but we'll make sure we'll drink a coffee with you in the corridors with our Fellows. Thank you. And Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. [inaudible] so you can actually hear me. There we go. Thank you. I, too, share Patrik's enthusiasm for this program and endeavor to try and make it at least to the cocktail hours when we've had those in the past.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Welcome on board.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. So, I think Patrik's covered the materials we wanted to around SSAC at this point.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So, we can go directly to Q&A. Yeah, Chokri. We have up on there. Please come to the mic. Okay. Keeps your hands for me to see.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Okay. I have two questions. The first one is about the WHOIS service. Do you think that the WHOIS service – information provided by the WHOIS service is [really a source of values]?

The second one [inaudible]. I've submitted a question to the Board during the public, the last public meeting, about the membership within SSAC and RSSAC. Why we did – do you agree with me that we have, that this technical advisory committee have membership within this advisory committee may be more diverse and the representatives of all the regions? So, my suggestion is to apply the ALAC model to the two committees, SSAC and RSSAC.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I didn't quite catch the last part of your second question there. The first part – if you can stand there, I just want to clarify I got your questions right. All right. The first question you had was about WHOIS and is the information provided by WHOIS valuable in a technical sense or just –?

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Technical sense.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Technical sense, okay. And the second question was about diversity in SSAC and RSSAC.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Membership.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Member. Yeah, in the membership of –

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Since all the members of the SSAC are appointed by the Board, from what I know.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay, so I'll explain–

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: How to become a member of RSSAC. That's [inaudible].

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: No, no. How we could change the model used with the membership. If you look at the At-Large model, we have a representative of several regions. Okay.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I understand now. Thank you. So, on WHOIS services, the easy to your question is, yes, and I'll move on. But I'll give you a better answer than just yes. Certainly, the reason that WHOIS was created in the first place was to solve technical problems because the networks at the time they were building them, they broke all the time and you had to get on the old phone to call up

the person at the other university and fix things. Right? So, the original purpose for them was very technical reason – is because things break.

That reasoning is still valid today. I was a member of the Expert Working Group that looked at WHOIS and the RDS and next generation services, and I'm a current member of the PDP on RDS.

Just throwing around acronyms. I know you aren't all familiar with all this stuff. So to give you an explanation of what I just said, a few years ago ICANN put together a group of experts to try and break this backlog around WHOIS and how we're going to do it going forward because both the protocol was an issue and how it worked, and then the information within it, for various reasons, is being scrutinized. Is it appropriate? Is it legal? Etc, etc., etc.

So, I was part of that group which put out a report, I believe three years ago now. And then the GNSO has instituted a policy development process – that's the PDP part – on RDS, which is Registration Directory Services. So, what we're trying to do is come up with a way of modeling the future of WHOIS and changing it to Registration Directory Services, which is a much better acronym or name for what we're doing, and that you have a robust set of services that use the new protocol called RDAP –

and I don't remember what that stands for, by the way; Registration and Protocol and I don't remember the DNA of-

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: There you go. Registration Directory Access Protocol. Thank you. See, there's too many acronyms for even us to keep up with.

Anyway, what I wanted to point out here is that what we're trying to do is come to some sort of agreement around the policy for what information is collected, what information is stored for how long, and what information is available to whom and under what circumstances so that we can modify the current – everything goes in as public., etc., and there's certain requirements around who has to put what information in to a model that is more robust and is more easily fits into the frameworks of local laws in various jurisdictions.

So, that's the goal. Getting there is hard. One of the things that drives that, though, is the purposes for you collecting the data, and technical purposes like fixing things that are broken are still very valid. Patrik mentioned that SSAC cares very much about access to data in order to be able to respond to incidents, really malicious behavior that is being done by large part either

through the security community –which is not necessarily law enforcement – and automation, those things that figure out whether or not you’re getting spam or not, and make it so you can actually still use email, for example. A lot of those decisions are based on information that’s provided by the WHOIS.

So, that’s that question. The second question was SSAC and how do we get to the diversity on SSAC. Now, RSSAC – I’m going to just touch on RSSAC, even though I’m not an RSSAC member. RSSAC is the root server operators. Those actually have to be people who operate root servers, so getting diversity there is about diversity in root servers. So I’ll let you ask that question to them, but there’s not a whole lot you could do about trying to diversify since you actually have to run a root server.

SSAC is a broader mandate. In fact, the composition has changed a lot over the course of the history of ICANN. Initially, it was a lot of people who were doing more things at the protocol level – a lot of the people who had built the Internet and were securing it from kind of the infrastructure level were the original SSAC members.

If you look at it now, there’s a lot of people with different backgrounds. Myself, I come from a cybercrime fighting background. Okay? So that’s purely in that space, although I do – I shouldn’t say purely. I’ve done some things like register

thousands of domain names and all kinds of other stuff, which made me qualified – and I get that.

And that takes me to the point where our first level of concern around diversity is actually technical diversity and not geographic, gender, etc. The number one consideration is do you bring skills that we don't have that we need? And every year, we evaluate our membership. We give them a skills survey. And we update the skills survey to make sure we're covering new threats and things that we haven't thought of before so that we can bring people in with those skills.

That said, if you take a look at our membership, we're not as diverse as we would like to be and, certainly, I'm sure many people in the community think we should be. So, we are definitely interested in recruiting more members from around the world, not just with the traditional North American or European and all that. We've got plenty of representation from there.

As Patrik mentioned, we have 37 members. We're actually a little lower than we want to be, so we have some room for that. We use an annual calendar year cycle, January 1st to December 31st. Right now, we are finishing up the year and our current membership committee is, at this point, just evaluating some internal stuff.

We will start next year, and we're actually looking at ways we can actually do better outreach and do some creative things around bringing in new members from various other parts of the world. You have to have pretty high technical skills and you have to be fairly advanced in your career in order to be on SSAC. One thing we probably won't be is very age-diverse, which is unfortunate, but you have to have the kind of the grasp of your own – be a subject matter expert.

That said, there's some – there are maybe some younger folks who do have that. But there will be a lot of gray or balding hair on the committee, unfortunately.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. And I was going to finish up by saying if you know people who might be interested, you can apply. On the Website, there's a link. You can get an application form and there's a process that we go through. We first evaluate whether or not you have skills that we need, and then if so, there may be an interview process, etc.

If you are aware of people who would fit in that and think they could commit to that, please encourage them to apply. Thanks.

MANUELA PERALTA SANTANA: Hi. This is Manuela, at Fellowship for the first time. So, as you were saying, I have a question related to that. So, due to that most of the sessions are closed, doesn't it become a challenge to get new people? Because, for example, if I'm not mistaken, the only session that was open, it was the one from yesterday – because all the other ones were working groups that you, of course, you have the high-level advanced work.

And the second question – I need to know: doesn't it become a challenge in order for you to get new members?

And then the second one, the chair was talking about the new things that you have, so I know that you are working out with WHOIS and DNSSEC, I think. But related to the address allocation system, there's anything that you're working currently on? Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Sure, thanks. So, on the first question, yeah, the nature of – when you're talking about security, you end up with closed meetings. That's the nature of the thing. And people do ask about them, and rightly so. And we've been trying to do more in the open when we can. But, the nature of it is that if you have want to have share sensitive information – and we get to see a lot of sensitive information – you can't do that in a public forum

because then people won't tell you about important security problems for a variety of reasons.

So, I don't know that that's impinged on us recruiting members who have a security background because they understand that. It doesn't allow people just to wander in and say, "Okay, is this something I might be interested in?" But then again, with the requirements you have to be on SSAC in the first place, you're not having random – people just can hold their hand up and say, "I want to join." It's just not that way.

On the second question – what other things around name space allocation, for example. So we are looking at issues there, particularly around collisions. This gets into things around IDNs and variance, and all those kinds of thorny technical issues that don't really have good solutions yet. And we're doing gap analysis in there to see how various rules and regulations that ICANN has set up may be in conflict with each other for as far as how you allocate those things.

And also, the name collision issue in general. The Board is going to be – as long as the vote goes as we're assuming it will – will be tasking us, actually, with a very in-depth set of studies around looking at .home, .corp, and .mail, which are three strings that are in limbo right now that were applied for that have large numbers of name collisions.

Name collisions – Patrik, I think, explained that earlier – are when computers out there are making requests that end up in the DNS, even though they’re not allocated as TLDs. And there are various reasons for that, but mainly software is asking for it as a DNS when it shouldn’t be – a DNS query. And so there’s that.

And then the general question of how do you evaluate this stuff? How do you measure that, etc.? So, that we’ll be doing some work there. And then just general name space. How do you allocate or how do you determine what the IETF puts in reserve versus what ICANN does? There’s all those kinds of issues because it’s a single name space in theory – in a generic theory – and when you start putting things in the IETF list, reserving them there, they start showing up in DNS. So there’s issues like that, that we work through. Next?

RAJEEWA ABEYGUNARATHNA: Hello. I’m Rajeewa, a returning Fellow. I have a question in IoT, Internet of Things. So, normally, we are always talking about the security and stability of the system. So, what is your opinion, and SSAC gives on maybe the future of Internet maybe [they think its] governed by the IOT governance. So, what is your concern and your stand on these discussions?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

A very topical question right now. We actually do have a work party – I'm a member of that work party – looking at this. And there are lots of publications around IOT, Internet of Things.

Just make sure everybody is on the same page there. It's the idea that we're going to expand devices from where we are right now in the billions to the trillions or more of devices. Whether it's your smartphone or your smart t-shirt or your smart light bulb, somehow or some way, these things are all going to get connected, and they'll probably be connected via the Internet.

So, there's lots of different work going on in there. What we're concerned with is the impact on ICANN space, which is the identifier system. Right?

So, we're taking a look at it from that angle and from multiple vectors. So, if you think about the impact on naming, if you have to name a trillion devices, how does that work. Right? What is the impact, potentially, if people want to get new TLDs and the like on the root system? Or what is the impact on DNS resolution or resolvers if you have all these things that you may need to cache? How big can you grow things and all that kind of stuff?

How do these things interact when people use their own independent protocols they create to talk on their local networks and those leak out? So, you get that name collision problem I was talking about.

Then you've got 1 billion light bulbs that are all vulnerable to something and now they're doing amplified DDoS, which is Distributed Denial-of-Service Attacks. Right now, those are bad enough with just regular PCs and servers and things like that. If you have all these other devices – and, by the way, everybody's home or small business or what have you is going to have these with much better bandwidth than they've ever had before – you now have a much bigger and harder to tame kind of weapon when it comes to DDoS. So we're really concerned about that.

Because those are typically or one of the – well, there's two angles where this impacts DNS. One is the reflective attacks using recursive name servers where you ask a question, you spoof who you are, and the answer – which is very large – goes back to your victim who you've spoofed. And then the other side of that is that one of the things that people do to take down content they don't like is go after the name servers for the domain names that host that.

Some of you might be familiar with what happened to Dyn DNS a year or two ago where they were targeted for one of the things they were hosting, but that took down hundreds of things which happened to be backend systems for a lot of other stuff. So businesses shut down because somebody was taking out the name servers for a domain name in a dispute over something

else, and it had a huge ripple effect. Those are the kinds of things we try and study and go.

It's a little far afield from IoT, but the problem with IoT is that it's enabling this stuff. It's much harder to fix than a PC or servers or things like that that we've traditionally seen doing that.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We have Afifa and Alexander. And I think that will be the last. Yeah, because Rod needs to leave.

AFIFA ABBAS: Hello. Afifa from Bangladesh, second-time Fellow. So, I got to know about one of the discussions that for any new gTLD before going live, it has to go through SSAC. So, I just wanted to know what does SSAC do in this regard? Is it a kind of vulnerability testing using any tools? If yes, then what are the tools you use for that?

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, I want to make sure I got your question right. Are you talking about an individual gTLD?

AFIFA ABBAS: Yes.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Okay. Versus – okay. So, SSAC does not do any evaluation itself of any of the new gTLDs. We are going to do, in particular, evaluation around this .home, .corp, and .mail – there’s [inaudible] that’s already out there – issue. However, that being said, we are going to be providing, hopefully with this project, some general guidelines on how you would do some of this testing.

Tools that are out there today include one of the – well, you have instrumentation at the root servers and at current major TLDs, particularly .com because one of the things that you have when you put a new string on the Internet, if it doesn’t know how to locally how to resolve that, it often appends .com to the end of it just automatically. So Verisign has some unique access to data around collisions because of that. But mainly, it’s the root servers.

And then the other places, major DNS resolvers. So if you take a look at the DNS resolvers around the world, some studies have shown there’s only a few hundred that supply resolution services for well over half of all requests. So there’s places you can actually go to see what kind of issues you have potentially with those kinds of collision issues.

And the root server operators do a project annually called A Day in the Life of the Internet. and we call it DITL because that's, of course – the acronym is DITL because we love acronyms that are confusing. But anyways, that data is made available to researchers, and you can actually take a look at that and see what kind of things are actually in those. Does that get to what you were looking for?

AFIFA ABBAS: [inaudible]. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And the last question, Alexander.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN: Good day. Alexander, second-time Fellow. At this meeting, we heard a lot about the [inaudible] system, which is implemented by Office of CTO of ICANN. And I got feeling that I already read something about this. And actually, it's SSAC Recommendation Number 25 issued in a year 2008, so about 10 years ago. It was about [inaudible] abuse of domain names and something like. So, 10 years passed and ICANN started some researchers based on your advisory council, or close to your advisory council recommendations.

So, it's maybe more general question, not about just your committee. So, do you follow your own recommendations? Not follow. Do you watching how these recommendations are being applied, are being used? Do you update them from time to time?

Well, IP packet is just sent and you're not care about recommendation from advisory something will need to be reviewed and checked are people following or not? Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you for asking that question. So, I would say that back in the day or a long time ago, the SSAC would make recommendations and we didn't actually know what was going on with them. Right? And if it was something really important, we might query the Board or whoever we made the recommendation to. That became an issue that we actually dealt with, with the Board.

Now, the Board has, actually, a Board advice tracker, which now is in place and has been brought up to date with almost all of our recommendations. I think some of the older, older ones aren't in it just because they're so old. And we are tracking the progress through what the Board's done with it, or if the advice is for somebody else, that's actually tracked, as well.

The advice for other people is a lot harder for us to do, but the Board actually has – we have a remit to the Board and the Board has a responsibility to us to actually respond and either say, A) “Yes, we’re going to implement it,” B) “We’re going to implement it with some changes,” or C) “We’re not going to implement it.” Right? So, it’s kind of got those choices.

And then they are still tracking once they say they’re going to implement it, what that actually means. So that’s fairly new so we’re going to see how that works, but it’s much better than it used to be.

On the question of revisiting or reissuing, so there’s two things there. One is we’ve done – sometimes, when we’ve given advice, circumstances have changed or we come up with new information and we’ve issued an update to that. Right? Or sometimes we’ve responded to something and there was maybe some policy development around it and we’ve responded to the result. So, that’s happened naturally.

What we’ve just gotten done internally, though, is we’ve gone through every single publication we’ve ever done and put them into bins. And one bin is, “This advice is perfectly fine as it is. We don’t need to update it.” One is, “This advice has been overcome by events. It’s no longer relevant, for whatever reason.” And the

third is, “This advice is something that we actually should take a look at maybe reissuing.”

And so what we’re doing next is we’re taking those and grouping them together so we can create new projects around that. So, we’ll either issue an updated version of the event, of a recommendation. We may bundle some together and say, “Hey, these three recommendations, we now have this new one that is modernized. It’s a new version of it that updates the advice.”

And we may issue some brand new ones in the same field that replace kind of the old one. So, we’re going through that process now. Given the workload that I know we’re going to have with doing some of the Board does is .corp, .home, .mail thing – (.com, .net, .org thing...no).

If they do that, I’m not sure how quickly we’re going to get to some of the other stuff. But that’s one of the reasons we’re going to bring on a few more members, too, is there’s work to do. It’s interesting work, especially if you want to go revisit some of this stuff and bring it up to standard.

ALEXANDER ISAVNIN:

Thank you. That reveals a lot about work of your Advisory Council.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much, and thank you, Rod, for your time coming and our applause to you and our congratulations, also, as an incoming Chair. So we'll be working with you again next time to work with Fellows and to integrate them more into your activities. So, thank you and congratulations.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you and I look forward to being together with the Fellows every ICANN meeting.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: With that, we finish our today's session. I hope that you found it very informative. Don't forget, if you haven't taken your lunch yet, so take your lunchboxes. And I am looking forward seeing you at 3:15 at Community Recognition Session in the Hall 4. You will see who will get the award this time from the community whom ICANN appreciates and highlights at every ICANN meeting.

And then there is an almost three hours public forum where I would encourage you to be there and participate, actively listen. And also, we will have the opportunity to be at the Board meeting at the end.

By 8:00, hopefully, we'll be [alive] to go to farewell cocktail party and see you tomorrow for our last wrap-up session. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]