SINGAPORE – Fellowship Morning Meetings
Thursday, March 27th 2014 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: The saying, "What doesn't kill you makes you stronger," that must be an ICANN meeting week. Or Mama J. One of the two, or both.

We're just going to get a presentation loaded up here. Some reminders for today. We aren't finished at 9:00. No, we are not. So at 9:00, we're going to move across the way to Hullet where we'll have our download from the week. That is mandatory. So we're all going to move over there together.

I'm going to say this in case we don't have time with the speakers. At 11:00 in the main hall is the Global Stakeholder Engagement Community Session where we talk about outreach and capacity building and how we're doing – our regional teams and our communication teams. So it's a good place to come in and provide input.

1:30 is the public forum. The alumni know that, for the new folks here especially, I do expect to see you at the public forum. It is the one time that you can be attending a Board meeting. The community helps to establish the topics. The Board, of course, pick the IANA Transition as one topic, but other topics will be selected by the community at the top of the 1:30 hour.

It goes on for five and a half hours. So it's a long input but once you come in there and follow the agenda and see the items that come up you can, of course, pick and choose to come in and out a little bit to

which one's that you'd like. Or just sit in the room and focus on some other things until your topics come up. I do insist that everyone at least come in and be part of it because it is a one-time only, three or four times a year, depending on how many meetings we have.

I will be sending out information about the post meeting report. I don't want anybody to stress about it. We'll talk a little bit about it in Hullet, as well.

LARS LIMAN: Good morning to you all. I'm one of the two co-chairs of the Root Server System Advisory Committee. It's great to see you all. I really don't envy you because I guess you're doing this every morning at 7:00 a.m. I usually get to sleep until 7:30.

It's great to be here. I'm really honored to be invited here to address all of you. I would like to do a quick overview of what the Root Server System Advisory Committee is and how we fit into the Internet Ecosystem. But first, I'm going to ask how much time do I have?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: It's about 15-20 minutes.

LARS LIMAN: Okay, fine.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Depending on when Fadi arrives.

LARS LIMAN: Ah, right. So, who are we? We are an advisory committee that, as most other advisory committees, our first task is to give advice to the Board. We have a fairly narrow scope for that. We give advice regarding the root server system as a whole. That means the individual root server operators.

There are 12 organizations that operate root servers and also the process that generates and transfers the root zone to the root server operators. That includes the IANA part of ICANN who do the administrative tasks of receiving requests for changes to the root zone.

They validate that, make sure everything is okay, and they propose a change which is currently authorized by the NTIA, the U.S. Department of Commerce. They more or less just rubber stamp what's going through there and it's sent to the root zone Maintainer, which is a purely technical function who puts this into the DNS System. That's the source for all the root server operators where we pick up the data and put it onto our servers.

I should mention I work for one of the root server operators, Netnod in Stockholm, Sweden. We operate the letter I, I-root. I've been working with that actually since 1992. That was even before the company Netnod was founded. I've been working with that root server since 1992, which is a scary number when you do the math.

RSSAC consists of root server operators. It consists of other stakeholders, technical and operational orientation on the group. We are just now undergoing a reorganization, so what I tell you here is how

it's looked in the past, how it's going to look in the future. The organization, how things are connected, has been changed.

We have this group of DNS experts. We have people from ccTLDs, from gTLDs, and also from people who run the regional Internet registries for IP addresses and other security experts and a mix of people.

In the ICANN organizational chart we're here, so we're an advisory group to the Board. (Switch slides, please. There you go.) What do we do? We give advice in order to make sure that all DNS queries are answered as quickly and as efficiently as possible and with the most up-to-date information available as distributed by IANA and Verisign.

We do a lot of outreach like this. We try to inform how the system works and what we will do, where we fit into the system. We do have liaisons to the Nominating Committee and to the Board. One Board member is appointed by the RSSAC. That's a non-voting member, though.

The same goes for the nominating committee. We have a member, but it is a non-voting member. We provide DNS expertise to the Board, primarily, but also to staff and to the greater community – to the other stakeholders, the other supporting organizations, and so on.

What we've done in the past, we've done recommendations from DNS, IPv6 root scaling. We did a study in anticipation of the new gTLD program. What we're about to do is to publish documents regarding service expectations - what should you expect from a root server operator? – and also some measurements. I get to you into that later on.

What we don't do: there are things that we do not get involved in. We don't tell root server operators what to do. RSSAC is not the root server operator's group. There is no formal group where you can have a chairman or a CEO to address to reach all the root servers. You have to talk to them individually.

RSSAC receives input from all the root server operators to generate advice, but it's not a conduit to give prescriptive advice to the root server operators and say, "You must do this." Since the root server operators are involved in the process of generating this advice, the hope is and the idea is that once the advice is out there, they will be willing to take it and hitherto that hasn't been a problem.

We also don't tell ICANN what to do. We give advice. This is also not prescriptive advice. We don't produce policy that is mandatory for the Board to follow like some of the supporting organizations. We do produce advice that they can look at and follow if they want to.

We also don't generate policy regarding the contents of the root zone. We don't care which top level domain is in there. We don't care what the rules are for putting stuff into the root zone. That's handled by the policy parts of ICANN, and they do that so well so we don't have to meddle with that.

If you look at the root server operations, for every root server operator, they do more than one thing. There is no organization that only operates the root. There's always other things they do as well, but it's always a separate part of their business. Running the root is one thing, and then they can be a registry, they can be an Internet exchange

operator, they can be a university zone, but the root server is always a very focused and deliberate part of the operations.

If you want to look at information regarding the root server operators, we have as root server operators a common webpage where you can have access to information about all the root server operators. It's at www.root-servers.org. This is the front page where you can see a map of where all root server operators have instances, where they have servers deployed to provide root service.

If you had talked to me 10-12 years ago, I would have said that there are 13 servers on the globe. That's no longer the case and hasn't been for a long while. We're probably up to somewhere between 250 and 300 servers by now. As you see there, they are spread all over the globe. There's still room for improvement, but it's no longer a question of 13 machines.

The newly announced IANA Functions Transition Process, we intend to take part in this. This statement signals something that has been actually intended all from the start when ICANN was created. I was actually part of creating ICANN 15 years ago. I was here at the first ICANN meeting in Singapore back in 1999. That's also when RSSAC was formed. We've been hoping that this would happen one day, and we have now seen the very first little step towards that.

RSSAC as one advisory committee expects to participate in the process but along with and together with all the other stakeholders that need to look at the future and see how we can create a stable future for us all. The things we will focus when we contribute to this process is of course

the security, stability, and resiliency of the root zone distribution system for all Internet users. That's our leading star and has always been.

RSSAC is undergoing a reorganization. We are creating now a two-layer model in order to have better processes for generating advice and producing documents. We are creating an executive committee, and that one is already up and running. We've had two meetings here. We're going to create a caucus made up of people with various forms of expertise.

The executive committee is fairly small. It consists of the 12 root server organizations – one representative from each – and it also consists of liaisons to and from various groups.

The number 12 there might be surprising to some of you because there are 13 letters, 13 IP addresses that can you reach to get root service, but two of them are operated by the same organization. That's why the number is 12.

The executive committee will create the initial process and procedures for running the RSSAC organization. We've reached a fairly mature state with that. We have a document in draft status that we are intending to use to get the organization going. That will be published, with some luck, at the end of April. Then we will continue to work to create the full organization and hopefully be done with that by June 1.

The executive committee will select and keep track of the various work items that we need to deal with. It will appoint work parties from the caucus and then be responsible for publishing the work when it's done.

Of course, the executive committee also works with appointing and accepting liaisons and elects the two co-chairs that we have.

The current two co-chairs are Professor Jun Murai from the WIDE Project in Japan and myself. Jun, unfortunately, couldn't make it to this meeting here in Singapore.

We have liaisons outgoing, as I mentioned, to the Board and NomCom. Incoming we have three liaisons that are listed in our bylaws which are from the IANA. Let me get that right. They are the administrative part of this for the root zone. NTIA, of course, because they are the authorizers and the root zone maintainer which currently is done by VeriSign.

We also have liaisons with the Internet Architecture Board. That's on the IETF side, the protocol specification side. And with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, and we are about to establish with the Government Advisory Committee.

The caucus is made up from people with various expertise. The DNS protocol side, how does the DNS work? DNS operations, people who work with server installations. They're either on the providing side, the authoritative side, or the consumer side (the resolver side). As I mentioned, registry operators, security experts, and so on.

We will try to form a group with varied expertise from which we can create sub-groups to do work on specific work items. Once the sub-group, the work party, has produced a draft document that will be circulated within the entire caucus to generate consensus regarding the document which will then be forwarded back to the executive committee for ratification and publication.

The current status of this is that we are developing our operational procedures, and we've had editing sessions this week to progress the work. We're at a somewhat mature document that will be circulated and hopefully then decided upon by the last of April. We've been through that.

So the next steps for us are to finish the initial procedures document and to appoint the caucus. We already have a basis for that, so to speak. We know which people we want to talk to to invite in the first round because the old RSSAC which was much more loosely connected was a very large group of these divided experts, so there's a starting point for us. Then we will, over time, invite you people as we see need for new types of expertise and people might want to step down and so on.

We also need to publish the two inherited documents. The old version of RSSAC actually had two documents in the pipeline that we need to publish and get out there.

We also work to establish better relationships with other ICANN bodies, the other supporting organizations and advisory committees, in order to be able to pick up issues that relate to root service early on in the process so that we can provide advice in parallel or preferably even early on in the policy procedures so that we don't run into problems at a late state when the policy documents are almost done.

The two documents that we are working on right now is one regarding root server expectations: what should you expect from a root server in terms of performance, reliability, and so on?

That goes out in parallel with a document that the Internet Architecture Board is writing because we've realized that root server requirements has two sides to it. It has an operational side where you do focus on reliability and performance and so on, but there's also protocol side.

Not so much about actual numbers, but how should they respond when you send the DNS query. What type of DNS response should you expect from a root server? That's more of a protocol issue. That's handled by the Internet Architecture Board.

These documents are intended to go out in tandem together, but they have very different publication processes. The IAB publishes as an RFC through the traditional standard series, and we publish it through the ICANN channels. But they reference each other, so they need to get out at the same time.

The other document relates to measurements. With the new gTLD program, we're going to see – and already see – a totally different change rate to the root zone. We're adding new top-level domains by the week. If you go back a year or two in time, it was maybe one new top-level domain per year. Now we're seeing between 5 and 15 per week. That's a very steep curve compared to what it used to be.

We want to measure some metrics of the root server system to be able to watch how it changes over time and see if there are any signs of stress. If the system starts to behave strangely that we need to make changes to either the process of adding new gTLDs or to the technical system of the root service, which is a more likely thing.

But since it's a rather slow business to change the root server system. As I mentioned 250 to 300 servers distributed over 12 organizations may need to be upgraded, replaced, so on, that is a lot of machinery. A lot of financial machinery. A lot of logistics that need to happen to make these upgrades, so we need to have a very long horizon to be able to keep things in check and make sure it's all up and running.

That's what I intend to say right here.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: That's all you do?

LARS LIMAN: That's all we do. I'm sorry, yes. So if you have questions, please.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Please, remember to state your name.

ANDREAS DLAMINI: I would like to know: what benefits does it bring to a country to host a root server? The second question is VeriSign looks like there's a special role different from the other operators. How is their role different?

LARS LIMAN: Thank you. The first question is somewhat – actually, both are not so complicated when you dive into it. Putting a root server in a country, I try to view it as you don't put a root server in a country. You put the root server in the circle, certain part, in the Internet topology.

I would like to rephrase it to be, "What's the benefit of having a root server nearby as opposed to faraway?" The two benefits it gives you is that you get a quicker response. You don't need to travel across the globe to send the query and have the response coming back.

The second advantage is that if there are interrupts with the network service in your area – and there have been some major interrupts, for instance, with the earthquakes and other type of natural disasters – when there are cable cuts, you can still have service and use, for instance, other local top-level domains.

You needed the root server to get the referral to the local top-level domain, but if your local top-level domain is still operational and the root server nearby is still operational, you can get that referral and actually use the system – the Internet for the local domains in your area – so that is a big advantage.

I should also add that root servers respond not only to legitimate queries. If you ask for a domain name that contains an existing top-level domain, you will get the referral and the client side, the resolver, will remember that. So next time someone asks about the same top-level domain, it will already know the answer, so it doesn't have to talk to the root server.

But for every top-level domain, that doesn't exist. People make typos when they type on the keyboard. That has to go to the root server and it has to say, "No. It doesn't exist." That's actually the major part of our queries are queries with typos because all the top-level domains that do exist are quickly learned by the client side. Most of our traffic is actually garbage.

That's your first question. The second was: how is VeriSign special? If you look at them as purely a root server operator, they are not special. Their system works exactly the same way as all the others. Of course, they have their design. They use their operating systems, their platforms, and so on. If you look at the [logistical] system, they work exactly as the others.

The only special role they have is that they have a contract which appoints them to be the party that edits the root zone in the DNS context. They receive the request from the IANA via the NGIA to do the change to the root zone and then distribute that to all the root server operators, including themselves.

They operate the servers A-root and J-root, but A-root is not special. It's operated exactly as all the others. There's a special set of servers from which we all, including VeriSign, copy the root zone. These hidden servers are actually ordinary DNS servers. It's just that we want to have well-defined points who are not susceptible to attacks and so on from which we pull the data.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Karel?

KAREL DOUGLAS: Lars, thank you very much, an excellent presentation. I would add one thing though, which is, what is the root zone from a non-technical point of view? Many of us, as well as me speaking for myself, I always find it somewhat fascinating to understand what the root zone is. Now when

you spoke, I'm getting the impression, "Well, listen, these are critical servers that support the Internet."

In Trinidad, I was at pains to explain to my senior, to my boss, how the Internet worked. I did say there were 13 root servers upon which the Internet [inaudible]. It was very difficult for me, so I'm always happy to have maybe if you could explain in a nutshell exactly how it works. Especially now as you say like the dot com and the new gTLDs, how those are going to be inserted into servers, etc. Thank you.

LARS LIMAN: Thank you. Very good question. I should have started there, I apologize. The root zone is the apex, the summit, of the DNS system. If you're a client and you don't know anything yet because you've just started up, your system has just started up, and you want to find a DNS record which is typically a host name, www.liman.se points to an IP address and you want to retrieve that mapping, you have to start at the top of the system because you don't know anything.

You want to find this record, so you ask a root server exactly that query. "What does www.liman.se,what's the IP address to that name?" The root server will tell you, "I don't know, but I can see but the name you're querying for ends in .se, Sweden. So please go and talk to the TLD servers for Sweden. They are over there, and it will list the servers and the IP addresses for the Swedish Top Level Domain servers.

Now, the client will again issue the same query to the Swedish Top Level Domain servers. "What does www.liman.se, what's the IP address?" And they will say, "We don't know. This is a subdomain. We have

delegated this. Someone bought this, but you have to talk to the name servers for liman.se. They are over here, and they will list, it will give the IP addresses."

And again, a third time, the same query will be put, and this time we are actually talking to the correct server so they say, "Oh, the IP address for www.liman.se is 192.138.whatever it is."

The client side, the resolver, will learn everything and remember that for a specific time. The time is specified in the response it gets. "You are allowed to remember this for this many seconds." That varies rather a lot I'd say, but in the higher levels of the DNS trace, it's usually a day or two.

The root servers in this system contained the list of top level domains and the list of the servers operated for each of these top level domains. That is actually a fairly small amount of data.

Before the new gTLD program started, so I haven't checked recently, you could fit the entire root zone file on an old floppy drive, ten times. That's how small it is. That's the amount of data we're talking about.

But it's a very popular database. A lot of people actually ask queries. It is a list of the top level domains, and for each top level domain the list of servers that operate for that top level domain.

So when you enter a new TLD, when you create a new TLD, you go to the IANA and say, "Here's this new gTLD. Please put it in the root zone." They will edit this little database. They will add the name for the new gTLD or new TLD and send that to the NTIA saying, "We want to make this change." NTIA looks at it and says, "Yes. That's okay." It goes to

Verisign. Verisign actually enters that into the computer, and then it's copied by all the root server operators and put into operation.

There is no technical difference between a ccTLD and a gTLD. As a root server operator, I don't care. I don't know if it's a gTLD or ccTLD. I can kind of figure it out. "Is it two characters? Okay it's a ccTLD. Is it more characters? Yes, it's a gTLD." But that's the only way. The information in the root zone is more or less identical. The IP addresses vary, the names of the TLDs varies, but the technical content is exactly the same.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I feel like I was at DNSSEC for beginners. I was expecting to see the clouds from the cavemen kind of coming up behind Lars. I had another hand up here earlier. Well, now I've got a whole bunch, and now I don't know what to do. Go ahead, sir.

BRIAN BRADY: Could you speak to the possibility of the expansion of the number of letter route from 13 to possibly more like 26 to allow for maybe greater distribution either geographically or just to handle additional capacity on the system?

LARS LIMAN: Yes. These are actually two different questions in my mind. When you refer to expanding to more letters, that would also map to more organizations that administer set of root servers.

Netnod that I work for, we administer a set of around 50 root server installations across the globe. We have servers all the way from Perth in

Australia to Tokyo to Singapore to all of Europe, Africa, South America, and North America.

If you're going to create another letter, you will really have to think, "What's the gain of doing that?" Because the root server operators don't control anything when it comes to data. We publish the data exactly as we get it, and we cannot make change to it because nowadays the root zone is signed with DNSSEC. The cause for doing that is precisely so that the data should be impossible to change by anyone in the chain.

That said, is it possible to create more letters? A good number of years ago I would have said no because 13 was actually the limit where we could fit all the root servers into one DNS packet. You want to be able to do that for the first query when the client will ask, "Which is the current set of root name servers?" It gets the response, "Here's the list of all 13 and the IP addresses and IPv6 addresses for all these 13."

According to old DNS standards, that needed to fit into 512 bytes. That's a very small packet, and you couldn't really fit more than a list of 13 servers in such a small packet.

That has changed. DNS nowadays has an extended version, so you can fit more into it. So, yes, you can create a few more, but you will start to run into those problems with packet size, again, at some number. So we cannot create 500 more. Then it gets into, yes, we could probably do one, two, three. Ten? I'm not going to say ten. One more, probably yes. Two more is probably okay, but we're running into this problem fairly soon again.

Then you have a problem to decide who's going to run these and why. That's something that we may have to look at in the future anyhow because we probably need to create a succession plan for root server operators.

It was initially a technical problem. It's not a technical problem right now to create a few more, but the gain of doing so isn't really that big because we have servers all over the globe and the root server operators are happy to talk to people about deploying more. We want to serve in more places.

If you think that it would be a benefit for you to have a root server near you and you don't have one, do come and talk to us. Go to the root servers page. Find the contact information for the root server operators. Send an e-mail message and say, "I live here and here. We have these and these properties in our network environment. We think it would be appropriate to put a root server here. Can we find a way to do that?" because we have a positive attitude to do that.

BRIAN BRADY: Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Here we're going to just take a pause, I think. Fadi just has a couple minutes to say hello, and we want to respect his schedule on this busy day. So welcome, Fadi.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Good to be here. Thank you. Sorry for my hasty in-and-out. We have, as usual, a very packed schedule. I think I was in this room until 1 a.m. dealing with some good things happening at ICANN.

First, I want to welcome you as fellows to ICANN. How many people here have been fellows before? Okay, so a good half of the room is repeat fellows.

The fellows program, in my opinion, is one of the brightest spots in ICANN's work. It really is. It really is. Some of the facts we're getting from Janice about the number of fellows who actually remain involved in ICANN and continue to provide community value to ICANN is remarkable.

It's a program that I know over the years when I look at programs or ideas for things to do, I usually look at the facts first and decide if we should continue supporting this. The last time she did this I said, "Can you double the program size? It was so good." And she said, "Well hold on there's a lot of work to do that. Can you give me a little time?"

But we did almost double the program this year and I'm going to challenge her to double it again next year because I do think, I truly think from the resource standpoint, this is the best money spent at ICANN, no question.

It's good investment for us. It's good investment in you. It's good investment in the community. It builds understanding and knowledge for all of us on how people on this planet can come together and actually make decisions bottom-up in a consensus way.

Governance, in general, is being challenged on the planet right now. There's massive issues with governance. Most statistics show that the level of trust in our governance models as humans now is at the lowest level since it's ever been recorded.

Most of us don't trust how we're governed. Very few of us have very high, let's say, opinion of the governance models we live under. It's bad in the developing world, which is a bad sign because supposedly here we've had governance and institutions and democratic principles. It's very bad.

I mean, in the U.S., most people really don't trust their government – most people. I mean, a great majority, 70%, don't trust how the government is run, have no faith in our government system. Then you go to the developing world, and it's not much better. There's a lot of issues as well.

So, here at ICANN, do we have a bright spot or do we have a dark spot on governance? This is a very important issue. It's not just about what we do with names and numbers. We also have a responsibility to the world that the Internet is a very powerful resource, and we are managing it for the last 15 years together as a community – governments, private sector, and civil society.

Is it working? That's the question. Do we feel it is working? Can we tell the world it is working? Does the world perceive us as working? So there's perception, there's reality, and there's real hard work that we do to make sure every day that we advance in this model.

EN

Therefore, I'm just telling you that your participation as fellows is the biggest hope for me that we'll continue to bring people to see the model, to improve it.

So you have a job to also improve it not just to accept what you see. You have the freshest eyes when you come as fellows. You see something that's not working, speak up. This is not your government. This is not the normal governance model you're used to. This is a place where every one of you has an equal voice, and you should reach me, reach Janice, reach anyone.

Yesterday at midnight, I got a call from one member of our community. I was with my wife celebrating her birthday, and they said, "No. You come back here. We need to talk to you." I came back.

This is how it works at ICANN, and that's remarkable. There is no place in any governance model where these things happen. There are very few places. I shouldn't say there's no place. There are very few places where this kind of equality at making governance decisions happens. Enjoy it. Cherish it. Preserve it. Help it. Advance it. Evolve it.

The worst thing that could happen to ICANN is that we become rigid. This is the worst thing that could happen to us is we become less flexible. Not dynamic. Non-evolving. Resistant to change, right?

When I came to ICANN, I will admit to you that were a lot of walls. There were a lot of rigid things. Staff and Board and community had walls between them. My staff wasn't allowed to talk to a Board member when I arrived. So all these, and I announced on my first day, "No more fortresses. We need an oasis."

For those of us who come from desert countries, you know how beautiful an oasis is – a place that attracts people. That brings people to life. That has no walls. As opposed to a fortress which is when we defend and make bunkers. We cannot be a fortress. ICANN must be a governance oasis, an attractive place where people come and find new ways of agreeing on things, and very few people understand this model.

Don't label it. This is my last message to you. We over-label things. I grew up in a country, in Lebanon, where people fought for 15 years. Most of my high school classmates are dead because of labels. "What are you?" "I'm Christian." "I'm Muslim." "I'm Shiite." "I'm this." "I'm that." "I'm Druze." "I'm tall." "I'm dark." It's remarkable what people can do to each other with labels.

Let's not run around with labels. "We're a multi-stakeholder against multi-lateral." It's just waste of time. We should agree to principles not to labels. The principle of inclusiveness. The principle of equal participation. The principle of consensus, bottom-up, decision making.

These are the principles, and if you don't know these principles please ask any of us. It's our job. We can be flexible on everything else but our principles, flexible on everything else. Change everything else, but know the principles of this community and stand firm on them. Help me do that. Help ICANN do that. Help all of us do that.

The world is watching us because, as I said yesterday at the APRALO Showcase, even the most hardened U.S. lawmakers do not understand multi-stakeholder approaches of inclusivity and consensus. They don't. Imagine the rest of the world who has not been as exposed to this approach. We are ambassadors of that model. But do not put labels. Do

not alienate others, say, "You're multi-lateral. I'm multi-stakeholder." It doesn't do us anything. Instead we're inclusive.

Look at ICANN. Everybody's welcome. Anyone is welcome. No membership. No fees. No nothing. Come, participate. You can't be here? Dial in. You can't understand? Listen to translations. This is the ICANN spirit, and we count on you to keep it. It is not my spirit. It is not Janice's spirit. It's our spirit, our principles.

So good luck. Thank you for being here. I hope this was fruitful for you. I hope you come enriched from this. I hope you can bring to your communities back a new experience that will enrich their lives and your life. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you very much. Much appreciated for your time. Good luck with your day. We do have five more minutes before our wonderful representatives of the Nominating Committee will step up. So, Lars, if you have a couple minutes, we have quite a few questions. Guys I'm sorry because I know that we're a lot scattered, but Rahul and Valentina, you both had and then, okay.

RAHUL SHARMA: Hi. Good morning. I'm from India. My question is the NTIA or the Department of Commerce approval required for amending any of the entries into root zone servers for all [inaudible]?

My second question is, you said that Verisign has a contract with NTIA directly. Do all the operators of root servers have this contract with

NTIA as well? And in that case, who is the operator of root service accountable to? Is it the NTIA or the ICANN because they have contracted both?

My third question is, why is only Verisign responsible for operating root zone servers for a pretty long time because their competitors that can be allowed? So are these criteria is fixed? Is it an open process wherein others can participate too? They can propose that they can operate the root zone servers?

A fourth question is…

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Whoa, whoa, whoa, down boy. Let's go with these couple. We have like three other people and two minutes.

RAHUL SHARMA: It's a very small one.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We have three other people and two minutes.

LARS LIMAN: I'm striving to remember your first question. You did ask, yeah, NTIA. NTIA doesn't make any change to the data. What they do is they approve the change that is proposed by the IANA. So the IANA does all the vetting, all the checking that this is a legitimate change coming from the right source and so on.

The NTIA approval happens before the zone is distributed to all the root server operators. It happens before Verisign, in its role as root zone maintainer, makes the change to the database and then it's copied to all the root server operators. So there is no way to bypass the NTIA with the current system. Now they've signaled that they want to step out of this in the future, so we hope that that part is going away, but currently that's the case.

You asked about contracts. Yes Verisign has a contract with the NTIA. That's the only root server that has a contract to operate root servers. All the others do not have such contracts, but several of the root server operators have made public statements regarding their service saying, "This is what we do, this is how we do it, and this is what we promise to do." These statements can usually be found on public webpages.

I know that for I-Root, it's on our public webpage. If you follow our homepage link on that www.root-servers.org page, you will eventually end up on the webpage and you can click your way through and find our statement where we promise to the Internet users, our community, we serve the Internet users. That's what we see our role to be, and we promise that we'll do our very best to publish correct data as we get it from IANA in a timely fashion as well as we can to as many as we can without bias. That's what we promise to do.

That is also our accountability mechanism. If we don't do that, we have, so to speak, broken our promise to the community, and then we can look at methods of having that fixed. We see the need for an increased accountability mechanism, and that is something that we will have to

look at and try to find a framework that makes this firmer and more clear, but that's the situation we are in today.

You had a third question, but I didn't get it onto paper in time. I thought, "Okay, one question, I can hold that in memory. Two, I can make that. Three, now I have to write it down," and then I've already forgotten. I'm sorry. Could you please repeat your third question. Just jog my mind please.

RAHUL SHARMA: My third question was: are there any competitors that have approached the NTIA or ICANN that they are willing to operate the root A server, and why is it only Verisign that is given the contract year after year for operating the root zone?

LARS LIMAN: Right. Yes, there are competitors that want to run root servers, period. There are several various types and organizations. Yes. A-root is not special. A-root is not the biggest, the best, the first, the anything. We could circulate the letters on these servers. It's just an index. We could have numbers instead. We could have pictures instead. It's just we need to set IP addresses to the different ones, and we chose letters. A-root is not, not, not a special server.

The fact that Verisign operates this root zone maintainer role is something you'll have to ask the NTIA about, why they get that contract every year. But I would say it goes back to them being the ones who did it in the very, very old [assign] – and now we're getting back 15-20 years in time – and they've actually done an outstanding job. From an

engineering perspective, it just works. They have the top-notch guys who do this. They're very well equipped to do it.

RAHUL SHARMA: Just a small follow up question. Okay.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: No. Love you dearly, no.

LARS LIMAN: I'm happy to talk to you afterwards if you have more questions.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Exactly. That's what I was just going to say. We'll do that as usual. You can see that I take your questions, and I get them to the speakers. We do the exchange. It's all good. You'll get your voice heard.

I'm really impressed, as we wrap up this part, of the seven years that I've been doing this, first of all, we never talked about NTIA. That never came into this room. It's just so exciting actually that this transition has created such conversation about an integral part of ICANN and the Internet Governance. For me, this has just been, thank you Lars, very stimulating.

We've only just recently had you start to come to these Fellowship Morning Meetings, and both have been this kind of engaged conversation. That really says a lot for what you're doing for bringing our site back into the fold, as it were, kind of more into the picture. So, thank you much for this morning. Everybody just get me your questions.

I will get them to Lars, and I know he'll get to them as soon as he can. Thank you.

LARS LIMAN: And thank you very much for having me here. I want to repeat and state again, please come and talk to me, my fellow root server operators, other members of the RSSAC. We are happy to talk to you. We like you to do this outreach, so don't hesitate. I may be tall, but I don't bite. I promise. Thank you so much for having me here.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you. Cheryl, would you like to come on up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I'd love to come on up, but I'd also like to invite my associate Chair to come and join us. And of course, Yjro, for those of you who are repeat visitors to the Fellowship Program perhaps from last year or even sometimes before, has been involved in what we're here to talk about, which is the Nominating Committee, for about four years, and he served as the Chair last year.

I'll tell you a little bit about us, and I'm going to ask Janice to just queue up pretty much just the website because we've taken a lot of time and energy to try and redesign something that we hope is somewhat useful to you. Not that the other one wasn't, but it wasn't the friendliest and most interactive space, so we're trying to improve a little bit.

For those of you who do not know me, my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and it's my honor to serve this year as the Chair of the ICANN Nominating Committee.

Now, most nominating committees, and depending on the culture you come from, might be an organization or a group of people who look at and select and perhaps make a list or what we sometimes call "slate of candidates" for a position. That is very much the normal role of a nominating committee, so they say. "We love you. We think you've got a lot to offer. Your skillsets are absolutely perfect to put into our mix," and then something else happens elsewhere. That is not, however, the case in the ICANN NomCom.

The ICANN Nominating Committee does a search, a select and a sift and a sort, and then appoints. So it is both a nominating committee and an appointing body. I'd like to tell you today so you can go back to the countries and companies and organizations that you come from that that means there is opportunity. We don't want to waste opportunity, do we? We wouldn't be here as Fellows if we were into wasting opportunity.

This year, and this year's getting a little short, but it happens every single year, we have opportunity for two seats on the ICANN Board. In fact, over a three-year cycle, we appoint eight, that's right, eight members of the ICANN Board. That's a fairly influential situation on a 15-person Board. Right? Think about this opportunity.

We are also in a position to appoint to what's called the Supporting Organizations. I know you've heard from them here, and you know all about the supporting organizations because when I led another part of

ICANN, I know you also learn about the Advisory Committees. I don't have to tell you what a Support Organization or an Advisory Committee is.

But each of those organizations have a leadership team or a council. We put someone on each year to the GNSO Council and to the ccNSO Council. In both of those situations, ladies and gentlemen, what we try and do to the best of our ability is put someone that would not be able to get a seat at that leadership table from the council itself.

As a member of the Board of .au, the ccTLD, in fact, we're an administrator because we sub-contract out the registry operations. As a director of that organization, and should I seek to serve on the ccNSO council, my pathway is through the ccNSO. It is not primarily through the NomCom. Now, exceptions happen, that's fine. We all like exceptions, they're exciting. They're useful. They're interesting, and they give us opportunity.

The same can be said, although less restricted, for the GNSO, but we do try and do what's called more independent appointments. We try and put people in with some fresh perspectives and with perhaps a little less necessarily just ICANN experience. This is where talking to you at the Fellowship is so important because so many of you have not been engaged in ICANN since before there was an ICANN.

Some of you are here to bring fresh perspectives and new voices, and these leadership opportunities could be very well perfectly designed for you. We also have, this year, two seats on what's called the At-Large Advisory Committee. I'm sure you remember a very, very interesting

presentation by Olivier Crépin-Leblond who serves as the Chair of the ALAC, and that's a role I have served in the past.

You will remember, of course, that the ALAC is geographically, regionally, sectored up into five spaces, right? He will have told you that the Regional At-Large Organizations put two people in from the EURALO. Well, the Nominating Committee puts the third person in geographically. This year, we are looking for people from North America and from Europe. Next year, however, we will be looking for the other regions. Okay? Opportunity.

If you feel you have the talent and if you want to know what we're looking for, it's on a website, which I'll tell you about shortly but hopefully, yes, there it is, sitting up there. Thank you very much, Janice. If you feel you know someone who has the talent, the skills, the expertise, and might I say, ladies and gentlemen, the huge amount of time that these leadership roles take. The paperwork often says up to 20 hours a week. That's a good week.

These leadership roles are serious. They can be treated very much as a part time, unpaid employment in some ways. But the opportunity to make good and change and develop something and be engaged, particularly in the SOs in the policy development process – and that's where the power for change sits, in the policy development process. Of course, I'd like to think in Advisory Committee process which acts as a valve and as an information input to these policy pieces.

If you think you're interested, if you think you know someone who is interested, then go into this website, and you might just perhaps click on the "apply now" button. There should be one somewhere. While

that happens – the magic will happen, and perhaps Yjro will be able to help Janice find that – I just want to tell you about what happens when you do that.

On this site, which might I say, have the most amazing people starring in it. It might just happen to have myself, and that is amazing enough, after all. But not only myself. It's a three-for-one deal here. You get Yjro with his expertise, and you get Stephane Van Gelder, who unfortunately can't be with us here this morning, but he's what's called the Chair Elect.

In the leadership of the Nominating Committee, we take a year in training as Chair Elect. Then providing we don't muck that up too badly, because there's a 360 review done on the leadership team by an external consultant. This is serious work, and we have to have absolute accountability, and we're working on the transparency.

It is an assumption that a Chair Elect will become a Chair, but it is not a guarantee. And, of course, the Chair and Chair Elect are actually appointed by the ICANN Board.

The rest of the Nominating Committee comes from the component parts of ICANN. You've heard just from RSSAC. They put someone on the NomCom. The rest of the committee is made up of people sent by the community to serve the community. But the Chair has the choice – they may choose not to, I'll hasten to add – has the choice to have an Associate Chair, which if you're smart will be somebody with the skills and experience of Yjro.

If we could, Yjro, do you want to get Janice to scroll down just after the next thing? I'll just deal with this first. Nope, you're too fast for me, Janice. Have a look at the timeline. I'd like you to have a brief word about that.

As you can see, up here, I wish I had a pointer, but I'll just wave my stick at it. As you can see, and of course you are all looking closely at fine print that no one could possibly read, so I'll try and tell you what's where.

When someone says, "Yes, I'd like to have a go at a position," – and it can be anybody – you select what you'd like to do. Are you interested in the Board positions? Are you interested in the ALAC positions? Are you interested in the GNSO positions? You select those as preferences, or if you're not interested in them at all, there is plain language explanations. This is all very new. It's a very different form, so if you've done it before you need to go and have a look again.

You also give us consent and authorization because whilst we have candidates confidentiality treated with the utmost concern, professionalism, and security, we also, for example, will be doing third-party checks on you. If you say you're the Professor of whatever at XYZ University and you've published in the following journals, we'll be reading those journals. We'll be looking at the University. This is a serious matter, so you need to consent for all of that to happen.

We have tight deadlines this year. In previous years, nominating committees have, in fact, extended their deadlines. I believe, Yjro, this is the last time I'm going to say this in the whole lot of this meeting. Trust me there will be no extension past April 1 this year, 23:59 UTC on April

1. All people who have begun this process by just filling out that part of the form and then other things happen – all people will then be fully considered. Come in after that time, first of all you'll have to come in before we lock it, but you will not be fully considered.

Now, I'm going to ask Yjro to, I think, get Janice to come back out of there and scroll down to where the timeline is and have a little talk about what happens when. Because one of the things we're trying to do is make our processes public even though candidacy is private.

I also just wanted to recognize, John, if you'd stand up and wave to the team. See that man? He's one of many, but he is a Nominating Committee member. I don't think I've got anymore hiding around. They do this to me. They get in the back of the room and they're, "I am here. Remember me." Hans has been doing it all week. It's a plot to make me look like I don't look in the room.

Anyone who under normal circumstances at an ICANN meeting is wearing a red lanyard is probably a Nominating Committee member. But because we're in Asia Pacific here and APRALO has chosen to have a color red, you also may find that might mean you've just been to the APRALO Showcase. So kind of read what it says, but check out anyone with a red lanyard. Make sure that it actually says that they're Nominating Committee, and they can help you. As can Yjro, as can I, and of course as can Janice. Over to you ,Yjro.

YJRO LANISPURO: Thank you, Cheryl. Yeah, this year there has been this sort of what I would call confusing similarity with these lanyards, but anyway, if you look carefully, you can distinguish the Nominating Committee members.

Well, April 1 in some cultures it is known as April Fool's Day, and newspapers publish all sorts of stories that are not true and so on and so forth. But I can assure you that what Cheryl just said that the April 1 deadline is a fixed one. That is absolutely true and no joke.

Okay, so what happens after that? The Nominating Committee starts reading, of course, the applications, the material that has been provided, that is to say a profile. The applications people who are candidates, they explain what kind of plus value they would bring to those positions they are applying for and so on and so forth. Also there are references. So the members have to read all that.

Then at the point is like two weeks from the deadline or three weeks from the deadline, we have to assess, that is to say, give our assessments. On the basis of those assessments, 15 Board candidates are sent for further scrutiny by a headhunting firm that is called Odgers Berndtson, usually just referred to as OB. OB is in Frankfurt.

So they make phone interviews quite long. I mean, like, one hour, one and a half hour phone interview, so it's really in-depth. They eventually provide us score cards that tell us a lot about those candidates.

While they are doing their job sometime after Easter, that is to say in the latter half of April, the Nominating Committee is considering candidates for the GNSO, the ccNSO, and ALAC.

EN

At some point in May, I hope by the middle of May, we get back the scorecards from OB on the 15 Board candidates that have been sort of selected [to the top], and then we have to make another selection. We need a short list that must be less than ten but hopefully even smaller number of Board candidates that are invited to London for personal interviews.

In-person interviews are made by the entire committee. One interview lasts about an hour. After the interviews and after the meeting proper, that is to say on Friday and Saturday, the Nominating Committee goes into seclusion in some secret place and we deliberate until we are ready. Until we have the slate, the Board members, and all the others. Then white smoke comes out like from the Vatican when the Pope has been elected, and we announce our selection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks guys. That's fantastic, and it makes me smile, the concept of we as Cardinals sitting in convocation and the rest of the world of waiting. It's actually quite amusing for another reason of course, Yjro, is because even though we will have done our selections at the end of the London meeting, the world won't find out for some time after that because all sorts of due diligence has to be done.

Quite serious background checks are done because, as you can imagine, with the world watching something as important and as exciting as what's going to be happening in ICANN over the next 12 to 18 months, and perhaps up to three or four years, there can be no margin for error. The announcement probably won't be out until September but, trust me, we'll know before we leave London.

One thing I must say to you: our members are bound by non-disclosure agreements, confidentiality agreement, whatever you want to call it and the code of conduct which is extraordinarily strict. They cannot talk to you other than to give you information which is, in the main publicly available anyway, or to explain a process.

They can neither confirm nor deny if somebody is a candidate. A candidate could walk up to the microphone this afternoon at the Public Forum and state they are a candidate to the record. Then if you came up to me and said, "Cheryl, I didn't realize Joe Bloggs thought they'd be a good director of the Board." I would say, "I can neither confirm nor deny that Joe Bloggs is in the running."

Appreciate we take our confidentiality seriously even when things are no longer confidential. Because I've got John in the room, I want John to stand up and come on down. It's a bit like a game show here, John. He's going to be another source of possible opportunity for you. I know how valuable it is for people who've come through the Fellowship Program to get engaged in different parts of the community.

I also know that we build leaders out of you sitting at this table. One of the pathways to recognition of your skills, your talents, and your capabilities as a potential leader in this organization, wherever it is that takes your fancy, is to serve on the Nominating Committee. John is doing that, and I would give him a few words to just do a bit of Q & A. What on earth is this like? Over to you, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Great. Yeah, it's on. Well, I think one of the first things I would like to explain, and that Cheryl asked me to talk about to a certain extent, is what is a Nominating Committee made up of and what it is like to serve on it.

If it hasn't been gone over already, the Nominating Committee is made up of various individuals. It's all set by the bylaws, and they are either members of the SOs, representatives of that, or from the various constituencies.

Once we get into that room and start our work, I can assure you, we're nothing like Cardinals. If any of you have gone through interviews or if you've interviewed for a job, it's one of the most important things you can do to help an organization, help your business, help the non-profit you may have worked for. That's what it's basically like.

We will start off with, as Cheryl said, a group of incredibly qualified candidates. It's all confidential. We'll assign those resumes out to various individuals to take a look at. We all take a very, very serious look at every single person that comes through this process.

We have teams that are then assigned the individuals to do what we call a deep dive. Those individuals will call the references and will really look at all the background of people to make sure that everything in those CVs and resumes is accurate and also to get a really personal picture of what that individual is like.

Then we discuss the individuals. Starting soon, we'll probably be to at least weekly or bi-weekly meetings, conference calls that will go on for a

while. Then it will culminate at the London meeting where we will be, this is like selecting the Pope, we'll be ensconced away from all the fun.

We will, again though seriously, we will interview people and seriously deliberate the candidates and finally come to a selection. Keeping in mind the bylaws, the diversity requirements that we have, and again everybody's qualifications. I'm glad to answer any questions that I can or turn it back over.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think it's time to open up for questions and, John, if you stay there in the front with us you can deal with some, Yjro can deal with some, and I can. After you, Janice. Please, tell us who you are.

ETUATE COCKER: My question is with regards to how you choose a specific candidate. If they are all qualified and they have similar qualification from different regions, how are you going to determine which region win the specific position?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to ask John to just remind you of some of what he just said in the terms of the how, but in terms of the regional diversity and the waiting, which I think is part of the question you're asking, there are limitations.

Obviously, with the At-Large Advisory Committee, we can only appoint from Asia-Pacific when it's Asia-Pacific's turn and we can only appoint to the others. But for the Board, there is a specific limitation. This is a

bylaw limitation. There cannot be more than five from one region. So we actually have to look at the make-up of the existing Board.

It's not just the geographic diversity we look at. If we have equally qualified candidates, and we often do, then we start weighting particular skillsets. The Board, for example, may have at one year said to say they particularly want audit and risk experience. So if someone was to have audit and risk experience, we would weight that more highly.

The same can be said for the ccNSO. One year they did ask. Although I was on the other side of it, not the NomCom side of it. I was on the asking side at that stage. They were to be sent someone, if at all possible, with legal drafting skills, and so that skill was more heavily weighted. John, do you want to add anything to that?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Not really. Cheryl, you did a great job of explaining it. The only thing I would say is if you want to get a really good picture as to what the particular geographic requirements are, just get on the ICANN website and click on the Board, and then there's Board Documents, and then underneath that it has the bylaws, and that sets forth the different criteria.

In other words, there's the five different regions and the amounts you can have per region. In other words, you can't have it too weighted one way or the other. I can tell you right now, it's a very representative Board though, obviously, geography will come into play in later rounds here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, just to follow up one little rounding of point back to the diversity issue. Geography is not the only diversity we should be looking for, strangely enough, and skillsets are only part of the diversity mix as well. It would be unbelievable to every woman in this room who comes to my Women in DNS Breakfast, for example, for me not to suggest gender should also be looked at in terms of diversity on a Board and, indeed, the diversity on a council.

But we can only appoint from the pool of people that put in their applications. If we get nothing but Europeans one year, we can't appoint a North American. We actually have to have that particular skillset, diversity choice, and geography in the pool of people. It's a two-way thing.

Did you see any other hands, Janice?

ARUA TARAVATU: Good morning. My name is Arua from Papua New Guinea. It's nice to hear Aussie accent. I haven't heard that all week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: G'day, mate.

ARUA TARAVATU: G'day, g'day. My questions are on the Seat 15. I've heard it several times this week, and what is NomCom, how do they get involved with it? That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm more than happy to take that because I can wear my At-Large Advisory Committee hat as well. We don't get involved in it. It has nothing to do with us. Seat 15, other than the fact some of us are also members of the community at large, Seat 15 is the seat that is appointed as a single voting member on the ICANN Board from the At-Large Community.

It is the ALAC and At-Large Community's job to appoint to Seat 15. During this meeting here, they have in fact finalized that process, and an announcement was made recently to say that there will be a new occupier of Seat 15 starting from the close of the Los Angeles meeting.

Now anyone who has worked in the area of Internationalized Domain Names, IDNs, or particular script interests may have run across a woman called Rinalia Abdul Rahim. She has actually previously served as a NomCom appointee to the ALAC.

So several years ago, NomCom happened to appoint this talented woman to the ALAC. In her services to the ALAC, clearly the community felt she had what it takes to go on and serve in Seat 15 because she's been announced as the winner. She is Malaysian, and she is therefore centered in the Asia-Pacific region.

Next question. I had one down the front. You had a question? No? Yes, please, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. My name is [inaudible] from Nigeria. I'm looking at the websites you directed us, and I'm seeing the composition of the Nominating Committee. I see that the figures are different by

stakeholder. For instance, ALAC has five; GNSO has seven; and one, one, one [inaudible] etc. What determines the figures? Why is GNSO seven?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I might also ask Yjro to pick up on this. Much of this is historical. At the time that the current model for Nominating Committee was developed, the people who put that together looked at what was called the stakeholder groups or basically the smallest component part that was active in the component parts of ICANN.

At that stage ALAC, and it still has, but it has always had the five regions. So it talks about its five regions. That's the five from ALAC. The GNSO, at that stage, had seven stakeholder groups, but they now have an eighth.

One of the things that is being discussed right now is bylaws because we're limited by bylaws. This is enshrined in those as to what that mix is. The bylaw says exactly what stakeholder groups come out of the GNSO and are appointed, and yet we now have another part of the stakeholder grouping in GNSO that doesn't have a seat at the table.

That said, there is a new Board Review Working Group. It's made up of only Board Members, so it's not reviewing the Board; it's a Board Member Review Group. They are looking at possible changes, outcomes, [inaudible] design, modeling of all of this. Yjro, have I missed anything?

YJRO LANISPURO: Yeah. Of course, a question which groups and in which strengths are on the Nominating Committee, that's not our decision. That's in the

bylaws, and this isn't made by the Board. Of course, this stakeholder group situation is evolving all the time, and they maybe change this.

It is a little bit problematic to my mind. If the number of these various groups keeps growing all the time and if we just keep on adding members to the Nominating Committee, at some point it will be too big. It's already now quite big with 16 voting members and two non-voting liaisons and then the three-member leadership team. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 21's not a bad number, but it is big. John, just a word from you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I would add too is that when you're focusing on the different constituencies and the make-up of the Nominating Committee, we really leave all of that at the door. Although we are appointed in that regard, when you get to the Nominating Committee, it really is a group effort to come up with the best candidates possible. It's not any sort of political in-fighting really.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, that's one of the fantasies and fictions that keeps getting promulgated. That's why we're doing more in the open. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to think that at least two of you will at one point in the not too distant future serve on the Nominating Committee and at least five of you would consider putting your own name into a position or someone you know.

I would like to thank you for your time and your attention this morning. Any questions you still have for us, Janice, as she said before, will take and we will answer, and I'd like to wish you a good day and goodbye.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you so much, Yjro, Cheryl, and John. Kristina is making her way up. It does feel like a game show of sorts. Kristina, I'll pull up the IPC.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Good morning, everyone. Thank you very much for taking the time out of your sessions to allow me the opportunity to come and talk to you about the Intellectual Property Constituency.

The Intellectual Property Constituency sits within the Generic Names Supporting Organization. As you may, I believe, have already been told, the GNSO is divided into two houses: the Contracted Party House and the Non-Contracted Party House.

Janice has brought up the GNSO council structure chart that gives you a little bit better visual understanding of how this will all work. We are in the Non-Contracted Party House. The Non-Contracted Party House is further divided into two stakeholder groups: the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. We are one of the three constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

The way we interact with the Commercial Stakeholder Group is that that CSG structure is really more of a broad, loose, umbrella primarily for organizational and communications purposes. But all of the policy

decisions and policy work within the CSG is done at the constituency level. So while we work very closely with our colleagues in the BC (the business constituency) and the ISP constituency, we make our policy decisions independently.

The purpose of the IPC is as what you might suspect. Namely, to ensure that the interests of intellectual property owners are reflected in the policies that are developed by the GNSO and that, to the extent that those policies implicate intellectual property issues, that we provide the information that is necessary to ensure that those factors are correctly and accurately taken into account.

We have about 95 members right now, but that's a little bit misleading because of that 95, 15 of them are International Organizations which, in turn, have their own members. Our largest International Organization member is The International Trademark Association, which itself has about 12,000 members, and our smallest international member has about 100 members. If you're looking at just how many members we have on our roster, it's 90; but if you're looking at how many individuals and organizations interests are represented, you're looking at about closer to 20,000.

In terms of the specific members, it's broken down into three categories. One is International Intellectual Property Associations. A second is National and Regional Intellectual Property Associations, and then the third would be Individuals and Entities.

For example, I'm an individual member. We have a number of corporations that are individual members. As a practical matter, I would say about half of the 90 are individual members. That's certainly an area

that we welcome additional participation. To the extent that any of you are in regions where the Intellectual Property Associations may not be very active, we would be delighted to have the opportunity to work with you and your colleagues in that area.

Our membership is really fairly loose in the sense of you need to demonstrate that you're committed to the advocacy and development of intellectual property, you're primarily and substantially involved in the field of intellectual property, and you make a substantial contribution either individually or through your members.

What that means as a practical matter is that under our current bylaws, which we are in the process of starting the amendment process, as long as you are not a government official or a government agency and you are not a student, that you are qualified for full membership.

The change that we will be making is that under our new bylaws we're going to formally create an observer category to allow students and government representatives to observe. It's our view that the government participation is quite effectively handled through the GAC and that we don't want to create a situation where we're creating conflicting fora. So, for now, we do allow informal observation to governmental agencies and students, but we're going to formalize that going forward.

Our members are very active within the working groups structure. We participate, I would say, at any given time we have participation in probably 80% to 95% of the working groups that ICANN has going.

Some of the issues that we have spearheaded over the years is, for example, in the planning and development of the New gTLD Program, we really took the lead on ensuring that the program included rights protection mechanisms for trademark owners and worked as well on not only the policy but also the implementation of those.

A number of our members are on the content side. We do have several members that are patent-related organizations but, for the most part, it's been our experience that ICANN policy work doesn't necessarily incorporate patent issues very often. It is, for the most part, content and brand interests and representatives.

I think that's really all I had. I wanted to make sure that we had plenty of time for questions. So at this point, anyone who has any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

VALENTINA BURLOIU: I wanted to ask if you gave advice on the .amazon and .wine and .champagne problems within ICANN.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: No, we did not, and part of that was that there was a decision that some of our members did. For example, the International Trademark Association has provided comments on this issue.

I should also note that I was council – well, I still am council – for Patagonia, Inc., which was the applicant for .patagonia. So clearly in my capacity as their representative, I was involved in that issue but, no, not

more broadly. We have really left that to our individual members to participate on those issues.

RAHUL SHARMA: Hi. Good morning. My question is, in the Commercial Stakeholder Group you have business constituency, IP constituency, Internet Service Related constituency. I believe there is a certain amount of financial implication or fees associated to become part of business constituency and other things.

If there is a finance involved, so then obviously there are some expectations and interests that the outcome of the group has to meet. What is the difference and what are the benefits of associating with the Commercial Stakeholder Groups in comparison to the Non-Stakeholder Commercial Groups?

KRISTINA ROSETTE: In terms of fees, our membership fee for individuals and individual entities, so corporations, is $100 a year. That might change a little but not very much. I know that there are other constituencies and stakeholder groups that have significantly higher membership fees, but we've done what we can to try and keep ours very low. We like to think of ourselves as kind of a lean and mean organization.

In terms of the differences, there's, I think, really two considerations that would come into play. First, looking just at the membership criteria for each of the organizations, which ones are you even eligible for? So that, I would suggest, would be your first step is to look for those either constituency or stakeholder group that you're interested in

participating, are you eligible for all of them? Because if you're not, then that certainly makes the decision a little easier.

The next step, I would say, would really depend on what your primary interest is, in the sense that we have members that are also members of the Business Constituency. We have members that are also members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We have members that are also members of the Registry Stakeholder Group, and we have a significant number of members that are now members of the Brand Registry Interest Group.

One of the things that has been perhaps the most challenging for us to deal with is the effect of the new gTLD program on our membership structure, simply because so many of our members either are .brand applicants or represent .brand applicants. So that's made it very challenging to make sure that interests are clearly stated, that their conflicts are avoided, and I think we've done a fairly decent job of that.

In terms of if you are eligible for the Intellectual Property and Business Constituency, I think that really depends on how involved you want to be and what you were looking to achieve from it. For example, certainly I know that our membership fees are lower than the BC. But I also know that within the IPC our membership, when it comes time to vote – which we really only do it for elections – that those votes are weighted.

For example, the International Organizations get three votes, the National and State Organizations get two votes, and collectively the category one members, which is individuals and entities, get a set number of votes.

It really depends on how important that is to you. For some potential members, it's much more important that they have the same vote as everybody else, in which case, the BC just by virtue of the structure, makes more sense. For others, where it really is intellectual property is their focus, the IPC makes more sense.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I appreciate that you just made a point that I don't think we've made this week, which is belonging to several different organizations within ICANN. There is really no constraint against that again as long as, like Kristina said, there are no guidelines about whether you are eligible to be in a certain supporting organization stakeholder group constituency. But otherwise, you can have at it and have your voice heard in multiple areas for multiple different positions.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Right. The only caveat to that is that within the GNSO, even though an entity or individual can belong to multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies, you're only allowed to vote in one. So, for example, if you decide that you want to be a member of both, or just taking some of our members, they're BC members and IPC members. They can only vote in one of those so they need to, when they apply for membership, indicate which one they want to vote in.

Similarly, I would expect that as our .brand applicant members become registries, I would expect, frankly, that they will probably decide that, "Okay, given my interests have changes, my relationship with ICANN has

changed, it makes more sense for me to vote with the registries instead of the IPC."

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Are there any other questions? Valentina, go ahead.

VALENTINA BURLOIU: And observer members will also have to pay $100 to be part of the Intellectual Property Constituency?

KRISTINA ROSETTE: As of right now, there's no membership because it's actually not a formal status. So what the observer status essentially means now is that you can participate in our meetings at the ICANN meetings.

We meet every month, and in the months that we are not at an ICANN meeting, we have a phone meeting. On the phone meetings that include briefings from third parties, like ICANN, or dispute resolution providers, you can participate in those. So because it's such an informal status right now, there's no membership fee associated with it.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'm sorry, you might have said this, Kristina. How do you go about applying for that status?

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Sure. What you would need to do is go to our website is www.ipconstituency.org, and there is a link from the home page that

allows you to get through the membership application. You would just need to indicate in the application that you are asking to participate as an observer.

Because of the process that our membership application processing requires that we have a membership committee that reviews and makes recommendations and then those recommendations go to the IPC Council, it generally takes between four and six weeks from when you submit your application to when you're notified of the formal decision.

I would say, that at least in my tenure, 95% of those decisions have been acceptance. I mean, there certainly have been some instances where government officials have wanted to be full members, and that's really not something that we can do so that type of thing.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you. We'll take one more, Andreas, and then we'll clear the house for the GAC.

ANDREAS DLAMINI: Thank you. What's your strong objection to government members joining apart from that they can also join GAC? You do have government lawyers who were not real members of GAC or their governments cannot nominate them to be members of GAC, and yet they would love to participate in this.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Primarily because that comes down to the structure of the GNSO and the GAC, so to some extent it's really not in our hands. It's really how the structure has been defined in ICANN in terms of we are the Commercial Stakeholder Group. That's really in large part what drives it.

We did at one point several years ago, try to allow government employees or representatives of government to participate on an individual capacity, but that then became very challenging both for us and for those persons in terms of identifying what the interests were. Were they participating as an individual? Were they speaking on behalf of their government?

We just found that it was, frankly, easier and less disruptive all the way around to really just have that very bright line. I think, candidly, that bright line exists in the entire GNSO. I think all of the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies – I think, I could be wrong – but I think that they all have provisions that, unfortunately, exclude government officials from membership.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you so very much for this, this morning. I feel like we're always kind of pushing you out the door. But as I've told the Fellows before, any follow-up questions, they'll send them to me, and I'll make sure they get into your hands.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you. I hope you've enjoyed the meeting and certainly encourage you to attend the

public forum later today which is, in my opinion, one of the highlights of the entire meeting. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: So, guys, we're going to move over to Hullet. So let's say ten minutes, kind of get ourselves together and get some coffee and etc. and we'll all meet over at Hullet. I'll just need somebody to help me carry that box that I carried from the staff room. I'll take some help carrying it over to Hullet.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]