
LOS ANGELES – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 08:30 to 18:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

BYRON HOLLAND:

Good morning everybody. Welcome to ICANN 51 and the first day of the ccNSO Meetings. Thank you everybody here for remembering we had a slightly earlier start than normal. Congratulations to you. I know at least you folks read the materials. Thank you for that. We have a very full Agenda over the next couple of days, hence the slightly early start. I'm going to pass it over in a moment to Katrina to walk us through some of the hat key parts of that Agenda. Before we do that I want to remind us that we have our usual visits to the Board and to the GAC this morning.

The Meeting with the ICANN Board is in the Los Angeles Room, which is one floor down. As seems to be customary we have a bit of a trek to get there. That's at 10:00 am. At 11:00 after the coffee break, we'll be meeting with the GAC. Fortunately those rooms are besides each other so we can have a coffee break in-between them and don't have to travel far between those two. The GAC is in the Santa Monica Room, also downstairs.

For those of you who may have noticed they were previously in the tent outside, I guess those accommodations were not to their liking, so they seem to have moved downstairs into the Santa Monica Room. Ironically of course they've kicked the registrars out of there, and the registrars are now in the tent. [Laughter] Where they so richly deserve to be, I'm sure. Anyways, on the outside looking in... We could go on. I'm sure.

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.

Good morning everybody. Good to see you all. Katrina and the Program Working Group have certainly done the heavy lifting on the program and have put together a packed Agenda but also one that's going to be very interesting and help us sort through some of the big issues that we, the community, and we the ICANN community, are facing. With that I'll pass it over Katrina to give us a little more detail.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you Byron. Good morning everyone. On behalf of our Meeting Program Working Group I'd like to welcome you all here. I'm happy to see your faces and I see that you're happy to be here and willing to participate in this event. As usual we have a Report Update, discussions and of course ccNSO Cocktail. Why have we started so early today? Because finally, the Final Report Framework of the Interpretation Working Group is out. I like these pictures because guys look very young here. That's how they looked when they started the work. [Laughter]

The work is done and they're happy to share the results with us. They're here, eagerly waiting to do that. Before that, I'd like to use the opportunity to thank everyone who was on the group, because their work was really hard and we're all very thankful that they went through that. Then of course we'll talk about Internet governance, after meeting with the ICANN Board and GAC we'll have a separate session dedicated to these issues. Samantha Dickinson will walk us through the current development status of the entire thing, which is really very hard to comprehend.

Then Janis Karklins will tell us about Internet governance and the future of Internet governance, and Staffan Jonsson will talk about Plenipot.

Use the opportunity here to ask your questions. Today we also have another session where we'll really have time for discussions. That's what people usually ask for. In your feedback you asked, "Give us more time for discussion," so this is the moment when we'll come together and start discussing. We'll talk about IANA stewardship transfer and ICANN accountability.

The idea of this session is to give you insight into these issues, to give you food for thought so that you can think about it, you can discuss it tonight during Cocktail and during Music Night, and tomorrow we'll have another session, another discussion, something more concrete, more to the point. Tomorrow's discussion will be led by Byron and Roelof. We'll give you more information about participants later, because we're still working with them.

Today we'll also have a Q&A session, which will be chaired by Lesley. The idea here is to ask your questions and choose the best people to represent you on the Council and on the ICANN Board. Be ruthless, ask your questions. Grill these people, maybe not the European one, but all the others. Grill them and make sure they give you what you want.

Tonight we have a coming together at the ccNSO Cocktail. It's really very close to the meeting venue. When you go out of the venue, turn right, and on your right side you'll see Hinoki and the Bird Restaurant. You're all welcome – every ccNSO Member, non-Member, any ccTLD representative here is welcome at the Cocktail. Of course we'll have to thank our generous sponsor, Nustar, for making this possible.

So welcome to the ccNSO. Enjoy these two days of sessions, discussions and presentations, and please give us your feedback. Don't forget to fill

in the satisfaction survey we'll send you afterwards, because we really want to know what you want to discuss, what you want to hear, and how you want us to proceed. Thank you and have a nice two days of meetings. With that, Keith and Bernie will start.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you. Good morning everybody. My name's Keith Davidson. We have this session for the next hour, approximately, and then we're going onto the Joint Meeting with the Board and then the Joint Meeting with the GAC, and then we're resuming on this session if we need to, for an extra half-hour, prior to lunch today. This is the Framework of Interpretation Working Group's presentation of its Final Interim Report. This is hopefully your last opportunity to review the output of this Working Group and make any comments along the way.

The purpose is that we want ccTLD approval of this Interim Report, so when we present to the GAC we are saying, "This is pretty much the Final Report," or, "We have agreed that this is our version of the Final Report, subject to your final input." So be ready with your cards later and be prepared to comfort yourself that this is the final version of this report. On that topic, just reminding you all that the measurement of the recommendations is are they in scope, are they within the scope of the Working Group's Mandate and Charter?

Be careful to assure yourselves that we haven't invented policy along the way, because this wasn't a PDP. It's merely the interpretation of existing policies and guidelines, so this is measuring to see that it was within that scope as well. This is not a question of whether you agree with the existing policies or guidelines at all – this is a question of whether the

interpretations are accurate representations of those policies and guidelines. That's the careful criteria.

If you disagree with one of the policy statements then we then have to go through a PDP to alter that, so that's a different animal – this Working Group's role was purely to develop depth and color around existing policies and guidelines. With that I'll hand over to Bernie to walk us through the final recommendations and report. Bernie, it's all yours.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you sir. Morning everyone. Thank you for coming in for an early start on what essentially, given the other presentations we've given you, should be very few surprises, if any. But given there may be some new people in the room, we're going to walk through the whole thing. Next slide. Our outline is we'll give you a status of where we are. We'll give you the highlights of our interpretations, the final report recommendations, our next steps, and then we'll do a quick review of all the great participants we had that worked for the number of years that are required to get this job done.

Status – where are we? Well, the FOI Working Group has published a Report on Consent, has published a Report on Significantly Interested Party, has published a Report on Revocation and has published this Draft Final Report. The FOI Working Group considers its interpretation work completed. Next slide.

Final Report highlights, or the greatest hits from the FOI Working Group. I think one of the key things that's important to remember is that RFC

1591 only identifies three mechanisms available to the IANA operator to assign or modify the management responsibility for a ccTLD. That's it. There's delegation, there's transfer, and there's revocation. There is no other option, and if you've been around for a while that may actually rub a little differently.

What we finished interpreting also is we said, "Other mechanisms may be available to the stakeholder community under applicable domestic law, however those mechanisms might not be practically available to the IANA operator." We're very clear we're not trying to substitute ourselves for national law, for other legal mechanisms that are out there, but in the absence of other rules, your base-set, based on 1591, is these interpretations. Next slide please.

Delegation – we thought it was important to actually run through it and actually give definitions, because when we started the work, one of the things that was interesting is that everyone knows its delegation, but what does it actually mean? When we started drilling down, people had varying interpretations of what delegation could mean, or meant, or should mean. We wrote it down.

The FOI Working Group interprets "delegation" to mean the process by which the IANA operator initially assigns management responsibility, or assigns previously assigned responsibility, after a revocation, for the management of a ccTLD. So now we all have a common reference point of what delegation means.

Next slide please. Transfer. The FOI Working Group interprets the term "transfer" to refer to the process by which the IANA operator transfers responsibility from an incumbent manager to a new manager with the

consent of both parties. Now, we will talk about redelegation and what that means in a few minutes, but if you go through the policy document the term that actually exists in there is “transfer”. There is no “redelegation”.

The FOI further interprets Section 3.6 of 1591 to require the IANA operator only to seek consent for a transfer request from the incumbent manager and the proposed manager. The IANA operator should not seek consent from the administrative or technical contacts. For those that have been around, we will remember the documentation and the requirements that it be the administrative and technical contacts, from a historical point of view, that approve transfers. Slight variation there. Next slide please.

Revocation – the FOI Working Group interprets the term “revocation” to refer to the process by which the IANA operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager. So yes, this is the nuclear option. It goes away, and it’s got all the baggage associated that we can think about, in that when you’re talking about revocation it doesn’t necessarily mean that the data’s going to follow along. The database is the operator’s data. What IANA manages is the assignment of the ccTLD itself.

Section 3.5 of 1591 explicitly contemplates revocation in appropriate cases involving persistent problems with the proper operation of the domain. If you go through 1591 it’s actually very clearly stated that if there are problems with the proper operation of a domain, IANA can revoke. The FOI Working Group interpret 1591 to permit the IANA

operator to revoke a ccTLD delegation in appropriate circumstances, where the manager has substantially misbehaved.

So there's the technical side – is the thing working properly? – and then there's substantial misbehavior. That's a really long discussion which I won't subject you to this morning. However, if you are interested in that, please read it in the Report. We probably spent the bulk of our time, once we got our cruising speed going, really hammering out the details of this thing. It is critical. It's long. It's detailed. But it was necessary.

All right. One of the things we're proposing as we define terminology explicitly so that we all refer to the same things the same way, is that we're proposing that "redelegation" should no longer be used. We're uncertain where the term popped up. We couldn't actually find it in any formal policy document. The thing that does exist is a transfer, and a transfer requires the consent of both the incumbent operator and the new operator, and we're going to talk about what consent means.

Also, there is absolutely no basis for an unconsented redelegation. The term "redelegation" doesn't exist and the notion of an unconsented redelegation, that's even further out there. What we'd like the community to think about using is no longer use "redelegation". It's a transfer. There's no such thing as an unconsented redelegation. There will be a revocation followed by a delegation. Next slide please.

Now, consent. What does that mean? As we know from the DRD Working Group, the definition of consent has over the years been interpreted in a variety of ways. I believe one of the main objectives of the FOI Working Group for the ccNSO was to clear this up. The fact that

it seems that the interpretation of consent has been highly variable over the years and sometimes between circumstances, was of significant concern to our community. Again, as per the terms of what does delegation mean, what does transfer mean, we've hammered it out.

The FOI Working Group further interprets Section 3.6 of RFC 1591 regarding agreement to the transfer as requiring the communication from the IANA operator requesting a party's consent should clearly state A) what the party is being asked to agree to; and B) what steps the IANA operator will or may take in response to the party's 1) affirmative consent; 2) affirmative refusal to consent; and 3) failure to respond to the communication requesting consent.

It doesn't stop there. Next slide. The IANA operator needs to establish and publish a procedure by which it will request a party's consent. The information that will be provided by the IANA operator in connection with such requests, and the manner in which it will receive and document the party's response to such requests. We're essentially asking IANA to not only settle on a very clear definition of what consent means, but we're asking them to publish that and publish how they're going to deal with that in the case of transfers.

Next slide please. The process used by the IANA operators should create a formal record reflecting who provided the consent or other response, the status of the person providing the consent or a response, and should demonstrate that a party's consent to a redelegation is clear, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively expressed, and freely given, as each of those terms are defined. I think we've drawn a fairly tight box around that,

and we're hoping that this will help clear up any misunderstandings in the context of transfers.

Finally, the IANA operator itself must be perfectly neutral and should not attempt to compel, threaten or persuade the party to approve their request. Again, I think we've drawn the box fairly clearly. This is consent. Next slide. SIP. Again, what we have noticed for those who haven't been following us too closely, you have seen this in a variety of flavors over the years. If you've gone through the IANA reports it's been significantly interested parties, it's been the local Internet community, it has been this, it has been that – very dynamic definition. So again we've decided to settle it down.

From an RFC 1591 perspective it's not local Internet community, it's significantly interested party. To be considered a significantly interested party, an party other than the manager, or the government, or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, must demonstrate that it has a direct material and legitimate interest in the operation of the ccTLD. We've clearly set the bar a little higher, and there's a number of reasons for that. There were some definitions in some of the IANA documentation.

Again, it was variable. We thought that given that the significantly interested parties do have a clear say in selecting a manager, that as a minimum we should define a framework around that to ensure the people who are commenting as SIPs are qualified to be heard of that, because their input should matter. So it's a balancing act, if you will.

Next slide. Still on SIP, the FOI Working Group interprets the requirement for approval from SIPs to require applicants to provide

documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA operator to evaluate and document this input for delegations and transfers. We're drawing the line in the sand – this is what it says and this is how we interpret what it should mean if you're going to do that.

Next slide please. IANA reports on delegations and transfers should reflect consistent applications of these FOI Working Group interpretations and should include the detailed results of the IANA operator's evaluation of stakeholder input regarding the requested action. Now, we will save you the ancient history lesson, but as many of you will know, from a historical perspective the data has sometimes been highly variable in some of the IANA reports. What we're looking for is to ensure that there is, going forward...

I'd like to state at this point that we're looking at the entire area of IANA reports, and we're not picking on IANA reports from yesterday or last year. Things have changed dramatically. But when you look at the whole scope of IANA reports and you actually analyze them in detail, which is what we did for the DRD Working Group, which was the precursor to the FOI, the point is there was a lot of variation. We're trying to just settle that down.

Next slide. Final Report. Admin contact. The FOI Working Group interprets the requirement that there be an administrative and technical contact for each domain including for ccTLDs, an administrative contact residing in the country to mean as a general rule that the manager must confirm, and the IANA operator must be able to validate that the administrative contact resides in the country or territory associated with

the ccTLD. Now, there have been a variety of discussions about these things. Let's just leave it at that.

There's a few important notes to this. This is to establish a clear intention from RFC 1591 that there be a local in-country or territory, presence. 2) The FOI recognizes that there may be extenuating circumstances where it is impractical or even impossible for the administrative contact to reside in the country or territory. CcTLDs that represent territories without permanent population will, by definition, not be able to meet the requirement. If the given island only has penguins, unfortunately penguins are not allowed to be the admin contact.

The requirement for an in-country administrative contact did not appear before 1994 when it was first introduced by RFC 1591. Let's not forget there were ccTLDs before RFC 1591. Therefore this requirement may not be expected of ccTLDs established or last transferred before the publication of RFC 1591 – the Grandfather Clause.

Next slide. Trustee. Yes. If you actually go through RFC 1591 you will see that a ccTLD manager is expected to be a trustee. Now, what does mean? The FOI Working Group interprets the requirement that the manager serves as a trustee for the delegated domain, with a duty to serve the nation in the case of a country code and the global Internet community to require the manager to provide mechanisms to allow for registrants and SIPs to provide input regarding registration policies to the manager.

2) To preserve the security and stability of the ccTLD. 3) To work with the IANA operator to preserve the security and stability of the global

DNS and Internet. Again, we've drawn a very clear frame around what a term means. Trustee means this. When we started this discussion, if you go to the legal definition of trustee, it's another thing completely. Actually in the Final Report we actually note that – that this is not a common law definition of trustee – that we've actually put the frame around it. This is what it means.

Next slide please. Another wonderful word is equitable. The FOI Working Group interprets the requirement that the manager be equitable to all groups in the domain as obligating the manager to make its registration policies accessible and understandable to prospective applicants and to apply these policies in an impartial manner, treating similarly situated would-be registrants in the same manner. Same philosophy here. A term. We've drawn a frame around it. This is what it means.

Next slide please. Those are the highlights and now we get into the recommendations, and they're fairly straightforward. Regarding consent, SIPs and unconsented redelegations – hopefully a term we won't use anymore – the IANA operator should adopt and implement the interpretations of RFC 1591 provided by the FOI Working Group, as presented in this document. No surprises there. Next slide.

Regarding IANA adoption and implementation of the FOI interpretations, the ccNSO Council should consider a methodology to collaborate with IANA to develop content and other tools to educate and inform stakeholders about IANA's processes and procedures that are consistent with the FOI Working Group interpretations. Basically, no one's expecting that this is going to magically change overnight. Some of the

things that are proposed here are, as a minimum, important changes. I think it's our responsibility to see how we can work with the IANA so that everyone gets a better understanding about how we envisage this thing to move forward.

Next slide please. I think this is a fairly key one for everyone. I don't think we spent a lot of time on this one because it was completely obvious to everyone. The IANA operators should continue to publish a public report on each ccTLD delegation transfer and revocation it completes. These reports should be published in a timely fashion, clearly identify the parties involved, describe its decision making process and the facts relevant to its decision, including information that addresses all relevant aspects of the FOI recommendations.

Often the only real historical trace we have of those actions by IANA of any depth is the IANA Report, and sometimes they're just great and they have a great value, at a minimum, to inform the community about how and why things went on. Unfortunately that has not – and I quote again from a historical point of view – always been the case. Sometimes one would expect that one might get a little bit more information from Board Minutes. That's not been the case either. Sometimes the text from the Board Minutes is quite long but actually says absolutely nothing.

So I think what we're asking for here is consistency and information. I don't think it's very useful to cut and paste the same standard text from one action to the next just to fill up space. I think what's more of concern and interest to everyone is to understand who asked for what,

who approved what, what was the process to actually make the decision, and then what happened? Quite important for us.

Next slide please. Next steps. All right. We've done this. What are we doing next? I think for that I'll hand it over to Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you Bernie. Our next steps. This is the Final Draft. This may be the last occasion for ccNSO Members to indicate their support or otherwise for the framework. If we gain your support today we'll submit the Report as a Draft Final Report to the Council Meeting tomorrow afternoon, for their interim approval, and then submit it to the GAC for any further comments from the GAC.

It seems like we've been in the home straight on this framework for some time now, but we really came unstuck with our GAC relationship when Frank March, who was the New Zealand GAC representative, had been taking the lead on this work, but he retired after the March meeting this year in Singapore. The GAC have not appointed someone to follow it closely since, or take the lead on it since. The other main participant in the GAC has been Suzanne from the US Government, and of course she is in a state of conflict with the IANA transition and the US Government's role in that, so she hasn't been able to take the lead and I think that's quite appropriate in that regard.

So what we're seeking to do with the GAC here is to find someone, or we've asked the GAC to find someone, to take the lead within the GAC. Therefore we've got a bit more homestretch to go in as much as the GAC could provide some comments back to the ccNSO. But our hope is that

we can get the final approval at the next ICANN Meeting. If the GAC don't have any comments then there'd be no reason to come back to ccNSO Membership. The Interim Final Report should be able to be stamped by the ccNSO Council at the next meeting, so this is potentially your last opportunity for input.

If the GAC come back and have substantial changes required, it will probably need to be referred back to the Working Group, further draft changes, and then it may go through another iteration of approval, if the changes are substantial. Now, remember the intention always with this report was that if the GAC and the ccNSO can both give their approval, we can jointly provide the framework to the ICANN Board, and it becomes binding on the ICANN Board, primarily because GAC's advice to the ICANN Board is binding on the Board.

This was to avoid us having to go through a PDP for something that was not a development of policy. So we remain hopeful that this can be a collaborative effort between the GAC and the ccNSO. With that, are there any questions or comments? Stunned silence. Microphones?

CHRIS LAHATTE:

Hi, Chris LaHatte. I'm the ICANN Ombudsman. I don't often come to the ccNSO meetings but I thought it was appropriate in this case because this clarification that we're talking about has got a number of steps where I could foreseeably have complaints coming into my office. Some of the decisions that are made are controversial and are matters that I could review. So I'm taking this opportunity just to introduce myself to those ccNSO Members who haven't met me before, and remind them

that the Ombudsman’s Office is also available to the ccNSO community, who haven’t been frequent visitors to my office, but can do so.

If in the process of revocation or delegation or transfer, there are some issues of unfairness or delay, then I am available to assist with that process. That’s all I wanted to say Keith. Thanks.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you Chris. Over to Lesley. Just on that topic, I guess the hope is that by having the framework there is less opportunity for complaints, as the results should be more predictable and consistent than they have been. Noted none-the-less. We’re trying to reduce your workload, not increase it. Lesley?

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thanks Keith. I’m just a bit concerned about the GAC, because I guess from my perspective it doesn’t feel as though the GAC have been as engaged as they might have been. Obviously their attention has been elsewhere often, during this whole process. The group have done some fantastic work, but I was concerned when Frank wasn’t able to participate further. What do you think the likelihood is of the GAC just signing this off?

I’m not known for my optimism, but I suspect they won’t just sign it off. Do we have any early indications of areas where they might want to discuss this further? Or are you confident that they have been engaged enough during the period to just sign it through?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Great question Lesley. It's really difficult to know. The GAC play their cards fairly close and they appear to often be distracted by shiny objects and that certainly has been a cause of the rocky road along the way. I'm a supreme optimist, so I've got some optimism, particularly after discussions in recent days with various GAC Members, that we can get to the finish line. I think we're extending our run in the home straight to try our best to accommodate the foibles within the GAC. I don't know how much of a wager you might want to put on it, but I'll put a dollar down on it.

STAFF MEMBER: Peter Van Roster from CENTR has a question. He says: "Thank you for the hard work and the useful update. Can you please elaborate on the exclusion of governments from the definition of SIPs?"

BERNIE TURCOTTE: They're not excluded. They're automatically included. If you go through the text what it means is they don't have to prove that they are an SIP. They are automatically a SIP in any delegation or transfer.

ELISE GERICH: Hi. Elise Gerich, IANA Functions Operator. I want to congratulate the ccNSO on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group work. I do have a question on clarification, since we will have to implement this when you all pass it at some point in time. You've mentioned early on that revocation rescinds the management of a domain, but it doesn't have anything to do with the content. Could you clarify if that means say I'm operating .us and the revocation of .us, you revoke it from me.

Do I get to hold all the second-level domains that I've registered in that? Is that the content? Or does the revocation mean that that content should be transferred to the new manager of .us? That's just an example. I don't run .us.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

That's a very good question. Thank you Elise. We don't know the answer to that question. There's no clarity from RFC 1591 or the GAC principles in terms of the ownership of the data within the ccTLD. So the term revocation refers to the IANA database entry only for that ccTLD. It doesn't refer to anything greater than that.

ELISE GERICH:

Wouldn't that be inconsistent though with the end of the presentation, where you mention what the goals of all the definitions are? It was to maintain the stability of the global Internet, which would include the stability of those people who've been managing second-level domains and operating them through their companies.

I'm just concerned that we may be ignoring the users of the domains in the revocation, by saying we don't come up with a way to try to smooth the transition from one manager to another. I'm asking for clarification. I'm not espousing my own personal views here.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

As we said, these are the highlights. If we go through the report in detail, there are several elements under "revocation" which actually deal with some of the concerns you're talking about. I think if we look at

it historically there have been cases where they were “unconsented redelegations” but there was no data. So there are a lot of different cases that can happen, but I don’t think this has been ignored. I think there are several elements under the revocation section, which provide some guidance, if not complete guidance relevant to that.

I think we want to point out that yes, in our interpretation the primary concern for IANA is the stability, and that overrides clearly a need for a change at that level.

ELISE GERICH:

I appreciate your response. Just as an operator though I want to mention that if you leave orphan domains out there, if I’m elise.us and the IANA operator has followed this guidance and revokes the manager of .us, and you’re left with a whole bunch of orphan domains out there, I hope that the Committee will take that into consideration for their interpretation, because you’re offering guidance to the IANA Functions Operator on how we should deal with this. Otherwise we’ll have more historical information about how the IANA Functions Operator didn’t do what they should have done.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Point noted. Thanks Elise. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Nigel Roberts. CcNSO Council Member and Member of the FOI Working Group. I just want to follow up on the last two speakers, and interestingly enough there’s a common thread. The FOI Working Group

was working on interpretation. That's construction of existing policy. Nothing we have done – and in fact we've been very careful, and it's been very tempting on occasions to try and slip into creative interpretation – has been policy making.

From Lesley's point of view, or question, I think I'm extremely optimistic about the reaction of the GAC and in fact any other SIP in this, because we have spent a lot of time interpreting the words that we have in front of us, from both the binding policy; RFC 1591 and the guidance, which is the GAC Principles. If somebody wishes to go against our interpretation, at the very minimum they have to offer a credible alternative interpretation. Because of the diversity of opinion, the diversity of membership of the Working Group, I'm pretty confident that in 99 per cent of cases, what we've done is the meaning of the existing policy.

The same thing applies from the point of view of Elise saying that she looks forward to implementing this once it's been approved. I have to take a little bit of issue with this, because the existing policy binds ICANN/IANA right now. If you want to do something different from what the considered interpretation is – even if it's only in draft form right now – again, you must put forward a credible and comprehensive alternative to the way we're looking at things, because this policy's in operation right now and has been since 1994.

So it's not optional. It's not that we're putting in new policy. This is existing policy. We're just saying in a bit more detail what we think it means, and so we can't really talk about transfers of intellectual property in terms of the second-level zone file, because RFC 1591 didn't cover that, and that would be something for PDP or negotiation

between whoever owned the zone file at the time. That's out of scope for what we did. I hope that's some useful comments.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks Nigel. I think the odds have gone up to 2:1, Lesley. Yes, I think over to Jay. Bart's correcting me on the queue. [Annabette 00:57:20]

[ANNABETTE LANG]: [Annabette Lang], .nl. I would like to follow up on Lesley's question and also what Nigel said, and my experience with the GAC, from my former life. The most important thing now in my view is to get the GAC on board. Those who are sitting in this Working Group have worked with it so long that it's important to get new readers, if they haven't really followed the process, to interpret it in the same way as you did. Is it as clear as you think it is?

It's important to tell the GAC that this is not new policy. It's an interpretation of what's existing today. Also, especially in connection with the revocation, I've heard some fears that the way it's explained in the paper gives a little uncertainty on when IANA can revoke. It should be very clear that it's only when it's global stability at stake, security robustness, those kinds of things, and they are really interested in finding that the rest is local. It's local responsibility, even if it's a kind of misbehavior you should try to find other ways. That should really be the last resort.

So just a little heads-up, when you're explaining this to the GAC. This morning I heard [unclear 00:59:00] from Norway say in a meeting,

between cc's and a European meeting, that he is willing to present this for the GAC. So he's on board and will try to explain.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

The odds just keep on increasing. Thank you. Just one issue though, one reservation I have with the GAC, has been some opposition from some individual GAC Members that they've brought to me on occasions. It's been because those GAC Members want the framework to create policy for them to deal with their recalcitrant ccTLD. They've been hoping that we'll create some policy on the fly to help them, and they've suggested some resistance to the framework because it's not doing that.

All I can do in those instances is say, "That's beyond the scope. If you want us to undertake policy development on certain issues relating to delegations, revocations and transfers, then bring them up and we'll entertain the idea of a PDP, but that's not the purpose of this Working Group and it's out of scope." Taking that in mind, now to Jay.

JAY DALEY:

Thank you. Jay Daley from .nz. As we know, some revocation and transfer processes take a very long time to complete. What transparency do you envisage us having during those processes?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

I think this is one of the interesting points as we were working through this. We're interpreting policy. What you're talking about is process. That is IANA's. How they consult with the community about how they're going to present this is a process question. We're not here to do

process. That wasn't our thing at all. We should not be doing that for IANA. That's actually a very bad thing for us to be doing because we don't understand their constraints from an operational point of view or that.

It doesn't mean the community can't talk to IANA about that, or IANA can't talk to the community about how it will evolve its processes for dealing with this, but that's beyond our scope as far as I'm concerned.

STAFF MEMBER:

I have a message from Becky Burr, who would like to express her apologies for not attending the meeting in person, as well as appreciation for all of the hard work of the FOI Working Group Members.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Noting Becky has been the Vice Chair of this group and often stood in for me, I think we can accept the apology, given the medical grounds that she's absent on. Also, I forgot earlier, Bill Semich, who's been a fairly active Member of the Working Group, has indicated his support for the Final Report, and his apologies for being unable to make it. Hiro and then over here.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you very much. In the Final Report, Section 5.1 says that the FOI Working Group interprets the requirement for approval from SIP to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders.

Does this mean that the government should issue a tangible document of support of the delegation or transfer?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Short answer yes, and long answer not just the government, but maybe the Computer Society and the university computers clubs and things like that. There's a measure of support. One of the concepts that IANA might entertain is having some form of feedback loop on its website, so it flags that this is happening, and that support or otherwise for the revocation and transfer could be done on line, and therefore not requiring people to go and post letters and so on.

DAVID [CARTON]:

David [Carton] from the .ie domain registry, looking after .ie. Can I add my congratulations and thanks to the Committee, first of all, for the excellent work over three very long years. You've been remarkable patient, and painstakingly gone through the detail. Can I suggest an addition to the next steps? That is to ask IANA to correct the kind of drift that has occurred on their website, in relation to delegation and redelegation.

From Ireland's point of view, the use of the term "sponsoring organization" has caused us particular problems. If the IANA website could acknowledge that it's drifted over the years, and even its TLD modification template, the very third/fourth line is asking for details of the sponsoring organization. So if you could add that line into the process, I think that would help the GAC approval, because I can say

from Ireland’s point of view, government looking at things like sponsoring organization wasn’t very helpful.

KEITH DAVIDSON: There’s a topic that we spent some time talking about in the Working Group and I thought we had agreed in the Working Group that “sponsoring organization” was a totally inappropriate term and we have recommended a replacement term?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: We were looking forward to put it in a glossary, that as with some of the other terms we just don’t understand where “sponsorship organization” came from, from the policies that apply to our universe and really should be “manager”. That’s what we’re referring, and only using “manager” all the way through.

DAVID [CARTON]: Yes, I understand, but if IANA could reflect that now on its own website then GAC Members could look at the website and see that the drift has corrected. I think it would make the acceptance and approval of the document much faster. At the moment on the website the TLD modification template 2012-02-17 is still asking for information on sponsoring organizations.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes, I think that’s a bit chicken and egg in a way. The Final Report needs to have its endorsement before we can work with IANA on its implementation.

ELISE GERICH:

I just want to respond to that. I know Nigel said earlier that there's nothing for the IANA Functions Operator to implement. These are the kinds of implementation that we're waiting for the document to be approved, because there's been long precedent of using terminology, as you say, "drifted", but we're waiting for the ccNSO to give us their FOI Report, at which point we'll mostly implement, from what I can see, language changes. The word "revocation" and "transfer" instead of redelegation.

Things of that nature are all wording changes, even though they do have some underlying concept changes. The same thing with sponsoring organization, manager. We take your point, but it is a chicken and an egg.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you Elise for the clarification. Any other comments, questions, observations? If not, gosh, we're early. If there are no other comments or questions, can we move to the cards? Be ready with your cards. It would be really nice to have some support for the framework, but how do the Members feel? A green card might indicate your acceptance of the FOI. The orange, you're still not quite sure and might feel it needs more work, and the red means you don't like it and we should start again.

Can we have a show of cards, or hands if you don't have cards. Green? Are there any orange? Red? I think we can note that in the record as being unanimous agreement for the framework, so thank you very

much. My sincere thanks to all the Members of the Working Group who've worked through this. We've met so frequently. It's been about once every two weeks, inter-sessionally, between ICANN Meetings. For those people who've had the tenacity and perseverance to often be on calls, from 3:00 am to 5:00 am and so on, thank you very much. We've hopefully got to the very last stages of this long race. Thank you

With that we can relinquish the floor back to Katrina or Byron. We'll give you back this half hour and a further half hour later in this morning's agenda. Thank you all very much.

KATRINA SATAKI:

This was an unexpected gift from FOI people. We've got 25 minutes before the meeting with the Board. I could sing a song perhaps? A couple of announcements then. As I already mentioned, we have the ccNSO Cocktail tonight. Here Gabi has beautiful cards. These are not invitations. They have the full information on them about the event; how to get there, when it starts, how long it's going to last and who is the generous sponsor of the event.

Gabi has all the invitations. Please pick your invitation up and enjoy the evening. Byron? I once chaired a lot of extra minutes with you. Would you like to comment on anything? Thank you very much. In that case I'll just go back to my highlights for those who were not here and did not hear the highlights this morning. Every time we have these Q&A sessions with our nominees, especially before elections, and you have to make a choice about who you want to support during the election. This time we don't have elections at all because in each region we have only one nominee, who has been seconded.

Still, we have a Q&A session scheduled for today. We sent several invitations to the community to ask your questions. Ask the questions you'd like to hear the answers to from your potential and current representatives on the ccNSO Council. What would you like them to do? What would you like to know about the candidates, about their work on the ccNSO, about the ccNSO? The same goes regarding the Board nominee. Again, we have one Board Nominee, Mike Silber, who's represented us for several years on the ICANN Board and he does a great job.

Still, maybe you have some questions. Maybe you want some specific aspect of his work to be improved. Please don't be shy. You can ask your questions directly during the session. If you are shy and don't want to ask your question you can send your question to the ccNSO Secretariat email or you can talk to Lesley. Lesley is ready to grill the candidates and ask all the questions you want to ask. You can do it now or use the coffee break before the session to ask her.

I'll elaborate more on this session. We'll start with some short reports from our representatives on Accountability Working Group, Jordan, and the ICG Working Group, Martin. Other Members of those Working Groups are also welcome and I hope they'll be present in the room. They will participate. In the discussion we'll also have Theresa Swineheart from ICANN. She'll give an update on the changes of this accountability process. I hope that Keith wants to say something more?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you. We just noticed, looking at the meeting schedule, that the ICANN Board Meeting with the ccNSO is marked as 9:45 am, in five

minutes time, rather than at 10:00 am on our schedule. I don't know whether we want to move now or not?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you for noting that. We'll try to find out and inform you very shortly. Thank you very much Keith. If you have a look at the schedule, we have another FOI presentation right after the meeting. Yes we do. You asked for that. They changed it? Okay. We must go now. They changed it, so we have to go now. Thank you for being with us, and please reconvene after the meeting.¹

[Tape change to ccNSO-members-2-14oct-en]

KATRINA SATAKI: Dear colleagues, please take your seats. Dear colleagues. Those 30 minutes that the FOI Working Group saved for us, they used those 30 minutes reporting to the GAC. Meanwhile we had to reshuffle our Agenda, so now we'll have a report from the Secure Email Communication Working Group and after that hopefully everyone will come back and we'll have a Q&A session, right after the presentation. Please take your seats. Jacques, the floor is yours.

JACQUES LATOUR: Hello. My name is Jacques. I'm with [.ta 00:03:16] and Fred from .br. I'm here to present our status update on the Secure Email Communication for ccTLD Incident Response Working Group – SECIR for short. We started the SECIR Working Group about three months ago.

It's a follow up from another Working Group, the Contact Repository Implementation Working Group, and in there there was a recommendation to build a contact repository for all ccTLDs, and a secure email system for ccTLDs to communicate with each other.

The objective of the Working Group is to implement a secure service by Q4 2014. That's the objective that was stated in the other Working Group. So far we've been meeting almost weekly and we're actually making progress on that. The idea is to build a contact repository of all the security contacts within each ccTLD, so that potentially we could send an email to all the ccTLDs on the planet, one shot, reaching all the right people. That's the objective we're working on.

The goal also is to build a system and production by Q4 with very near zero cost, so as low cost as possible. We'll look at that in our requirements. The goal of the platform that we need to select, it needs to integrate with regional organizations like CENTR and LACTLD and so on. The idea is if you're a contact once in the global repository, then you can be assigned to a region and we don't have to duplicate information, so it makes it more efficient. The goal also is to be bigger than the ccNSO. It's to reach all ccTLDs on the planet.

I don't know if you can see this well. Basically the idea is that we've looked at various models to create the repository. The challenge is populating the system with the contact information and we've decided based on our requirement to use a delegation model where the ccTLD manager assigns security and stability contacts in the system, and basically the database is for ccTLDs, used by ccTLDs. All the contacts in there, for example the requirements say that for .ca all the people need

to have [unclear 00:06:25] email addresses. You can't use personal addresses. It's for ccTLDs to be used.

This piece here is the contact repository, and then it integrates with a secure messaging system. The idea is that any individual in the secure repository could send an email to all of their contacts for all the ccTLDs, and that's the first ring that we have here. If somebody detects an incident, that person can send to the entire group a notification that something's happening in this region, or whatever. The objective is that out of that incident people could create Sub-Working Groups to deal with specific incidents, like DNS or all that stuff.

They've the ability to create a separate Working Group based on the security incident, with the right people, and also have the option to invite external people in those groups to manage the security incident. We've documented the requirement for this. We've documented what the repository should look like, what the email system should look like, and how the overall administration of that system should look.

One of the big objectives was to integrate with regional groups. There are multiple options we're looking at, but potentially if you send an email to all contacts, either the email goes to the global group and not the regional group, or if the email goes to the regional group as well. So we need to figure out how the integration of say CENTR security people would integrate with this system. So we still have a few questions to look at. Once we started to look at this there's an open source platform that's available, that meets the requirement to do this.

The issue is it's a piece of software, so we need somebody to run the software; to tune it, to meet his requirement. We've had discussion

with the DNS OARC to operate this platform on our behalf, to administer the platform, and also to customize to meet our need initially. We're looking at costs. The Working Group has a very low cost email system. There might be some cost for customization or operation in the future, so that's something we need to look at, but I don't think it's an exorbitant amount of money. It's something we can afford.

The Ops-Trust platform is being open sourced right now, and DNS OARC will be looking at implementing that. We're making good progress. Also this Saturday there was a DNS OARC AGM, and we've presented this to the DNS OARC community and there was no objection for having OARC to run this. So we're in a good position to have a functional secure repository and email system by Q4 this year, or maybe a little later depending on resource availability.

Next steps. We need the SECIR Working Group based on if you approve this approach we'll wrap up requirement. We'll supply that to DNS OARC. In return they're going to give us what it costs to have the secure platform up and running. By the next ICANN Meeting we should probably have training slides close, as to how to use the system and how to join the secure mailing system. We have two feedback questions. Based on this, show your green card or raise your hand if you're in favor?

I'd like to know if you're in favor of the model we presented or not? The second question is are you okay in having DNS OARC operate this platform on our behalf? Question one, green? Okay. People not in favor? So far so good. We'll work with that model. The second one is, are you okay in having DNS OARC as an organization to operate this

platform on our behalf? Okay. People who have issues with DNS OARC raise your hand? Done deal. Check. Thank you.

This is the people on the Working Group. Me, Erwin, Christian couldn't make it here. He's the Chair. Nice. [Gander 00:12:33]. He was supposed to be here. That's all. Thank you. Questions? [Applause]

KATRINA SATAKI: Please, all the nominees come up to the table to answer the questions.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. We're going to move onto the well-advertised session, talking with our Nominees to the ccNSO Council and also our Nominee to the Board. Several of you have said to me candidates should have a grilling. Some of you have said they should have a light toasting. I'm going to rely on you also asking questions, but as you imagine, I have some that I've thought up just in case people don't have questions. I think I'm missing Margarita.

Our time for this session has been cut short a bit, so I'll ask candidates for nice precise, crisp questions. We had a lovely example earlier of a very non-crisp and lengthy question. Please don't copy that. First of all we're going to start with questions for the ccNSO Nominees. Interestingly, all of you have been on the ccNSO before for varying lengths of time. Let me just prewarn you – I'm going to start with Katrina. For all of you, let's look back a minute.

When you first stood for the Council, why did you stand and what were you hoping to achieve? Katrina, you've been on the Council since 2012

so this is your first time you're re-standing. Look back a minute. What were you hoping to do?

KATRINA SATAKI:

I've been asking myself the same question. Why did I stand? I was approached by [Johanni 00:16:05] and he was about to leave. Unfortunately he could not continue his term on the Council and therefore he asked me if I would agree if he nominated me for the remaining term. Then there was Andre, who was a second candidate, and we had to fight against each other. We were good friends. It seemed, "Yes, I can do that, and I can do something good for the community."

I perceive the next question. I wanted to do much more than I did, so therefore I really would be happy to continue three more years, to complete some things that I still have in my mind but still haven't managed to do.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Same question of Vika. Vika, this would be your third term on the Council. You've been around since 2009 on the Council. What have you achieved and what more would you hope to do in a third term?

VIKA MPISANE:

That's an interesting one Lesley. [unclear 00:17:24] honest you could say one of the achievements has been to make sure nobody stands to contest elections against me, from the region, but that's not an achievement. I think the most important thing has been to synergize the

flow of issues from the ccNSO [unclear 00:17:42] to the region they represent, Africa.

Having been with the regional TLD organization there for six years as well, as a member, that's been one of the key achievements, as well as participating and having the presence of the African region in the ccNSO Working Groups and structures. I've been with the Finance Working Group. I was for a couple of years in the Program Working Group. That's pretty much what's been achieved in the last few years.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. Young-Eum, now you amazingly have been on the Council since 2004 and don't look a day older than when you started. What were you trying to achieve and what do you hope to achieve now?

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thank you Lesley, and so do you. Well, it takes me back to the creation of the ccNSO and the heated debate we had within the ccTLD when we were under the DNSO, a constituency of the DNSO. We were having this heated debate about whether the cc's were being given the appropriate recognition within ICANN, as we should have, and the fact that ICANN had recognized that and during its reform it gave the cc's an SO status, and that's why the cc's decided to remain a part of ICANN, and the ccNSO was created.

I was fortunate to be a part of that debate and I strongly felt that the cc's needed a strong voice within ICANN. Because I was there and knew I was able to contribute a little bit to that process, I thought if I could continue doing that, I would. So here I am, after all these years.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Byron, 2009 you joined. I seem to take some of the responsibility for that, so I'll admit to that up-front. This is your second term you've just completed. You're up for a third.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, I think you do bear some responsibility for this. I seem to remember being volun-told at some point that I should participate, and suddenly here I am, all these years later. In terms of a third term, I'm interested in continuing on in terms of the role I have as a Councilor, for a couple of reasons. One, I find from a personal front the work that we do to be relevant, important, interesting, and certainly, given the events that have unfolded since March in the US Government announcement, absolutely critical to all of us, and certainly to my own organization in CIRA.

Not only do I find the work interesting, but it's absolutely critical to the health of my organization. So on a personal front there's that, but I think much more importantly than that is that I believe in the work that this organization does, that we represent very well within the ICANN community. I think that while we're very different in many ways among each other, we often are able to represent a common reasoned, calm, thoughtful front, on significant issues in the overall ICANN fold.

For the time-being I have support of my Board, which gives me the opportunity and the time to actually devote to these kinds of issues on behalf of this group, and I'm happy to do that.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you Byron. You mentioned time, and I have some stats on time in a while. I was going to ask about people’s ability develop and commit to the time that’s needed to be on the Council, but before we do that, Margarita, this would be your second term on the ccNSO Council. Why did you stand, first of all, and why are you re-standing?

MARGARITA VALDES: First of all I need to thank too, [Nick Tilly 00:22:44] because they support me. My first question was to my Director, Patricio, if he supported the idea to reapply for the Council. Second, I have the normally perceived support of my colleagues in the region, in Latin America. We are very active in LACTLD. In the case of me, to have this support and time, and the motivation to contribute to this community, it’s an excellent place to do it. I’d love to have more participation in the groups.

Sometimes I felt a little shy in terms of I’m not a native English speaker, so sometimes the discussions are very hard for me. But I put my best effort for that, and my expectation in this term is to have more participation in other groups that need more Councilors in them.

LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. Okay. Has anyone any questions? Otherwise I can carry on with my list. Mathieu, I’m relying on you.

MATHEIU WEILL: Thank you Lesley. Thank you everyone for the clear descriptions. I’m happy to see the quality of the candidates. My question will go to Byron, not as a candidate for the North America region, but more of the

Chair of the Council. It strikes me that we have a range of elections this year with only one candidate per seat on the Council. You may have heard there are discussions about accountability right now. I think the democracy, accountability and elections are one way to hold the Councilors accountable.

I have a concern that because we're not really into elections, we're not actually promoting our model as a democratic and accountable model for Councilors. My question is, how does a Council take that into account? Is that a concern that you share within the Council? How would you plan to address this in the future?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Just to be clear – in terms of how the Council is accountable to the community? How Councilors could be accountable to the community. Certainly overall I think that that should be a concern – not that there's any particular issue to be concerned about right now, but without a doubt that should be one of our concerns at all times – how are we accountable. There's the democratic process that we're engaged in. On the other hand, as you can see from most of the regions, there's only one candidate.

So yes, there's an election taking place, but it doesn't have the accountability function inherent in an election where there's more than one candidate, so of course that's a concern. Part of the accountability I think is trying to tease our more people to participate in the election process, more people to stand up for roles on the Council. I also look to all the people who are sitting here in this room to think about standing

and running – obviously not this time but in the future – to make sure that we have a healthy, accountable group of potential Councilors.

I think that’s one thing right there – how we tease out more people to participate here. That would help ensure overall accountability. I think there are probably some other practical, logistical things that we could do – just in terms of participation and what I would call co-accountability. How do we hold each other on the Council, in particular, but in the broader community – for the work that we’re doing, or not, our participation in Working Groups, etcetera, or not?

On that front, I think it’s up to us as Councilors to make sure that we hold our peers on Council as accountable as possible, on a day-to-day basis, and whether that’s making sure you’re on a phone call, where sometimes we don’t get quorum because people don’t show up. It’s incumbent upon us to do those kinds of things, to hold each other accountable. Those would be a sort of general, higher-level principle in terms of more people participating in the process, and another specific tactical thing that we need to make sure we have in terms of the culture of the Council.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you Byron. I was going to raise exactly that issue actually, on participation, because when I was Chair, sometimes it was difficult to get a quorum on the Council, for decisions. Also, it was sometimes very difficult to encourage people to participate. I have some participation stats here that I could embarrass various candidates with, but I won’t. I would just say, you are elected in a personal capacity, but you cannot act

without support – support from your employer, support from your family, support from others around you.

Can I run down the line again and ask people to comment on how much support they have for standing this year? Also, whether they would like to be able to participate more, or whether they feel they are exemplary in terms of the level of attendance and support they are able to provide to the ccNSO? Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. That’s a good question. I’d like to start by thanking Dina from .lt for nominating me, and [Baguelis] from .gr for seconding it. Talking about support, Dina promised never, ever to nominate me again. I have to do my best to finish everything I started and everything I have in my mind within the next three years. Here I can see Giovanni is supporting me, showing a picture saying “We love you”. I really feel that I have support from colleagues, and it really means a lot. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Margarita, are you able to attend enough? You were talking earlier about increasing your participation?

MARGARIA VELDES:

Yes, absolutely. Well, as I said, in this... Always my role is to be in the conference calls and participate. Normally when some issues are interesting for my community, normally I send emails to LACTLD that it permits they could be updated, but it’s happening in the Council.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Vika?

VIKA MPISANE: Yes, support is important, as you said, from your employer, because you have to allocate some time to these meetings. From your family as well, and also from the community, especially in my case from AFTLD. They were the ones who've nominated me all these times around, because [unclear 00:31:15] accountability that may [unclear] trusting. For me, this time around I had to at some point explain certain things to AFTLD about my participation or lack thereof in the past year, which was clarified.

I [told them 00:31:30] that is an important accountability measure, to say, "Listen, we saw this and this was not happening. What was the reason?" As part of the nomination and being [seconded 00:31:43] into this.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you Lesley. I thought this was going to be a moment of self-criticism, recognizing the deficiencies of myself so far. I have to admit that I haven't been as active as I should have been, especially within the AP region. I see that there's a lot more coordination among regions like Latin America and Europe. Actually, that's what the AP region has been discussing, the suggestion of Dawn, who mentioned that the AP region should get something together.

We should start something that maybe the Latin American and European region has been doing. We've been discussing that and we are going to discuss that, and I think that's something that I'd like to start more active things on.

LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. I think it's key for people to give that accountability, and thank you for your honesty on that. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: In terms of support I have the support of my organization currently and I can say that, and be held accountable because the Chair of my Board is in the room as we speak. I do have support from my Board at this time, and we believe that overall the work of the ccNSO and in particular the issues around IANA and accountability are critical to us all and critical to us as individual organizations, and therefore I currently have the support of my Board in participating. Also, in my organization generally I have the benefit of having policy people to support me in the day-to-day activities of the ccNSO.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Any more questions for ccNSO candidates before I move onto Mike? Not literally. No? Could we just express our thanks to the candidates for standing, for being successfully nominated, and subject to the Council resolution tomorrow, duly elected. We look forward to you delivering on those commitments. Thank you. Mike, where are you? First elected by the ccNSO in 2009, and then for a second term, you're

up for a final term, which would be your last one, if I understand the bylaws correctly?

MIKE SILBER: My last consecutive one.

LESLEY COWLEY: Your last consecutive one? Gosh, you're a sucker for punishment. So you're there as a Board Member, therefore you're independent, but of course you regularly come and are accountable to the ccNSO community. Do you think the ccNSO is given sufficient consideration at the ICANN Board? What are your successes in terms of bringing our views to the attention of the Board? What are areas where maybe with hindsight things could have been done slightly differently?

MIKE SILBER: Thanks Lesley. It's a bit stage. Firstly, thank you to those who have nominated me. I think it's worth discussing the question of the nomination and the status of the ccNSO process around selection of Board Members, but let's get onto that a little bit later. In terms of is the ccNSO taken seriously enough, I think it is, but I think there's hard work in doing that. Possibly because this is a community that gets on and does its own work, first and foremost, that unless the ccNSO community is making a particular fuss about a particular issue.

For example, that's could be around accountability and transparency. The rest you need to keep dragging back and saying, "It's not all about gTLDs." In a very similar vain, my colleagues selected by the NRO have a

very similar situation, where they keep going back saying, “It’s not only about names. Yes, the main focus may be names, but it’s not only about names.” I think that’s one of the critical things. You’re not there as an advocate.

You’re not there as a cheerleader for the SO that appoints you, but at the same time, keeping that focus when so much of the noise and attention is in the gTLD space is absolutely critical. I think that’s something that I’ve done reasonably well. In my first term it wasn’t always easy because the ccNSO had another appointee who was not necessarily focused on the views of the ccNSO and seemed to have used his selection by the ccNSO to get onto a bigger stage. Great person, a great candidate, but his focus seemed to wane from this issue.

My perspective, first and foremost, is somebody who comes from the cc community. I still serve on Vika’s Board, and until such time as our administer appoints a new Board, it seems that I’m pretty stuck there. But my passion, my background, my history, is on the country codes. While I’m not directly and operationally involved, I think I have that as a first point of view. The one thing I need to throw back to you is say because I’m not directly involved on a day-to-day basis as a ccNSO Manager, I need possibly more input than for example somebody like Chris. Chris, being a cc Manager is more familiar with some of the day-to-day challenges.

I could use some additional feedback on where the touch points are, where the pain points are, what’s going on. Because the other thing that I think I bring – and I’m not sure if it’s good or bad – is that I actually have a day job that’s outside of this industry. I work for a Telco that

builds fiber networks across Africa, so I'm not fully immersed in the DNS industry. We can ask the question of whether that's good or bad, and I think there are points to be made on both sides – that not being in the DNS industry on a full-time basis, I add additional perspective, I bring certain values that come from a general business and governance perspective.

But it also means that I'm not necessarily drinking Cool Aid on a daily basis. Sometimes I need more input, and that I think is the responsibility of the SO that sends me – to actually provide me with that feedback and involve me, immerse me, in some of the issues that they're facing.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. I think I heard about getting those connections up and running effectively and so on. What successes have you had? What things do you feel particularly proud of?

MIKE SILBER:

Being involved in the selection of the new CEO, who I think has brought a fresh air to the way we do things at ICANN. Pushing back very hard on some of the management decisions that negatively affected the ccNSO, as well as the organization as a whole. I think two areas where I took a degree of leadership are at the moment I Chair the Board Risk Committee, and we have swung that Committee around from previously being a part-time afterthought. It's now taking a pretty focused area in the space.

I think that my dissenting voice on the New gTLD Program is something I'm also pretty proud of – to actually stand up and say, "This

organization is not mature enough to take forward some of these issues.” While my voice was drowned out by the applause, I think some of the reservations I expressed and some of the issues that I raised have come through. For example I took a huge complement yesterday from the legal staff when we were discussing some of the new gTLD evaluations and I was looking for the geographic names panel reports.

You wouldn’t be surprised to realize that there are none, because the one-sentence reporting was simply included in the initial evaluation and extended evaluation and tracked in the [disgraced tag 00:41:55] system. Then go and look at the community priority evaluations. There are comprehensive reports, standalone reports, on each and every evaluation; well-reasoned, well thought through, and I didn’t draft them. But I was used as the litmus in terms of what’s expected of ICANN in terms of actually delivering documents against which decisions can be measured and evaluated.

That’s a fire against a hold of every person’s feet in this organization – staff, my Board colleagues, and the SOs and ACs. It’s, “Don’t just express an opinion and because you’ve put it in a document think that it’s there.” It actually needs to be motivated, justified, and it needs to be accessible to people going forward, so that there’s a record of the decision made, as well as the thinking and the reasoning behind that record.

That’s something that I’m going to keep banging on about – whether it’s in the IANA transition, the accountability and transparency, or day-to-day operations. We need to be open, we need to be transparent, we

need to be able to access not just the decision but also the thinking and the reasoning behind the decision.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Can I just check if anyone in the audience wants to ask a question? In which case we'll get you a mic. I'm eating into your schedule here Katrina. I know Byron had a question as well. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Mike, thank you for standing, first off, and having been a Board Member, which I know is a considerable time requirement. My question is one of governance overall, particularly as we go into these interesting times around IANA and accountability. That's in the context of you are a Board Member of a US private corporation, and that has a very clear set of requirements in terms of duty of care and duty of loyalty to do what's in the best interests of that corporation, and not necessarily what's in the best interest perhaps of the constituency that put you there.

I don't say that to frame it up negatively. That's just the fact of private corporation law in the US. Can you talk to us a little bit about how you bring forward the interest of the community that you're from, given the requirements you have in terms of duty of loyalty in the organization you're a Board Member of?

LESLEY COWLEY: Let's accumulate the questions we have. Roelof and then Mathieu and then Don.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you Lesley. Mike, it's always been a tension, and I know that it has the specific attention of the ICANN Board now, but can you give us a bit of your insights on how the time or the attention of the CEO should be spent between improving the quality of the organization itself and things like globalization, and Internet governance in the global scene?

LESLEY COWLEY: Don't forget, we've still got the session with Board Members coming to visit the ccNSO at some stage I think, Katrina, on the schedule? We're not sure. Mathieu and then Don please.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much Mike for standing. I know it's a very, very heavy involvement and commitment that you've demonstrated for several years now. I'd like to ask for a very concise answer on a very brief question – which are the two or three items that we, as ccNSO Members, can hold you accountable to in your next term?

LESLEY COWLEY: Don?

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you. Don Hollander from APTLD. Mike, how well do you think your colleagues on the Board understand the special nature of ccTLDs, and what effort is being made for the new Board Members to make sure that they understand the special nature of the ccTLDs, and your role in that? Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Right, so if I just briefly summarize – that was questions around independence and also at the same time being elected by a constituency. CEO time, where should it be dedicated? The three things you will deliver, or plan to deliver, and Board understanding of ccTLDs.

MIKE SILBER: Got them. Thanks Lesley. Thanks for all of the questions. Regarding this question of the best interests of the best interests of the corporation and whether there’s a contradiction over that, I don’t see it as such. I think it does create a slight nuance in terms of when you’re viewing, considering, possibly even voting on an issue. But ultimately, while this organization doesn’t have members or shareholders, ultimately the best interests of the corporation have to be aligned, in my opinion, with the public benefit as regards the operation of the Internet’s unique identifiers.

In my view, there is no ability to advance the interests of the corporation ahead of the public benefit. Now, I do understand that there may be certain direct operational decisions, where there may appear not to be a full regard for public interest, but ultimately my view is that these are stakeholders. The public good is ultimately our God, and the interest of the corporation cannot contradict that. I don’t see there as being a significant tension over that. It does mean occasionally on issues like officer compensation and things like that, items are kept secret, confidential, until the [minority 00:48:35] is published, in terms of some of the decisions we make may not be fully transparent. That’s an

interesting further debate, but I personally take the notion of public interest throughout.

Then in terms of the program for the year, what Roelof is talking about, it might be interesting to get Chris's view there as well. I think there are many voices in the community that regard too much time having been spent on external issues in the last year, and possibly not enough on internal issues. My view is that your house needs to be in order for you to go out and say, "We're the right custodian for certain of these functions," "We're the right entity to take forward certain of these roles," or, "We'd like to be a willing partner and participant in certain issues where we're not going to be the custodian, but we're a significantly interested partner."

In that regard, I really think that this year has to be a year of internal consolidation. While we can't take our eye off what's happening externally, I think that we need to do a lot of evaluation. The initial part of the New gTLD Program is coming to an end, which means we need to do a lot of internal analysis, introspection, what was good, what was not good? Are we going to launch further rounds as the gNSO policy requires? What is involved there? Secondly is accountability, and I think that's a huge issue. It's very difficult for us, and whether you want to couple or decouple the issues, it's very difficult for us to go ahead.

Especially so when we do have a history and a legitimate history of complaints around process followed or not followed, of decisions taken or not taken, and while the decisions may have been correct, the communication having been absolutely awful. I think these are all areas that need us to say if we're going to be taken seriously as a mature

organization, we need to make sure that we behave in a mature manner in how we interact with people.

That doesn't mean as maybe you had the experience when you were children, being sent out of the room when the adults were talking. If we're going to expect everybody to treat us like adults, then all the adults need to be in the room when the discussion is had. There are no secret deals. There are no misunderstandings or *fait accompli*, which are then presented to the community without the community being engaged.

Mathieu, I think really excellent question. In terms of the two or three things, that's an interesting thing, because is that things that I will deliver versus ICANN will deliver? It's a question I'd like to engage with you and with the ccNSO a little further, because I'd have absolutely no objection putting together a set of KPIs and coming back to you in a year's time and saying, "Mike, please present against your KPIs." It's something I'd like to give a bit more thought to, and I'd be very interested in what the community's thought is, in terms of what should comprise those KPIs. I have no problem with the notion of let's look at some key deliverables and how we get there.

Then lastly, Don, in terms of your question, no, it's really not well understood. As much as Chris and I try very hard, for example on Sunday morning we had a policy briefing, all of the policy staff explaining what's going on. Bart did his presentation. There were questions because people didn't understand how this fitted in. We're keeping on having to repeat because the experience of the majority of people on the Board, even those who are not US-centric and have experience of

their own country code, they don't understand the special nature of the ccTLD community and the specific provisions that are put in around the creation of the ccNSO.

It's an ongoing requirement that they be reminded and that the issue be raised. Unfortunately, because of the volume of work that's coming in, and a lot of it gTLD related, in three months' time you need to remind them again, and two months after that you need to remind them then. To some extent, whoever the ccNSO selects for the Board position, they have to have the patience to keep coming back to that same issue and raising it in a polite but firm manner and saying, "You're ignoring the special nature of the ccNSO. You're ignoring the impact of the IANA function on ccTLDs. This is not just a gTLD or general global Internet governance issue.

"Those of us in country rely on the predictability of the IANA function for connectivity in our country. Don't forget that you need to pay regard to that." That's something that unfortunately fades away after a little while and needs to be brought up again, and people need to be reminded.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. I think we need to close it there because we have exceeded our time, but I think that was a very good set of questions, and thank you for your answers Mike. As you know, quite a few people in the ccNSO are very keen on KPIs, so we may well take you up on your offer for KPIs for the next term.

MIKE SILBER:

Absolute pleasure Lesley. My one comment that I would make, if I could close – and apologies for jumping in of the time – is I’m term-limited, so this is my last term, or at least my last successive term. I was somewhat disappointed that there was nobody who was willing to run again, so this time or in three years’ time you have no option. You’ve got to find somebody. For any of you who are in the room who may be interested, please come and talk. The ICANN Board is a bit of a learning curve.

The idea is as far as possible – and I know the ccNSO is effective and efficient and gets people in a year before the term starts – but Chris and I are there to mentor, to help. If anybody’s interested and wants to understand the time commitment now rather than in three years’ time, waking up and doing this in a rush, please come and talk to me. We need to look at good succession planning. We need to look at good options, and I would like to start doing that now.

If people are interested, if they’re just contemplating it, I’m more than happy to keep it confidential so you’re not accused of lobbying or jockeying for position. But if you’ve got any questions, you want any insights in terms of how the Board works, time commitments, whatever else is required, please come and chat to me. I’m always available.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you Mike, and we’ll make sure that that offer is shared more widely with people who maybe aren’t able to be in the room today. Please join me in thanking you and everyone on the Panel for this session. Thank you. [Applause]

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. We reconvene at 2:00 pm sharp. Yes, in 14 minutes, because we have guest presenters. Please be here on time. Thank you.

[Tape change to ccNSO-members-3-14oct-en]

HIRO HOTTA: Good afternoon. Can we take our seats? We're going to talk about the IGF and the diverse IGF initiatives. I'd like to thank [unclear 10:50], Janis Karklins and Staffan Jonsson for giving this presentation. As you know, the IGF is turning nine years, nine events so far, and the continuation of its Mandate has been discussed for the next five or ten years. There have been several regional initiatives regarding the IGF, regional IGFs, national IGFs, and recently there were some other global initiatives like the IGF Supporting Association, Net Alliance and all these kinds of new organizations trying to support this global initiative.

We're going to listen to this presentation and we're going to hear from Staffan as well a little bit about the Plenipot ITU happening in Busan, Korea, during this month, which of course has to do with the Internet governance developing in the future. Please Samantha, do you want to start?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Hi, I'm Sam Dickinson. For some of you who heard a presentation from me at the CENTR Meeting, this is kind of like that but it's got more pictures. Some larger context of why Internet governance is becoming

more complex – we all know about IANA stewardship transition, the fact that the New gTLD Program has blurred the lines between the types of TLDs there are, but it's blurred the line between ccTLDs, gTLDs. The geographical indications has blurred the boundaries between international trademark issues, trade issues, and Internet issues.

We all know about Snowden. The fact that we keep getting these really large security incidents, that we then find out that the flaws have been there for years, that worries governments. We've recently had a case in the US where there's an attempt to seize the assets of the Iranian, Syrian and North Korean ccTLDs, as being associated with countries that are harboring terrorists.

Also, respective roles of stakeholders. We've had a few interesting discussions in the last few years. The stakeholder groups in the Tunis Agenda that came out of the WSIS process listed the private sector, civil society, governments, intergovernmental organizations. The technical community actually wasn't a standalone group. It was considered to be part of each of those groups. Nowadays the technical community exists. It started existing in the UN space with the CSTD Working Group on Internet Governance. It was the technical and academic communities.

Academia would like to break away from that. What do you do when you want to start forming individual groups? You can see it happening here at ICANN, as new gTLDs have come along. What used to be a fairly cohesive group of gTLD operators has now broken into brands, communities, etcetera. So the Internet governance ecosystem is a little bit hazier than it was ten years ago. What is the role of different stakeholders? If there are respective roles in different [unclear

00:14:30], what are they? What's the role of governments in a truly multistakeholder, bottom-up process? What's the role of non-governments in a multi-lateral process?

This is my scary slide. There's a lot there. I think this will go up on the website somewhere so you can read this at your leisure. This is an attempt to just try and pick out some of the biggest global events that are happening and where they've come from. I don't have a pointer, but on the top left-hand side you'll see this all started back in 1998. I don't think I was using the Internet in 1998, not in Brisbane. It goes back a long way.

Now, if you look at that, the WSIS Tunis phase goes down into the IGF and enhanced cooperation, and I've got a few boxes saying various consultations, ccTLD Working Group on Enhance Cooperation. Now, I'm sure you've all heard of Mandelbrot Sets, that the more you drill down the more complex it gets. It doesn't start becoming simpler. Well, this is enhanced cooperation. They just get more complex. The more you look at things, the more processes there are.

I suppose the point I'm trying to say here is don't think that if you start looking at one area you're going to understand it. It's going to get just as complex. The Net Mundial initiative started off as the Net Mundial Alliance. It's not the initiative. Quite possibly, I've heard rumors that the name is going to change, partly because the Brazilians are very unhappy apparently that the name of their meeting has been appropriated. Many who went to August launch, which was just before IGF, they went open-minded and came away feeling disillusioned, which is never a good sign.

Many of them felt that the process had been overly-designed. They had no chance for input there. For me, I'm actually not bothered if it's a top-down process. I know that's probably a bit heretical in this community, but for me the Internet governance ecosystem is big enough. There's more than enough topics for us all to have our own little space to play in; that there is space for us to possibly have a top-down initiative that's for business leaders. It may work, it may not.

I think the problem with the way the initiative was launched was there was a mixture of language. It used a lot of the language of multistakeholderism, but it also used the language of executive leadership and that's where people weren't sure what it was and distrusted what it was about. Part of the problem here is that we have a lot of important events coming up in the next year, particularly the plenipotentiary, which we'll hear about later, and the UN GA's WSIS Plus Ten High-Level Event.

There were virtually no developing countries that attended the event, the launch in August. I think there was something like seven developing country representatives out of 77, which is a really small percentage. If developing countries are feeling marginalized further from Internet governance processes because of an initiative like the Net Mundial Initiative, will this affect the way they participate in these big inter-governmental meetings coming up? I've come up with an acronym myself – IYAI: Is It Yet Another Internet Governance Initiative? Will it work?

One of the positive outcomes I can see happening is that people who are suspicious of this will think, "No, we really, really need to support the

IGF,” so that may drive people into the arms of the IGF, which is a good thing. Or, is it going to be something that people use as proof to show that the Internet governance system as it is today really isn’t working? Here’s another graphic. Some key global meetings that are coming up in the next year and a bit. As you can see, it’s a really crowded calendar. There’s no way you can follow all of this and do your daily work.

Just for one example, if you look in the bottom left-hand corner, this is when the consultations start for the UN-wide review of WSIS. This is a really important event, but you just look at everything else that’s happening. That’s just before the target end-date for the implementation of the new stewardship mechanism for IANA. Where do we get the time to follow all of this?

System highlights – we saw that calendar at the start, the really scary one. I’ve picked four. I’m not going to talk about Plenipot. I’m not going to talk about IGF. In January, the World Economic Forum holds its annual meeting in Davos. They will be discussing the future of the Net Mundial Initiative. The World Economic Forum Meetings are not open to everyone. They do say they’ll be providing an online discussion forum. I’m not sure what that means. There will be a webcast, but we really don’t know enough yet about what’s happening to know how it’s going. I’d say just watch this space.

I pulled out from that first picture and expanded what’s happening with this high-level event at the UN GA next year. Back in 2001 there was a UN GA resolution that along with an ITU resolution led to the WSIS phase. That then led to phase two, which came out with the document that we all know as the Tunis Agenda – the Tunis Agenda for the

Information Society – IGF and the concept of enhanced cooperation came out of that.

What is actually really interesting, people say that enhanced cooperation and IGF are two separate processes, but if you follow the documentation back, that only came up in about 2010 and it was actually Perminder Singh, who was a civil society person, who was really pushing that. Before that, that language had never appeared in a UN document, but now it's there and it gets repeated each and every resolution. Next year is the ten-year anniversary of the end of the WSIS process. Last year there was supposed to be, at the end of the year, a resolution on ICTs for development, that would say what would happen.

It was so contentious no one knew what they wanted. There was a division between states that wanted it just to be a high-level PR event that said, "Hey, wasn't it wonderful what we did ten years ago?" Other states wanted it to be a full repeat of the original WSIS process, including all those preparatory meetings. There was no agreement by the time the resolution needed to be decided, so the resolutioning resolved in part to hold informal consultations.

That was supposed to end in March this year. It was still so contentious that they went through to July. The outcome was a two-day meeting, which will be happening in December 2015 as part of the UN GA, which means it's not open like the WSIS Forum. If you want to go every year to the ITU-hosted WSIS Forum, you can rock up. You can't rock up to this thing. There will be some multistakeholder representatives there, but it is a UN GA event. There will also be a preparatory process that begins in June.

That's a preparatory process for inter-governmental negotiations. As part of that there will be – and it's described in the resolution – an informal, interactive consultations with all relevant stakeholders. It depends on whether you're considered a relevant stakeholder or not. Also, that consultation, what happens to it? It may not be included, we don't know. Because it's a UN high-level event, I'm assuming that the outcome document may be a UN GA resolution, but I'm not sure.

One of the interesting things is the Tunis Agenda really was the first major UN document that supported multistakeholder participation, but as we've got to this ten-year event it's not multistakeholder. We're using the same modalities as the negotiation for those 2005 WSIS documents. I'll quickly run through this because I'm running out of time. The worst possible outcome is that the document ends up ignoring all of that multistakeholder informal consultations and ends up being another multilateral negotiation.

I don't think it's going to get rid of the multistakeholder text. It's really hard to take agreed text out of a UN document. It tends to be recycled. The battle is about new text. It may be that you get the multistakeholder text staying, but you get more multilateral text going in there. This is me on my soapbox, so I do apologize for this. We tend to just trust each other in this ecosystem. We always point the finger at someone else – ICANN. It's really easy to point to the ICANN Board, ICANN staff and say they're evil and doing things for their own nefarious purposes.

It's easy to point to ITU and say they're evil and they're doing things to take over the Internet. Why do we do this? More text, you can read

that online. I think it's part of our culture. It's easier to blame someone else than to see how you may fix the problem or be part of the solution. What can you do? How can we move forward with this? I think we need to stop being caught in the hype. There's always a lot of news reports about Russia taking over the Internet, China taking over the Internet – don't listen to those. Those are often not necessarily true.

There was a story recently about Russia having a kill switch. They wanted another kill switch with the Internet. Later Russia came out and said, "No, that's actually not true," but people don't remember that. When Russia clarifies something, that's not something that gets reported. You remember Russia wants to create their own national Internet. We also have to think about playing the longer game. When people go along to UN meetings, quite often what we do as a technical community, is we look at the scary words in proposals that come forward.

But the intergovernmental negotiation tactic is you are more extreme in your proposals, because you know you're going to end up somewhere in-between. So when you see a proposal that looks extreme to you, they're not expecting that actually to get through – they're expecting a watered-down version. So remember that. Don't be relieved at the end because you didn't get the more extreme words in there. They may have got somewhere a little bit further along the track, that may down the track be built on.

Share information. Talk to your governments. One of the things I found really useful is I'm on Skype with a lot of government folk. What that means is if they're in a meeting and something technical comes up and

they don't know the answer, they can immediately just go, "Hey Sam, can you tell me what this is about?" and that's really useful. The other thing that's really useful about Skype in intergovernmental meetings is people can't tell when you're organizing a plan.

The number of meetings I've been in with ITU where you see the governments that don't use technology stand up, walk across the room, talk to their allies, walk back, and you know they've just agreed to some plan. If you're doing it on Skype, they can't tell. Also, don't assume that everyday Internet users don't care about Internet governance. I'm sure some of you have seen the news articles about in the US, FCC put out a public comment about net neutrality. They got almost 2 million comments. That's an awful lot. That's just end users. So as ccTLD operators, you are in a position to be able to talk to your communities and your end users.

Participate. Talk to those you don't agree with, because the more we engage in conversation, the more we understand their position and may find a middle ground. If we just assume that the other side is always evil, we're never going to get anywhere. Also, all those activities, don't participate in them all. Be selective. Figure out what you can participate in. Be on government delegations if you can't participate as a ccTLD alone. Where you can, also respond to the surveys, questionnaires, RFI and comments, as there's a lot and they don't tend to get responded to. That means that organization or governments don't get a well-rounded view of what the public thinks. I'm on time. I'm doing okay.

In summary, with Internet governance, stay calm. No need to panic. Be a strategic. You're playing for the long game. Pace yourself. I can attest

to this. After IGF I was sick for two and a half weeks. I was absolutely exhausted. So as an organization, pace yourself. Share with others and engage. Be part of the solution and stop blaming others. A quick plug for what I'm doing in the next three weeks, I'm reporting from plenipotentiary, so I'll be producing live Tweets from the events, daily blogs, and anyone can use those daily blogs and repurpose them for their communities.

If you're interested, go to that URL and you can follow along. Any questions I suppose we'll save until later, but that's my context.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you Sam. Really complex scenarios and I think scary scenarios in the worst case, but also very informative for many of us to closely follow this event. It's really interesting. Let's wait for the questions. Let's now hear Janis Karklins. We'll ask questions to the presenters at the end. We're now going to listen to Janis Karklins please.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much. Let me start by asking one question. How many of you have been in any of the IGF Meetings? Please raise your hands. It's not that bad. I was told to give basic information. Actually I'll give more than basic information. IGF, as you know, is one of the central pieces of the Internet governance ecosystem. It's considered one of the major elements that support multistakeholder Internet governance model. That's why it is very important to maintain this multistakeholder engagement platform, floating with all means.

This is a conclusion of my 15-minute presentation. That does not mean that I'm stopping here, but this is the essence. IGF was created as a result of WSIS negotiations. It was created as a multistakeholder discussion platform. It's evolved in the past nine years and it's proven the necessity and usefulness. When specifically talking about [ninth 00:33:34] edition, which took place in early September in Istanbul, we had gathered more than 2,400 participants from 144 countries.

They were representing different stakeholder groups with a majority participation from Turkey, which is obvious, and Europe, but equally with a relatively high participation from Africa and Asia specifically, and Latin America maybe a little less. You know that IGF is the subject of many discussions and I wouldn't say attacks, but it represents a piece that everybody tries to regulate and then present it in its own way.

But what's important that there is an attempt of modifying the nature of the enterprise, and that is not overly good for the Forum itself. Why? Because the Forum was created as a free-floating discussion platform. The moment you start negotiating the spirit of this, the free engagement disappears and the focus goes to [commas 00:35:20] and then words. This is not what IGF was supposed to be. Therefore one of the tasks of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group is to balance between drive for more structured outcomes from the IGF and maintenance of this free-floating discussion and engagement in IGF.

Maybe it's easier to say than do. When we look backwards, IGF has always produced a number of outcomes or outputs. There's always been a report of the Chair, which is a recap of the most important substantive elements of every IGF addition. There's been a number of

spin-off initiatives, including the dynamic coalition initiatives, on different issues. We've gathered consensus around difficult questions or we have, from IGF discussions, come out with projects that need more focused attention and academic research and reflection on.

I think the questions related to Internet jurisdiction, that is led by Bertrand de la Chapelle, is one of the spin-offs out of all the IGF discussions and Internet governance processes in general. The IGF in Istanbul was the first meeting after the Net Mundial Conference organized by Brazil and ICANN. If you remember the origins of Net Mundial, that was an initiative that came out after the presentation of President Dilma Rousseff at the GA in September 2013.

The Net Mundial, at the end, produced the document that can be considered as the first ever multistakeholder negotiated document, or document negotiated in a multistakeholder manner. I think that is maybe the biggest achievement of Net Mundial, that it tested and proved that multistakeholder negotiations are feasible and can produce a good result. That put additional pressure on the IGF because we had to live up to the expectations of the community, and in preparatory process to Istanbul IGF we really tried to accommodate a number of suggestions that were encompassed in the outcome document of Net Mundial.

Starting with bringing some issues where consensus was not reached in Brazil, specifically net neutrality to IGF, and continue community discussion in this topic, but in a very structured and focused manner. Secondly, we followed the recommendations of Net Mundial in the respect of creating a link between global, regional and national IGFs, and

we'll try to implement those recommendations in the preparatory process leading us towards next year's IGF.

Finally, in preparing the Istanbul IGF, we were guided by the recommendations of the Working Group on Improvement of IGF, which will be maybe the only document against which performance of IGF will be measured, when it comes to the assessment of IGF during the WSIS negotiation process. What's important to mention about the Istanbul IGF? First of all, that was a successful meeting. We introduced a number of innovations.

Maybe the most important ones were five best practice compilations on issues like developing meaningful stakeholder mechanisms, regulation and mitigation of spam, establishment and support to CERTs for Internet security, creating an enabling environment for local content creation, and online child safety and protection. These five compilations were produced by the global Internet community, but experts, and they are now available for use by those who are interested in using them. That should be considered as a move towards a more structured outcome of the IGF.

The next element that's worth mentioning is that many critics of IGF say that IGF is just a discussion forum and nothing happens. We made a call to community asking them to provide us with information on a voluntary basis, on what has happened in-between IGF meetings in terms of decisions or very concrete actions and projects. That compilation of that information was produced and it proved that the concept as it was developed initially, that IGF is a Forum that contributes towards better

understanding of issues and informs the decision-making process, which should be done elsewhere. So we demonstrated that that was the case.

Secondly, it's worth mentioning that the big emphasis during Istanbul IGF was on the question of human rights on the Internet and specifically on freedom of expression. The Human Rights Caucus produced a joint statement, which was a few days after the end that the IGF delivered in the Human Rights Council. It's also worth mentioning that during the Istanbul IGF we launched the new initiative in support of the IGF and that is the IGF Support Association, which is a vehicle through which funding will be provided to IGF Secretariat and to participants in IGF, and specifically the focus will be put on funding national and regional IGF initiatives.

This is a little bit like a crowd sourcing project, where everybody can participate with their small contributions; individually or bigger contributions from organizations. Now we are in the process of thinking about the next addition of the IGF, which will take place in November 2015 in Brazil, [Jau Pisau 00:43:55], if I pronounce it correctly. It's in the north-east of Brazil, on the beach, and this particular meeting will be very important because it will take place a very short time before the decision on extension of the IGF will be made in WSIS Plus Ten Review Event.

We need to make sure that the IGF in Brazil produces a very good impression to governments and to the negotiation team. That is important. We will continue working in the same spirit as we prepared the Istanbul meeting, continuing putting emphasis on the tangible outcomes. We'll continue with the best practice work-stream. There

will be another five documents produced on topics that will be determined by the MAG during the first MAG meeting in early December this year in Geneva. You're most welcome to participate in that meeting and contribute.

It's also important to see how next year's IGF can contribute towards negotiations or towards the outcome document of WSIS Plus Ten Review. It was already mentioned that this WSIS Plus Ten will be intergovernmental negotiations with consultations with the multistakeholder community on relevant topics. I think it would be very useful, taking into account that the IGF will take place in November and the high-level meeting is scheduled for December, that we invite negotiators of the document to Brazil and organize this engagement with the community on a whole range of issues that would be of the community interest.

In November there should already be maybe a stabilized draft of the document and the community will have the possibility provide input to the document, and from the other side the intergovernmental negotiators will see what the IGF is about, the spirit of IGF, and hopefully that will encourage them to make a decision on the extension of the mandate of IGF for another time. If you would ask me whether I am optimistic about the future of the IGF, I think I am.

I think there is obvious need for a multistakeholder discussion platform, and if the IGF for one reason or another would not be extended, I think that another place will be created or somebody will take this initiative and carry it forward on a different legal constellation, because for the moment the IGF is an arm's length from the United Nations, which

allows very strong involvement of governments and provides certain legitimacy from the UN side. The UN Department of Economic Social Affairs is in charge of managing the UN trust fund and managing a small secretariat that works on the preparation of the IGF.

I think that we're on a good track, and all I need to say is please continue supporting the IGF with your input in substantive work and your presence in the IGF meeting next year in [unclear 00:48:12]. Thank you.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you Janis. Now let's listen to Staffan Jonsson and after that I'll ask you to prepare your questions for our three presentations.

STAFFAN JONSSON:

Good afternoon everybody. I'm Staffan Jonsson of .se and I'm talking a little bit about the next UN Conference coming up, starting this Sunday, the 19th, and going on for three consecutive weeks, ending at the beginning of November. That's one of the next steps in Internet governance going on. I will probably have a picture here. In-between I'll ask how many of you are familiar with the International Telecom Union. Hands up please if you know about the ITU? Quite a few do, or the other half are asleep.

How many of you are aware about the WCIT, the World Conference? About the same number. Half of you know about it. Good to know. As mentioned, I'm talking about the upcoming ITU Plenipotentiary Conference. What can we expect from it? It's really hard to know. I'll try to mention three things. The first one is about mapping policy decisions within the United Nations as a whole. This is a very wide area

to cover. Then I'll try to narrow it down into the International Telecom Union or the ITU, which half of you know about, at least half of you, and then about the upcoming conference in South Korea this coming Sunday.

With regards to mapping policy decisions, this is a little awkward since I have the right answer to my left, since Janis is very involved in the UN process. Let's see what's happened. I gather if you're into policy making within the UN you do find four directions for your work. You can consider it as north, south, west and east. To the south you have quite specific issues about electronic communication and infrastructure issues going on.

To your north you have human rights and especially the rights of freedom of expression online, etcetera. To the left you have the development issues within the UN and to the right you have the ambition to get economic growth working. So when setting Internet politics or Internet policy you'll probably have influence from all these four directions. Of course within the UN you'll always find the GA in the middle, and it's maybe still going on, I'm not sure.

It's of course the centerpiece of the UN and this is the two outcomes of the regulatory process last year – the right to privacy in the digital age, and information and communications technologies for development. If you go to the next step within the UN you have the four directions to turn to. This organization might probably be the most interested down south, in the International Telecom Union, and rather gaining issues on electronic communications. My point is that you might find policy initiatives from all of these directions.

To the south east in this picture you have the WSIS process, as we already mentioned. The WSIS Plus Ten. We have several outcomes of this process – the Tunis Agenda, the WSIS Forum, and the IGF. To the south you have the ITU and you have some conferences that have been going on for several years now, just to illustrate the outcome of the organization so to speak. To the south west in this picture you have a different set of organizations, more tending towards trade and development, but also interested in electronic communication.

There you have the [unclear 00:53:03], the [unclear], the CSTD and the Working Group [unclear 00:53:08] IGF, etcetera. To the north you have the more conscience-minded issues. If I may say so it's about freedom of expression online, it's about freedom of information, not to mention that somewhere in all this there is access to the Internet, which is central in some cases. The full picture, just of institutions, engaging in Internet governance, it might look like this. They have four different interests or directions pulling them apart.

The outcome is mentioned in the blue to the southeast, in these other processes mentioned just now. I won't go through them again. Let's drill down the attention into the ITU, which several might know about. It's led by Dr Hamadoun Touré at least for a while more. I'm not sure if he's stepping down yet. It's changing. So this is from the WTPF, which is one of the ITU or UN Conferences held in 2013, where he was so fed up of saying that he wasn't taking over the Internet that he actually wore a helmet. That's' brave for being this man, because people usually don't put hats on. Not in a physical way.

So what about ITU then? It's an instrument for global Internet regulation, or rather it's become one these days. It used to be about telephony. It's the first arena for international agreements originally regulating telegraph established in 1865. ITU is one of the UN organizations keeping meetings on a regular basis. As I mentioned, originally regulating telephony, but in recent years going into regulating the Internet as well, on the global or UN level. This is within the UN often a central actor in establishing these kinds of conferences.

Historically we've had one or two of these as well. Just two years ago there was an attempt in trying to regulate the international telecommunicate regulations, which also implied the Internet. This had quite a lot of newspaper coverage because it was an organization that usually talked about [tech 00:55:55] staff, and all of a sudden turned into quite a political arena. It was a very interesting meeting to go to, because they fully changed face during that time. It looked something like this.

You take a big room, you take quite a lot of guys standing together and trying to negotiate something. This is something similar to what's coming up now in the Plenipot, with people staying in the same place for three weeks trying to negotiate some kind of wording and drafting online, on the screens. The difference with this organization is there is permanent drafting where you have two or three versions parallel for the same wording. So it's very specific, very narrowed-down to texts.

As I mentioned at the beginning, we have two very interesting Internet governance conferences coming up. 17th November, next Friday, at the plenipotentiary or the four-year plenum for ITU is coming. The last time

was in the plenipotentiary in 2010. There is also another conference, but let's start with the Plenipot, as it's called. There are some suggestions about Internet regulation also in this conference of course, coming up since 2010, so it's been cooking for a while, and now we'll see some suggestions.

We'll have some initiatives for resolutions or regulations. For example ITU's role in online child protection, which might not be very interesting directly to our current situation, but it might also have a very huge effect on us in the long-run. We had the resolution 182 about the role of Telecom in ITU climate change, which also is more a politicians' or policy view on regulating the net than we might be used to, at least in the ICANN arena.

Then we have the ITU role with regards to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses. This is the upcoming resolution one of two, which is a way of maybe trying to regulate domain names and addresses in the UN sphere. This resolution one of two is coming up. It covers some issues that might become very interesting for us as a group, and one is for example the output from Geneva in 2013.

There are the Internet exchange points and how and why they should be regulated. It's about broadband connectivity. It's about the deployment of IPv6. It's about how the UN sphere could support multistakeholderism in the ITU version of it. It's about how the ITU could support in-house cooperation in the CSTD way or in one of the others. But what is also specific about these meetings is that we can

expect ad-hoc resolutions coming in almost at sitting tables, so there's very little time to prepare, thereby formulating a view on what to say about these things.

So these are difficult to handle actually. I'll just mention also the one that was already mentioned, the WSIS Plus Ten, or the World Summit on the Information Society, coming up in December in one year. That also might have a very important effect on this world. So what can we expect from the Plenipot meeting then? We can expect rivalry in Internet policy making, and apart from what I just mentioned, I'm not sure what to expect other than that. That's all I'll say. Thank you.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you Steffan. Now we're ready for questions. Please stand up or use a microphone. Say your name and ask the question. I have some questions prepared. Let me ask this to Sam. There used to be very high expectations from some of the groups in the IGF, like civil society and governments, and that was discussed at least in the CSTD Working Group five years ago when they were discussing the continuity of the IGF. How do you perceive that those expectations have been made or have been changed from those original ones? Sam or Janis?

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you. I think the answer is partially because as usual, the biggest room in the world is room for improvement, and we can't say that we've achieved everything, or we've not met all the expectations of different stakeholder groups. One thing that is obvious is we do not have sufficient representation of representatives from developing countries –

both from the government side but also from the technical community side and civil society side. That is something that we need to improve and then strive to get more new people in.

Secondly we need to bring in those who do not believe in a multistakeholder Internet governance model to engage in discussions, because on a number of occasions we're talking about issues to those who share the same opinion, and that it does not achieve the intended objective to change the opinion of those who are not convinced on a number of issues. Therefore we still need to work on improved attendance, bringing also new participants. We do not have sufficient representation of non-Internet industries in IGF, and that was mentioned.

I hope that for instance the discussion in that, which was next January, may trigger some interest in other industry areas, to send the representatives to IGF. For instance, if we look at the automobile industry, I think that automakers are very big consumers of ICTs in general, and what they like to do or what their aspirations are, we simply do not know because we're not reaching out to that particular industry.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON:

I was just going to say something about the creation of those original recommendations. I was one of the Members of IGF Working Group, as were you. Many of the civil society folks were very unhappy with those recommendations. They didn't think they went far enough. It's an interesting example of the different expectations different stakeholder groups have. If you come from government, you're used to negotiating

and not getting everything you want. As [Marcus Comera 01:04:14] used to say, “Is everyone equally unhappy?” It’s not “is everyone equally happy?” but “can everyone live with it?”

Whereas for some stakeholder groups like civil society, they’re very idealistic so when they’re after something they really want the full thing. One of the difficulties in a multistakeholder environment is people have different levels of expectations. Even with those original ideas about how IGF should be improved, some of the stakeholder groups didn’t think they went far enough. They were. They were fairly watered-down from some of the original recommendations that were coming in. I think it’s done quite well, given it virtually has no budget.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thanks Sam. Given how close the Plenipot is, I wonder if any of you had the opportunity to look at any of the proposals or submissions that have come in, and think that there are any that we should be alert to? Anything that should concern us? Concerns you? Maybe just give us some insight into what’s actually coming forward shortly?

STAFFAN JONSSON:

Well, as I mentioned, yes, there are some resolutions that might go either way. I mentioned that the last one – the one of two – which draws from several earlier meetings. But when you’re specifically talking about names and numbers within the ITU, there might be a change not foreseen and it might go quite fast. So yes, it’s worth looking at the process. However, it’s quite complicated to see the process from the

outside and to understand what is happening, since all issues are opened and they are discussed or negotiated in parallel for three weeks.

So you almost have to be there to be more specific. I'm looking at [Johan 01:06:10] to get some acceptance of this. Yes, there are some really interesting solutions coming up, but at forehand it's difficult to say what will happen with them. We'll see.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: There is one resolution. I'm getting mixed up because I'm jet-lagged. It's the Arab Common Proposals, the RCC Common Proposals, which is the old Soviet Area, and Saudi Arabia put in some proposals. It's only those three that to me looked problematic. In the past, the last Plenipotentiary was far more divisive. You couldn't even mention the Internet community in a footnote. There was an argument about having us mentioned in the bottom. But there is one proposal that changes text, that used to say that the ITU could be something of an enabler for people wanting to discuss the domain name area.

It's been changed in the proposal to saying that the ITU is a platform for member states to discuss domain name system. If that went that way, that seems to be that they'd like a bit more input, be more active in that area. So that's probably the one proposal that's most relevant to this group.

STAFFAN JONSSON: May I just add, to Byron's second question – I failed to answer it – but is the document out? This is of course an ongoing discussion within the UN of whether you should have drafts public or not, and to my

knowledge it's more not than drafts are actually being published. There is always a huge portion of civil society representatives, or paying member companies that actually participate in this. They usually get hold of the documents. Some do have a password to the internal document system within the UN as well, but that is actually up to every country's representative to give out those.

The documents are often, as in the WCIT for example, they documents were out within 30 seconds from when it was laid out, so they will somehow trickle out to the public, to interested people, but I guess it's [Twitter 01:08:50] to find out actually what will happen. What do you think?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: I know for a fact they will be appearing on WCITleaks.org. The people behind WCITlinks.org have a password, so they just put all the documents up there. WCITleaks.org. Keep an eye on that.

ALAN: I'm Alan from .ca. Firstly before starting I'd like to give ourselves a plug, and Sam as well. We worked on a paper with CENTR on the ITU in the context of Internet governance. We spoke to it a couple of meetings ago, so it's available on the server website as well as the CENTR website. I call it "The Idiot's Guide to the ITU" but it's directed at the cc community, so you might find it informative. Now onto my question.

Obviously a look at the timing of the WSIS Plus Ten Meeting in December 2015 is against the September 15th deadline for the IANA transition proposal. What do you think the impact will be on the WSIS

Plus Ten discussion, in the event that, heaven forbid, the community doesn't produce a proposal by September 15th? Or worse still, it produces one but for whatever reason the US Government rejects it?

STAFFAN JONSSON: [01:10:42] I think in the first case scenario there will not be a big impact. I would even say there would not be impact at all. If the proposal for one reason or another is rejected, either by NTIA or even worse by the Congress, then there will be very strong affect to the negotiations; the outcome of the negotiations of the WSIS Plus Ten. Therefore we need to be very careful in this respect. I would argue strongly in favor of maybe postponement of the presentation of the proposal, rather than rushing out by all means and putting something on the table that may be rejected. The political risk is very high.

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you. Any more questions? No. In that case, I think we're done.

JACQUES LATOUR: Hello. We're going to start our security session. Today we have two speakers; Merike Kaeo from Internet Identity and Dina Beer from Israel. I guess you can go ahead.

MERIKE KAEO: Great. Hi there. I just wanted to give a talk that talks about some of the basics, because we all forget the basics and we all think "Oh, cryptography's the latest thing and we all need to do it" and yet all the credentials keep getting popped. I decided that I really wanted to

discuss and raise the awareness of some of the things that are currently ongoing that really are troublesome from a security standpoint. Just a couple of things – trends and ongoing attacks, I think most of you probably will be familiar with it. Some recent exploitations and impacts.

Our community responsibility, because people are always pointing the finger in terms of whose responsibility is it. “Oh, the standards are broken, oh, the implementation’s broken.” Everybody’s always pointing at everybody else: “Oh, the dumb users,” right? Really it’s everybody’s responsibility. Then also giving some pointers in terms of what can we do, because we really, really have to get better at our own environments and securing them.

This graph is interesting because it shows that back in the 1990s you didn’t have a lot of attacks. You had some spoof packets. Maybe somebody was playing around with a worm. Then in the last 20 to 30 years what’s happened is that the attacks have gotten much more sophisticated and also they’ve been automated. So it’s not unlikely that you have abuse of hundreds of thousands of domains per day. That’s a large number. If you look at what’s been going on also with credentials, I think every day we see, “Look, seven million credentials again,” and you have to change the username and password.

So the problem is very real, and we really have to pay attention to this. How many will actually admit to having credentials stolen in their environment? Who’s had to change their password in the last six months? You probably should do so anyway. Looking at credential leakage, even last night there was this big newsbreak that Dropbox had credentials stolen. It turns out it wasn’t an issue with Dropbox but it was

the fact that users are reusing the credentials – so it's some other site, maybe a social media site, where they weren't very diligent about protecting their username and passwords for their customers, but their users all use the same username and password.

So that's really a huge problem. If you think about it, in your environments, how many registrants use usernames and passwords that they also use for other sites? I'd almost be willing to bet a beer or two, or probably a glass of wine in my case, that they do do that. It's just common. It's easy. There's also a lot of uncontrolled processes where new passwords are sent in clear text emails to users. I'm not going to say the name, but that happened last week, a registrar. I don't call that stupid because I've been doing security for 20 years. I have a lot of knowledge.

If somebody's new and that's not their core competence, they just didn't think about it. So in my mind they have to be educated that, "No, when you're sending your credential, you want to make sure that it's protected. Either you call them up or you use some kind of cryptographic means to send it via email – but you don't do it in clear text." That happens more often than you'd like to think, and if you're a technical person and say, "That's really stupid," I'd encourage you to turn around and maybe write a paper as to how should you actually go about doing it, and really help educate everybody.

There's also the issue of exploiting vulnerabilities to get unauthorized access to systems where password files may be stored. This is something also where people have to really seriously take a look at. If we look at two critical vulnerabilities in the last six months, these are

huge and impacted basically everybody. SSL TLS, most people who run any kind of web-based service use these protocols to protect the web servers. So you had Heartbleed, back in May, followed also in June by more vulnerabilities.

That particular vulnerability, if exploited, allowed for potential credentials to get accessed. You weren't sure whether or not somebody could because there was a memory leak and you had to have all kinds of information. There wasn't really a way to tell, "Well, did people get access to the information?" These bugs have existed for years. So to be on the safe side though, you really did want to change credentials just to be safe. Quite frankly we have to be on the lookout for more vulnerabilities because I loved Heartbleed, and the reason why is because I like the protocol IPSEC.

Those of you who are technical, you may know that there's been a lot of controversy with IPSEC versus TLS SSL. They both kind of swore to do the same thing. People said, "No, I'm going to use TLS. It's easy. You don't have to think about it." With Heartbleed I feel vindicated that no, you do have to think about it. You have to think about what is the protocol doing, and where could things be circumvented, and you really have to pay attention. That's true for any kind of protocol.

You can't blindly say, "No, I just trust it and don't worry about it." Then also, with the latest bash vulnerability, it's a shell that's used so that if people write scripts on a web server you might have used this particular instantiation of a shell, and it had a vulnerability where it's even worse in some cases than Heartbleed, because it would allow for an

exploitation where somebody can run a script on the actual server. That means they can potentially own the entire server.

What was really interesting about this one was that there wasn't just one bug. It ended up being six different vulnerabilities that were discovered over a span of three or four days, until you actually had a final fix. People still need to be vigilant, because even today I heard of a new way that potentially could be exploited. I did put here on these slides a website that I used, because there are so many different pointers to where you get information on shellshock.

That one is the definitive one that actually shows what can get exploited, and anything new is put on there as well. For those of you that are technical and are looking at this kind of stuff, this will be the definitive pointer that I would look at. Any of you that are in the role of having to keep track of vulnerabilities, I'm in that role. I'm the [unclear 01:21:49] and so all of this is my problem. It's a huge problem. People always say, "You should do this, you should do that." Well, we know the ten steps, but operationally, how you actually do that is extremely difficult.

One of the things I'd encourage everybody to do, especially for your web servers, there's a tool available on the Internet, which I love. It's by Qualys. I have the pointer here. You can actually run some tests on your server. What's really good about that is it will actually tell you where you have weaknesses in your configuration so that you can change them if you can. The only thing I will point out is that there's a checkbox that I would mark, because if you don't then it will show the results when people go on the website, and if you aren't so good with security yet you may not want people to be able to see that right away.

The thing is, I went through this in my environment of whether I wanted to use it or not. The thing is that for all the publicly-facing servers, anybody can run that test. So I'd absolutely use it, but maybe just mark the checkbox that they're not going to put it on their website in terms of what score you got. Also, I'd encourage everybody to get on mailing lists for the vendor security announcements.

It's something that I do because of the fact that we have so many vendors in our environment that I can't keep looking at their websites or checking myself. I want them to notify me, and that way I can then make a decision on whether or not I need to patch or not. Also, subscribe to your national CERTs, because I think most national CERTs have an alert list. Because I'm based in the US I just put down the pointer for the US one, but I'd very strongly encourage you to look at that.

I know that there's been a movement to really create national CERTs that are very diligent in what they do. I know members of a few national CERTs, and I think they're absolutely excellent. Also, follow industry security blogs. The ccNSO does have a site for that. I started looking at them going, "You could spend all day just reading this stuff, so which two or three do you pick?" That's up to you really, but I'd encourage you at least to look at the list and then pick one or two that you feel are relevant, and with your morning tea or coffee, read some of that.

It has to become a habit, just to understand what's going on and what vulnerabilities exist. The next two slides are more information. People do have to do a security assessment of their environment. It's boring. It is boring. You have to look at every single device you have, every single

application – where could somebody potentially exploit something. But if I hear of a vulnerability, there's two things that I care about. One is what is the likelihood of risk? I only care about the real critical ones. The ones where there's a pretty high and certain likelihood that we can be exploited, and that's because tools are available.

This happened with Shellshock. Shellshock was announced at 7:00 am. By midnight that night there were already scripts that had already been created to actually exploit the vulnerability. So to me that was pretty high priority. Then also, what is the actual impact of a successful exploitation? Because sometimes people panic a lot and say, "Oh my gosh, we really have to upgrade," but then when you look at the devices you're not really impacted by this vulnerability or an exploitation. So you do have to assess it – if you have the staff.

If you don't then the recommendation is usually to apply the patches whenever you can. That's probably good practice. But if you have the staff to be able to do it, actually take a look and see whether or not you can be exploited. Another thing I want to talk about just briefly is credential life-cycle management. Everybody does this poorly. I don't care what industry you're in. I usually equate this to a pilot checklist. I have a lot of friends that became pilots.

Some of them, "I have something else to do. I have to go shopping or wash my hair," because they're the type that would be like, "Yes, I've got enough fuel, I checked last night." You don't do that. The checklists are there for a reason and you have to go through them in detail. Security's just like this. So there's actually work ongoing in the SSAC, and immediately after this talk I'm going to that meeting.

I'm part of a Working Group that's just getting started on credential management, because there are two SSAC documents – 040 and 044 that talk about what you should do to have secure credentials. But people aren't really utilizing the recommendations. Not many people are doing two-factor. There's still an issue, within the registrar industry, of credentials getting hacked. So one of the things that we determined within SSAC was, "Maybe we really need to educate and write something to determine how people should deal with the entire credential life-cycle management."

So creation. Those of you who are technical, I do encourage you to run password-cracking tools on some of the databases, just to ascertain whether or not they can be easily cracked. Then depending on how big your environment, you may want to actually notify people of that, because if you can do it, so can somebody with malicious intent. You want to really be careful how you distribute them. Cryptographically protecting credentials is a good idea. How you store them is important.

There's something for you technical folks. Look at pass-the-hash attacks. This pointer shows you a specific write-up that Microsoft did, because just because you have passwords stored as hashes doesn't mean that they're not crackable. The same thing is you have to look at renewal, revocation and recovery. Again, the entire life-cycle of credential management. Then as a last slide, one of the basic things that you can do is really control the access that you have to critical servers. Do it on a need-to-know.

If people don't have to have access to the servers, don't let them have access. Credential management. Do not share credentials across

systems. It's a very bad practice. Test the password strength, for sure, and if you can, use two-factor authentication. I've been a firm believer for ten years of two-factor authentication. There's no reason not to do it. Also, keep track of your operating systems and application versions. This is also something people don't do.

I have a spreadsheet and I've asked people in my company, "I want to know every single operating system version and application version." They're like, "Are you crazy?" I'm like, "No, because once I have a vulnerability, I want to assess within a couple of hours what's potentially impacted. So that's it for my talk. Again, back to the basics, but the basics are important. Any questions, if I have time?"

HIRO HOTTA: Any questions? Three, two, one, zero...

MERIKIE KAEO: Thank you.

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you. That was a good talk. Next is Dina Beer, and she's going to talk about Cyberdome – defending the DNS environment.

DINA BEER: Hi everybody. My name's Dina. I'm from Israel, a very peaceful area. We never have any war, any trouble in there. Only once a year, and every time we have that we have trouble on cyber as well. Last year was one of the worst experiences we had. I'm not going to talk with you

about what's going on internal on our security, but I want to tell you what happened in our DNS environment. We have to remember one of the reminders that we got this summer was we are not only a registrar.

We are the ones to be sure that the .il is working around the world. I guess our [name is not new 01:30:56] before we understood that. Cyberdome is the name that we used in Israel, because as you know there is something that's called the Iron Dome. It's the defense system that Israel has today to keep its citizens safe from the rockets that we are getting all the time. Let's start from the beginning.

Internet. Internet has become the [unclear 01:31:24] of the 21st Century. A way of life. Everybody has the Internet. Everybody speaks Internet. Everybody speaks with the WhatsApp as well. The countries today are investing huge budgets to promote and secure technology, and we know all the time that [unclear 01:31:37] March 2012. Technology is moving so rapidly that in the future we anticipate that the cyber threat will pose the number one threat to our country. I can tell you that today is that day, at least in our case.

What happened to us? A little bit. We have a few challenges. We have the technologies, the policy, the politics and the business, of course. We have the innovation and the constraints, and the security, the routing, the access, and everything else that has to do with being Israel, the country that we are. So what do we do?

More than 150,000 cyber tacks are recorded on a regular day in Israel. That's daily people. Every day we have more than that. There is a 40 per cent annual increase in [unclear 01:32:27] data bridges, and it's not smart bridges. Believe me [unclear 01:32:30]. Most of them are

phishing, defacement and D-DOS. During the last summer military operation against Hamas, it was an increase of 1,000. We have more than one million per day attacks to our servers. The target attacks were carried out during a period of two weeks. We have during two weeks more than 12 million attacks.

So how many hits? Just a number that I was surprised at. How many hits do you get to [determine a hacker 01:33:02] in Google? More than 70 million. Was it a fair thing that you got? “How to become a hacker.” So everybody can be a hacker today and everybody can attack. When the military operation was started we go to advise that. We have to be prepared. We have to carry out analyses daily, deploy and provide equipment, configure the equipment properly, reserve some resource for any case, have trained staff, and simulate attacks beforehand. We could simulate what we’ve got here. That’s the one.

So how do cyber attacks affect [us 01:33:57]? First of all it was all around the newspapers. Everybody was in panic. Everybody. “Wow, they are going to take down the Internet.” Nobody dies from it, yes? We are in the country where soldiers die. Everybody was panicked. “What will we do? What if it happens?” including our very good Prime Minister who said, “We are being attacked right now.” Notice rockets. We have defacing. Google defacing and pages defacing. Our training website was defaced. People couldn’t get inside... [audio cuts out 01:34:36]

[Tape change to ccNSO-members-4-14oct-en]

MATHEIU WEILL:

Welcome everyone. I suggest you take your seats. Our panelists are ready and we are coming to the much anticipated session on the IANA stewardship transfer, or transition. I don't know. Maybe the FOI has an opinion on that. IANA stewardship and accountability. The goal of this session is not like the other sessions you've seen so far, because we're only the appetizers. We're only here to provide you with initial ideas, before the real session that takes place tomorrow about the same topics, and by the time of which I hope you will have had time to ponder about what we can expect from those two tracks.

I will follow Martin's suggestion to start with the beginning, and remind everyone about all the history of ICANN. But maybe before that I will introduce the panelists. We have the pleasure of welcoming Martin Boyle. He's going to be more focused on IANA stewardship transfer. As I understand, he's part of an interesting Working Group on the topic. Jordan is going to be our accountability panelist, given all the work he's been doing on the topics that's been mentioned so many times since the beginning of the week. We're delighted to have Theresa to provide us the ICANN inside view about how these tracks are being managed.

Of course, I'm not going to go through everything around ICANN's history. I just want to stress two points around this session. Please make it interactive. We need your questions. We need to be discussing the options and the substance. We will try to be extremely concise on process. This is by design. We can answer any questions on the process topics, but I think it's been covered and covered and it's high time we

get onto what really are the options that we have to discuss. So I count on your engagement and implication on those sessions.

Without further ado I'd like to ask Martin to provide us some context about IANA stewardship transition and the work that's been taking place for several weeks now. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thank you very much Mathieu and good afternoon to everybody. At some stage I'll get my slides, but I'm very pleased to see that rather orange photograph of me. I think I must have gone wrong with the spray tan. As Mathieu's just said, I'm going to talk about the IANA stewardship transition. I thought I'd say a little bit about process, because we don't seem to be able to get away from process in this activity yet.

Move onto talking about the timescale, which obviously is a particularly sensitive concern for us all, and then move onto talking a little bit about how to get involved in the process and I hope in that bit we'll hear people coming in with ideas of their own as to A) how to get engaged, but B) also how to engage with others. The unwieldy title of an IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, I can't ever remember that without reading it. Fortunately they came up with the three-letter acronym ICG, which has 30 individuals, direct and indirect stakeholders, from around the communities.

The ccTLDs are quite strongly represented on this Committee, in that we've got the four direct Members appointed by the ccNSO, of which Keith is in the room, Mary is certainly around but I can't see her, and so

if I get any really difficult questions I'll point you in their direction. Also, we've got Mohamed and Demi and Hartmut, all of whom are quite well engaged in the ccTLD community. That's quite useful – that we're going in with a reasonably strong understanding of the issues that are specific to ccTLDs.

Our role is specifically to coordinate. We are not going to be writing the proposals, and we don't want to judge the proposals either. We're just going to be looking at how the proposals can work together and to make sure that they do answer the question on the exam paper. This whole process is running in parallel with the accountability process. We've got a head-start on them now. As we've heard earlier today, that is actually quite a linked process. We have issued our request for proposals to the communities into protocols, numbers and naming communities, the gTLDs and the ccTLDs.

Very clearly, what we're looking at is stewardship. We're not looking at trying to reinvent the policy areas. This is the IANA role, the role that currently the US Government fulfills. The request for proposals that we issued I think marks us into a point of moving from talking about process to throwing out the challenge of working on what the proposals are going to be – the constructive bit. Our RFP very specifically turns around and asks for the activity to take place in the relevant community process. For us that's the Cross-Community Working Group for Names, the CWG IANA, I try to remember it as.

What we're actually asking is that the bottom-up process, the engagement with the other communities, happens out in this affected community group. So we don't want to have people coming into us with

their own separate proposals, and we don't want people to send us comments. We want them to engage with the CWG. If anybody does send us comments then wherever it's appropriate we'll just forward it to the community group. Inevitably, it has to be an open process.

It's got to be inclusive, and these processes so far, all documents have been published, including documents that shouldn't have been published, that the email lists are published, and contact points are also published. Now, the proposal elements that we're looking for, there's the list of them. The slide set has the details in there. It will be on the site. You can go and look at the slides if you want to. An even better idea is to go and look at the source documents.

Numbers two and three though, the existing pre-transition arrangement and the post-transition arrangements for oversight and accountability, this actually does say that what you're doing with your post-transition is you do have to make sure that you've got the mechanisms in place for looking after this transition. This is what the US Government was doing. That has to obviously then fit with whatever comes up in the ICANN accountability discussion. Now, the CCWG, we've got five ccTLD Members on that group, of which so far I've seen Lise and Vika and Staffan obviously. I think all of those are in the room, so again questions on the process there.

Again, it's an open process, and you can register to be a participant. As a participant you can take the microphone and put your stuff in. The only thing you can't do is voting. Timescales. Very heavy. This is a very simplified picture from the ICG's timeline, but the real key issue is that that sits over in the bottom right-hand corner, where we've got the hard

stop of September 2015, but it became quite clear to us that before September 2015 we're going to have to get proposals, even if they're not quite finished, but that are clear enough, into the US Government so that the US Government can start doing the discussions that they need in the process.

The other thing to notice is that you have those three green slabs, which are all about going back out to the community – back out to consult, to make sure that people are signing up. This is a consensus-building process, and in addition I will expect the CWG to be doing something very similar on building that consensus of continually revealing its drafts to the outside world and taking the input that comes in from there. Now, how to get involved. Well, ccNSO's been very active, as you already know. They've established a cc world mailing list, which gets out to beyond our own little room to those people who prefer not to be in the ccNSO.

The regional organizations, they've been taking good interest in this from Europe. I've been active in the work of CENTR, where we've been looking at the principles that would have to underpin a successful solution, and the risks that might affect us. There've also been national processes. Worthwhile talking with your government, with stakeholders in your country, to make sure that everybody is understanding the process and engaging as appropriate. I'm sure there are lots of other ways of doing it that I've just missed out.

For you, follow the discussion. Even better, get involved in the discussion. All the Members of the CWG and the ICG will be more than happy to talk to you about your ideas and the way forward. Interact with

the process. The time to start preparing if you haven't already really is now, because it is important that we achieve. It's really going to be vital to show that if we don't get to September, that we've got a very credible story that we're well on the way to a solution. But frankly, I think we are in real problems if we haven't got out output by September.

That's my source of documents for reference. The SSAC documents are particularly useful. 68 has come out just this week. Over to you for questions. I'm known for my timing. It's called revenge for that photograph.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Just to kick off the discussion, what's going to be very concrete terms for ccTLDs on the table of the discussions and that we should watch? What is that concretely going to be talking about, in those two groups, probably within the naming one?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Within the ICG we'll be looking to report back to our colleagues on the process, trying to make sure that the process that's going through is fair, is open, and is transparent. I think that's going to be an easy job to do. What might be a bit more difficult is when or if we get proposals in from people who have preferred not to engage in the CWG process, and decide that their own input, their own views, are important. That is something we will have just refer back to the community on.

Things we're going to have to look carefully at is the fact that as we all know, Cs are not Gs, and that we're going to have to make sure that the proposals that come out do meet the specificities of the cc community –

that we're not contracted parties, that we have national sovereignty issues associated with that.

DON HOLLANDER: Don Hollander from APTLD. I'm not sure if it's for you Martin or for Theresa, but who's looking at the issues outside of the three streams that the US Government may be providing, given that ICANN is acting as an agent for them? These are issues in terms of liability and in terms of allowing ICANN to deal with countries that may be under a sanction for the US Government – so it doesn't refer to the protocols, numbers or names? Thank you.

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, I like the difficult questions and that I think is particularly difficult. Very short answers. I think that is something you're going to have to look at through the CWG discussions, because yes, some of those are really going to need to be addressed.

LISE FUHR: Lise Fuhr from .dk. As a Member of the CWG, one of the issues that's been raised and that I'm also concerned about is the accountability process that's in another Working Group, and how the ICG will work together with the Accountability Working Group. Have you had any discussion about this?

MARTIN BOYLE: On the basic fact that that group doesn't exist yet, we've seen ourselves very much as parallel tracks, but that we would be needing to keep in

touch through the process. The difficult bit obviously is to know how, when and where, and that I hope will become easier as we go along. I would actually say that as we're going through, we're looking for coherent solutions.

Part of the coherent solution for the naming community I think does have to bring in things like making sure that the service level agreement is being kept to, that things are being done correctly, that it's based on policy, and also that there is an appeals mechanism that's independent. If it has the inbuilt accountability, I'd like to see that there. The important thing is then how does that then fit in with the wider accountability discussion?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

A question that arises in my mind is around the ccTLD community, the 246 [SD 00:21:12] ccTLDs of which about 160 have some relationship with ICANN, either through the ccNSO or through exchange of letters and so on. Whose responsibility do you think it is to reach those ccTLDs to involve them in the dialogue, given that a group of 10 or 20 ccTLDs could stand up at the 11th hour and say, "We weren't properly consulted, we didn't really know about this and we don't want any change," and stand in the way of the entire transition.

What do you think the steps are that we should be looking at to mitigate such things happening, and whose responsibility is that? Is it the ccNSO's? Is it ours individual to outreach? Is it the RALOs? Is it the CCWG? Is it the ICG? Is it ICANN's role? Where do you think that responsibility lies Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, I could turn around and say, “You’re a Member of the same Committee, Keith, and your answer is probably as good as mine. I would see it though as being a shared responsibility – that the ccNSO has done its work of building the list, of making sure we’ve got the contacts... Lise?”

LISE FUHR: I just want to add that I think the CWG is also responsible for ensuring that we involve as many ccs as possible, because you need to have it all the way down to all the groups.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yes, that’s essentially what I’m saying – that the ccNSO has done some, we need to carry on doing it. The RALOs have got many of the ones that are not involved, that they’re aware of, they’ve got contacts with. Then there’s the CWG, the ICG. Yes, we’ve just got to try to make sure that what we’re doing is clear, that people are aware of it, and keep on sending them the emails.

MATHIEU WEILL: Last question by Byron and then we’ll go to Jordan for the accountability track.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just wondered if you had any sense, picking up on Keith’s question, of how much is enough to give you confidence in the proposals that come

forward from the naming community? For example, if ten ccs came to your group late in the process and said, “We’re not happy,” is that enough to scuttle it? Do you need unanimity? Is there a veto? Have you thought of any of those kinds of issues? Of course, just being a little bit skeptical – what if some come late in the process simply as a tactical maneuver, to scuttle it?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Yes. I think that really is just an extension of the previous discussion, but if someone doesn’t want to engage in the process early, it’s going to be very hard to make them engage. But I guess the underlying question is, “Why have you left it until now? You were told about it,” and that’s where making sure that we have gone out to these people is important.

The other thing though is probably a carrot, and that is as you’re going through the CWG work, some of those Members have actually got completely different interests to the average ccNSO Member, and some of those ideas have to be captured in the proposal. We do need to make it quite clear to them that if they get involved then their concerns can be at least discussed, perhaps addressed, in that activity. If they leave it then probably not.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you Martin. Good discussion starting but I’d like to keep some time for the second track, with Jordan, who’s going to give you a quick overview of what to expect on the accountability side. What does that mean?

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks Mathieu. Yes, what does that mean? Things are going to get simpler in terms of me discussing process, but not in terms of what you need to think about. We'll see how that goes. As Mathieu said at the start, my intention is to get you thinking. I don't have answers, but hopefully provoking you into some questions that you'll want to discuss in tomorrow's session. I haven't been on this stage before presenting, so I just want to thank my colleagues Keith, Jay and Debbie, who've educated me a lot in the ways of the ccNSO and with the work that is represented in this slide pack.

I'll just go through a bit of the context about what's going on. I'll talk a little bit about the process and the timeline, but really spend some time on some questions that I think we all need to be thinking about as ccTLD managers, and some reflections on some of those questions, as a way to get you thinking. Obviously this accountability discussion is happening because of the stewardship transition.

There's an ongoing [trop eninum 00:27:38] in ICANN anyway, but the sharpening up of it is related to the transition and the really clear linkages between an acceptable accountability settlement and the ability of the US Government to accept the transition proposal that's been sketched out already today. You see the natural institutional desire of a large organization like ICANN to be free, to be autonomous, to be managed by its own community and now with an external constraint like the US Government contract.

It's the ending of that contract that gives us, as a community, a point of leverage to demand and require changes in the accountability settlement, if we think they are needed. We're thinking about

accountability in two places. One is ICANN’s general accountability to the Internet community, and the other is for specific IANA functions after the contract. We’re doing it also in the context of an organization that we know doesn’t have Membership and really doesn’t have a money problem.

Two of the traditional ways to keep an organization under control are by stopping giving it money, or by voting out the Board. We can’t do either of those things. So there’s an institutional lack of oversight there that I think has just been ignored because of the USG contract and because people thought the status quo was carrying on at that fundamental level. If not ignored, at least obviously not well developed.

Finally, I think there’s a bigger picture here, which is one of the elephants in the room around the ICANN community, and that’s the issue of trust. The trust the community does or does not feel in ICANN to stick to its scope, to perform its functions in the way that we expect it to do so. You can never fix that with accountability mechanisms. They’re related. We have to make sure we don’t try and overcook the accountability system simple because there are trust issues going on.

One of the difficulties here is that accountability is woven through both of the processes that Martin and I are talking about. The proposal from the staff that was released last Friday is that there be some kind of CCWG on accountability and governance. It’s proposed that it have two tracks. One is the matters that are relevant to the IANA stewardship transition, and the other is the broader ICANN accountability picture. The first one is a difficult thing to say, because nobody can tell us before we’ve done the work how much we need to solve the accountability

problem before the transition proposal can be accepted or not, because we have to come to a consensus as a community, right?

The different ones of us have different accountability demands and expectations. That's one of them. I don't know what this group is going to be called. That's the working title from the paper. Accountability also appears in the work of the ICG and the Naming Related Functions Working Group that nobody seems to have a proper label for yet. Because in the RFP that the ICG released back in September during the IGF, they were very clear that they want very specific information about the functions that are to be done, and what the policy authorities are for those functions, and what the accountability requirements are for those functions.

That accountability work that's being done in that Working Group and then being assembled by the ICG, is going to have to be related somehow to whatever the first track of whatever Accountability and Governance Working Group is going to be doing. I think working out how to do that is going to get much easier once both of those groups have started doing some work, and we can start to see what the outputs look like. But at the moment it's just something that's raised as a point.

So you can talk about accountability in either of the Working Groups. You can do it in the names-related Working Group that's working for the ICG, or in the accountability and governance structure, which is just being fleshed out. The last point I'll make on process is that the ccNSO is going to have to make sure that it has got coordination mechanisms between cc delegates and the ICG, cc delegates on the Names Related Working Group, cc delegates on the Accountability Working Group, the

Council itself, and any other sub-groups that are set up. Then at least everyone can get a picture of where this is going.

That's another context I actually didn't mention – fatigue. Trying to follow any one of these work streams is hard. Trying to do that while running organizations is even harder. Trying to do that while ICANN's normal business role is on as well, makes it kind of throat-slitting at times, but anyway, I'll move on. The stewardship transition plan, the whole thing, needs to be ready by about June next year if it's to have any chance of being done by September. The Naming Related Functions Working Group, as it sketched out yesterday at lunchtime in its session, has a very aggressive plan to try and finish its work by the end of January.

This is not stuff you need to be thinking about next year. This is stuff you need to be thinking about now, or yesterday, or last month, or in March. There are some dates. Keep those dates in mind. Start doing work on this now. Don't leave it until after Christmas, otherwise you're going to have an unpleasant January. I think that some of the questions we need to think about in this accountability bit are who does ICANN need to be accountable to?

Is there some ill-defined global public interest? Or does ICANN need to be accountable to us – the people that it serves, the Internet community? Or is it a complicated mix of both? What is it accountable for? Is it accountable for making us feel good? Is it accountable for making governments feel good? Is it accountable for performing the functions that we need it to do? Is it accountable for providing an open

space for the policy debates that we need to have in creating an effective Internet?

Those are two critical things, because until you know who it has to be accountable to or what for, it's very difficult for you to design mechanisms that might deliver you that. There's the broad picture of ICANN accountability versus the specific role of the IANA Functions Operator. There are differences there that need to be teased out. We've already mentioned the point about the IANA stewardship transition. We don't need to have a perfectly accountable organization in the sense that there's no such thing.

I'm sure there might be people who've got a list of bullet points as long as your arm, or people who'd like to use accountability in a way that's actually just about delaying the process because they don't want the transition to happen. I know there are people like that around. We need to be really sensible and as an example, if you are a registrar and you didn't like the way that Compliance and GDD was dealing with you, you shouldn't use that as a reason to try and block the transition.

The accountability system will be at a right level, or adequate level, when that problem can be fixed somehow. If there's a problem that can't be fixed, we need to do more work on accountability, but particular detailed specifics shouldn't be used to hold things up. Some more questions are to think about actual mechanisms, once you've decided who it should be accountable to and what for. Do we need separations of functions? There's been a discussion about saying, "Take the IANA Operator and put it in a bit of a bubble."

“The structural separation, make it an ICANN subsidiary company.”
“Have an IANA policy board that makes decisions and doesn’t just leave the ICANN Board in its horribly conflicted role that’s already there.” Is there a cleaner process needed for Board Member elections? That won’t work if you only have one nominee for one slot, which we had today here. Maybe the NomCom needs to appoint fewer directorates. Maybe constituencies need to elect more. Is there a need for a membership concept to be delivered?

Members in whatever frame could hold the Board to account, could elect directorates much more easily, could spill the entire Board if they didn’t like the direction the company was taking. Is there a need for a new appeals body – a group of wise old heads from the ICANN community with a very specific remit under the bylaws to be able to reverse Board decisions in certain circumstances? Do we need to say, “Actually, the best thing for ICANN is to not run the IANA functions at all but to be the policy clearinghouse and the agent that interacts with other organizations to run IANA?”

I don’t know the answers to any of these questions, but they’re ones that appeared to me as relevant while I was writing this slide pack. Accountability is [unclear 00:36:59] settlement that can allow transition. Without accountability the community isn’t going to let the US Government make this transition. For us, in names, in ccs in particular, our accountability is in the worst spot of all three customer groups of the IANA functions. There’s absolutely no doubt about that in my mind. The numbers people have their own global organization that sits outside the ICANN framework and directs the IANA Operator, pro forma.

If the ICANN Board said no to any of their requests, they would simply move the administration of numbering elsewhere. They've threatened to do it before. Same with protocols. The IETF could easily run protocol registries itself or have someone else to do it, but we cannot create another ICANN outside ICANN to deal with ICANN, because it would be the registries, the registrars, the users, the governments, everyone who's already in the ICANN framework, being replicated to another organization.

Ours is really the most complicated one, and connected to that we have to understand that the numbers and the protocol communities might be really uncomfortable with accountability suggestions we might come up with, because they might be concerned it would make their accountability situation worse. So we can't just do it in a vacuum. What all of you need to think about in your own organizations and your own ccTLDs is what is your bottom line?

What is the lowest threshold of accountability improvements, if you want any, that you're going to put up with? Where's the deal-breaker for you? If you haven't thought about that and you don't know it, these are going to be very difficult conversations to have because everyone will be going, "Well, I'm not really sure yet. I'll see how it plays out." You can't have a discussion or decision without that. That's all I had to add. The accountability proposal is linked there, and so is the process, which is on these slides, which I think will go on the website. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much Jordan. That was very comprehensive and highly concrete as well. Lise?

LISE FUHR: Yes. I saw on one of your slides you wrote “lack of oversight”. Is that a final decision that there’s not going to be an oversight as part of accountability?

JORDAN CARTER: No. What I was saying with this slide is that today’s settlement, if you like one of the instruments of oversight, is the IANA functions contract with NTIA. The transition takes that away. Absent that... if you think that has any impact in terms of oversight, that oversight goes away. What I’ve heard, talking to people at the last four ICANN Meetings I’ve been to, is that people think the oversight situation, the accountability situation, isn’t at the right spot. That’s all I’m saying there. I’m not saying that we should end up with none. I’m saying that people are raising concerns about it at the moment.

MATHIEU WEILL: Are there other questions for Jordan? I’ll ask mine. Jordan, you actually provoked us into saying, “Okay, what’s out bottom line?” What’s yours?

JORDAN CARTER: You’d have to ask Debbie that. More seriously, we haven’t come to a final conclusion on that yet. The reason for that is that we did do some diagrams about the array of IANA functions, and we took some pretty heavy criticism from parts of the ICANN community and staff for doing that. What we were told was, “Don’t start leaping to solutions. Let’s get

the process sorted out first.” We took that on board, so we haven’t done any further work on the actual solutions that we’re after.

We are advocates of proper structural separation because we operated ourselves and we know that it works, and we know a lot of the concerns that are raised about it are meaningless when you actually look at the detail. Whether that’s the right option here, we haven’t done the stress testing yet.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Excellent. Thank you. If there are no further questions for Jordan I’d like to turn to Theresa and ask you, Theresa, to provide us with anything we may have missed, but also maybe your vision about how those two tracks are going to be inter-related and how it’s going to work out in the end.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

First, thank you for having me here. Jordan, I’m going to give you my schedule. I have about four other presentations so I’m going to ask you to cut through those because that was very comprehensive and a really good overview of issues that are coming up in the accountability discussion. Just a few additional things that might be worth taking a look at, especially as one’s looking at what might fall into different categories or solutions.

In the first round of comments – that is the set of comments prior to the 21-day comments – there were 49 comments received, and a very wide range of substantive issues identified around accountability, and also proposed solutions, that came in from the range of community input

that came in through that public comment cycle. Those are compiled. There are excerpts taken from the submissions that had been made.

That might also be a useful thing to look at in the context of looking what might be relevant for work stream one or work stream one, or looking at solutions and various other things. So I just wanted to flag that. A lot of those were also reflected in the second round of comments, so you may see some repeats there. But otherwise I just wanted to flag that it's actually quite a useful listing of different issues that had ben raised and substantive.

With regards to how this will work moving forward, I think these kinds of conversations are already very, very useful. It's really trying to identify what is going to be relevant for the change in the historical relationship with the US, what might be seen as an oversight or a checks and balances mechanism for ICANN in the context of the IANA contract, and in looking at how to put that into a work stream with a shorter timeline.

I think in the context of what needs to be submitted to NTIA, you've also heard it from them that this is something that should really come alongside what is submitted by the ICG – that they do expect this issue with regards to what's reflected in work stream one of the accountability process. How that gets coordinated with the ICG I think is something that's going to be important to figure out what the liaising mechanism is on the timeline there.

Given that there's a lot of dialogues and opportunities, I think that should be a fairly straightforward way to do it. I don't have the answer. I appreciate that these are very complex issues. This is a unique time in the history of the organization. It's never needed to look at this topic in

this kind of way, so as the community is formulating its Working Group and its Charter, of course we're all in this together so just let us know how we can be of assistance as well. But I don't have any pre-proposed solutions, obviously.

MATHIEU WEILL: Are there any questions from the room? Remember, I said it would be great to be interactive.

DON HOLLANDER: Theresa, when I asked the questions about the [long streams 00:45:14] I saw that you were keen to answer, but didn't get a chance. Is somebody within ICANN – Legal for example – going through those risk and tax and liability and other issues?

THERESA SWINEHEART: As an organization operating in the US we already have that responsibility. That's a responsibility that exists regardless of the relationship. As we serve the community and community members in the context of anything that relates to US law, we need to be in compliance with those aspects and that includes areas of operation with regards to potentially countries – whether the US may have a different kind of relationship. So those issues are already handled as part of our operations as an organization, and as operating the IANA functions itself.

So those are things that are already there. Obviously Legal is looking at that in the context that if there is anything that would change in the context of not having the contract with the US, but my understanding is

that if so it would be absolutely minimal because we already have obligations under US law. We have obligations under any other country's law to the same extent.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Any other questions? Instead of closing remarks my suggestion would be to go to all three of you and ask what is actually the most surprising or extreme solution you've heard about either IANA transition, or accountability, just to provide us food for thought about what the extreme options are that are currently mentioned? We've heard about scenarios. What would be the one thing that really surprised you or you found quite extreme, but still is going to be discussed at some point, or at least has been mentioned?

MARTIN BOYLE:

That's a very interesting question. If I knew then it would probably be a more comfortable place to be in. I suppose the two extremes that I can see would be the extreme number one, which is the "dear old Uncle Sam, don't go away, stay with us," which I actually think ever since the March announcement is no longer an option – that the box is open, we've got to now do something about it. The other extreme I guess is that you take something like the IANA and you say, "Actually, is it a single entity? Can it just go off into three or even perhaps four different boxes and be dealt with in four different ways?"

The other point I'd make is that yes, there is no pre-defined thing that says a solution is off the table. I think we've got to recognize that those scenarios have got to come in and we've got to be ready with the

principles, the criteria, that we need – using your own words Mathieu – for selecting the best options from that and justifying and reasoning that. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Excellent. Thank you Martin. Jordan, you're in a better position because you had a little time to compose yourself and think.

JORDAN CARTER: I kind of thought of the same things that Martin did actually, but I'll give another one that has appeared. I think the most surprising and in one way extreme solution would be nothing changing except ICANN taking over the root zone management function from Verisign and bringing that in-house as well. I haven't heard anyone mention that notion since March, and I don't think it's on the table, but I've heard it mentioned and that was what you asked, what we've heard.

The other one is that we see over time a much reduced and smaller ICANN because it's only dealing with names – just as the NRO deals with numbers and the IETF deals with protocols, and some other agency that just isn't part of the ICANN family is the IANA Operator. I haven't heard anyone really suggesting that's a good idea. People seem to think that putting that naming and numbering protocol together is kind of important in coordinating the DNS, which actually happens to be ICANN's job. Those seem to be extremes.

What I've found interesting is that some ideas that were being characterized as extreme a few months ago aren't anymore. Separation options have gone from being absolutely unthinkable and totally off-the-

table to having to be seriously considered. God knows where we'll be in another nine months. That's all I can say.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Jordan. Theresa, do you want to answer the question as well? I don't want to put you on the spot.

THERESA SWINEHEART: I'm actually not going to answer that question because there are all sorts of scenarios. More what I would answer is the announcement that came in March was a unique thing. I think many of us, and many who have been following ICANN's formation, had hoped at some point in time that such an announcement might be made, but we've gone through numerous cycles in the evolution of the organization. So it's a very unique opportunity. The announcement very much focused on the transition of NTIA stewardship role in the IANA function.

I think what's been very useful with the announcement as well is it's raised a range of other topics, scenarios, opportunities and various other things. As we're working towards what is the goal of many in the community, to try to reach a September 15th achievement of this stewardship transition, there's a lot there. It may be useful to think about what is essential to achieve this transition, and what are things that then we can all work towards after the transition.

The community, and ICANN as an organization and the Board and everybody, have always been very good at raising issues; whether it was the introductions of IDNs or whether it was any other topic, of raising issues that were relevant for the community. So the mechanisms, the

establishment of a CCWG with two work streams, the mechanisms of the organizational structure, and the community engagement and these opportunities to raise issues at any point in time and bring them to the organization and reach resolution on them, mean that we can look at things as they come up.

But in the meantime we have a relatively short timeframe, if the community is striving for a September 2015 timeframe, to achieve specifically the transition of NTIA stewardship role. That doesn't of course mean that other topics are off the table, it just means that given there's only 24 hours in the day, we have an opportunity also to see how we want to pace ourselves. So I throw that out there, just because there's been so many very good substantive points that have come up in discussions, and really good things to strive towards. It's just a question of when and how.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much Theresa. I want to thank our three panelists for providing us with their thoughts. Thank you very much. I think what's important really to bear in mind is that now is the moment to think about this. Yes, the genie is out of the bottle. A lot of things will come up, but we'll have to prioritize at some point. This point is really coming fast at us now, so hopefully by Marrakech, when we discuss this, the whole landscape will have changed, and maybe some options will become totally accepted when they were extreme before, or the other way around.

So stay tuned. I hope this feeds your reflections until tomorrow's session. Thank you very much everyone. [Applause]

KRISTINA SATAKI: We continue with some updates from ICANN. We continue today's Agenda with two more updates from ICANN, and we'll start by a presentation on IDN update by Sarmad Hussain. The floor is yours.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Hello. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to give you an update on the IDN Program at ICANN. I will go through four different items. First of all I'll give you a very quick overview of what the IDN Program at ICANN does, and then just focus on one of the large programs we are currently undertaking. It's called the IDN TLD Program. Finally, I'll give you some overview of the outreach we're doing to the community and discuss the next steps for the IDN Program going forward.

As far as the IDN Program is concerned, we are largely running, at this time, three different programs, or areas of work. One of our main focuses is to assist in the IDN ccTLD string evaluation part of the IDN fast-track process. The second program we're currently focusing on is the IDN TLD Program. What this program is doing is currently organizing communities to develop proposals, to develop an equivalent of what was previously a language table, and which we now call a label generation ruleset for the root zone. I'll talk in a bit more detail on that in later slides.

We also assist in the process of IDN implementation guidelines. These guidelines are developed in collaboration with the ccNSO and gNSO, and we assist the process. These guidelines are basically geared towards promoting IDN registration policies and practices, to minimize consumer

risk and confusion. Then we're trying to do a significant amount of outreach to the community to inform the community of what the IDN Program is about, and especially to get the community involved in some of the projects that we're undertaking.

Let's move to the TLD Program. As far as the ASCII-based domain names are concerned, basically we've always had a very conservative approach to what is possible at the root zone or top-level. For example, a label like abc-124 is possible at second-level, but for the top-level normally the names are very constrained, so you can only have letters but one cannot have hyphens or digits at top level, to formulate labels for domain names. For ASCII that's reasonably straightforward because letters are easier to define. We have A through Z.

But when we go to languages beyond Latin script or beyond ASCII, this becomes a more complex problem. So we're currently running a large project that aims to define basically for all the different scripts that we use, what are "letter" equivalent code points in Unicode, which should be allowable to formulate labels at the root zone? So through this project we're trying to answer three different question. First of all for any script, Cyrillic, Chinese, even Extended Latin, what are the characters that should be allowed for the root zone?

The way Unicode is encoded or the way the script works, if there are characters that are multiple characters within that script or across scripts, which are confusable with each other, we need to identify what those characters are and possibly whether they are variants of each other or not. Then finally we also want to look at defining whether there are other additional constraints on the labels for well-formed

labels. This is work that ICANN is organizing, but it doesn't obviously have the expertise.

The community has the expertise as far as scripts are concerned, so what we intend to do is there was a community-based process. To solve this problem on which characters should be allowed to form top-level domain names in the root zone, there was an initial study done in 2011, which looked at six scripts, just as a start, to identify what the challenges and issues are. Based on those issues and challenges, which were integrated into a report, there was a community group that developed a process on how to solve this problem, or solve this challenge.

The process that was eventually defined with the community that we're now executing, basically says that we start from what is called a maximal starting repertoire, MSR means this is the base-set of code points that is the starting point, which means that these are code points that do not, for example, include digits. They do not include punctuation marks, hyphens or such characters. They only include letters or possible letters in a script. That is a starting point, but they may still include letters or code points that are not relevant for top-level.

So we need advice from the community on how to shortlist from this larger set. We formed what are called Generation Panels for different scripts. We would form a GP for Chinese, for Cyrillic. They are script level GPs. These are community members who come together and deliberate and discuss on what letters, characters or code points should be allowed to form labels for that script at the top-level.

Each script community gives their own proposal, but the root zone is a singular zone, which is a singular zone and therefore all the different

individual proposals from the script need to be integrated together into a single large ruleset or what we call root zone LGR. We maintain an Integration Panel at ICANN, which receives proposals from the GPs, which are community based, and integrates that into the larger set.

At this time we started executing this project about mid-year last year. The Integration Panel was formed and a call for GPs was released. The Arabic GP was the first one to respond in November last year, and they started work early this year and they anticipate to finish their work towards the end of this year. It normally takes about a year for each GP to do their work. The Chinese GP just got seated. They just started their work, and they also anticipate to finish up their work early next year.

Basically, what we are aiming for is instead of waiting for all communities to get together and formulate an LGR, we will formulate an LGR incrementally so that scripts that come forward with a proposal earlier can be served earlier as well. Based on expectations of receiving proposals from the Chinese and Arabic communities to have the first version of LGR out towards the middle of next year, around June next year, other script proposals, as they come, we will integrate them and incrementally develop the LGR.

This is the status of where the different scripts are. As I said, the Arabic and Chinese are already formed. The Korean script community has organized itself. They are meeting regularly but they're still currently thinking what the scope of their work should be. As soon as they formulate a proposal we will seat them and they will start their work. There's some initial interest by many languages, but they're still in the

format of stages. We need community input from all of these script communities.

If you belong to one of these script communities, one of the things we'd like to do is reach out through you to your community members and encourage them to volunteer for the GPs, to contribute for formulating the LGR. Those in orange are those we've had initial interest for, but for those in red we've had no interest. No initial interest at all. So we really want to reach out especially to those scripts. Again, if there are people in the community here who could help reach out and get to people who are interested in contributing, it would be great to pass that message on.

For those who want to get involved, they just need to email to identlds@icann.org. It's listed here. Then the process will start. We've actually been trying to engage with the communities. We're now starting to give regular program updates to SOs and ACs at ICANN Meetings so that we can get communities more involved in the process we're doing, and also obviously report back to the communities on the progress we're making. We maintain a very active set of email lists and information on-site to keep the community updated as well.

Going forward, obviously our main goal is to develop an LGR for the IDN TLD Program and get as many GPs for as many scripts started and working, so that we can finish this as soon as possible. We may be coming back to the ccNSO for guidance on IDN implementation guidelines. They were last updated in 2011 and there's been some community interest on revising them. These are guidelines for applying it [applicable 01:08:45] at second-level. We will actually be coming back to ccNSO and asking them if there are issues that need to be addressed

at second-level, as far as IDN TLDs are concerned, which need to be discussed.

Once we get feedback from ccNSO and gNSO, based on the feedback, we'll then devise the step forward. We continue to support the IDN ccTLD fast-track process, and we'll continue our communication with the community, and outreach to the community, to make sure that the community stays informed with what we're doing. I will stop here. If you need to know more details we have two sessions tomorrow morning – at 8:30 am and one at 10:00 am, in the tent outside. Please do join us to learn more details about the IDN Program. Thank you very much.

KRISTINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. It's very interesting to see so many scripts that are populating the Internet, especially in the domain name world. Any questions? Any volunteers to do the work on scripts in your languages? Greek, for example? Any questions? If no questions, thank you very much. [Applause] Our next presenters are from the Underserved Regions Outreach Program.

AMY BIVINS:

Hello everyone. My name is Amy Bivins and I'm a part of ICANN's Registrar Services Team. I know we're at the very end of the day today, so we'll make this quick for you. We just wanted to come and talk to you for a few minutes about the work that our team is doing related to outreach to underserved regions – specifically related to potential new registries and registrars – and trying to better understand the market conditions related to becoming a registry and registrar in these regions.

Also it was to better understand some of the challenges that are faced in terms of trying to see if there's anything that we can do on ICANN's part to facilitate more businesses in these regions, by becoming registries and registrars. This project has several different phases right now. We put out a call for public comment back in March or April of this year, and we posted the results of the PDP in July. We followed up with a project roadmap that we posted last month, and it's on the ICANN Wiki, so I'd encourage you to all look at it and provide input on it. You can provide input at any time.

The project roadmap really falls into three different categories of things, that from our side, the registry and registrar services' side, that we're looking to try to do to facilitate outreach to underserved regions. One is to look at ICANN materials and accreditation requirements and think about how these requirements play out in various regions. We've heard from the community that in certain regions some of our requirements are difficult to meet, specifically the RAA insurance requirement.

We're in the process of doing a consultation on this requirement to see if there are changes that could potentially be made in this area, and we'll be posting more information about that hopefully before the end of the year. We're also working to increase collaboration within ICANN, so between the GSE Team and the Registry and Registrar Services Teams. Most of the reason why we're here today, externally, is we want to work more with you, ccTLDs, because you have experience in these regions and I think that we can really learn a lot from you.

We're hoping to increase dialogue with you on this. We're here to start that dialogue and hopefully move it forward. Specifically the third track

is more long-term planning, and we're hoping to start this next year. We want to put out a call for comments and input related to market conditions in various underserved regions. We want to know what you think about the challenges that people are facing in these regions, and why there's low demand for domain name services in certain regions.

This is one of the points where we really want to get input from you about this, because you're very familiar with these market conditions, and so we hope that you guys will participate with this. One of the examples – and we've heard some interest from some of you about this – is that one of the outreach efforts that we're working on now is being coordinated by ICANN's GSE Team, specifically by Baher in the GSE Team. It's the DNS Entrepreneurship Centre, and it's a partnership with the Egyptian National Telecommunication Regulatory Authority.

The goal of this project is to set up a center where businesses can go to get training, education and materials about how to run these types of businesses in the domain name industry. The hope is that once this center is up and running that it will be a center that we can replicate elsewhere, or learn from, and try to better understand what these regions need in order for the domain name industries to grow there. This slide is just a timeline of this center. The plans for the initial setup, through getting it all completely up and running.

The center just launched in July this year, and right now they're very focused on just getting up and running and starting to design their training programs. Right now community volunteers are very active in trying to set up these training program curriculums. They'll be continuing on this process through July of next year. They'll be moving

onto the next phase where they're hoping to become more active, be further along in the curricular and to start offering some of these training and consultation services locally.

Then by 2017 hopefully the center will be fully up and running. Then for the next steps on this, as I mentioned, we're hoping to do a study next year. Before we do the study we're going to solicit input from you and the community generally about what you think we should be studying, because we're trying to set up a study to figure out what we could be doing better, and in order to figure that out we need to know what the challenges are. So we're going to be looking to you for more input about what you think we should be looking at – what sorts of factors.

So I encourage you, when you see that, to provide your input. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

Hi. Debbie Monahan, .nz. I'm just interested in what sorts of things or criteria you're going to look at to try and identify the regions that are underserved. What is your definition of underserved, and how are those criteria going to make out? When you talk about regions, are you talking regions or sub-regions and countries or other such things? How deep are you going? Or is it too soon?

AMY BIVINS:

In answer to your question, the second one, all of the above I think. In terms of trying to even define what underserved is, that's one thing that we need your help on, because it's really challenging. We all know generally regions where we don't have a large number of registries and

registrars, but trying to really nail down and figure out what regions are not being served well and that we can serve better. Trying to come up with how to measure that or how to plan. We need your input on it. We want to know what you think. That's one of the things we'll be asking you about, coming up next year.

KRISTINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any more questions?

AMY BIVINS: My colleague Howard is also going to give a quick presentation.

HOWARD LI: I'm Howard Li, and some of you might know me, and some of you don't. Yes Keith, I see you nodding your head. But now I'm on a Registrar Services Team in ICANN, as staff. The reason I'm here today is that previously we heard that ccTLD operators have interest on this project, which is called the WHOIS address cross-field validation. What it means is that in the 2013 RAA the contract required the registrars valid the WHOIS address form; that the street exists in the city, the city exists in the province or state, and the state exists in the countries. That kind of validation is a cross-address field validation.

The background of this one is there are sections laid out in the 2013 RAA, which is the Section 1.e of the WHOIS accuracy program specification in the RAA. It says, "Validate that all postal address fields are consistent across fields, for example streets exist in the city, city exists in state or province, and the city matches the postal code." That

kind of requirement – and where such information is technically and commercially feasible.

The Section 6 of the transition addendum provides that the ICANN Registrar Working Group will identify a set of tools to complete the cross-field validation when such [two 01:22:00] mutually [agree] between ICANN and the Working Group. ICANN should provide registrar notice and the registrar should comply within the 180 days of the notice. Actually, here it's the requirement for the registrars, but if the ccTLD operators are interested in participating in this project, we welcome you to join in with providing other [vices 01:22:27] to how we can get better.

We're seeing the [rally] of the address validation, besides that it's required in the RAA and is asked for by law enforcement. We see it become a more reliable WHOIS data, and we'd use the compliance issues. The ccTLD operators don't have that right now. Protection reduction in the fragile and abusive domain name usage, I would say, in [unclear 01:23:05] registration. But it's more reducing the abusive usage of the domain names with the websites, and the better business intelligence in the long-run. For this project, some key issues we have identified.

There would certainly be more. Actually, some of those we would see as which countries or territories' addresses can be verified, or should be verified to what level. Some places on earth that just don't have an address, or there's just no place to validate the address. The other slide, more technical issues like the data format. What kind of data format can be verified in ASCII or internationalized WHOIS data like WHOIS data address in Chinese, in Cyrillic or in Arabic. Other approaches like should

there be a post-registration validation or a [unclear 01:24:31] registration validation.

What's a success? What's a fail? What kind of mechanism should we use to validate it; through an API or through a bug transfer validation. That's a lot of questions that remain to be answered. For the next step we are reinitiating the Working Group within the Registrar Stakeholder Group. If you're interested in it we invite you to join too. In [unclear 01:25:08] you can give us some other [vices 01:25:09] and also follow up with the progress.

The second one I was putting on there was to consult with the other community members, such as the ccTLD operators. You're here. So we'll set up the working scopes and the timelines and identify service providers. We actually also identified an opportunity for ICANN's role in the operationalization of the validation requirement, which is basically the Compliance issues – how Compliance will monitor the validation processes. That's it. I don't have a lot for right now. If you're interested in it you can contact me directly at howard.li@icann.org.

KRISTINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Any questions? If no questions then thank you very much for coming and sharing information with us. Thank you. [Applause] Just some final remarks. Tomorrow we reconvene at 9:15 am. Unfortunately Becky cannot make it. We really hoped at the last moment that she'd be able to come and give us a very interesting update on a very interesting and potentially very meaningful court case for us. She unfortunately cannot make it and therefore we'll skip tomorrow's presentation.

We will start with a short report from the SOP Working Group. Giovanni will be here, telling us about the work of the group and asking for some feedback from the community. Another thing I'm really looking forward to is seeing you all tonight at the ccNSO Cocktail. It's really next door. 7:00 pm we meet there for chats, for some informal gathering, to discuss today's events, what we learnt today, and to plan the future, in some not-so-official way. I'm looking forward to seeing you all. Have a nice evening, and see you tomorrow too.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]