# EN

SINGAPORE - Fellowship Morning Sessions
Wednesday, February 11, 2015 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

PATRIK  FÄLTSTRÖM:     … It's a problem that's existed on all versions of Windows, which means I encourage all of you to upgrade all your servers and laptops as soon as you can, and I really mean as soon as you can - don't wait until tomorrow or anything like that.  If it's the case that you don't use active directory authentication then you're probably safe.   If it's active directory error that's specifically problematic if you're participating at conferences like this, without using VPM.  This is a bug that Microsoft have been working on for about a year or something. What else do we do?

Well, we make recommendations to ICANN Board, specifically.   We answer questions from them, but also other groups within the ICANN community - for example GNSO or ccNSO and such.  We write between six  and  eight  reports  a  year;  that  includes  various  different recommendations.  They can be everything from suggestions on policy changes to actions that we think ICANN should take.  We primarily work with DNS issues because ICANN mostly works with DNS issues.  But it's also the case that we are responsible, according to our Charter, to also look  at  other  parameters;  for  example  IP  addresses  and  routing,  et cetera.

Without further ado, I was thinking of opening up the floor to you, to ask me questions.  Before we do that, I'd like to know approximately what kinds of people are in this room.  I will give you a couple of categories of people - if you  work  with  legal  issues,  if  you  work  on  networking,  if

you're a programmer, and I'd like you to raise your hand if you feel you belong to that category.  Yes, you're allowed to raise your hand multiple times.  I really like it when people work with legal issues, or are lawyers, and are also programmers.  I like that.  I like it when government people also work with networking, so the crossover of things is important.

So first, how many people here work with networking?  As in you actually do deal with IP address allocation and routing?  Thank you.  How many are programmers?  You don't have to work as a programmer, but you must have written a couple of programs that are longer than a hundred lines of code.  Excellent.  How many people here think they have legal competence or work as lawyers?  I don't raise my hand.  You see that?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:     Quickly, if someone has their laptop audio off, if you can shut if off?  We can hear the echo.  Thank you.

PATRIK  FÄLTSTRÖM:     How many people here represent or work for, in one way or another, a government?  Including if you're an advisor to the government.  You don't have to be employed by them.  That's also good.  I really like that people have multiple skillsets.  With that, over to you. Questions please.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:     I know a couple of you already had some questions.  Don't be shy.  It's early.  Wednesday.  Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED: Good morning.  My name is Naveed.  I'm a technical person.  I'm a researcher in the networking side.  I've been associated with this DNSSEC connectivity with ICANN.  My question is: what kind of thing do you do that's different from the staff that's involved in the DNSSEC process?  And how can one get involved in SSAC if one wants to?  I would really want to do that, because I'm a technical person, and I've been doing the stuff that you people are involved in.  Is there any regional set-up, just like the ALAC people have?  That's what I'd like to know.

PATRIK  FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much.  We'll start with DNSSEC.  It's correct that we're working with DNSSEC as well.   We in SSAC are responsible for the session for DNSSEC for Newcomers, on Monday, and we also have one more deep, technical session on DNSSEC on the Wednesday, that runs from 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM today.  That's seriously technical, which means that's probably something you'd want to go to.  SSAC is the organization that holds those.   There's a similar outreach program that [Yanis 00:05:25] is running, but we are doing it specifically for DNSSEC.

CcNSO is also hosting a technical program called Tech Day, that was running Monday this week. Those are the technical outreach things that we run.  We have the Tech Day on Monday morning.  We have the DNSSEC for Newcomers in the afternoon and then DNSSEC deeply technical today.  In the session today we are discussing specifically with a lot of people working or implementing DNSSEC on issues we have seen in deployment, including root key rollover and other things that we'll probably discuss on today's agenda.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The difference between us and the staff who go into DNSSEC is that SSAC don't work with any operational issues, where ICANN staff work with running L root, for example. They also work on the management of the root zone. They also work with changes to the root zone. We don't do that in SSAC. We suggest the policies that they should use during their operation. I myself work for Netnode in my day job, when I don't spend time here at ICANN. We run the Internet connect points in Sweden and Denmark, and we run I Root, so we also run the root name server. We also run DNS for 35 ccTLDs around the world, and we have hardware in maybe 55 different locations all over the world, including Africa, Asia and South and North America.

So we seem to be pretty similar, so go to the workshop. The last question was how to engage in SSAC. Our Committee has an internal Membership Committee, so you have to apply for Membership. The application is passed through the Membership Committee, which implies that you first have to respond to a survey and say what your skillset is. It's not the case that we only need technical people. We also need people from law enforcement, from governments, people from legal background, because the skillsets of SSAC, as a whole, need to be complete. As you might understand, at the moment we do have quite a lot of technical people.

We've had a case for the last two years when really deeply technical people in DNS were not accepted; not because the person didn't pass the bar, but because we already had people knowing that. So in SSAC you don't need people that have the skillsets that I have; you need people with skills that I don't have.

SPEAKER: Hi, [Shiva 00:08:03] from Trinidad and Tobago. I'm glad you raised that point, because part of what I do is not more at the technical level anymore, it's more the strategic level. For example in my country IPv6 hasn't been ruled out because of strategic cost. It hasn't made it up to the Board level to say, "Let's go to IPv6." I've been to a lot of technical DNSSEC presentations, IPv6 as well. What are you all doing with respect to outreach and engaging strategic persons like myself, who try to get strategic awareness across; things like phishing? For instance, ICANN was subject to a phishing attack recently, in November, so things like DNSSEC, IPv6, and phishing, at a strategic level?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: We're working on advisors, which means that we create a Working Group with a specific target. That group finishes the job, publishes the document and dies. That means that SSAC itself does not work on the long-term strategic issues. We work on specific issues, but those issues… For example at the moment we're working on credential management and registry and registrars. We're also following the phishing attack issues with ICANN, even though we don't work with it, because that's something that IT and security take care of. We do work together with the Anti-Phishing Working Group and currently we're looking at the data they've collected regarding the new gTLD launch.

So we're following these things, but we're not really working on it. If you want to work more on the long-term strategic, for example update of IPv6 or DNSSEC then you should look at the various programs that the Internet Society is running. I encourage you to try to contact Dan York,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

and that's a name that you should pass to people. Dan really would like to get in contact with people here, because that's the outreach program. He's been running the outreach and strategic program for IPv6 and DNSSEC deployment for the last ten years almost, and he's one of the people that arranged the DNSSEC Workshop today, together with SSAC.

So we're working together with Internet Society to make sure that the content of the Workshop today matches where ISOC at the moment is with their long-term strategic plan.

ROANA: My name is [Roana], first-time fellow from Sri Lanka. My question is: security is a large subject, so as ICANN is working on names and numbers, is your work related to those two areas?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: One can say that, as you say, security is a large subject, and because of that we say security, stability and resilience. Normally people say SSR issues, just because most people when they think about security immediately think about encryption and privacy issues and wire-tapping and those kinds of things, just because everyone talks about that. I try to say that we, in SSAC, are not so interested in those things. Of course we are, do we work with those things. But what is more important for us is to look at the ability to communicate, because if it's the case that the IP packets do not flow between you and me, it doesn't matter whether the traffic is encrypted. So we cannot forget the robustness issues.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

To go back to the parameters and the IP addresses we're looking very much at things like the allocation mechanisms - what is the risk that we have conflicts in the allocation system?  What's the risk that you have… What happens if it's the case that people use unallocated IP space?  How can you increase the likelihood that you actually know that a route announcement is correct or not?  And this is the DNSSEC issue: how do you know that a domain name that someone claimed to host as a specific name server actually is hosted at that name server, and isn't some kind of phishing or other kinds of taking over?

So that is the kind of security robustness that we look at.  Everything from the packet level operating system, like this Microsoft vulnerability that has implications on name space collision issues, certificates, certificate naming, but also all the way up to more strategic issues. Although regarding strategic issues - that was a very good question by the way - we look at specific things that we believe must be done for a strategic plan to move forward.  Because there are certain things - for instance in the WHOIS discussions, which is a long-term thing.  But we've written a couple of reports regarding taxonomy, regarding other types of things that we think could help things move forward.

STAFF MEMBER:                 I have a remote question from [Giden]: "I'd like to know why the active directory bug by Microsoft took so long to be resolved?"

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:          Microsoft has published quite a large number of blog posts, and I read some of them.  That's why I almost missed the meeting, because I had to

ICANN | 52
Singapore

go through these things, because I expected to get these kinds of questions. So thank you very much for the question. One of the reasons why it took such a long time for Microsoft is that this is not - as Microsoft described it - it was not an error in the software. It was an error in the design of active directory. They had to redesign how active directory is doing authentication - re-implement that in all versions of their operating systems - make sure it's [backware 00:14:08] compatible and then release it, and that's quite a lot of work. A lot of people have been working very hard to resolve those issues.

JONATHON:          Good morning. My name is Jonathan, a first-time fellow from Burundi. In your completed projects I can see fast flags hosting in DNS and a domain name front running. Can you talk about that a little bit?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:          Yes. I think specifically the domain name front running was an interesting report, because there were a lot of rumors saying that front running, which… To explain to people that don't know what front running means, it's that if it were the case that you wanted to register a certain domain name, you may first look where the domain name is registered. Then there were some rumors saying that if you looked at whether a domain name was registered, you disclose on the Internet that you might be interested in the domain, and then if you, one hour later, registered a domain name or try to register it, you see that the domain is taken.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

There were some rumors there that people were eavesdropping on that checking of whether the domain was free, and it's a drop-catch on the domain, and they registered it faster than you. That was the rumor. We went through lots and lots of data. We talked to many registrars to see what was happening and looked at log files. In the report we concluded that we couldn't see any evidence that was happening. This is one of the few reports where we're looking at the problem, we find that there is no problem, but we still release a report. There was another case three weeks ago where we actually had a report finished, but we concluded, "No, we shall not publish it because people will just be confused by having the report published."

So when we're working on something it doesn't mean that we will publish a report, but with the front running that's one thing. Regarding fast flags, that's another interesting thing. The issue behind fast flags has to do with the fact that there is some caching in the DNS protocol and name service in the world. If it's the case that you're a criminal it might be the case that you set up your DNS, you set up a certain IP address or name server for a domain name, then you change the DNS. But after you change the DNS but before the caches are empty, then you do all your criminal activity. So you do your criminal activity with the help of not things that are in the DNS but things that are cached.

That makes it much, much harder for law enforcement and other people to see what actually happened, because if they look in the DNS they don't see any evidence that things are set up the way it looks like, and if people then change the name server IP address, for example a couple of times a second, in that case it's really hard to know what the setting was when the criminal activity happened. There's a very nasty version of

ICANN | 52
Singapore

that, which is that you register a domain name, you register name servers and start running the DNS, and then you unregister a domain name so you're no longer the domain holder, but then you use the domain name while it's cached.

That's another fast flag type activity. We're looking into that in great detail. We're really looking into those types of things. You'll see some of those issues in the name space collision issues and certificates; similar types of issues. We're currently, together with the RSSAC, looking into the time to live issue of record itself in DNS, and the RSSAC is looking at the TTL for records in the root zone. In SSAC we're specifically looking at implications for the TTL of the DNSSEC-related records in the parent zone, which are non-[unclear 00:18:30] - what the values could be to transfer domain names and mitigate some fast flag issues. So we're moving towards some recommendation in that area. Thank you.

AMANYA:              Morning. [Amanya], I'm a fellow from Bosnia and Herzegovina. I wanted to ask you about the legal challenges that you're facing in terms of security. You partially answered it now in the previous question, but I'm just wondering, just identify what kind of a legal background you expect from a team, and were there any cases that actually brought you in front of the courts?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:    I would say that luckily enough, regarding security issues, there are these kinds of incidents. A lot of the court cases actually end by mitigation, or the direct dispute resolution between the involved parties.

ICANN | 52
*Singapore*

Unfortunately I think that most court cases I've been involved in have had to do with [IPR 00:19:34] issues and trademark and other kinds of infringement issues. But regarding more traditional criminal activity, yes, I was in court the first time for people breaking into computers where I was working in 1993, where we managed to bring people to court and they were found guilty for using computers at the university where I was working in 1992. So yes, I've been dealing with various court cases.

The legal issues that we're working with, or that I'm working with, is first of all I work a lot with Internet governance related issues; lots of international law, quite a lot of things that have to do with the sanctions, quite a lot of things that are CSR-related issues, which is the companies' implementation of various social responsibility issues. It also has to do with things like the ability for law enforcement to do their work, the ability to pass data between law enforcement entities cross-border. I've written myself a report on cross-border implication on blocking, together with the Council of Europe.

So I'd say the legal issues more have to do with the international law, and stress, and inability to deploy software and services globally because of differences in legislation in different jurisdictions, which means that very often myself and other technical people have to help and advise legal people when they are discussing the differences in different jurisdictions. I hope that answered your question.

STAFF MEMBER:    There is a remote question from [Mamadu]. He has a question for you saying: "Patrick, as the Vice Chair of the ICG, out of his IANA transition

process regarding numbers, protocols and names, he mentioned that you posted a picture on Facebook in which you're tired and embarrassed."

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:     I didn't hear the last sentence.  Can you repeat it please?

STAFF MEMBER:         "You posted a picture on Facebook in which you looked tired and embarrassed.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:     Yes, I did.  That was more a joke, and other people forced me to do it. Anyway, I think it's important I have fun when doing these kinds of things, especially when you negotiate such important things - you cannot just be boring.  Anyway, yes, I'm Vice Chair of the ICG, which is one of the two main tracks, and we have received the response from the protocol, we've received the response from the numbers.  We've not received the response from the names.  The names community are working really hard at this meeting, and they said last week, "We will deliver to you not until June or July."

Yesterday evening I heard much more optimistic numbers from them, and it all depends on how much people manage to work together this week.  That's really, really important, so I hope we'll get the response as soon as possible.  The reason why I was tired is just because all of our timeline was relying on the three proposals arriving at the same time, so we could do an cross-assessment of the proposals, side-by-side, but now

when they arrive out of synch we have to use different processes, different scorecards, to do an assessment of two of them first, and then add the third one that's arriving.

AHMED:                        Ahmed  [unclear 00:23:32], Fellowship, Sudan.  You mentioned in one of the courts that you deal with sanctions.  Can you give an example of what sanctions you deal with in the court?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:            No, I don't deal with sanctions in the court, but I am looking into interpretation of sanctions, and a lot of people that of course ask me and others, like with other legal situations, what kinds of implications certain decisions or sanctions might have on the ability to communicate broadly over the Internet.  No, I've never been involved in any court cases that are involved in sanctions.  I have though been involved in requesting permission to, for example, provide services, even though there are sanctions.  I've been working on that side.  Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:         Great questions everybody.  I know there are a couple more hands that have started to come up, and I always hate that part when we have to move along, but we have so many [unclear 00:24:41] from so many stakeholder groups and constituencies that we do want to give everyone their opportunity, and Tony is in the back waiting to come up.  Patrik, thank you very much for your time.  Thank you for your insight into the Microsoft issue.  If anyone has any questions about that, would you mind if I…  Your day is packed, but…

ICANN | 52
Singapore

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:    No, no, people can reach out to me.  I'll leave a couple of business cards here in front, for people that want that.  Regarding the Microsoft thing it is a normal patch Tuesday thing like they always have.  It's critical this time, if you use active directory.  Have a look at that at least and make your own assessment.  Thank you.


JANICE DOUMA LANGE:    Good morning Tony.  I'd like to introduce Tony Holmes, who is the Chair for the Internet Service Provider Constituency.


TONY HOLMES:    Thank you Janice.  Good morning everybody.  Janice is right - in our constituency there are many Tonys, but you don't have to be a Tony to join, so…  It's always difficult to follow Patrik.  He describes himself as a geek, but he's far more than that.  He's probably a geek plus, so I'll do my best to follow.  When we come to these ICANN Meetings there are always parts of the program that you enjoy more than others.  For me, this is always one part I do enjoy, because it's always a privilege.  I know how hard you have to work to actually be a fellow, and really appreciate that.  I get quite excited, because so many of you are going to be the future of the Internet.

I look back at my involvement.  I've been involved with ICANN since its initial meeting, so probably far too long, but it's been an exciting journey for me.  I represent BT here, British Telecom, as a [lower 00:27:00] ISP.  Obviously everything that happens here is of some importance in that area.  My reason to get involved initially was that in BT I was responsible

ICANN | 52
Singapore

for their numbering, naming and addressing strategy. The whole future of telecommunications and information society was coming together, and certainly with an interest in IP addressing and the evolution of domain names it seemed the right place to come. But I look back at those times now, and being involved in the strategic setting for the company I can see how well we did.

We used to do plans for the first one or two years, and plans for five years, and plans for ten years - so very optimistic. Some of those we got right, some of them we got wrong, some of them we got right but for the wrong reasons. The pace of change now is just so much faster. I think that the future is going to be so exciting, and to make the future evolve in the right way, it is going to be dependent upon identifiers - so again names, numbers, addresses is such an important part of that, and of course it's part of ICANN's core mission, so that's going to be play quite a part in the future.

To come back to where we are as ISPs, obviously as ISPs and connectivity providers we have a real interest in the policies that evolve that impact those things. That's why we're actually here at ICANN. We represent both large and small ISPs. We have some multinational representation, but we also have some very small ISPs as well, and we reach out through association, such as the ISPs Association, that give us a root to keep those people engaged. You don't have to attend all of the ICANN Meetings to actually participate in our constituency either, and we're very aware of that.

Certainly some of the smaller ISPs that we need to reach out to, that need to be aware of the policies that are now being generated within

ICANN | 52
*Singapore*

ICANN, they're busy building networks.  They can't fly all over the world to come to ICANN Meetings, but the information is just as important to them as well.  Some of them merely want to be kept up-to-date with some of the technical aspects that are happening here - some of the issues that Patrik referred to.  So over recent years we've started a separate stream within our constituency that purely challenges the technical information, because if you start talking to some engineers and people with a real engineering focus, and you start talking about ICANN and the PDP, that isn't going to be where they engage.

So we have to try and hit both sides of that audience and make sure that we are a two-way channel, so we can tell them the things that are happening here, get some feedback from them, and then, through the activities that we have as a constituency, we can reflect their views and interests.  So as a constituency we sit within the Commercial Stakeholder Group, and that is in the Non-Contracted Parties House.  I'm sure you're quite familiar by now with the structure of ICANN.

That isn't always an easy place for us to actually operate, because the Commercial Stakeholder Group is comprised of the business constituency, who you will hear from later, and also the intellectual property constituency.  So we come at it from a wide range of aspects. As ISPs we are interested, certainly, in some of the intellectual property issues, but we wouldn't be at the forefront of leading the work on that. One of the challenges that we faced is integrating ourselves within that stakeholder group, when we may have very diverse inputs, and widely varying interests in the same subjects.

**ICANN | 52**
*Singapore*

This is now under consideration within ICANN, and I think there's a recognition that the voices of the individual constituencies are just as important as the collective voice as well. So the dynamics in how we fit in and how we operate within the structure of ICANN is somewhat changing. The big issue for us at the moment is of universal acceptance. Looking at the introduction of new gTLDs, I think if you look at the structure of ICANN and the various memberships of the constituencies, you'll have an avid interest in the gTLD program from the start to the end, but certain aspects of that will be more important to you. As ISPs, the most important part of the gTLD Program is now.

We're now at the stage where the new domain names are going into the root and we need to make sure that they work, because as soon as anything goes wrong in the Internet, from a customer perspective, you need to have someone to turn to, to help you, and traditionally that's the ISPs. If anything on the Internet doesn't work then our telephones ring. So we need to be able to answer those questions, and it's another reason why we have to work very hard in getting the message out there from the largest to the smallest ISPs.

To give you an example of what happened in the past, when the domain name space went through an earlier expansion program, we moved from the three-character domains to longer domain names. We came to an ICANN Meeting and in the Open Forum we had a number of people suddenly come to the microphone and say, "There's a real problem here because we've now expanded this name space, we have different length domain names, and ISPs are blocking these." We thought, "We're not aware of this blocking happening." The problem was that they had

ICANN | 52
Singapore

reports from their customers that these names weren't resolving, and there was an assumption it must be through ISP activities.

What was actually the problem was that in terms of some of the application developers, in some of the software manufacturers, they actually had limitations on the length of domain names. The problem we then faced was trying to get that message out to the appropriate people to resolve those issues, and we are very aware now that we're going through a much larger, much bigger expansion of the name space, so we need to be able to react and make sure that all those elements are taken care of. We came into this meeting, where this was our number one issue as ISPs, and we needed to find a way to resolve it.

The good news is that as soon as we arrived we got talking to some of our associates in other constituencies - the registry constituency, the registrar. Also we looked towards the ALAC, because as users it's important to get the word out to them and to get the experience back from their Members when things are breaking. ICANN has really come together as a community to help resolve that, so now there's a project that's being set up. There was a session held two days ago looking specifically at universal acceptance, and there's going to be a program of activities, which is probably going to last for the best part of ten years, to make sure that as these issues are identified then this Committee can log what the problem is and take action.

As I said earlier, it's a really difficult area because whilst in ICANN we've got a broad spectrum of interest, not everybody is currently here, so we need to reach out to those people involved in software development, involved in application development, and of course they come in various

shapes and sizes. There isn't one big, global body that we can go to, so it's an education process and it's very much an awareness and outreach activity that we need to undertake on that.

In the past some of the other issues that have been pretty prominent for us are things like name collisions. So again, it's this issue of when things don't work then as ISPs you're very often the first port of call. It's the associations that we represent that customers turn to. In terms of the big issues that are happening here - I know from an earlier question you're very aware of the activities going on around the IANA transition; and again, that's something that's of prime importance to ISPs - anything that impacts the security and stability of the Internet, and that has the potential to do that.

That could be from a technical perspective in terms of some of the changes, or in terms of some of the PDPs that impact IANA - it will have an impact on our operations. So we are very involved in those activities, both from the stewardship and the accountability stream as well, and obviously that's ongoing work. A number of us have also, over the years, been pretty involved in the Internet governance issues, because one of the things that we've all benefited from is the ability of the Internet to evolve at a tremendous speed, and to make that happen you have to have the right environment.

Certainly coming from a company that's a very big ISP, but also a telecommunications provider in the past - the line there is getting very blurred now - the environment that surrounded the telecommunications environment and the strict regulatory control of that arena doesn't really fit with the Internet. We've been quite active in some of the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

discussions over the years where that's been very much to the fore. I believe that's still very much an open issue. The proof of this particular multistakeholder model is going to be how it works in the future.

The challenge is that all along the line I think ICANN and the other groups, the RIRs that are fundamental in providing infrastructure and making the Internet work, they're constantly under the spotlight, and whatever happens with ICANN we cannot afford for it to fail because fundamentally the internet would change if that was the case. That's why it's so important that as well as putting all this effort in, and the community is really engaging in the IANA process, as you'll be aware, that while that's happening the other issues that impact us, particularly as ISPs, the day-to-day operational excellence that we expect from ICANN and its operations is maintained.

With that background, I should probably pause here and look for some questions, rather than give you more of an explanation, although I'm happy to do that if that's desired.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:     Something interesting, Tony - two things I want to cover. One you brought up emphasized a cross-community aspect, and there have been questions earlier in the week about, "Can you work in one community and the other?" and about shared interest. So I really appreciate the fact that you talked about that you go to the registries, you go to the registrars, you're talking to intellectual property - so there's a real need for the multistakeholder model to not work in silos. They have to be speaking to one another, even though they may be speaking on the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

same topic from a different perspective. We've been emphasizing that part.

Two - you hear in many different ways, from the folks that have been talking to you, that it's about volunteers, and it's about they need more people. It's about education, which is the word Tony's used. Education and engagement, and engaging means you're hopefully being a volunteer, and one way is to help us with our communication streams, because we may not be the best at that. We've posted on the bathroom wall for some time, and I was going to lead into a segue earlier to talk about Wanda and an example of the Fellow from Los Angeles and what happened from there, to see how easy it is?

TONY HOLMES: Yes. They're very interesting aspects, and of course across ICANN and the various groups you can be involved in more than one. We are part of the GNSO, and as I mentioned part of the CSG there. Within our Membership we have people who represent entities that are involved in other constituencies within the GNSO as well. Some people come to ICANN where they're purely a registrar, and that's where their interest is, or they may be a registry. But others come from companies where they have multiple interests, and could engage in multiple places.

I come from one of those companies. In the past, BT was a registrar, so we could have engaged in the registrar constituency. We did engage in the business constituency, because as a business we had an interest there. They were dealing with things that sometimes were quite different from what we were dealing with in the ISPs. There were areas of common interest, but they also had separate streams. We also have

ICANN | 52
Singapore

an interest in intellectual property, so we could have engaged there. Sometimes you have to make those decisions. The way the system works today is that often you will find people from some companies are engaged in one or more constituency.

For instance, we have members in the ISP constituency who are also involved in the business constituency today. The only limitation on that is that under most charters today you can only vote in one place. So you can engage in the dialogue and certainly have an influence in the way the discussion's going, but if it comes to voting then you would vote in one constituency. The good news about that is that other than the election processes for various officials, we don't get to vote that often, other than in council. Of course, with the GNSO Council the constituencies have seats allocated. We have two seats on Council.

So we vote on particular issues in there, and under our Charter the way the process works is that all of the issues are discussed at the constituency. We come to a conclusion as to how we're going to vote and the Members who represent us on Council are then bound by those decisions, so they can't just sit on Council and decide they're going to act one way or the other. I've never really found that that's a problem, because in most decision-making processes that have taken place within Council I'd suggest that the constituencies where we could participate, in addition as ISPs, we tend to think similarly on most issues.

So I don't think that's a barrier in any way. In fact, it's something I'd encourage - that broader representation - because the more engagement you have through the system and the more views you have, what comes out at the end should be a better result. We have to try and

take account of all views.  So I think that situation work well.  In terms of engagement in a constituency, I mentioned earlier that you don't have to come to every ICANN Meeting.   We have Members through associations who are quite active in giving us their views and their feedback, but we very rarely see them.   It's keeping those channels open, keeping the two-way information flow that's important.

One of the things I'm very thankful for recently, from ICANN, as an organization, is that as ICANN has grown as a body then they've been able to help us undertake more and more outreach, which has proved very successful.  We've still got work to do, particularly in some areas.  I'm very aware that the representation from ISPs in Africa is something that we've found quite challenging, and there are reasons for that as well, because in terms of growing their networks they're very much going through that phase - their focus may be on other issues.  But what happens here is just as important.

So we are now very focused in trying to reach out to those parts of the community where we have lower engagement than others, and try to see how we can make that connection.  I think we're at a stage where I would suggest some of the other barriers to participation that have existed in terms of being able to actively contribute and engage in a discussion, I think those barriers have gone.  I'm very keen, if anyone here has any connection with ISPs, to try and make those links, very happy to follow up.

My request to some of you would be even if you're not representing the ISP community, that when you go back home and you do associate with ISPs it would be very helpful if you said, "There's this group in ICANN

that covers a lot of the issues that you have an interest in. Let's make that connection and see how we can also bring them into the fold and take account of their views as well."

STAFF MEMBER: There are three questions from remote participants. The first question is on whether there are any Caribbean participants of the Cable and Wireless Company in the ISPCP? The second question is: what is the level of awareness of universal acceptance with respect to ISPs? The third question is concerning engagement, so: are there any concrete efforts from the ISP constituency to get ISPs from under-served or less privileged regions to be actively participating in policy making at ICANN?

TONY HOLMES: Thank you. They are really excellent questions. In terms of representation from the Caribbean, we do have I think two Members from the Caribbean, but I can't remember offhand where they're form. I'd have to come back and clarify on that. In terms of universal acceptance and awareness, that's the reason we came into this meeting really feeling quite unhappy about the situation, because we felt the awareness of that was, at that time, incredibly low. Our intention when we came here was to raise this with the ICANN Board. In fact, we did raise it with the ICANN Board yesterday.

Fortunately, by the time we had that session with the ICANN Board as a constituency, things had changed, and for me, one of the real pleasures of coming here is that situation changed because the community came together and recognized there was a problem. In the early sessions that

were held here in Singapore earlier in the week there were discussions that just occurred between ISPs and registries and registrars, and we found out that we all shared some anxiety about this particular issue. We then spoke to some members of ICANN staff, and they'd already started to recognize there was a problem here.

That led to the session that was held two days ago, where this group was formed to address that. The answer is that the level of awareness at the moment is very low, but the good news is that we actually now are moving forward, very quickly, with a plan that should change that. It's going to be a difficult one for the reasons I mentioned earlier - reaching out to some of these groups that need to engage is going to be a challenge. The other thing that we need to get is data as to what's wrong. For instance, I know on some of the initial gTLDs that have been out there, from some of the gTLDs that have been used for banking, they have a problem with IDNs.

The sort of issue they've come across is that they will have, on their sites, various links where you'll be required to fill in your email address, and as soon as you type in anything that isn't recognized today as an email address it says, "Incorrect address." It doesn't go any further. It just doesn't recognize that, at the application level. It's the type of thing that becomes more and more difficult as you introduce IDNs. If you're using different scripts you'll find that there isn't always the recognition there. That's one example of universal acceptance of gTLDs and some of the problems that we have, but it's just one example.

There will be many different flavors of problems as we move forward. Some may be where the person using websites will be required to enter

information. Others will be that it accepts the information but as it goes through the technical realization then you'll find that it doesn't work for some reason or the other there - it may be the Unicode issues, it can be anything. We don't fully understand the scope of the problem. We do know that there are many, many places along the way where we will incur problems. So we're now at the stage where we have to reach out to these people; not just to tell them that they may have these problems, but to say, "We need data back on this, so what can you do to actually help us as well?"

In terms of engagement for the parts of the world where we're still struggling, the good news is that ICANN now has a particular group that really is there to help the community in terms of engagement. We have used that with some success, certainly as ISPs, across the last year. Our Membership has grown through our activity in outreach events, helped by ICANN to actually ensure we get into the right places. There is a program in ICANN that enables us as Members within a region to actually go to various events and actually promote ICANN, promote what ICANN does, promote the constituencies, and through that program try to raise the engagement levels.

One of the problems we face - and I mentioned Africa earlier - is that the Membership from that area of the world is still growing, and we need advocates there to actually go out and help point us to the right areas to grow the Membership. The program that's currently undertaken in ICANN enables you to operate within a region, and it's very difficult to hit all of the areas of the world if you haven't already got a reasonable participation there. That's a challenge that we do face. It's one that's been recognized. The only comment I'll make is that over the last two

ICANN | 52
Singapore

years ICANN, as a community, has really focused on engagement, and it is starting to come up with real rewards.

It's work in hand. There's still a lot to do. We're very aware of it - far more than we were before - and I'd certainly like to think that if I were to return in a year's time, even, then I could give some good news that we've actually been successful, because we do have a program to attack that.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you. We're just running out of time, so Babu, I'm going to go to you because you had your hand up. Very quickly, the program Tony is talking about is the CROPP. I've been working with Rob Hogarth, the Senior Director for Policy Building at ICANN, for the past two years. We have several different programs. I was speaking to [Said 00:52:51] yesterday afternoon. I'm going to share those with you afterwards so that you're more aware of these different engagement programs that we're trying to do, and continue to impress that. You yourself can be that conduit. We did have a young lady - Wanda, from Trinidad and Tobago - at the LA Meeting.

The light bulb went off for her when Tony came and spoke. They ended up speaking afterwards. We got Albert Daniels in the mix, who is the Stakeholder Engagement Manager for the Caribbean, and it took two months or something? It was an immediate event that Wanda was able to get everyone to. It was funded by the Regional Engagement Group for ICANN, so we're here to help you to build those kinds of events. We see that spark and that interest, and just say, "I'd like to help, I don't know how," well then we have to figure out the how.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

We won't make you carry the burden, but as recently as LA we've been able to develop an event based on a conversation that Tony's had with the Fellows, just sitting in this room. So it can happen. We try to make it as painless as possible to have you engaged. Babu, I'll let you round it up.

BABU: Thank you Janice. My name is Babu [unclear 00:54:10], first-time fellow from Nepal. I'm working as a legal advisor to ISPs in Nepal as well. Definitely I'll recommend to them they join this community. As I'm a legal advisor to them I have also concerns about their affairs. So how, individually, can I participate in this constituency? Thank you.

TONY HOLMES: That's really music to my ears, that we have a new link there. We're a very friendly bunch, very easy to get on with and very easy to engage with. All you need to do is either speak with me, and I'll make sure the links are in. I'm sure Janice would also assist with that. I must thank you, Janice, as well. The way you explained that was probably far better than I did, and certainly it really is working, this program. So we just need to make those initial links, and although we're pretty focused on some of the technical issues in ICANN, the policy issues also have some legal knock-on, quite often.

So we're not out of those discussions. In fact, I'd think from an ISP perspective, sometimes that's every bit as important as the technical issues that come up here. The good thing about ICANN is you get to be involved with people like Patrik, who are very much at the heart of the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

technical issues, but also you get involved in the policy issues, which just effect all of the stakeholders in a very intense but diverse way. I'd be very keen to follow up with you. I'd also like to say that we were very fortunate yesterday that we were joined for our constituency meeting by a couple of Fellows.

We very much welcomed you. I think I maybe surprised some of them when I asked them to come and sit at the table with all the other Members, but it's very important to us that we do integrate with you. You're going to play such an important part going forward. We're always pleased to see you and engage on whatever level we can, so thank you very much for joining us, those that did.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:    Thank you again, Tony Holmes. If anyone does have a question, if you'd like to walk to the back to check in with Tony, please feel free, as Byron makes his way up to the front.

BYRON HOLLAND:    Good morning everybody. My name is Byron Holland and in my ICANN capacity I'm the Chair of the ccNSO - the country code Name Supporting Organization. Although that sometimes feels like my day job, my actual real day job is as president and CEO of the Canadian Internet Registration Authority - more commonly called CIRA - and we're the country code TLD operators for .ca. The ccNSO is the SO structure within ICANN that represents country code operators. We're a volunteer-based organization, so no country code operator has to be a Member of the ccNSO - all of us who participate in it do so willingly and as

ICANN | 52
Singapore

volunteers to it. there are currently 152 Members of the ccNSO, and a Member is an individual country code operator.

There are 253 country codes in the world. 152 are Members, and we represent close to 70 per cent of all of the ccTLDs registered in the world. So we're a significant majority but most definitely we're not every country code operator in the world. Everyone is welcome to join. Some country code operators elect not to, and some don't join as Members but participate on a regular basis. So we're very open, very inclusive, everybody's welcome, from the largest country code operators like China and Germany to the very, very smallest country code operators.

We're extremely diverse, and to understand that diversity it's important to understand that ccs themselves, while often viewed from the outside as a homogenous group where we all look and feel the same to some degree, ccs are actually remarkably different; in governance structure, in business models, in revenue models, in ownership structures, and certainly in size. We have ccs that literally have less than 1,000 registered domains registered with them, up to Germany with near 15 million, .uk with 10 million, and China close to that.

So we have a very, very diverse group of Members from any metric that you look at us from, and particularly from governance structures. Some ccs are operated by governments, some are operated still out of academia, out of universities, some are relatively private sector looking, many, like mine are private, not-for-profit corporations and act in the public interest of the country we come from. That's important because

ICANN | 52
Singapore

one of the key differentiators of cc operators is we have a tie to a country. It's obvious, but what does that actually mean?

What it means is that there's an element of sovereignty associated, or a nationalism associated with most ccs - all ccs in some way, shape or form, and that means that we're bound first and foremost by domestic law and domestic legislation in all of its forms. I tell you that because it relates to how we have to interact, or how we do interact with ICANN. We're not contracted parties with ICANN, so we typically have no contractual relationship with ICANN and its overall structures, which means we're all here because we want to be here, we voluntarily participate in ICANN, and its structures and its policy making process.

As a result we're not bound to contractual, financial relationship in any way; we voluntarily contribute financially to ICANN, and it's very important we have a very strong relationship with the ICANN community, but we do it because we voluntarily participate here, we voluntarily financially contribute here in ICANN. That really is because of the sovereign nature of the organizations that any of us cc operators run. Unlike in the GNSO, our sister organization, if you will. Inside the ccNSO we typically don't do a lot of policy creation.

We're here more often than not to exchange best practices, focus on security operations, best of breed elements of our business - anywhere from talking about marketing and sales, which we all do to greater or lesser degrees, to the hardcore running of the registries, the endless set of security problems that we face. As I'm sure you know, there are bad actors out there on the Internet and they're remarkably creative and

ICANN | 52
Singapore

persistent, so we have regular exchanges on what's happening on the Internet and how to best defend ourselves.

I know certainly in our case, in .ca, like many, there was a time not long ago that when we looked at malicious activity on the Internet that was directed at us we would see spikes, and we could see when it was happening. We look at that now as the good old days. Now the only time we see a spike is because we're having multiple simultaneous attacks that have spiked it, because anybody that runs a registry is basically consistently under some sort of advanced, persistent threat. So there's a lot of exchange of information about how to best defend what we're seeing, and also working together, global nature of the Internet, we'll often be commonly be experiencing the same kinds of issues.

That's to say it's more an exchange of best practices and information happening within the ccNSO as opposed to policy development creation, acceptance and implementation, which tends to happen in the GNSO construct. So we're also very different if we compare and contrast to our sister organization, the GNSO. That gives you hopefully a flavor or sense of what the ccNSO is about, who the Members are, and how we fit into the overall ICANN ecosystem. In terms of some of the key things that we're facing, like many elements of the Internet community, probably the biggest single issue right now is around the IANA oversight transition, which I'm sure you probably heard lots about by Wednesday morning.

It really is critical to the registry operator community, which is really what ccs are, because fundamentally most of us who run registries have one supplier, if you will, and that supplier is IANA. They essentially hand

ICANN | 52
Singapore

us the product, which we then turn into domain names and sell to the public in the various ways that we do it.  So how IANA runs, how IANA is governed, what the oversight mechanism is and the redress mechanism if things go poorly with IANA is absolutely critical to how ccs operate.

So it's arguably the single most important issue that we could face - that we do face - and that is how can we be sure that IANA will continue to be run in a stable, predictable and consistent manner, that offers us, as the real customer of IANA, some redress if things go wrong?  Because at the end of the day right now, for better or for worse, the US Government, through the Department of Commerce and NTIA, who hold the contract for IANA, which ICANN operates - it's a three-party contract with the US Government holding the contract for IANA, which is run by ICANN - if you pull the US Government out, how do we as the operators be sure that there's reasonable oversight of that function?

If you think of that contract as a piece of paper right now, essentially the US Government has the authority to roll that contract up and turn it onto a stick to beat ICANN with, as a metaphor, if ICANN doesn't behave properly or do the job of the IANA functions properly.  Now, fortunately ICANN has done a very good job with IANA.  IANA services are highly regarded in the operator community and we're very happy with the way it runs right now, on average, which is why it's so important to us that this oversight transition goes well and that continues to be the case.  So that's issue number one for us right now.

It rolls into the accountability, which as you can see is directly tied to the operational issue, because in order to be sure the operations continue effectively you have to have some accountability mechanisms built in

ICANN | 52
Singapore

and around it. So those are definitely the hot issues for us, as the operator community, but we're certainly engaged in many other elements of the ICANN world, but right now and over the course of this year, those two issues are consuming most of the time that cc operators would devote and spend in and around the ICANN space.

Hopefully that gives you a little bit of an insight into what cc operators are like, how we work in the ICANN community, and what the key issues are facing us over the coming year. With that I'd be happy to have a conversation or engage in any way. If I could just make one final comment: most of us are here because we believe very passionately in the transformative power of the Internet and all it can offer. We're all volunteers, and we welcome passionate and committed volunteers into the fold. The evidence is people that flow through the Fellowship track and people who have mentors in some way, shape or form, typically are the ones who really get engaged and stick around.

I know the Fellowship Program is a great program and offers opportunities to find mentors, et cetera. Take advantage of those, because the community will be very happy to have more people get very engaged.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:     Perfect segue. Ahmed, I'll go with you first, and then we'll come over to [Owa 01:10:22] and then [Said].

AHMED [EESA]:     Ahmed [Eesa], Fellow of Sudan. You mentioned there are 152 ccs, and you mentioned also there are 252 country code names. I know there is

only 193 countries in the world. Does that mean a country can have more than one? Or is it a secondary country code, or what?

BYRON HOLLAND: That's a very good observation. Yes, it would seem that the math doesn't add up, but in fact it does, because it's country and territory names. Every country and territory has a country code, so even though there are only 193 countries, there are a number of additional territories, each of which get their own cc. It's based off of the US cc list, so it's an exact match to what the UN says is a country or territory name.

[OWAL]: Good morning, this is [Owal 01:11:55], a Fellow from Bangladesh. I know that there are ccTLDs that are actually assigned to the territories and are not running quite well, like .bd, in our country. So there are some technical issues like security vulnerabilities and there are outages, record outages in fact, on .bd. I was wondering whether ccNSO has any role beyond the delegating of the authority for .bd or something? Is there any opportunity for this scope to guide them and to make them aware about upgrading their systems or things like that? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: The short answer is yes, absolutely, and to a great degree that's part of what this community does; is to have an exchange of expertize and ideas. If the operators are interested in being a Member and participating, without a doubt they could get a lot of that expertize and insight, but the way the ccs are run is determined in country, so I can't

say to .bd, "Here's how you should do it." The ccNSO is not structured in a way to dictate how things should happen.

We're there to offer insight, expertize and advice if it's asked for, but because of the way ccs are delegated, which is typically delegated to the government of the land, and then the government in conjunction with civil society, the technical community, business, the actual industry, comes to conclusion on how that cc should be operated. Like I said, in my case those communities came together and decided that it should be a private, not-for-profit corporation. But in other countries they decided to run it out of the government or other different solutions.

Because we're a volunteer organization, only if that cc wants to come and participate can we offer guidance, but if they do, absolutely. There's incredible expertize in our community that we're very open to sharing.

[SAID]: Hi, my name is [Said 01:14:45] and I'm from Afghanistan. The other day, when we were in the Middle Eastern Strategy Update one of the concerns that was raised about the IDN TLDs was the supply of TLDs, which was more than the demand of these domain names in the market. The concern was that ICANN is not working with the TLDs or the registries or registrars to create the market before the supply. I was also reading about the .ca success in the recent past, compared to the early times of .ca and how it's created that market for itself.

What was the strategy that CIRA adopted in the recent past that worked out for them? Probably it could work out for .af, which I think just like

[Owal] mentioned, it's one of the domain names that's not working out in that community.

BYRON HOLLAND:     That's a very good question.  It's going to be a different answer I think for different specific ccs.  In terms of CIRA, part of is there's been an evolution of cc operators over time and in early days basically it was an engineering, technical challenge: "Can we build this thing and make it work?" because of the history of many of the legacy TLDs, of which we would be one, and many of the established ccs would be in this bucket as well, they started as technology companies providing a service and there was rapid adoption of our domain names.  So basically if we turned the machine on and ran it well, customers came to us.

That has evolved as ccs and the whole industry has matured.  Now we really, as operators, have to make the market, as you are actually indicating.  We have to sell, we have to do the marketing, we have to create demand for our own product.  If you look at growth rates in the whole industry, it's not that long ago - mid 2000s - where typically growth rates were double digit, 20 per cent year over year growth rate, and that was without any marketing.  Now most of the legacy registries are either flat - zero growth - some are in slight decline, in terms of growth rate, and some are single digit.

.ca in the final quarter of last year, so the most recent quarter, we were the fastest growing cc operator behind China and .tk, who are very unique and different.  So of the legacy operators we were definitely the fastest growing, and that's because of the work we've done around marketing, sales, repositioning the organization and all of that kind of

business development effort.  Some will say that seems very business oriented for a cc operator, but the way I view it is this is .ca and other country codes.  We're a national public resource.  We're a renewable national public resource, and it is my job to get that resource into the hands of Canadians - so communicating to them, telling the story, making them aware.

That's all part of our job - to get that resource into their hands, get them online with their address.  There's no magic bullet.  It takes a series of steps and building on a strong technical foundation to start.  That's where it starts.  That's where it allows you to then build on top of it.

ISAAC MBOSA:             [Isaac Mbosa], first-time Fellow from Zimbabwe.  I'd like to know, we are a registrar, not a registry, and how can we fit into the ccNSO?  Then also, another issue is [I cannot/ICANN] [unclear 01:19:23] influence over the ccTLDs.  Don't you think trying to ignore the issues, not having a direct influence on that, is also affecting developing countries whereby the ccTLDs are mismanaged or at the end of the day people won't have an online presence because of many issues?  Is there a way whereby you can chip in, or ICANN policy can be changed so that you can have an influence over the management of ccTLDs?

BYRON HOLLAND:          That is a very delicate question.  Because of the sovereign nature of ccTLDs we can't impose rules and policies on each other - same as I would resist if ICANN came down and said, "You, .ca will run in a certain way."  If that's inconsistent with the way that Canada needs to operate

ICANN | 52
Singapore

its TLD I would resist that strongly.  Unfortunately in some areas that isn't helpful to the community, and I fully recognize that some ccs are not particularly effectively run.  Ccs are the creature of the local community.  They're there to serve the local community and be operated by the local community for the benefit of the local community.

It's not for outsiders, non-community members, to come in and tell that cc how to run itself, how to govern itself.  That can be a challenge because if it's not going well, how do you get out of that problem, out of that trap?  I recognize it's a difficult one that a number of ccs are in, but at some point the local community has to have the spark to make it go, and then if you reach into the ccNSO there's a wealth of experience and help available, but we can't force it on you.  That's not ICANN's role.  Most ccs will resist that very strongly.

We don't want ICANN telling us what to do.  In fact, we've fought long and hard to not have ICANN have any direct authority over ccs, because we are there on behalf of our local or country environment.  So somehow the local community has to be able to find that spark to reach out, and then there will be lots of help.  That's probably not a satisfactory answer, but I'm just trying to be as candid about the situation as I can be.  There are good reasons for it.  Like I said, ccs are sovereign.  We really don't want a California-based corporation telling sovereign entities what to do.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:    We are running out of time.  We have one remote question, which I'd like to go to.  I know Babu and Naveed, you have questions, but since

you have been at the mic earlier today I want to pass it over to someone who hasn't.  Let's go remote first.

STAFF MEMBER:              Thank you.  The question is: "Is CIRA able to share some of the strategies or best practices related to marketing other ccTLD managers on request?"

BYRON HOLLAND:            Yes.  If somebody wants to reach out to us we'd be happy to do that.  They can reach out to me directly, and most likely what I would do is put them in contact with the Head of Marketing at CIRA.  I'd be happy to do that.  Janice knows where to find me.

SPEAKER:                  Hello.  I am [unclear 01:24:08] from Senegal.  I have a question for you.  Is it that… [speaking French 01:24:15]?

BYRON HOLLAND:            No.  In a sense, it's the same answer that I gave to a different question, in that the ccNSO in particular does not interfere in matters that are sovereign to the cc or country in question.  What happens in country is up to the cc operator, its Internet community, its registrar ecosystem, its government.  A ccNSO does not interfere in country.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:       Thank you for the reminder that we should all have our headsets on when we have multiple languages in the room - note to self.  Byron, I

want to say thank you very much in respect for your time, and for Elisa's time coming up here in front.  If anyone has a question, like Babu, if you'd like to follow Byron to the back of the room I know he won't mind. You may have to walk and talk quickly, but thank you again, very much.

BYRON HOLLAND:            Thank you very much for the opportunity.

ELISA COOPER:              Hi.   My name is Elisa Cooper and I'm the Chair of the Business Constituency.  You were just hearing from Byron and he's part of the ccNSO, but the Business Constituency actually feeds up to the GNSO. Even though those two sound alike they're actually quite different because the GNSO is the group that's responsible for developing policy within ICANN. Janice, do you have that slide that shows the structure of ICANN, or any one of those slides?  As part of the GNSO we have many different interests, and half of those interests are represented by what we call contracted parties, and I'm sure you've already heard from some of those folks.

Those are the registries and the registrars.  Again, this is the group that's developing policy.  So on one side of the house you've got people that actually have a relationship with ICANN - the registries and registrars. Again, this is in the GNSO, but on the other side you have the non-contracted parties and that's basically everyone else who doesn't actually have a formal contract relationship with ICANN.  So under the Non-Contracted Parties House you've got the Commercial Stakeholders Group  and  the  Non-Commercial  Stakeholders  Group.    Inside  the

Commercial Stakeholders Group that's where the Business Constituency resides alongside the Intellectual Property Constituency and the ISPs.

So the three of us together again make up this Commercial Stakeholders Group that's part of this non-commercial parties house. What does the Business Constituency do? Why are we here? Why do we participate at ICANN? Well, the Business Constituency is really the voice of business on the Internet, and we represent all different types of businesses from micro or mini enterprises where it might be just one or two people who are operating a company, to mid-sized businesses, to very large businesses with 50 to 100,000 employees. So it really runs the gamut. The one thing that I would say about all participants within the Business Constituency is that if the Internet is important for running your business and it's critical for the operation of your business then participating within ICANN, within the Business Constituency, is a place where you can have your voice and concerns heard.

Now, specifically we're focused on three different things. One of our Charter elements is that we're focused on ensuring the Internet is a safe place for businesses to conduct transactions with their customers, and it's a safe place for businesses and their customers. The second thing that we develop policy around is ensuring that the supply of registries and registrars is competitive, and what that means is we want to make sure we have choice in who can be used for registrar services, and we have different registries to choose from. The third element is that we are very concerned and want to ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet.

When we say that we want the Internet to be safe and secure we mean it in a couple of different ways. We want it to be safe in that if you're looking at a domain ownership record, a WHOIS record, that is accurate, we want to make sure that there are accurate and good rights protection mechanisms available to us, but from a technical perspective we also want to make sure that the Internet itself is resilient and is working properly and is safe from that technical perspective. So it's sort of all of those things combined. Now that I've told you a little bit about who we are and what we do, again, we're interested in creating policy that does those three things and ensures those three things - again, that the Internet is safe for business and their customers, that there's competitive supply of registries and registrars, and that the Internet itself is secure, stable and resilient.

Let me tell you a little bit about how I came to be involved with ICANN, because it was definitely a multi-step process. Let me tell you also that I'm not one of these people that have been here for 10 or 15 years. There are many people you'll find here that have been active for a very long time, and I'm actually a relative newcomer compared to some. I've really been active within ICANN maybe for about five years, which if you talk to some people here you'll find that they've been here almost from the beginning. So I'm not somebody who came to ICANN with a lot of institutional knowledge - I had a lot of learning to do.

But when I first became involved with ICANN it was because my business, the business that I work for, my company, was involved in providing registrar services, among other things. So some of my colleagues were active at ICANN and I was following what ICANN was doing because my customers at my job were basically very interested to

ICANN | 52
Singapore

understand what was going on at ICANN, and so they were relying on me to track what was going on.  So at first I was just participating not very…  Sort of from the outside.  So I was looking at the ICANN website and I was listening to webinars and I was reading the documents that were posted for public comment.

I was not attending the meetings, per se, but I was basically just following information that was available through the website.  So that's how I started.  But after a while I thought, "If I really want to be an expert I really want to start attending the meetings and I want to be active within the constituency."  So I then joined the Business Constituency, and I was not attending every meeting.  Maybe I went to one or two meetings a year, not many, and then at some point I became much more involved and I ran for a position in leadership.  But it was definitely a multi-step process where at first I was just watching what was going on, more from the outside, and then as I became more interested I joined the Constituency and now I'm active with the leadership inside the Constituency.

In terms of joining a Constituency, a couple of things.  One, you don't have to join a Constituency to be involved with ICANN, however when you join a Constituency there are a lot of benefits, and some of those benefits are that there's so much going on at ICANN, and when you belong to a Constituency you're working with other like-minded people who share similar perspectives and can really spread the work.  One of the things that when you belong to the Constituency is that you're working together as a team to review everything that's going on, and a big part of the way that policy is developed at ICANN is participating in Working Groups or responding to comments or reports that get posted.

When you're just one person it's hard to do all of that, but when you're part of the Constituency you can break that work up, and some people will focus on one area and others will focus on other areas, and it's also a place that you can go to get more information about any of the reports that are going on, or ask for further clarification. It's really a place where working as a team you can have your voice heard. That's not to say that you have to do that.

You can always post your own comments or write a letter to ICANN and it will be made publicly available, so you always have that option, but like I said, when you're part of the Constituency you get that benefit of working together as a team and being able to work collaboratively and work together to have your voice heard. Let me stop there. I know I did a lot of talking. What questions are there, or what can I tell you? What are you interested in hearing about, relative to the Business Constituency or ICANN? I know you've heard from a lot of folks already. Am I your last presentation?

This morning, but you have tomorrow too? Fadi? So you've heard from everyone. So what questions can I answer for you? Like I said, I'm not somebody who's been around like some folks have been, for ten years, and have been doing this for a very long time. Let me answer any questions maybe that you have. Yes?

AHMED [EESA]:          Ahmed [Eesa], Fellow of Sudan. You mentioned you are the voice of business, and you mentioned you focus on three things; one of them is the safety of the Internet. Yesterday was [unclear 01:35:45], it is a day to say how we will provide safety to the Internet. One of the things I

think is do you have any plan to make the Internet safe? Especially if you look in the world you will see some people, like here, they get to the Internet with 42MB per second, and in many countries you have 15KB or 20KB per second. When they are going slow they leave their computers, or if they get into an Internet café they leave their accounts open so anyone can come up after that and get into your account, because you [fail 01:36:38] to get to the Internet.

You put in your password and you do many things, so all of these things I think you have to do something about. Do you have any plan to help the service provider to move from IPv4 to IPv6? Because that will also be helpful for speeding up the Internet. Thank you.

ELISA COOPER:    In terms of safety we're really focused on the naming and numbering system, so when it comes to the ISPs and their services, since they're not under the purview of ICANN we're not focused on that, but things that we are focused on in terms of safety are things like ensuring DNSSEC is available, and that's utilized - there's very low utilization of DNSSEC actually. We're focused on WHOIS information being accurate, so that when somebody is operating a website and they're committing fraud or doing something that's problematic, it's that you have the ability to at least contact or uncover the actual owner of the website, which is often very difficult and typically when fraud is going on that information is inaccurate.

One thing right now that we're obviously very focused on is the IANA transition and looking at what that new structure might be. That's very important to us and that certainly plays a role in the security of the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Internet. So we're really focused on the things that are really under ICANN's remit, which is the naming and numbering systems, although I'm sure there are many people in the Business Constituency that definitely have other kinds of concerns - it's not what we focus on in terms of the policy that we develop.

lZAK SAID: Morning. This is [Zak Said 01:38:54] from Pakistan. I'm an ICANN

ZAK SAID: Morning. This is [Zak Said 01:38:54] from Pakistan. I'm an ICANN Fellow. I have a question. We talk about this multistakeholder model being actually followed and implemented by ICANN, right? By multistakeholder we say we've got different stakeholders as part of the effort that we're actually working towards, a secure, stable, sustainable and resilient Internet. Now, when these stakeholders themselves have some conflict or you see some policy or some issue among themselves, how is ICANN looking into that, and what is ICANN's position on that?

I'll give you an example: for example, these telecom operators and ISPs and the over-the-top content providers have got these policy issues, for example the infrastructure sharing and net neutrality, or maybe the local [unclear 01:39:52] bundling and stuff like that. So what exactly is ICANN's position in such situations? Thank you.

ELISA COOPER: Just so I have a little bit more clarity, are you asking when there's no consensus how do decisions get made? Well, it is quite a process. The whole PDP is one that's very thorough and actually takes quite a long time. But it is required that there is consensus before the policy. Each group works towards consensus, so in the Business Constituency for

ICANN | 52
Singapore

instance, there are some companies that feel strongly that they want a particular model for the IANA transition and others want another model. Sometimes we can't come to a consensus position and we won't have one, or we'll have to explain that some feel this way and others feel that way.

But the multistakeholder model, in my opinion, is one where you've got representation, and we have that representation. Now there's questions of, "Well, is the current multistakeholder model the structure we have, particular in the GNSO, is it fair? Is it working?" and those are questions that we're always asking. But my personal opinion is that the multistakeholder model that we have is really the best one, because it allows for all voices to be heard, and granted, trying to come to consensus sometimes is a very long, arduous process.

But at the end of the day we come out with decisions that are coming from the bottom-up and all different constituencies are heard, especially the private sector along with all of the others, including those that are directly impacted, like the registries and the registrars. But we also have others like the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So the answer to your question is that when we can't agree, it's something that we have to work towards. That's just how the process works. We have to come to a consensus.

CHARLES OLO:     Thank you. I'm Charles [Olo] from Kenya, first-time Fellow. Thank you for the presentation on the multistakeholder process. I have a question: from what we've seen, as far as I've known ICANN, each year we have representatives from every country, and are we only seeing the same

people, same faces coming to ICANN?  How are you ensuring that the representatives bring in the concerns of their constituencies?  Because in a multistakeholder process or in a community there are various ideas and various issues, and I don't know whether you analyze that whatever you're getting from the representatives is the correct version on the ground.  Thank you.

ELISA COOPER:

Yes, that's something that we're struggling with; to have greater diversity.  I can tell you that's true in the Business Constituency.  We have a high concentration today of companies coming from North America and a low concentration coming from Africa and Latin America, and even Europe to some extent.  So outreach is very important to us, and is something that we're continually striving to do better with.

Frankly it's part of the reason why we come and talk to different groups; to make sure that people know about the Business Constituency and know that we invite all types - we want all types of businesses to participate that have an interest and a concern about ensuring essentially the safety of the Internet for their business and for their customers. So we know that this is an issue and we're seeking to do better.

SPEAKER:

Hi, I'm [Mohamed 01:44:24], first-time Fellow from the Gambia.  I heard you mention things related to security, stability and resiliency, more specifically in terms of making sure that conducting business on the Internet is safe.  I've attended a couple of sessions and one of them was

ICANN | 52
Singapore

actually based on the category one new gTLDs.  What I'd like to know is what exactly is the Business Constituency's position in terms of the WHOIS accuracy system, that's being debated on?  What exactly is your take on the WHOIS accuracy system?  Also, taking into account things related to privacy?  Thank you.

ELISA COOPER:          Okay, so our position on the highly-regulated strings, the category 1, we recently signed onto a letter with the ALAC, asking for them to cease continuing to delegate those highly sensitive strings.  I think we're very concerned about them.  There is the potential, I think, for fraud and misuse if the public interest commitment specifications are not implemented properly, and essentially if we don't follow what the GAC has been saying all along.  I think it would have been preferable if none of the strings had been delegated, because there are a number of them that have already been delegated.

So this is an example of the kind of things where we're thinking about companies and consumers and how the names might be abused.  So we feel strongly that going forward those highly-regulated strings, the PIC specs are implemented in a way to ensure that registrants are legitimately associated to those TLDs.  Your second question was about the WHOIS accuracy study.  I can just tell you what our position on WHOIS is, in general.  That is we're very focused on accessible and accurate WHOIS.  That's very important to us.

Those two things together are necessary for businesses, when there's an issue with a website or a domain has been registered and it's infringing on somebody else's rights.  We need to know who owns that domain so

that we can contact them, and if that doesn't work, if we to pursue some other form of recovering the name, we need that to be accessible and accurate.  Then your final question about privacy, it kind of goes along to WHOIS.  We need that information to be available.  One of the things that's being talked about from the Expert Working Group on Directory Services - this is a group that was put together to look at how we could change the WHOIS system again - WHOIS records are the ownership records for every domain - how could we improve that?

The idea that came from the Expert Working Group was that you would have this gated access where anybody could get a limited set of information, but then if you were a brand owner or you had some legitimate right you could request the full information.  I think we are supportive of that approach, but at the end of the day I don't think we're supportive of people hiding their ownership information on WHOIS records.  Good questions.

SPEAKER:               [Cha 01:48:19] from china.  You mentioned the IANA transition is the main focus area of this Business Constituency.  My question is: what is the general response or general points of view from your Business Constituency about the IANA transition?   The current proposals - especially the proposal talked about by the CWG?

ELISA COOPER:          Of course we're very supportive of the transition.  It's not a matter of being supportive of the transition.   I would also say alongside our interest in the IANA transition we're also very interested in the

accountability mechanisms that will need to be employed before the transition occurs.  I think we're still looking at the different options; the internal option and the external option for the actual management of the IANA functions.  So that's what we're looking at right now.  I don't think we know yet which one is what we would support or if we'll be able to, or if we'll have some Members feel strongly that they're supportive of the internal option and others of the external option.

So we're just trying to understand what the impact of one is versus the other.  But in terms of the transition itself of course we're very, very supportive of that, and we're actively following.  On the accountability side our Member of the Business Constituency is working on that CWG and has been very active, and we've very focused on that as well, because those new accountability measures need to be implemented before the transition will actually occur.

BAVRUM ARIL:         [Bavrum Aril 01:50:17] from Nepal, first-time Fellow.  I have some confusion about [cost cutting] issues.  You are talking about Business Constituency?  We just had ISP Constituency as well, and in the one aspect both of them are business - ISPs are also business.  How can you distinguish between this Business Constituency and ISP Constituency? Thank you.

ELISA COOPER:        That's a very good question, because actually Verizon for instance is an ISP, but Verizon is also in the Business Constituency, and I believe they may participate in the ISPs, they might participate in two places.  The

ISPs, the Business Constituency and the Intellectual Property Constituency, we're part of a group called the Commercial Stakeholders Group, so the three of us together comprise part of the Non-Contracted Parties House. So your question is what is the difference between the ISPs and the Business Constituency? Well, their Charter and their focus is different. They're really focused on things that are impacting them as ISPs, so let me give you an example.

For instance, right now they're very concerned about universal acceptance of new gTLDs. That is a concern for business too, but it's probably not our top concern. Our top concern is probably around how the launch of new gTLDs is impacting business and issues that are coming from that, as opposed to universal acceptance. Because they're impacted by that because when domains don't resolve or there's an issue, they're often the first line of contact. I'd need to look at what their Charter is, but their Charter and their focus is different than ours.

Now, if you're an ISP and your interest is broader and you're more interested in just looking at issues that ISPs are looking at, and you're actually interested in making the Internet safe, and the Internet's important for your business, and you have a broader interest, then certainly the Business Constituency could be a place for a company, even if it was an ISP. Like I said, Verizon, who is an ISP - but they also provide cellular service and they provide all kinds of other services - they participate in the Business Constituency. But I agree - right now, more than ever, we see a company who might participate in a couple of different constituencies, and that is possible.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The way that works is you can participate in multiple constituencies, but you can vote in just one, so you have a voting membership in just one. So you can follow along with what's going on in the other ones, but you won't have that ability to vote for the leadership and…   So good question.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:    With that I think I'm going to wrap up this session so Elisa can get to her first session today and we can all have a quick chat before we send you off into the big, bad world.  Thank you so much, Elisa.  If anyone else has any questions that you think about later, again, please email them to me and I'll make sure that Elisa gets them, and give her a little slack-door in the week just in case she can't get back to them.  Gentlemen, we can go off of the record?  Thank you very much to the interpreters.  We're good.  Okay, so a couple of things just to talk about.  We're at the end of the week and it's been long.  I've never had to walk in your shoes.

I sort of do, because I run parallel, and play multiple roles here, and I'm going to sleep at the same time and I'm up at the same time, so I think I can well appreciate the level of tiredness and fatigue and brain-swelling and ready to go.  I think in general - and I just want to say this because I want tomorrow's download to be about you, not about me, so I'll take my turn today - in general, I've really appreciated the fact that a group of 47, which is our largest group ever, as we continue to build the Fellowship Program, as Fadi keeps saying to me, "Keep building it, keep building it," I just want to comment you, because of 47 to continue at the pace that you have been and be working together…

It's easy when it's a small, intimate group.  When it gets larger it's more diverse, and for me it's like herding cats, as we say in the US.  I just want to say in general I'm really pleased with everybody and their participation.  The questions have been fantastic.  This is what we're trying to encourage more and more.  You can see the community leaders, they'd much rather have you ask a question than just sit here and talk at you.  Any follow up at all, again, come back through me for anything.  I will impress upon you, those of you who'd like to come back again, for me, and it is the ex-teacher in me, I've been taking note for those of you who aren't that interested in being part of this process.

I'm a very fun person, but I'm also a very serious person about this Program and about ICANN and about the commitment to engagement and outreach.  That's where I get disappointed.  If you want to be part of this Program, for future growth and future learning, go back and think about it, and think whether this Program is for you.  As a second-time or third-time Fellow, or coming back as a coach, you get a lot more leeway.  I so appreciate the alumni who have come back - the coaches - to the morning meetings, because I actually gave them a pass.  I said, "If you've already heard it, please, I'm not here to repeat things and neither are the leaders," and I so appreciate the coaches that have come here every morning when they didn't have to.

So your second or third time is really about focusing on what you still need to learn - bringing more questions, making sure you've reached out in your region, or your university, or your place of employment.  Talking to the regional teams, making an attachment to them, and then coming back ready to be that next level.  But the Fellowship is not for everyone, and I'm not upset about it.  Don't get me wrong - I'm not.  It's just not

ICANN | 52
Singapore

for everyone. It's structured in a way, it's demanding of time, of energy, of focus. So I just say to those of you who've had your head more in your Facebook and your work and surfing the web during this time, search yourself, because I don't think this is the home that you need.

But I welcome every one of you back as a second or third time. Again, I promise, it's a different experience. We're growing and we want it to be a growing experience for you. But I felt the need to say that, because I see a lot of repeat applications, and the regional team recognizes when people aren't working in the region. I recognize, from past experience. So I just say go back, and make sure if you apply again - and I do encourage you all to do so; don't get me wrong - really consider that this is the right way for you to move through, or if you need us again. You may or may not. You can come back right away or come back in a couple of years, and a year or two makes a huge difference in how you're feeling about participating in the Program like this.

So again, I first and foremost congratulate you, because you've been an elite group, an amazing group, and for me moving forward, knowing that I can more or less, with my coaches, help handle a larger group, I can go back to Fadi and to my boss, Nora, and let them know that this is working, we can make this manageable and working. For the rest of the day today there are a couple of key sessions; one is IANA. It's a very basic IANA: Who? What? Why? And I know I need to get you out to there. There are other sessions. Again, please stop at the booth, talk to me, talk to your coaches. The good news is there's no afternoon session today.

You're off the hook, get out of town, go for a drink, chill with your coach if there's not a session to catch.  Fadi's asked me to go to a university with him for some outreach, and so I wouldn't be back for it, and I thought you guys deserved it anyway.  So make good use of your day. Tomorrow morning I implore you to be here at 6:45 AM.  Fadi is here at 7:00 AM.  He's going to spend 45 minutes with us.  It's going to be fantastic. It always is.  But I would like to respect his time and everybody get here at 6:45 AM so we're ready for him.  Then it's just us chilling out. We have no remote participation, it's just us, in a room, just talking about the experience.

Okay, well, thank you very much for your time and attention to what I needed to say.  Again, I just want you to remember even though I have some constructive, forward thinking, I do want you to know that first and foremost I think you all have been fantastic, and I really appreciate you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

ICANN | 52
*Singapore*