
SINGAPORE – Fellowship Morning Meetings
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Hi guys. If you wouldn't mind going to the side of the room, and if you don't have in front of you a headset, make sure you have a headset for this morning. If you don't have one in front of you, then grab one from the side of room, but make sure you have a headset and get it ready to go on.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. This is just audio test for Adobe Connect. 1,2,3,4,5. Right.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Good morning. That was so weak and we're on Wednesday. Good morning. Thank you, much better. So, first if you weren't in the room earlier, make sure that there is a headset, and get it on your head, get it on your head. Put it on, headsets, put them on. Wow, guys, Wednesday morning, 7:10, let's go.

You're putting me back in my teacher days and these are, you know, eight, nine year olds, let's go. Sébastien, will not be waiting for you, he'll start to *parlez-vous français* [speak French] quickly. I took five years of French, you'd never know it from what I just said, that's really frightening for the American education system. Headsets, are they on? Orange juice and coffee down, let's go.

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.

So, without further ado, I'm going to hand you over to Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: *Bonjour.* Good morning. Well, it is fairly well. I'm going to speak in French, because I believe that whenever we are talking about international organizations, to take advantage of the language services that we have available to us. I can speak English, that's for sure, and I can also say some words in Spanish, but I would like to use my mother tongue.

My name is Sébastien Bachollet. I am current am a Board member of ICANN. I am in seat 15, and until the end of this year, I will be a member on the Board. And I'm here with you, in this program led by Janice because I think it is an excellent program that allows people from all parts of the world to have an exchange among themselves.

And very quickly we realized that there are a number of colleagues that can make it through the different structures of ICANN. When I started in ICANN, I really dreamt about a program like this one, that would spare ourselves the fact of having to spend two or three years to learn how the organization worked.

So, I thought that we were talking about a public participation, and we had all of the language issues, and another issue was the organization of meetings. And the group in which I was working submitted a report that has been published for public comments. I'm not going to ask you to participate in this public comment period, but if you want, you can give your input.



And if you have any views about how we can organize the meetings, and you want to share them today, of course I will be more than glad to take your observations. And of course, now you can make use of the technology with a hashtag ICANN MSWG. You can use Twitter, that means meeting strategy working group.

It is quite cold here in the morning when I get into the rooms, and I would love for us to go to different places in the world, so we can take all kinds of comments. Even if you want to say that it is too cold in the rooms, or that you want to go somewhere else in the world. I wanted to make this brief introduction, and I would like to get your feedback regarding the ICANN meetings, whether you find them useful, you think they are too complicated, whatever you want to share with us about ICANN meetings.

So I would like to know whether you have been approached by many people during this meeting, speaking to you in a language that is not the ICANN language or English. I hope that those of you who have not, who are not French speakers, have understood the translation into English, and all the rest of you, that you have been able to understand French.

So I would be here to take any questions or any comments that you may have. Now you have the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Good morning Sébastien. It was very nice of you to speak in French in order to open up this community, to all languages. Yesterday, you pointed out the difference between globalization and internationalization. Not much was said about that, but perhaps you



could elaborate more on that today, about these two terms related to the Internet governance, because I would really like to know what we should understand by these two terms, globalization and internationalization.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you. It seems that we are going to delve into political issues right now. The problem of use in terms and knowing the meaning of these terms and agreeing on these terms, and on the meaning of the terms and the translation of the terms, is quite difficult because today we can say different words in the different languages to mean globalization, internationalization, and all governments use these terms.

This means among nations, and governments love talking about things that can be done among or between governments, or between nations. But when we have to talk about more complex issues, more global issues, issues that pertain to the entire world, it is much more difficult for us to find the right terms.

If you speak French, perhaps you would have to use that terms [French]. That has quite an economic tone and connotation. We don't like using that term because that term is more referred to in jobs that can move from one place to the other. But, when we speak about globalization, in English, we speak about being part of something that covers the entire globe, the entire world.

That is why we use the term globalization. And in my opinion, globalization includes internationalization. One is inside the other one,



because the purpose here is to make sure everybody can be involved. Oftentimes, we say that this includes governments, but I say that this includes all structures, all individuals in the world, all partners, all stakeholders in the world, and in particular, this is applicable to globalization of ICANN.

I think that you are a little bit sleepy this morning. I'm trying to wake you up, because I want to get difficult questions from you. Yes, go ahead.

KATHY:

My English name is Kathy. I would like to ask a question. In this...

Good morning. I come from China, and I'm a lawyer. Working in [?]. My question is that, in this community I have noticed that there is a legal structure. So I would like to ask, how can I be involved in this working group? And what is the content of this working group?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I'm not sure I have fully understood your question. When you say that there is a legal structure, yes, ICANN is a legal structure. But I think you are referring to a specific working group that takes care of all issues, all legal issues. Is that correct? Are you referring to the Global Advisory Committee?

The Committee that acts in an advisory role, with regard to globalization and all of the legal structures of the organization, I think that that is the group that you are referring to. This is something that we are discussing



right now. There are five or six questions that we are trying to answer. I'm hearing myself here.

There were six questions on the table in relation to globalization. We have the question about globalization of ICANN as an organization, the affirmation of commitment, the commitments undertaken by ICANN, and these are two topics on which we will continue to work with multistakeholders and the other working groups.

Some units are going to disappear because the community thinks that we have too many things, too many issues that are being discussed concurrently, and we need to choose. So, there is a group responsible for the legal structure. And this group has halted its activities for the time being. If you are referring to this group, it is too early to say. If you are asking something different, perhaps I have not answered your question.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

Actually, I might want to do this because of our time constraint, I'd like to introduce George Sadowsky, another member of our Board. Let George say a couple of words and then if you have questions for either, just to close up, that would be great.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Good, good, good. Thank you Janice. I will speak in English. I want to make five points, I guess, very quickly. By way of background, I came to ICANN, and I came to the Internet through academic computing universities, but also through the United Nations where I worked for a period of time.



And in the 1970s and 80s, which is probably before some of you were born, I was doing technology transfer in various countries. A lot in Africa and in other countries also. And what struck me, and gave me the motivation to continue and finally end up here, was the observation that any of the countries that you come from, at that time, were struggling with what I call information poverty.

That is the inability to get information that's needed to solve problems and make progress. So, ICANN is part of a larger ecosystem, the Internet ecosystem. It has very specific responsibilities. There are other parts, the Internet Engineering Taskforce, the Internet Society, and so on. And I think some of you are very familiar with those organizations. ICANN has a limited mandate, but a very important mandate.

And these are exciting time for ICANN because by virtue ICANN having the responsibility for the navigational infrastructure of the Internet, that is the names and numbers that allow you to go from here to wherever you want to go, the world is now focused on that infrastructure. And there are issues of, who does it belong to?

Who controls it? In fact, if control is the right word, I don't think it is, but other people do. And how will it evolve for the benefit of everyone in the world? That's exciting because the dialogue is heating up. The NTIA announcement, which you're familiar with, is two weeks old now, and people are talking about it, and we're really as a community need to respond to it in a way that will be appropriate for the development of the Internet.

In addition, there is a new form of governance that is emerging. It's called multistakeholderism, and from my point of view, what that



means is, every stakeholder, every group, every sector, choose your own word, that has a stake in the development of a process, or of an institution, or an idea, can sit at the table.

And can contribute to the solution of a problem, the development of a process, the evolution of a technology, etc. Now there are various forms of multistakeholderism, and what you're seeing at ICANN is one, what we call in substantiation of that model. It has strengths, it has weaknesses, it's new, it's experimental, we're working on it.

And so far, it's turning out to be a rather good form of organization for doing what we want to do. So, observing that, you are observing that in it's infancy, and I hope it will have a long life. So why get involved in ICANN? One, it's really interesting. Two, you can make a difference in your own countries as well as in the world generally, in how the development of these navigational structures occurs, and how it can be made better for everyone in the world.

Finally, you're the recipient of a very important, very important prize here. You have been chosen for this Fellowship Program, and I suspect it's been a great experience, but I would hope that you will take with it an obligation to go back to your countries, and to teach others, and to get others involved, and to work for the Internet in your own local environments and help make it better.

Help people understand what's involved, how to use it, what the global drama is with respect to Internet governance and where it might lead to. I'll stop there.



JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I thought you were on a roll. I was taking notes for the future program actually. I love those questions. Why should you get involved in ICANN? Because I think, when you get here and you start to get into these sessions, and into this crazy maniacal pace, and you start to hear people saying, “Oh, I just joined another working group. I’m on my third working group, and I am on calls from six at night until two in the morning.”

And it must seem like, “Why would I get involved in this?” A little bit crazy. So it’s a really good question to ask and to walk away from here and ask yourself the importance of it. And I think, actually by giving back, wherever you’re going back to, I think the answer will become clear.

You know, we become teachers ourselves, and there are many teachers actually of different sorts in this room. I think when you become a teacher yourself, you really start to see the value. You understand that look on someone else’s face, when they’re starting to get a level of understanding about something, and then you remind yourself, “Wow, I got that, you know, in five, six, you know, nine days. And I want to learn more, and I want to teach more, and I want to get involved.”

So I really appreciate those questions that I’m scribbling down here. Are there any other questions for Sébastien or George? Unrelated to... Raoul, you want to go and then [?]?

RAOUL: Good morning. My name is Raoul [?] from India. And after learning, I’m here for the first time, my first ICANN meeting, and it has been a good



experience. My question is that over the course of three days I've learned about various structures, constituencies, and how things work. But I still haven't been able to figure out when it comes to standards and protocols of [?]?

What is the role defense institutions? Let's say IETF, IEEE, ISOC, or WTC? So what all institutions are being engaged in developing of standards and protocols at different levels? And how does work of one institution differs from another?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

So [?] that happened to be in the room. I will actually speak after these two gentlemen. The difference between the various standards organizations is how you reach consensus, that is the most – the largest difference. Just like how you reach consensus within GNSO, within SSAC, within GAC, that also differs.

Within ALAC, they have a different way of finding consensus. You probably have a different way of finding consensus in this group, when you decide how to get coffee and what to do in the evenings. So, the important thing is that each one of these groups has, over time, developed their own consensus based process.

If you look at the IETF, the way they developed their documents is that anyone can, on the mailing list, participate in the work of a working group. And when the working group have reached an agreement on the document and the working group chairs say when they think everyone agree, then they have a last call process, where anyone can object to the document.



And that is during a very short time period. Very similar to the open consultation that is used here in ICANN. So there are some similarities.

RAOUL:

This is a follow up question. I think I need to frame my question better. It's IEEE that is [?] of developing a protocol of different process, IETF also. So my question is, do these pairs have understanding as to what all standards and protocols will be developed by one body and not the other body? And then how do they collaborate on different fronts.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yes. Between the standards organizations, they meet each other, and they are agreement between most of the standards organizations, on what maturity does one organization, what maturity should a document within one organization reach, to be able to be referenced from another organization?

So for example, in the IETF, they have something called Internet draft, that cannot be referenced, but the Internet draft then becomes a RFC, request for comment, that can be referenced. So I know there are agreements between, for example, ISO, IETF, and ITU. I think there are also to [?] and to IEEE, and a few more. But there are meeting, and they are agreements between them.

I was the liaison between IETF and ITU for many years, and I am still liaison between one of the groups of [ISOC?] and the IETF.



UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you. I think it would be long, but I would like to know more clearly, how the procedure and how will politics are [?] or approved by the Board? Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And would you mind stating your name for the record?

UNIDENTIFIED: [?] from [?] Senegal. Thank you.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. In ICANN, the Board does not make policy, and I suppose under extreme conditions it might, but in general, the process is very much a bottom up process, where for example, the GNSO proposes a policy through a development process, and the Board looks at it.

The Board looks at the process by which the policy has been created. And if in fact, the rules have been followed, and everyone who has any interest in the process has had an opportunity to put input into it, then the policy is approved.

There are, on the fringe I guess, there are issues that might deviate somewhat from that, but by and large, think of it as bottom up, Board approval.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: This is Sébastien Bachollet speaking. The issue of... I believe it's a little bit automatic of a summary, to say that the Board does not draft or prepare policies, because where do we find representatives of all of



these stakeholders in the organization? Well, that is exactly the ICANN Board.

So, when we speak about issues, or address issues, concerning several sectors of the organization, well of course, we aim at setting up working groups, including more stakeholders. However, at the end of the day, there is a GAC communique on GNSO policy, and an ALAC communique or a statement on GNSO policy.

And then we have this, you know, exchanges going back and forth for everybody to agree. And the Board does have a role. I know that officially, the message is that the Board does not draft or prepare policies, but there comes a point in which we have to strive for agreement among the parties sitting at the same table, and the Board's role is to facilitate global policies for the organization.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Add one thing. I have to go now to another meeting, but if you would like to carry on any further conversation, catch me in the hall, or somewhere around, and we'll be glad to talk further. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

This is Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you everyone for your attention. Thank you for being here this morning. Thank you for spending time in the organization. It may be the first time for all of you, but definitely not that last one. Thank you. [Applause]



PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Good morning. So you, we have met before. Most of you, I think, were at the meeting yesterday when I brought the rest of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee to meet with you. Today, I was thinking of you explaining a little more formally who I am and what I'm doing here, and why I think it's important that you are coming here to the ICANN meeting.

My name is Patrik Fälström, I work for a small not for profit organization in Sweden, that is name [?]. We are 15 people, and we run the Internet connect points in Scandinavia. The largest Internet connect points, and we are probably the fourth largest Internet connect point provider in the world, if you don't count the commercial exchange point in the United States.

We also run one of the root name servers, the one with the letter I, and we run DNS for, I think, 45 ccTLDs in the world. And we have name servers in about 55 locations all over the planet. We're also responsible, believe it or not, for distribution of time in Sweden. So when anyone in Sweden wants to know what time it is, they send questions to our servers.

So now and then I get a question for people, and I get email or text messages when they say, "I'm late to my meeting. Can you fix that? I just need an extra half an hour. Can you adjust the time?" Which I cannot. So, all of this sounds like quite a lot of things to do, but we're only 15 people, so we're just a small organization.

And part of what we're doing also includes working, for example, in ICANN, where we are now. I have been chair of the Security and



Stability Advisory Committee this year. This is my fourth year. And we have a new election this fall, where we're going to appoint a new chair.

I might re-up. And if the other members of SSAC like me, they might reelect me.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I think that will happen.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: We'll see. So what is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee? You have already got an understanding of the difference between the supporting organizations, which run processes that develops policy. And then you have the advisory committees that give advice. And we're one of those advisory committees.

And if you look at the charter which you see on the screen, it says that the Security and Stability Advisory Committee advises the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. This includes operation matters, matters pertaining to the correct and reliable operations of the root name system, administrative matters, for example matters pertaining to address allocation and Internet number assignment.

And registration matters, matters pertaining to registers and registrar services such as WHOIS. SSAC engages in ongoing threat assessments and risk analyzers of the Internet name address allocation services, to assess where the principle threats to stability and security lie, and



advises the ICANN community accordingly. This is of course, something that I could have told you before the meeting yesterday, but this was a test meeting we had.

So, the questions yesterday, of course, showed us in SSAC, what you thought we were doing, which is a lot of security issues related to DNS. But as you see, there are many, many more things that we're looking at. Of course, DNS is one important component, but we will also hand over operations of DNS, but we're also looking at registration services, pure operational issues, and basically anything that can impact security, stability, and resilience of the Internet ecosystem from an ICANN perspective.

We are currently 40, 4-0, members of SSAC. And you become a member of SSAC by applying and being approved. And to be approved, you need to have a skill that SSAC so far does not have. Because the idea is that all of SSAC, which should be as few people as possible so we can work effectively. And our goal is to be able to produce reports which are useful for the community.

We produce about... When I started as the chair, we produced four reports a year. My goal was to during my time, increase to six. We are up to eight. So we are double the production since I took over after Steve Crocker, that was the chair before me. I think one of the reasons this is not under – it's not only me who has done that, of course, I'm not SSAC, it has to do a little bit with ICANN as a whole being more structured, so it's easier for an advisory committee to participate, and then it's easier to produce reports.



Before I took over, SSAC was more engaged in the ongoing discussion, which of course, to some degree is positive, but if you write strict advice, it's actually better to concentrate on the advice, so that's what we're trying to do now. The way we operate, is that we create small work parties, it sounds like we're having fun which actually we do have.

We don't call it working groups, we call it work parties, otherwise you would be so sad, they party all of the time. And the latest reports we wrote had to do with denial of service attacks, using DNS and other UDP based protocols, and also how resolvers and then resolution of domain names in computers and applications, how the current nonstandard use of search lists impacts the security and stability.

Both of those reports are extremely technical for normal people, people that, there are many people that use computers many times a day, and they still don't understand the reports. That is actually intentional, because what we have tried to do is write reports which different parts of the community like. They tell us that this is really, really good and we can reference this.

So, about two years ago, we did a measurement of how often, for example, our reports have been referenced. How many hits you get in Google. If you search for our report names, and we saw that the numbers were actually lower than we expected. So we were analyzing that, and we saw that we tried to write reports that everyone could understand in sort of engineeric [sic] language, regardless of who the report was targeted at.

And we did a test, and we saw that, well, wait a second. Let's write a report to GAC, to governments, where we've used this language



governments use. And then we wrote a report to the technical community, using the language engineers use. And then we wrote a report targeted at the ALAC community, using language that they use. And that was much, much better. So, if you hear, or if you see that our latest reports are hard to understand, than it might be because the report is not targeted at the person that tries to read the report.

So over time, we are looking at what recommendations we make in a report, because our reports, at the end, have very, very firm recommendations. Sometimes we ask the ICANN Board to make specific decisions. We might ask the GAC to do something, recommend to do something, very, very specific. And when we're doing that, we are targeting the recommendations to specific organizations, and we are working really, really hard to make sure that the language we use in the report is understandable by the target of the recommendations.

That's our goal. Now, this means of course, that we write reports just like the two last ones, which large portions of community do not understand. And sometimes it's important for the community to understand. For example, one of the last reports, the last, number 64, gives very strong recommendations to vendors that we believe are not producing good, quality enough hardware and software. And that includes home routers, mobile phones, operating systems.

And we strongly recommend them to produce higher quality products. Of course, why should they listen to us? They want to make money. Their goal is to make money. Their goal is to maximize the revenue of their shareholders, we have to remember that. And the only way to



affect that, is to have the users and the buyers of their products be the ones that force the manufacturers to make better products.

So we need to at the same time as we write a technical recommendation to the vendors, we at the same time, need to give recommendations, which we have not done in the report, to normal users and buyers of those products so that they can – so they can also tell the vendors that they have to do a better product.

So what we have been doing in the last six months, is to work with ICANN communication team, and agree that starting between now and May, we will start to do podcasts and videos, where we're explaining every report. So we will divide our output in two different ways. We will have the reports, which even more, are targeted at the – whoever we are writing the recommendations for, and then in parallel, we are doing normal outreach and communication that is targeted to other audiences, which might, for example in the case of the vendors, which targets normal end users and buyers of their products.

And that is how we feel that we are fitting in the life cycle of increasing the quality of recommendations of products, and at the end of the day, the various mechanisms in the system. And that's also where we fit. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

I was just going to say, and I was glad you followed up with the podcast, because one of the problems we've talked about at ICANN, the years that I've been there, is that we tend to just post to the bathroom wall, for lack of a better term. Right? And so all of us are sharing the same



bathrooms in ICANN at the conferences and offices, and if we're only sharing the information amongst ourselves, and this is Janice Lange for the record. Sorry.

If we're only sharing information amongst ourselves, than how are we getting it out? And so, Patrik I'm assuming now, by hearing what you're saying, that I can go back to the communications team and ask them directly, where they are going to post such information, make sure – trying to find out the pathways they're going to try to get beyond the people who know about an ICANN website.

Because I have relatives that don't understand how to get to the ICANN website, and what that means. So I'm wondering what kind of strategies you might have?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

We have not done all of the details yet from our perspective. We have started to work with Duncan, so Duncan is our contact person. You can talk to him. We have concentrated on making it... So far, we are only made a timeline for the first sort of, how often should we do it? How should we use it? How should the actual production work?

For example, we happen to have a meeting in Washington, early May, where I happen to be there, and that's where Duncan's team is. So, we are trying to resolve the logistics of the production, we have not yet talked about the publication. And I'm happy to get input from you, not only you go [?] there will be, I want you to tell us where we – how we should spread this. Another thing that I want to say, where Sébastien



and myself are working together, is to make the information accessible to more people, also in multiple languages.

So we in SSAC are pushing really hard to increase the amount of translation we're doing in ICANN. This is of course a budget issues, but I must say, and admit, that I am one of the persons here in the ICANN community that ask myself whether it's better to put money on translation than interpretation. It might be the case that we have to choose between the two. Today we have interpretation on an increased number of meetings like this one, but in reality it's better to put the money on translation.

We have to think about those really, really difficult questions. Of course we want both. But maybe you have to prioritize. Where this, for example, I would say is an important meeting to have translation out, for some of the Board meetings there is already interpretation. For the Board meetings and some of the public meetings, it's important to have interpretation. But maybe not the high number of meetings we have. Maybe we can translate much more material.

So some of our reports are translated, the more popular ones. But just because we don't have budget to translate everything we do, we publish our reports in English and then if we get a lot of feedback that people want it translated, then we are doing translation afterwards. So yes, I really, really happy to work with Janice to see what are the most effective ways of sort of disseminate this second channel.

We have our reports and now we have this second channel to the non-targets of the reports themselves, and I think you are a very important community to get feedback on that.



ANTHONY NIGANII: Good morning. Anthony Niganii. So when you're talking about translation and the interpretation, within the process, have you started to explore how you can look at accessibility? Specifically for people with disabilities, visual impairments, or physical impairments, hearing impairments.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes. Regarding accessibility in general, we are – okay. Two answers to this. First, the SSAC reports and the protocols, yes we're including accessibility. And some of you that work on accessibility might know about [?] from Australia that originally comes from Sweden, so and I'm from Sweden, so we're in close connection to each other.

So yes, we're including that in this – the reports we have are only text, and we try to produce them as texts. So all tools that blind people and others who use this, should be able to parse them. Regarding the reports we are writing regarding accessibility, no I don't think we're doing enough yet.

We are looking at... We have been forced to look at, and prioritize unfortunately, security and robustness issues, which makes it possible to communicate at all, because if you cannot communicate, it doesn't matter, than it is not accessible to anyone. So we have been concentrating on being able to send IP packets between two parties that want to communicate.

In the next step, we are to make sure that the two parties send bytes in such a way so that they can understand each other. So no, I am not



happy with us not doing enough regarding accessibility. But, one of the reasons why we are down prioritizing that in SSAC is that we do believe that other parts of ICANN is doing that.

We are normally writing advisories when we think other parts of ICANN are not doing the work good enough. For example, Trademark Clearinghouse you've probably heard about. We have been looking in great detail on how to handle non-ASCII, non-English characters in Trademark Clearinghouse, and we were not happy because the Trademark Clearinghouse did not take non-ASCII characters into account, at all.

And the whole process started and people paid a lot of money to register trademarks, and there was no support for internationalized domain names. We wrote a report, it was pretty sharp saying, "This must be taken care of." Finally it started a while ago, and now we see two weeks ago, I got the first note from the people working with Trademark Clearinghouse, where I saw the proposal that they are currently working on, on how to update the rules.

The update is not there yet, but at least I see some good things happening. So our advice normally comes in when we see that things ICANN does not work. And accessibility, just because my contacts [?] and others, seems to go pretty well, so we don't really see any reason to step in.

UNIDENTIFIED:

My name is [Braum?] from Malawi. I wanted to find out, especially on the operation of the SSAC committee, mostly if you are also working



with the private sector and the business. Who also in the security [?]? And I wanted to know how they report their finding to your committee, and then how do you take them up? Also, I wanted to know, are you giving priority to filing your findings to the Board?

And are they addressed? Or do you get their approvals – or do you have to wait for the Board to meet and then the approvals are approved or rejected, and then you go back to do your papers again? Considering that the issue of security, it takes time obviously. We're talking about the security and stability of the Internet. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Regarding security and how get information to SSAC, we are, I think nowadays, the only group that do have some meetings which are closed. Where no people are allowed to participate. We have very strict rules on who can be on our mailing list, ICANN staff cannot be on our mailing list, only the SSAC members.

And this is just because we are sharing very delicate security incidents and information between each other. I would say that probably half of the people in SSAC, including myself, are members of very, very restrictive communication on the Internet security, and we also have law enforcement people on SSAC, and we must be able to share that information with each other, and produce reports which stay completely secret until we release it.

Let me give you two examples. One example, there was an incident that was found... There were findings this last weekend about the potential issue with the DNS. That was shared with us in SSAC, and we



are currently still investigating on what the actual details are. And in security areas, one uses a protocol called the Traffic Light Protocol, TLP, to know whether information can be shared or not.

And for those of you who know, that TLP red means that you're not sharing with anyone, where amber means that you can share the information that is on the need basis without talking about where it's coming from, and green means that you can share it. The first half day, that was TLP red. So that is the level of information that we sometimes share.

As the chair of SSAC, I felt a little bit uncomfortable because I don't want to have TLD red on the SSAC mailing list. That is one level too high. But it seems to be the case that what we are currently working on is already sort of known, it's a new attack vector for a well-known problem. So the first answer to your question is, just because we are closed we can share and will be able to see this kind of information.

The second question is how do we interact with the Board? When we have written a report, and we are done, then we actually share it with the Board for 48 hours before we make the report public. That makes it possible for the Board to prepare for potential reactions, but our recommendations to the Board are still made in isolation. So it's not until... So the Board chooses themselves, whether they would like to act on it, on our recommendations are not.

And one act can be that the Board decides, "No, we don't want to do this, that SSAC recommends." We have worked out with the Board a mechanism where they track all of our recommendations, and I will try



to get up on the screen so you can... If you go to My dot ICANN dot org, so you can see what the Board has decided to do.

So the Board has a choice to implement the recommendation as it is, try to solve the problem in a different way, or ignore us. But they at least, in My dot ICANN dot org, the website with all of the information on what's happening. So let's see how this works. And then, resolutions and advice, and then advice to the Board... Yeah, okay, My ICANN, yes.

So if you go down here, you can see here for example, the first one here, DNS Abuse, there is a recommendation from 2014 02 18, where you see the recommendations on the right column. If you press the plus sign, I think, okay that one is so large. Scroll down and see whether we have something which doesn't have so much text in the right hand side. Oh, the new gTLD, that is from ALAC.

So this is currently from SSAC and ALAC, you see that in the center column. There for example, advice – our advice is the recommendation to the [?] recommendation one. ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, blah, blah, blah. And then you see, action taken by the Board, additional information, date completed to close. So this is the tracking system that we have now to keep track of what the Board is doing with our recommendations.

And you see the right most column, you see ongoing. So you also see the status of the advice. But it's very important to know that even through we're an advisory group to the Board, the Board do not have to do what we propose. What they have to do, is to react on our advice, which can be to say, "No." Because they might have other input. They might do different, draw different conclusions.



UNIDENTIFIED: The other parts was the engagement with the private sector, the security search companies.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: As part of our search for members of SSAC, we ensure that the complete set of members of SSAC includes law enforcement, private sector security people, people from security companies. So we do have those as members. So we don't even have to interact with them, they're already part of SSAC.

So we have, for example, from at least historically from law enforcement [?] fellow, we have people from Department of Homeland Security. We have very close interaction with this year's Organized Crime Agency in the UK and FBI, and all of those law enforcement. We have interaction with the CERT, and various and [MOG?] and various, [MOG] we have [?], which is sort of one of the founders of [MOG] on SSAC.

So that's how we are. And my role in Sweden is also a little bit special, advisor to the Swedish government since many, many years. So we do ensure that SSAC, as a whole, directly have all of these connections that we are looking for.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And that ties back to when you were saying for an application, you're looking at getting diversity. So just because you have all of these, you



know, technical background or a law enforcement background, if you already have that, than you're not exactly looking for that maybe.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yes. For example, as you understand, we do have quite a large number of people with DNS expertise in SSAC. So the last three years, we have got excellent applications from the world's best DNS experts, and we turned them down, because we already have that. We don't need any more experts on DNS in SSAC.

But on the end, we need other people. So we have, for example Julie Hammer, which is our liaison to Australia, that is coming from law enforcement, legal background is one of the later members that we brought just because we wanted that expertise. Also, regarding, of course we have [?] of course secondary objectives, like gender balance, and language, and culture, and geographical region.

And she, except for language, well, Australian, well it's not really English. But anyways, well she's actually pointing this out so I can make this joke. She matched all of those secondary criteria, so she's an example of being an absolute, excellent, stellar member of SSAC.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

And as usual, we're going to have to call this part to a close, because we have two more speakers, and because Patrik has a meeting to get to. So we have them kind of tightly locked in here. So I want to say thank you very much once again, and any questions for Patrik, I'll make sure to get his email address, copy it to everybody, if that's okay? All right.



You can touch base with him later on this week. Thank you so much.

And Tony, you can come on down. We have a roving mic and you can sit, whatever your comfort level is. Great. And so for the record, this will be Tony Holmes, who is the chair for the Internet Service Provider constituency.

TONY HOLMES:

Well good morning everybody. It's my privilege to talk to you this morning about the ISP and connectivity providers, and how we relate and how we react in ICANN. So I'm sure you've already had a lot of presentations, and you've heard a lot from other constituencies, so you would know probably the main cup of ICANN, and how at the top level it fits together.

We're a constituency within the GNSO, and we sit within the commercial stakeholder group, along with the business constituency, and the intellectual property constituency. Although, I would suggest we have slightly different focus to some of those other constituencies, which does bring some balance to it as well. Now I'm aware, I think, that some of you are ISPs and connectivity providers, or you come from that background.

Could I just ask if there are any other ISPs here that I haven't spoken with? Okay. Thanks. As part of the GNSO, obviously we are concerned with all of the topology issues that come within ICANN, but the main cup of our group is a little bit unique, because as ISPs that includes all of the really big, pure ISPs, as well as which it includes a number of tel codes who provide ISP services and very small guys as well.



So how do we reach out to those? Well sometimes it's through linkages through [?], where we have the Internet Service Provider Associations, most of those are organized on a regional basis. And through our channels with them, we reach out to a number of small members who can participate through [?] or they can become members of our constituency and deal with us direct.

So if I look around, if we take Europe, we will have the big tel codes plus [?]. If we look at South America, slightly different make up where we have people like [?] who are large Internet Service Providers themselves, but also reach out and include a number of smaller members they operate with. And of course, some ISPs, they provide a different range of services as well.

In some parts of the world, it's certainly the case in South America, they also provide registrar services as well. So their interaction in ICANN itself can be quite different, and they would maybe have a broader view on some issues, which again brings balance to the discussions that we have. Often the policies developed within ICANN, to actually hit home for ISPs further down the path. So whilst there maybe policy development processes around the expansion of the namespace, for us the important part is going to be when suddenly those names are in the root and they become operational.

Why is that? Well, I think most of you would appreciate that as the providers of infrastructure and the role that we have and the relationship with our customers in providing access to the Internet, when anything goes wrong it's not only the ISPs telephones that ring.



We are the first people that get the call and say, “Hey, this isn’t working.” Or something needs to be done.

And that gives us a slightly different perspective on things. One of the issues that you may be aware of at the moment that’s getting quite a lot of focus, although I would argue from an ISP perspective, still not enough focus, is the issue of name collisions, where we’re now at the stage where we’re going to insert a number of new top level domains within the root, and some of those names are already being used in private namespace.

Now dependent upon how people have configured their servers, it will determine whether those names are looked at in terms of the public DNS first, or whether they’re looked at in private DNS. And that order is absolutely critical because if the first place they go to resolve those names is in the public namespace, then you get these, what we call name collisions, and what used to resolving in a public – in a private network environment, will now actually resolve in the public network.

So it’s issues like those that become very prominent for ISPs. And part of our role is trying to get that word out to other ISPs that may not engage in ICANN or may not even be engaged directly. The other aspect of the ISP business, and I really like to stress, is that in some parts of the world where the Internet is growing, I think the role of ISPs is absolutely critical, because the one thing you need is infrastructure, which we provide.

The other thing you need is competition, because if there is one thing that is going to make access easier, and drive down prices to make the Internet available to all, it seems to be the competitive environment.



And whilst, as ISPs, some may argue, well it isn't as important as others would stress, I think the reality is wherever there is competition between ISPs and infrastructure, the access grows quickly, and the price reduces.

So we really are at the forefront of a lot of the gateways into the Internet for the future as well. As part of that, the technical realization of IDNs and IDN variance is something that also is really important to us as ISPs, because if you're not attending ICANN, and the ISP business, the nature of it, is that ICANN isn't the core function for ISPs.

It's running an infrastructure and the day to day interaction with customers. What ICANN does impacts all of us, but it isn't at the forefront of everything that we do. So when something comes along like the expansion of the namespace, or the introduction of IDNs, it's beholden on us to actually help get that message out to the whole ISP industry, so that they are aware of what's happening, what they need to do, what they're going to tell their customers when they get queries, and really to relay the messages in the right way.

The other significant difference for a lot of ISPs is the environment that we work in. Because I mentioned at the start that we also include, as our members, a lot of large ISPs who are also very large tel codes. And as we know, the telecommunications market is pretty heavily regulated compared with the Internet. One of the key standpoints for the ISP constituency is support for the multistakeholder model.

And I'm sure you've heard an awful lot about that over the week, but it's again, something which we are strong advocates of. In the Internet environment, the strictly regulated telecommunications approach,



would really stymie the expansion and innovation of the Internet. So in this particular environment, even those companies who traditionally have come from the regulated environment, are very much supportive of the multistakeholder approach.

You would have also heard of the IANA transition, I'm sure, and all of the focus that's going to be on that over the next couple of years. Again, that's something that really is incredibly important for Internet service providers and connectivity providers. How that's going to work, and how it's going to be governed is of prime importance because what comes out of that is potentially an impact on us as ISPs on every issue related to the security and stability of the Internet.

So it's a very big issue for us along with everybody else, and we'll certainly be playing our part as that picture unfolds moving ahead. I'm sure it's going to be quite an exciting and a rocky ride as well. Examples where we've played a major part in ICANN already, well there is one that comes to the floor very quickly, and that is when the namespace was initially expanded so that we went beyond the three character names.

A number of those names never resolved, and in the early days people took a view that they're not resolving because the new names that were introduced, anything longer than three characters were being blocked by ISPs. Now we had to do a lot of work to try and get underneath that and find out what the real problem is. And what it was, was that the application providers and the software developers, they hadn't really been aware that the namespace was going to be expanded in that way.



That we were going to have domain names that were longer than three characters. So it was their software and their applications that hadn't been amended in a way that allowed those new names to be used. So it wasn't something that the ISPs were actually playing a part in, but we had a very big part of the resolution of that particular issue, where we had to help get the word out.

And whilst, if it hadn't been an ISP problem, we could have solved it quickly because of the relationship we have between the [ISPs?] and other parts of the industry. We suddenly found that there wasn't a global body of application providers, there wasn't a global body of all software developers. So we had to put an awful lot of effort into getting the word out through our membership and through different forums that we participate in to resolve that problem.

The other parts of the ecosystem that we work very closely with, of course, are the standards organization. Most of our members are pretty active and certainly adhere to the developments made within the IETF. Along with the regional Internet registries, because IP addresses are very much the life blood for ISPs. We haven't got... If we haven't got IP addresses, then we can't reach out and grow our services, grow our infrastructure to provide access to the Internet.

So inherently, one of the issues that, again, we've been pretty active in, here's the promotion of IPv6. Haven't totally resolved that problem, but it's something that's very much at the forefront for all ISPs. So I should probably pause at that point and open up for any questions on anything to do with the ISP constituency or the work that we do.



ANTHONY NIGANII: For the record, Anthony Niganii from Canada. As you're probably aware of the challenges we're facing in Canada with the price of accessing the Internet, and trying to get the more competitive market going, how does your group able to either support or push that [?] for the benefit of the end user?

TONY HOLMES: Certainly through the [ISPs?], a lot of our focus has been the issues around that, around price, around infrastructure roll out. We're never in a position on a national basis, other than to provide some input, and opinions that people can come to.

Certainly within our environment, there is more and more focus, I think, from those who are responsible for perhaps steering the decision, some with prices. And certainly in the UK, there is an awful load of interaction, if I take that as an example, between the ISPs and the regulator on some of those key issues. And I think that's really the way that that's gradually picked.

In other parts of the world, the situation is somewhat different because you face a different set of challenges. For instance, in some parts in Africa, where it's find saying competition will actually resolve some of those problems, will help infrastructure roll out, will help reduce the price of access, but what you actually need to do is to somehow encourage other ISPs to go into those parts of the world.

So I think part of it is chicken and egg. The environment has to be right for those other ISPs to move into those markets. And there has to be some form of encouragement for them to go. One of the benefits from



the Internet Governance Forum, I think, is the discussions that have taken place around that, and the need to do capacity building has got a lot of focus, and ISPs are very much engaged in some of those capacity building exercises.

So it's really working hand in glove with all of those play a part in resolving that problem. No easy answers, but it's something that once you unlock it, it seems to make such a difference.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, this is [?] from [?]. My question quite like the same as his, but have you any policy recommendation to build infrastructure, especially for developing countries?

TONY HOLMES: Well, actually, offering policies is really a difficult thing to resolve without looking at particular instances. But there are some excellent studies that have been done which some of our members have played a part in, as well as, of course, the work that a lot of you will be aware of I think in places like OECD, that actually point to the key things you need to do to create the right environment.

It is the right environment that is going to resolve those problems. But you need to look at the principles that have come out of some of those studies, and how they apply to a particular region. In some parts of the world, that's happening very quickly now because the power of the Internet is such that there is a real drive to resolve that.



In other parts of the world, it's still seems to be lagging. So one of the things I would be hopeful for is that organizations or groups such as the Internet Governance Forum can bring some of those people in, and help give them the best way forward in terms of best practice and to see how that rolls out.

VALENTINA:

Hello. My name is Valentina. I'm from Romania. I wanted to ask you, how is the Internet Service Providers Constituency responding to censorship?

TONY HOLMES:

That's a very topical one, of course, and one that is getting a lot of focus. We haven't, as a constituency, taking any position on that issue at all, but certainly there is a recognition that the way things have been done in the past, isn't the right way to go. So there is, let's say, a general acceptance within the constituency that that particular issue is certainly going to come under the scrutiny.

And that censorship is something that we wouldn't support in anyway. The openness of the Internet is absolutely critical to the whole function of the Internet. So having an open Internet and free access to all services and applications is something that, as a part of ICANN, we would very much support.

Anything that is restrictive, in any way, is really going against the principles that we hold quite dear and support.



VALENTINA: But could you state some of the reasons why you didn't adopt a formal position on this?

TONY HOLMES: Well because most of our work is focused around the day to day infrastructure issues, the technical issues that impact us in the Internet. For instance, the previous presentation that you had from Patrik on SSAC. One of the things we do as a constituency, we always look at the reports from SSAC, and a lot of those do have technical implications for ISPs.

So we need to look at those in a slightly different way and see what we need to do to try and improve the services through some of the problems that the SSAC looked to help us with. So the focus is very much on infrastructure issues. The other part of our activities in ICANN focused on the policy development work in the GNSO.

Now there isn't anything specific on censorship that's come through that route, so whilst we may get involved in some discussions and debates, particularly through other associations through the [ISPs] who will be looking at those things, as a constituency of ICANN, we are pretty overloaded with issues.

There is just so much happening here, that we don't have the luxury of looking at some of the broader aspects in the way that we could do here, and do in other forums but address through ICANN.



JANICE DOUMA LANGE: So if there were enough voices coming up through avenues within the GNSO saying that, “We would like to have a policy development process. We’d like to have something centered around censorship.” And there was enough, you know, content and rationale behind that, and if it came out through the process it might be something and it would rise to the top.

But how does that interact with the fact that ICANN really doesn’t engage in content? Is there a relationship there to that?

TONY HOLMES: Well, the question that I took here, I took on the basis of being an ISP, because those issues do impact ISPs. When it comes to ICANN, I think what you’ve actually said Janice is the explanation of why it isn’t on the agenda here, and why we don’t resolve it in ICANN. Because clearly, ICANN does have a very tight remit, and that is a very broad issue.

It impacts certain parties in ICANN. We are one of those. But this wouldn’t be the place that lack the attention. So in terms of discussing that within the constituency, we wouldn’t be in a position to try and take a view, or express an opinion on that, unless it came up in the way that you explained. And to be quite frank, that isn’t likely to happen in the GNSO, because they’re buried so deep in policy issues which really are the core focus for ICANN at the moment.

WILLY: For the record, I’m Willy [?]. I’ve witnessed the conversions between mobile connectivity, 3Gs, and so forth, particularly in the developing world, with the regular infrastructure of cables and fiber. I mean, how



do you envision this marriage between telecom with mobile connectivity and regular ISP. Is it a threat to regular ISPs? And how do you cope with it?

TONY HOLMES:

Well, I certainly wouldn't look at it as a threat, I would look at it as an opportunity, and it really is a game changer, that there is no doubt about that for ISPs. There will always be a need for those ISPs that don't provide that type of access, but the future is very much in the path that you're setting out without any doubt whatsoever.

To be fully connected, fully mobile, all of the time, 24/7, it's the path we're going down. So I don't actually see it in any other way than evolution of the system. And well, since the Internet came about and it's still pretty young, that evolution has been going on all of the time, and things have been changing all the time.

So it's just another step along the path. It will provide different challenges, it will impact the nature of business for a number of ISPs. But nothing is going to be static in the Internet anyway. So it's just yet another step along the evolutionary path.

BENJAMIN:

For the record, my name is Benjamin [?] from Nigeria. Well, I want, I mean I'm talking to you as someone from [?]. So, are there busy [?] standards that you hold your members to, internationally or regionally? Why I'm saying this, coming from a development area, region, ISPs are, you can barely call, you say you know ISPs. They give you lousy services, and because governments don't relate.



First, from where I'm coming from, there is no strong SLAs that make a mandate for ISPs to deliver a level... In fact, quality of service is not there. So people cannot pay for things, and they don't get it. So, yeah, that's why... You know when you mentioned SSAC, to me they write reports and advise and all of that, I would have loved to ask him, how do those reports change the industry, even when he mentioned vendors?

But just coming, because you belong to the ISP segment, and the structures that also look at this kind of things [?] to ICANN, how do you try to get all of these things to benefit the end users?

TONY HOLMES:

That's a really good question, and it's one that is close to my heart as well. And I fully agree that in some parts of the world, ISPs provide lousy service. The adherence to SLAs can be flaky. But again, I'm picking that, I think it's about changing the environment to make it work. The one thing we can't do, of course, as ISPs, is to go into parts of the world and change that in any other way.

Then to show them what's best practice, to encourage them to operate their market, not in terms of regulate the market. I don't think that is the answer. It's about creating the environment that's going to grow the right healthy Internet in a way that opens up and provides that service. So, best practice is something that we can help with in terms of providing steering and guidance.

We can't mandate the adoption of that. The good thing, I think, is that now there is a lot of focus because the Internet is so fundamental and



so important across the globe. That the authorities in a lot of those countries who can steer the market and steer the environment, are really looking at some of the benefits they can accrue from that. That the worse situation is where you have one monopoly provider in an area, no competition. They don't have to worry about what they're providing in terms of service.

If you want access to the Internet, you take this or you don't have it. That's the worst case. And there are parts of the world where that's still needs to change, but I think the awareness, and growth, and power of the Internet is going to help change that, because if you don't change it, then as a part of the world, a region, or a nation, you can't accrue the benefits that we all get from the Internet.

So if you want to build on the power of that, you want to encourage education, social mobility, all of the benefits we get, benefits for business as well, you have to change that environment. So gradually, it's happening. Some parts of the world, far faster than others. The downside is that there is often such a cost of that, that's another huge barrier. But in terms in helping with capacity building, it's getting a lot of focus now. And even those of us who come from a developed part of the world, see tremendous benefits from helping others.

So trying to reach out and assist with capacity building, it's actually getting a lot of momentum.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

I'm going to have to say thank you here. I know there is some more questions, but once again, I will connect you with Tony to make sure



any of these questions do get answered throughout the week. But please understand that Tony's docket will be pretty full through getting on the plane perhaps on Friday or Saturday.

But just get any questions to me, I'll get them to Tony, and with your email address, and I know that we can address them that way. So go ahead.

TONY HOLMES:

Just on that point, I'm certainly very keen to have more dialogue and answer any questions. We already provide through the ISP constituency, a lot of awareness and outreach on a number of topics. One of those is focus towards the new gTLD program. So every week, through our website, we provide an updated list of all of the new top level domains that are going to be inserted in the root, in terms of their actual operational decision.

So whenever decisions take to put a new gTLD in the root, and its approved, it goes on our list. As part of that, we look at those particular domain names, and we identify some of the ones where we think as ISPs, we may have problems through potential name collisions. So I would be more than happy to provide a link to that site and talk to anybody about that particular issue, because I think that's something, it's a constituency, we're very, very keen to get the word out to other parts of the world.

So if you're interested in hooking into that site and being put on the list so you can get that regular update, again, just let me know and I'll make sure that happens.



JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'll do that. I just need a note for that Tony, so I'll make sure that that happens. Okay. Thank you again very much. [Applause] And Byron? Come on down. This is like the... Yeah, exactly. And for the record, Byron Holland, the chair of the ccNSO, and our last speaker for the morning. Saving the best for last.

BYRON HOLLAND: I know Tony. He's pretty good too. All right, well good morning. Thank you for having me here. My name is Byron Holland. And I am the president and CEO of [sierra], which is the country code operator for Canada. We do dot CA. I'm also the current chair of the ccNSO. And in addition to that, right now, I am also on what is often called the high level panel, or the fifth strategy panel. It's official name is the panel on Internet cooperation and governance mechanisms.

Not exactly a catchy one, which is why it often ends up being called a high level panel. But I do wear those three different hats in the Internet space. And my goal here today is just to provide some insight on what the ccNSO, in particular does, but I am informed by those other hats. So if there is any questions around those, I'm happy to entertain them as well.

But in terms of how the ccNSO operates, and how people get engaged and participate in it, the ccNSO is a voluntary membership group inside the ICANN structures. So while there are approximately 250 country codes, the ccNSO has a membership of 149 right now. Now that 149 represent about 99% of all country code domains in the world, so while



we're only 149 of 249, we do represent almost all of the domain names out there.

Like I said, it's a voluntary body. There are no fees associated with becoming a member. It's a way to interact with ICANN to participate in the overall governance within ICANN, and the policy development making process. But as independent entities that have some element of sovereignty associated with them, the decisions that we make are also, unless done through PDP are not binding. So we use more moral persuasion, participation, best practices, those more informal mechanisms to generate adoption to the work that we're doing.

There is no hard and fast way to force our members to adopt the outputs of whatever work we're doing. And that makes us actually quite unique and distinct from other parts of the ICANN organization, not the least of which is the GNSO. When they adopt something, it tends to be binding on their membership. So that's certainly quite different.

We engage often through the vehicles of working groups, study groups, cross community working groups. In fact, of all of the structures within ICANN, we probably engage more cross-community than arguably any of the other specific structures, and that's in part because we typically do a lot of work with the GAC. Even though we're separate, country codes have, generally speaking, a good – generally speaking, a good relationship with their governments, although that is certainly not always the case.

Most of us do have a reasonable working relationship. And that's the next point that I wanted to make, is that cc's are delegated through



ICANN today and typically to the government of the land. And that government then delegates the authority to operate a cc to whatever structure has been come up with in that country. In Canada's particular case, the government went to the Internet community, and said, "How should we do this?"

Back in the late 90's, and it was determined that a not for profit corporation was the best way to do it. And you'll often find that in western democracies, that is the case. Certainly, you'll find that elsewhere. Sometimes cc's are run as government departments, sometimes they're still run out of academic institutions, and in a few very rare cases, there are still some old ones that are owned by private interests.

The reason I tell you that, is those very different governance structures still all have their roots going back to sovereign governments, almost all of the time. And that's a very important fact when you're considering cc's and their relationships with governments, which is one of the reasons that we are separate from the GAC, but often will work closely with the GAC, particularly on thorny issues that relate to sovereignty, delegation and re-delegation of country codes, etc.

And it's within the ccNSO that we manage those relationships. Because of that, the cc community has no contracts with ICANN, no contracts with IANA. That is an extremely important differentiator between us and the g-space actors, or other actors who are contractually bound to ICANN. Certainly we guard this very jealously, and over time, ICANN has occasionally tried to encourage us through various means to exchange



paper in some way shape or form, but we do not have contracts with ICANN.

And our independent because of the sovereign nature of our organizations. So that provides quite an unique perspective on the ICANN world. We come here, we're active participants, but we operate within the ccNSO in a very independent unique way because of the sovereignty issues that we have. One of the real interesting outputs there is that we do a lot of work in country often.

Many of us do a lot of work in country. We're very active with the Internet community, because to some degree we're trying to both foster and represent the Internet communities in broader forums like ICANN. And we also do our best to develop capacity within our countries to a great degree.

Again, always the caveat that we are not a homogeneous group, we're not all the same, so it does vary from country to country. But very often it's the case that a part of our role is trying to develop the capacity in country. And it's a very good way for people to get involved who might not always have an ability to interface with government on Internet issues, coming through your cc, participating with your cc is actually a good way to get involved in country.

And I know that we and others actually sponsor folks to come to ICANN meetings, IGF, etc. So you know, there is many ways to get involved in the Internet governance space and through your cc, either into the ICANN structure, ccNSO, etc. is one way, but also you can participate through into IGF and other structures through your cc.



So, you know, cc's really tailor themselves to the local flavor. And I would encourage all of you to understand your local cc and we'll see what kind of opportunities they have for you. When we are here in ICANN, our meetings are open. We meet all day Tuesday and all day Wednesday, which I do have to leave about two minutes early because I am the chair of it, and I have to go chair it at 9:00.

And you're welcome to come. Meetings are all day, we do a lot of work around broad Internet issues in country, best practices, certainly right now, Internet governance writ large is a key focus of our attention. And the withdraw, or the proposed withdraw of NTIA from its accountability slash oversight role in the ICANN ecosystem, and IANA in particular, is very important to us.

And I thought maybe I would just touch on that subject. Needless to say, it's probably the biggest single issue in the Internet governance sphere right now. IANA is a function by which our country code zones, or the data for our country code, IANA is the entity that puts them in the root for us, more or less. So we are a customer of IANA. And in fact, currently, before we get 1,000 gTLDs, to date we have been IANA's largest customer, because there is simply more of the cc's than there are the g's.

So what happens to IANA is very important to us, not just on a technical, or clerical level, but also on the policy and governance layer, because going back to sovereignty and our relationships with governments, how policy is implemented in the technical layer is extremely important to us. And that's... Even though many people consider IANA really a



technical function, it is in fact the intersect, of sovereignty, policy, and technology.

And when you pull the NTIA out of this equation, and you look into that issue, the next biggest hot spot, or source of political tension, will be sovereignty related issues of cc's within the IANA function, because not all policy is crisp around delegation and re-delegation of country codes. And certainly, you know, we're all aware of the changing circumstances of different countries.

What happens when a country code is not agreed on within country who should be the operator? And there is countries today where that's the case. And suddenly you have a massive political policy issue that lands on ICANN's doorstep, which is fundamentally a technology organization. And what you'll find in the coming days and weeks is this issue further develops, I would suggest to you to pay attention to the country code issues, because that will become the next hot spot in this Internet governance debate.

And it's here in ICANN, where the ccNSO deals with those kinds of issues. Now, like I said, we represent by far the massive majority of domains, but we only represent 149 of 249 cc's. So we don't speak for all cc's. There are regional organizations who actually have access to country code operators who are not part of the ccNSO. And we have good relations with those regional organizations, which is another opportunity for people to participate and find a way into this world.

But those regional organizations will also be part of the discussion around how do we deal with contested delegations and re-delegations? But ICANN, this is really the forum where we deal with those. I was just



going to say, that's what I do, that's what we do, but I'm also very interested in understanding how we can get more varied participation, especially from – I hate to say this, probably politically indelicate. But when you look at the mic in an ICANN meeting, you'll find its often occupied by old gray haired guys, right?

And what we need as a community too is more youth and a wider variety of inputs and feedback. You know, the first two and half billion people, we're already online. It's the next two and a half billion that this organization, and Internet governance in general, need to take account of and start to morph to make it more accessible.

ANTHONY NIGANII:

Okay. Anthony Niganii from Canada. And my question is going to be, and you're probably going to understand the issue to the First Nation's challenges of being a government of their lands, as well as trying to get their sovereignty recognized within Canada. So it's looking at the opportunity as to how can they also become involved with this, even though they are not a country, but they are considered nations?

And it's probably not just unique to Canada, it might be to other indigenous people around the world, trying to get their sovereignty recognized. And so when you look at the policies, is it something that is brought up as an idea yet for discussion? Or is it something that would be relatively new?

BYRON HOLLAND:

So in terms of having a country code you mean?



ANTHONY NIGANII: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: So country codes, the two digits to the right of the dot, are taken specifically from the UN ISO 3666 list. We don't even begin to get weighted into that political mine field, nor does ICANN. It basically says you are either are on the country list, or you're not. And we just simply take that list and country codes flow directly from that.

UNIDENTIFIED: I've got two, three small questions strictly for you. This is [?] from Pakistan Fellow. I'll be talking in my personal capacity. The first is, what are the requirements for becoming a ccNSO? You should be a registry, or a registrar, or somebody else can come up and be a part of this? Because I just confirm that my country's ccTLD is not a member of ccNSO. So I was just curious to know about that.

The second question, there are certain ccTLDs that there are not actually being used as ccTLDs. So for example, this dot TV, dot CO. They are more used as commercial or gTLDs. So how about that? Is that okay with the ccNSO?

BYRON HOLLAND: So the first question is, it's the registry operator who can be a member of the ccNSO. It's not for registrars or any other legitimate actors, but we only have membership, or our only membership are those who



operate the cc registry for a country. That's the only kind of member we have.

As far as question number two in terms of how does an Internet community or country elect to operate their country code? That's the sovereign right of the Internet community in their country, and we as a cc community don't, we don't interfere with each other's methods of operation.

So there are those who have gone to a very commercial end of the spectrum. If you run a country code out of an university, which is where many started, or out of a government department, that's sort of one end of the spectrum. And it goes all of the way to operating almost exactly like a pure for profit entity that uses the country code two digits in some sort of a marketing oriented way.

But we don't have a policy on that one way or the other.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

We can take just one more question than we need to move. What's that? I'm not quite sure what I'm looking at there. I think, as a teacher I would go to the next student.

UNIDENTIFIED:

[?] from Senegal. As we would say in our country that our country code development for dot SN, is our flat on the Internet. How does the GAC, in order to implement politics, you know that's the country code domain? It's a good measurement, so that it does [?] committee, to bring together, implementing politics or something like that.



BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not sure I understand the question in terms of... So in terms of the relationship between GAC member...

UNIDENTIFIED: ...ccNSO.

BYRON HOLLAND: From your country and the country code operator?

UNIDENTIFIED: I emphasize the question...

BYRON HOLLAND: Sorry. Part of it is just that the sound is really bad for me here. I'm having trouble even hearing it.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's on the highest level. On highest level, between the ccNSO and the GAC. How does it work together? I would think that our national countries that... Our country code [?] as our national flat on the Internet. It's national, but just think of that, how it work between the...

BYRON HOLLAND: I mean, we actually have a relatively close relationship, as far as independent communities go. We typically work together in that almost more than any other two separate entities, we do more cross



community working group work. So, you know, we have a working group on this tough issue around delegation and re-delegation of country codes.

It has members of the GAC and the cc. We have a working group that's forming around country and territory names, and without going into that, there are many political and contested issues around that.

I mean, if you just think of the way Amazon and [?], dot Amazon and dot [?] played out. Many thorny issues there. So we work together on working groups to come up with common solutions on issues that are relevant to both of us. And we actually do that more than I think any other two independent groups do. So that would probably be the primary way that we do it.

We also tend to just know each other. It's in my interest to know the Canadian GAC rep and what they're worried about in their issues, and have conversation and make sure we're on the same page, as much as we can be. We don't agree on everything, but as much as we can do we try to be supportive of each other, in our case at least.

I'm sorry, I do have to go and chair a meeting.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

So, we're going to, nope. We're going to clear the room not only for Byron to get to his meeting, but for the GAC to start theirs. So I will be sending around email addresses, any other questions, we will be able to address throughout the week.

I can send them to Gabby or Christina.



BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, absolutely.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Okay. So send any other question to me. We'll get them to Byron. And thank you so very much for your time this morning.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And guys remember, we'll be together again at 5:00 in Moore, where we were last night with John Crane and the security team, and our – his associates with other security forces, global. Come to the booth if you have any questions about your agenda, and have a good day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

