EN

BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (9 of 13)
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we get the slides up there so we can start?

BRAD VERD: I have my own here so I can read it. [inaudible] read that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yeah. I do the same thing. You have to remember to push both buttons at the same time.

BRAD VERD: Right. I know. Yeah. If I [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The last time the ALAC met with RSSAC was, I believe, about eight years ago. I won't try to explain why neither of us have initiated anything since, but that's behind us.

 I'd like to welcome Brad Verd, who's the co-chair of the RSSAC. His current co-chair has just been appointed to the Board by the NomCom and is probably somewhat occupied these days.

BRAD VERD: She sends her apologies for not being here but appreciates the invite.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Without any further ado, I'm going to turn it over to Brad. I'm presuming Brad is going to give us a little bit of an introduction as to just what this RSSAC stuff is, or maybe even what root servers are. Although, we did spend a few minutes today talking about that, so I hope everyone on here knows, if they didn't know before.
	But, I'll turn it over to you. I'm sure we'll have an interesting session and probably some opportunity for good questions and answers. Thank you.
BRAD VERD:	Thank you, all. Again, my name is Brad Verd, co-chair of RSSAC. Thanks for the invite to talk about our new governance model that we've proposed to the Board. I'll be running through that here.
	If there are questions, please interrupt me. I'm not opposed to that. I'll try to address it.
	We have a number of RSSAC members behind us back here. I might draw on their expertise. But, hopefully we'll be able to address any questions you have, and we'll go from there.
	So, let's see if the clicker works. All right. So, I'm going to be going with two slides here because I can't read that one up there.
	So, really, this is just a representation slide. Don't get hung up on this one. This just showing kind of staggering Internet growth. I think somewhere today we're around four billion devices on the Internet. It's supposed to keep on going at crazy numbers.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

We just point to this because the current implementation, or, say, how we got here with the root server system, kind of never really had this type of growth in mind. And, there was never really a structure around it.

So, we, RSSAC, have say down and went through these long outstanding questions that have been out there for decades, simple ones, like, "How do you add, how do you remove, a root server?" There's no process for that. So, that's what we were trying to address. That was the impetus for trying to address with this new governance.

So, before I get into the meat of it, we introduce a number of acronyms. So, I want to run through them here, really quickly. RSS stands for the Root Server System, which is the entire root service. Al the servers that serve the root we refer to as the root server system.

There is the root server. So, there are individual root servers in the root server system. Then, there is the RSO, which is the Root Server Operators those servers that provide the service on the root server system.

In the governance mode, we introduce five new functions, which we have acronyms for, of course. There's the SF, which is the Secretariat Function. There's the SAPF – and I'll go through these in detail later. I just want to kind of call them out here. There's the SAPF, which is the Strategic Architecture and Policy Function.

There's the DRF, which is the Designation Removal Function, the PMMF, which is the Performance Monitoring and Measuring Function, which is

usually the tongue twister for everyone, and then there's the Financial Function. All right, So …

ALAN GREENBERG: Brad, before you start, can you give a three-minute summary of what the current governance model, so to speak, looks like, and what is the relationship between the various root server operators and that kind of thing?

BRAD VERD: It's less than a three-minute cover, because there is no governance model. I'll cover some of this here as we get into it, but the root servers are all volunteer-based. I'll point to a reference document. There is a history document that RSSAC published that goes through the history of the root server system and how it came to be as it sits today and all the current root operators. There are twelve root operators operating 13 identities in the root server system. All those operators are volunteer, and they all agree to serve the IANA root.

So, I think some of these will come out as I through – I go into the impetus of why this starts here, which is essentially: right now, there is no governance model. Right now, the governance model – let's say the last governance was in 1998, and that governance model was Jon Postel. It was never documented what he used as qualifications for new root server system. There was no process on how to add them, how to remove them. It was one guy.

So, it's been two decades now – three decades – without any process. So, we are past due. That's what this is supposed to be addressing.

So, setting current expectations, this document was a three-year effort within RSSAC. As you can tell, the initial draft and model we see as a starting point. So, this is a conversation, the start of a conversation. We expect community expect, community feedback, and this will probably evolve as the conversation progresses.

Right now, the document is with the ICANN Board, and we are waiting for feedback on the initial – let's just say, initial feedback from the Board, if they have questions or they want clarifications or whatnot. Then starts the discussion of the implementation – what's next, basically. That'll come from the Board.

So, our initial impetus. So, obviously, you guys all remember 2014: the transition, a lot of global engagement, and the multi-stakeholder approach. We witnessed all this happening. In 2015, we recognized – we, RSSAC – that there was going to be some focus on us, maybe when the IANA transition was done, and we needed to get ahead of the curve and maybe start addressing some of these outstanding questions of accountability, who's holding the root server operators accountable and for what, continuity of the service, and who are the stakeholders of the root server system. All of these were not defined.

So, in 2015, we embarked on this three-year effort. We did it via a number of workshops, where we sequestered all of RSSAC in a room for 72 hours, beat on each other for a long, long time, and worked through things.

As you work through kind of a timeline of our workshops, you can see that we kind of fine-tuned it and, as Tripti would say, we peeled the layers of the onion, starting out with, essentially, the three questions that I mentioned – the evolution, accountability, and continuity. We pulled those apart and asked more questions. We ended up getting into the evolution and how tall you got to be to ride the ride and what does good, good, good look like. We started to ask, "Who are we accountable to? What are the measurements for accountability?"

Then, in October of 2017, we created this mind map of what we were thinking. We had all these pieces, but we weren't quite sure how it fit together. So, we sat down and put it together in this mind map. Out of the mind map came these five functions that I've identified earlier.

Then, at our last workshop in 2018, we completed the document, essentially, which is RSSAC037. It's a big document. It takes some time to read. But, there's a lot of detail in there.

So, what I'm going to cover here is very high-level. A lot of the question you might have, If I can address them quickly, I will. But, there's a lot of detail in the document. We tried to cover everything we could and be as thorough as possible.

So, this is just a pretty picture reference for you guys to understand kind of the global DNS root services. Right now, there's 1,000+ servers that represent the root server system. That's the pretty cloud on top. Hopefully you guys are familiar with DNS and kind of how it works with the first level, second level, and third, down to the individual machine or the stub resolver on your laptop.

On the right is the list of the twelve operators that operate the 13 identities in the root sever system.

All right. Okay. This is very important. So, if there's one takeaway today, this is the page. So, we sat down and said, "What are our guiding principles for the root server system?" A lot of these were existing and were used as guiding principles for the root sever operators that were operating the root prior to any of this work beginning. Then, we added a couple more at the end there, which I'll cover.

So, I'll just run through them one at a time here. So, Principle #1: To remain a global network, the Internet requires a globally unique name space. I think everybody understands that one. Pretty basic, but we needed to make sure it was here.

All the root server operators, as I stated earlier, agree that IANA is the source of the DNS data for the root. So, hence, your one globally unique name space.

#3: The root server system must be a stable, reliable, and resilient platform for the DNS service to all users. So, we don't filter. We don't block users. If you ask a question to the root server system, as long as it's a legitimate question, you'll get an answer.

Principle 4: Diversity. This is: Diversity in the root server operations is the strength of the overall system. So, diversity here is hardware diversity, network diversity, operating system diversity, and name server software diversity. This is so that there is no one thing that can

take down the whole system at one time. So, diversity, diversity, diversity.

Principle 5: Architectural changes should result from technical evolution and a demonstrated technical need. To be very clear, we have an agnostic approach. We are neutral. We answer technical questions. We identify technical needs. Any politically driven question doesn't fall here. Okay?

Principle 6: The IETF defines the technical operation of the DNS protocol. So, they define what the protocol is, and we serve it. So, they are the stewards of the DNS protocol.

Principle 7: Root servers must operate with integrity and ethos demonstrating the commitment to the common good of the Internet. Basically, good stewards.

Now, these next four we added onto our guiding principles. These are new and, for the first time, documented or shared. The other ones have been shared in the past.

So, #8: Obviously, the RSOs must be transparent.

#9: RSOs must collaborate and engage with the stakeholder community. So, that's ICANN. That's everybody here.

#10: RSOs must be autonomous and independent. That is the: no organization should be able to capture or take control of all of them at any one time. They should be independent. Again, that kind of goes back to our diversity.

One of our strengths, not only in hardware. OS, and software is that we have diversity in operations. We have twelve different organizations. They all run things differently, which is a strength for the resiliency of the service.

Then, obviously, #11: RSOs must be neutral and impartial. Again, we answer all questions coming to us from anywhere in the world. As long as it's a legitimate question, you will get an answer.

All right. Moving on. This is a simple visual representation of what our scope was in the model. I think this picture was stolen from an SSAC document and modified a bit. It kind of shows the ecosystem from the TLD operators on the left, all the way over to the DNS resolvers on the right.

What you see in the white box with the IANA and the root zone maintainer was, essentially, what was covered in the IANA transition.

In the blue portion, the light blue portion, that is what we are addressing. That is the scope of what this model covers. Okay?

Jumping down one more, what was our model design principles? These are … well, you might think is common sense. We wanted to document them. We wanted to have something to keep on going back to when we reached conflicts or whatnot so that we could have reasons to move forward.

So, obviously, avoid conflicts of interest – the model – so that nobody can take control or capture anything. Separation of functions. We

thought that was very important. Then, as we continue to hear throughout ICANN, transparency and audit ability here.

Next one. All right. The first question that we tried to address was, "Who are the stakeholders?" While it seems like a simple question, this was not a simple answer. It took a long time and a lot of discussions and a lot of raised voices to reach this.

Let me just run through it really quick. In the middle, you have the root server system. Bottom left, as we stated, is one of our guiding principles: the IETF holds the pen on the DNS protocol. So, the IETF and the IAB, because of that relationship, are obviously a stakeholder.

The root server operators themselves are a large stakeholder. Large investment. Again, they run this on a volunteer basis. They are a stakeholder.

Then came the bigger. Who represents the global community? This discussion went round and round and round, and, ultimately, the ICANN community is the best representation out there to represent that global voice.

Next slide. Here's a visual of the model. It is an interplay of three constructs, all operating in parallel. So, I'll go through this in more detail, but, essentially, this is the visual where you have the stakeholders, as identified earlier – the ICANN, the IETF, the IAB – and the root server operators, all having responsibility of these five new functions: the Secretariat Function, the Strategic Architecture Policy Function, the Financial Function, Designation Removal, and

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

Performance Monitoring. You can see how the Secretariat Function would interplay with the current DNS operators.

Then, just to give you a little bit of background, the initial question that started all of this work, while there was optics around the IANA transition and things are kind of being identified – one of the long outstanding questions that I pointed out earlier is, how do you add and/or remove root server operators. So, that's why you see a whole box here dedicated to that. That was the first question we were trying to answer. Everything else kind of grew out of that. Obviously, we spent a lot of time on that, and I'll cover that here in a bit.

Next slide. So, it's, again, a balance of interplay of separate functions, and governance overlaid on all five of them. That's just a visual for you.

Now I'll go through the different functions. So, the Secretariat Function. Right now, the RSOs, let's say, organize themselves. What I mean by that is that they meet by themselves. They have infrastructure. They have tools. They have process. They have procedures for continuity, for events, for communications. They have assets that the servers run on. All of this, again, is done kind of volunteer.

So, what we're suggesting here is that a Secretariat Function is formed, and they take over that role, basically coordinating meetings. They hold common assets. They're also a conduit for the community on how to reach the RSOs. That's been a bit of an unknown, a mysterious way to talk to the – these root operators are there, but nobody knows how to reach them. This would become that window into the root server operations, among other things.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

Second, we have the Strategic Architecture and Policy Function. So, there are three tracks in here: strategy, obviously coordinating with other stakeholders, and strategic vision of the root server systems. Examples include ICANN Board, IETF, SSAC, RZERC, ALAC. For whoever has a say or needs an influence on the strategy, it would be this group who would be talking to them. They'd be strategizing how to incorporate emerging technologies and how to sunset those that have run their course.

Architecture. You can see how these go hand-in-hand. They're ensuring the guiding principles of the root server system. The RSOs remain embedded in the technical and operational activities, and they define the system-wide externally-verifiable metrics so that people can understand the health of these systems.

Then, obviously, the outputs of both the strategy and the architecture needs lead to a policy function, where they would be operationalizing the minimum level of performance developed by the SAPF and communicating them to the PMMF, with is the performance metrics function. Then, they would also be articulating policy and handling any grievance concerns in the RSOs and/or the root server system.

A simple example of a grievance is if somebody is not meeting service-level expectations and they're potentially slotted for removal. Somebody might have a grievance there. We can come up with any number of different grievances, but it would be the policy function that would be addressing that.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

Moving on, we have the Designation Removal Function. Pretty simple when you put it in this term, but there's a lot of interplay with other functions that make this really complicated. But, when you boil it down, it's just: designations plus removals equal the set of operators.

Then, we have the Performance Monitoring and Measuring Function. This is a number of different things that should be monitored to understand the health of the root server system. Obviously, there's the technical metrics. System capacity, bandwidth, and queries processes are things operating as they are expected to. Then, there's the non-technical pieces, which is ethos. Are they being good stewards? Are they acting with the best practices of the Internet at heart? Then, obviously, the financials. Are they a financially sound company to be a root server operator?

These are individual root server operator technical metrics on the left. On the right, they all define the overall health of the root server system as a whole.

So, the Financial Function. This is new. As I stated earlier, the current model is volunteer basis. So, this would introduce: the option to receive funding should exist. If funding is accepted, that's coupled with service-level expectations.

Funding should be sourced from the stakeholders and related parties. Obviously, funding should include support for the root server system operations, if they are any emergencies that require something to be addressed that was not in the current plan or something is going on. And, then, clearly, an R&D piece (Research & Development).

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

This shows you a little more about the financial function. These pies are not representative of size, so look at the dollar signs. That's supposed to kind of give you how much it would be.

Obviously, there was a cost of getting here – what we spent at our workshops, pulling people together. That adds up to a sum of money. We agree that there should be a sum of money for emergencies, if there's a DDoS or something that money has to be spent right away on, there should be a bucket to be pulled from.

Research and development should be a piece of it. Again, not a large piece of it. Obviously, there's a cost to implement the model that we represent here. There's a cost here with the community. There's a cost to ICANN. There's just a large cost here.

But, the bulk of the money would go to operations.

So, we were asked by the Board to put a price tag on it. That is not easy. We spent a lot of time trying to figure this out so that we could answer the Board's request. Rather than putting a price tag on it, what we thought is that we would give a framework for the Board to come up with the cost on their own. I'll explain that in a minute. And, the reason being is that – so, we introduced this BPQ, which is Bandwidth, Packets Per Second, and Queries Per Second. But, there is one other key factor that is not something that you can put a tangible dollar figure on, and that is the risk level that the Board is willing to accept for how you operate a system. So, it's much like a multiplier. So, that was our approach.

Next slide. So, if you take those three – bandwidth, packets per second, and queries per second – and try to apply that to a standardization, a model, maybe, or look at in the industry what the cost is, there are large platforms all over the world providing service – an easy way to generically come up with what the cost is to scale.

Then, the big question at hand would be the risk. So, you take the actual cost just to do day-to-day, and then there is pretty much a multiplier for the cost of risk. That needs to be answered by the Board on what risk level they would be willing to accept. Then, you would end up with an estimating cost for the model.

So, this approach, again, goes into a bit more deep detail in the document, but it was our best answer to try to address the Board's request for a price tag.

Then, we have the manifestation of the model. So, you've already seen this picture. Really, it goes to our three recommendations that came out, which is: the RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the model for implementation. So, again, we said that this model is the beginning of a conversation. Maybe the community reads it and everybody is fine with it and says, "It looks great. Go forth," but in our discussions, we kind of expect that there will be tweaking and turning of the knobs, and maybe we move this and add this and change this a bit. All this has to happen and, again, we're waiting on the Board to respond.

Recommendation 2: Use the provided methodology or a similar one to cost out the implementation of the operations of the model. We in our

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RSSAC are financial experts. Don't claim to be, don't want to be. So, putting together that financial model, the BPQ, was our best approach. We're not saying it's the right approach, but it's what we thought would work. But, if there's something else that the Board has or the community sees fit, then, obviously, we should figure that out.

Then, obviously, Recommendation #3 is: Implement the model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. Those are the three recommendations that you see in RSSAC038. So, RSSAC037 is the model. RSSAC038 is the actual advice that went to the Board with these three recommendations.

I have, in this presentation – I'm not sure I want to get into detail in on those – we have flowcharts. Maybe I'll just kind of show you that –

ALAN GREENBERG: Brad, we've got about eight minutes left, so if you can –

BRAD VERD: Oh. Well, great! So, in this presentation – really quick – we came up with a number of scenarios. What were trying to do is validate the model. So, we run through a number of scenarios … let me see if I can go back one slide. We run through these scenarios in a flowchart version, so you can see how the model would work.

Designation. Obviously, that's been the outstanding question. How do you add? Then, there's a voluntary resignation. What if somebody

wanted to quit? How do we handle that? Today, we don't have a process.

What if somebody was underperforming? How would we remove them? Again, you can see the flowchart and how the different functions would operate to make that happen.

Catastrophic shutdown. Business just, one day, closed its doors, for whatever reason. Those are things we have to think about.

Then, there is the age-old question of, what if a root server operator went rogue? So, we talk through those.

So, you guys can go through the slide deck and look at it. I think, right now, we'll take some questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have two people in the queue right now. Three. Dave first. And, can we use one-minute timers please?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Thank you. Thanks, Brad, for the comprehensive presentation. I have one comment and one question.

My first comment is about security. In your principles, eleven principles, you mentioned that the RSS should be stable, should be [inaudible], but there was no mention of security. Should the RSS be secure? This is my comment.

Okay. Let me come to my question. So far, we have had no security incidents on the RSS. Can you confirm that there is no risk at all that we might get any security incident on the root system?

BRAD VERD: To your first point, security, I guess, is implied. So, yes, security is paramount. The operators spend an enormous amount of time, process, procedure, and money on security. So, yes, that is paramount.

Is it called out specifically? Maybe that was an oversight. It's certainly implied in the principle that you referred to.

Can I guarantee that there's no security incident? Absolutely not. Every root operator – again, we're working all the time of every day to ensure system stability and resiliency. If you're on the Internet today – I think we stated this with the Board in Panama, we stated this with the Board in San Jose – you're at risk, period. Any system out there. It's been validated. There are large enough attack systems out there to take, if somebody wanted to, down anything.

So, the answer to your question is no. I cannot guarantee it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a speaker queue of six people at this point. Our next guest is in the room. So, I will keep on going through the queue, but very short questions and very short answers, if an answer is necessary.

Next, we have – oh. Next, we have me. I'll skip me. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. I come from the Asia-Pacific regional organization, and we have at least one ALS that is running the L-Root server and another one setting up a J-Root server. These are both ISOC chapters. [I] was the principal. I gather that you would like more of such instances? Or, how is it?

BRAD VERD: So, this is really an operational question that you're asking right here, not anything regarding the model. But, going to geographic diversity, if you were to go look at root-servers.org, which is the website that the root server operators have put together, right now there are other 1,000 instances of the root server system all over the globe. And, there are a lot in Asia-Pacific, not just the two you refer to. Hundreds, and more and more are being deployed all the time. There are number of root server operators, if you have an organization that wants to host of these instances, that are willing to work with you and make that happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was actually going to comment on this. So, actually add to this. Is there a single location, maybe Secretariat, if a country wishes to host a root server that they can contact? Because I've

been in touch with several countries and they basically don't know who to get in touch with.

BRAD VERD

So, as I stated in the model here, there hasn't been. That's what the Secretariat Function would address. RSSAC has volunteered to do that in the meantime. So, all the root server operators operate independently, and there is no single representation of the root server operators.

So, if somebody wants to host one, they can reach out to RSSAC. We can forward that request to the root server operators and hook them up in that manner.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. So, I had just a comment, which is: well done on all this. Because I've been on the net since '88, and I remember the urban legends of pulling sockets of a root server [inaudible] –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

You could have plugged me off there. [inaudible]

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier spent four years cutting me off when he was Chair. I find this delightful. Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: If we can go back the slide that refers to the stakeholder model, because I didn't quite get that.

BRAD VERD: Sorry. The stakeholder model?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The stakeholders –

BRAD VERD: Yeah. The stakeholder right here?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. So, I didn't get why it's put like this. You have the ICANN community up there, and it seems like the –

BRAD VERD: Nobody is on top of anybody here. There's no hierarchy.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. I just didn't get how this is – oh, so it's just a random name of putting the …

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

BRAD VERD: You can move – nobody … Yeah, pretend it's rotating. They're all just stakeholders.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I always hear about 13 root servers, but you mention 1,000. So, I'm very confused. So, I don't know how many letters are out there.

But, the question I have is, if this happens, where is this going reside? Here in ICANN? If that's so, is there a new organization within ICANN? Or, is it under your …

BRAD VERD: Well, that's to be figured out, what the Board says. The model, obviously – yes, it would be here, within the ICANN community, with the IETF and the stakeholders also engaging, which they're already engaged here at ICANN. But, they would be engaged in this process also because they're a stakeholder.

Regarding the numbers that I was talking about, there are 13 identifiers in the root zone, A through M. The root server operators use Anycast technology, where every server responds identically. The root zone is

DNSSEC validatable, so you can make sure that you are getting a valid root zone.

No server is different or hands out any different responses. So, there are, yes, over 1,000 instances of root servers all over the globe.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've run through the queue, except for me. I have two comments, not questions. Number one, there's often been a question raised of who are the users? Who are the root servers serving? Of course, we've heard answers from: the registries, because you're dispensing information for them. The answer I like best – I know, Olivier – was from a past co-chair of the RSSAC, who said the users. All four billion of them. So, just for interest.

It's going to be challenging to see how we can implement this, if we can, without ICANN being at the core or something and not violating the principles, the diversity, and independence.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I think, if I can just reflect on that just briefly – and this is in the document, so , again, I'd recommend that everybody go and read the document. A lot of that was, if there was an organization – let's hypothetically say ICANN – who was going to fund root server operations, the independent statement was essentially that anybody who was giving money to the root server operators – not just ICANN; it could be anybody – had no influence on how the operations were done.

So, that's where the independence is. So, the root server operators, again, all agree to serve the single root, the IANA root. If somebody is going to give them money to do it, they have no influence on how that operation is handled.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Brad. I'm going to echo was Olivier said: bravo. Those of those who've been around for a while would have put very large bets that this would never happen. Thank you.

And I know the RSSAC people and a few other people around this organization who have been rather heavily at work for a while. But, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're going to flip immediately in. This is a short section. We're starting a little bit late, but we have 15 minutes. Or, we did have 15 minutes. I'd like to quickly introduce Brian Gutterman. Brian is with the Global Domains Division, and he is responsible, if you can see the words, and if we can stop having the conversations around the table – Program Manager, Registrant Services. GDD cares about registrants. For a while, I will echo what I just said to Brad. Some of us would have put a large bet that that would never happen.

Delighted to have you here.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Thank you so much for the introduction, Alan. Thank you to the ALAC leadership and the regional leaders for the invitation to come speak. My name is Brian Gutterman. As Alan said, I'm a Program Manager for the GDD Strategic Program's team. Thanks to those as well to those participating on line for joining.

So, I'm going to start with just a few works about the Registrant Program, which was started about a year-and-a-half ago, outlining … the slides. The clicker …

ALAN GREENBERG: The clicker is not working. Could we go to the next slide, please?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Oh, there we go. I got it. I'll push it harder. So, I'm going to start with an overview of the program goals, what we've done so far, and then I'm going to get to a recent report that we've published and distributed to the ALAC in September about some of the issues and challenges that registrants are facing in managing their domain names. I'll speak in some detail to that.

Then, what I'd like to do is really open the floor and stimulate some discussion about registrant issues amongst yourselves and answer any questions you might have.

So, the goals on the Registrant Program are twofold: educating registrants about their rights and responsibilities, the domain name

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ecosystem and how to navigate it, and the ICANN policies that impact them, and identifying and raising awareness about issues and challenges that registrants are facing. That is what we tried to do with the first version of the report that we recently published, bringing to light some of the data that we have, although somewhat limited in scope – some of the data that we have within the organization about some of the issues and challenges that registrants are facing.

The first part of the first program goal on education – for those that aren't aware, you can find these resources at ICANN.org/registrants. It's somewhat easy to navigate here from the ICANN.org homepage. There's a variety of things you'll find here, like educational blogs, FAQs, past presentations we've made at ICANN meetings, and, more importantly, links of ways to contact our Global Support Center (GSC) and way to file complaints with our compliance department.

So, I encourage you, if you haven't had a chance to take a look at these resources, to have a look. You might find it somewhat interesting.

So, quickly, what are we talking about from our perspective, from your perspective – the kind of materials we are writing. Who is our audience? Obviously, there's millions of registrants out there.

This particular slide describing the typical registrant that is contacting our Global Support Center have noted that many are small and medium business owners. They're individual Internet users. They consider the website to be mission critical. They often have a heightened sense of urgency, and that goes as well to those contacting compliance.

So, they might be frustrated with their communications with their registrar for whatever reason. Their website is down. They want to get it back up, and they have contacted ICANN Global Support Center as a last resort. So, this provides some context.

So, the materials that we're writing aren't necessarily intended to be for a technical audience, maybe the ICANN regulars, the technical community, and so forth. It's more so a small business owner, sort of a mom and pop. They have maybe one or two domain names and a website that they use for commerce or for writing blogs or whatever it is. So, that's sort of who we're talking about when we talk about registrants here.

So, this report we published in September – oh. Skipping ahead. Issues and Challenges Impacting Domain Name Registrants. If you haven't had a chance to read it, I encourage you to do so. It's published on ICANN.org. I believe it's in the slide deck, in the Adobe Connect, that was shared with ALAC, so you can read it there.

Again, one of our primary efforts or goals of the Registrant Program is to identify and raise awareness about issues and challenges that registrants are facing managing their domain names.

So, we have collected and published a bit of data from across the organization – from the Global Support Center, from Contractual Compliance – as well as some observations from the Complaints Office. So, the compliance data is really just repurposed from reports that they put out quarterly online. They're very transparent in publishing what they publish.

In the Global Support Center, we had to do a little digging and analysis of our own. The observations from the Complaints Office I'll describe a little bit later, but the Complaints Office put out its first report back in March and had some stuff in there that we thought was relevant to this report and to promote in a bit. So, I'll get more to that later.

The data itself, the methodology, the GSC data is for a six-month period, from July to December 2017. Further, we dug a little bit deeper into their data and analyzed 15% of the total inquiries from each category there. Again, I encourage you to read the report to get more details.

The Compliance data set is from June 2018, and the monthly dashboard report from Q2 2018 – they can be both accessed in their entirety – those reports – online. So, please do that if you're interested in this kind of stuff, as well as their methodology for reporting. The Complaints Office report, again, is an important report. I think the ALAC would find it useful, if you haven't gone over it already. That was published in March 2018 by our Complaints Officer.

A couple of the high-level observations we made. For example, the four most common in inquiry types from registrants were pertaining to domain name management issues, WHOIS verification and suspensions, rights protection in ownership disputes and transfer issues.

One thing that is important to note related to compliance data is that they do not track if complainants are indeed registrants. Sometimes they are, sometimes they aren't. And, they aren't able to track that to full detail. But, they have said, and they have spoken to this in ICANN

meetings and regular updates, that some of the most common complaint types from registrants are related to their domains being deleted, having issues renewing their domain names, having issues with transfers, and issues related to UDRP.

Another thing to point out here – the observation that we put in from the Complaints Office report was that what the Complaints Office is hearing is that many registrants don't fully understand ICANN's remit and scope of authority, so what can ICANN do for registrants if they're having issue vis-à-vis what registrars and registries can do and should be doing their customers, the registrants.

I think I'll skip over these details. I put in a couple of slides of some of the tables that you can find in the report. Again, I'll just let you have a look at these yourselves. This … yeah. So, transfer issues and renewal issues. Again, there's some detail here, and we've outlined some of our high-level observations in the report. So, please have a look at that.

Next steps in terms of the reporting. Again, this was our first version of the report. We hope that the community finds it useful. So, we publish this. We promoted it as a blog and an announcement on ICANN.org. We distributed it to ALAC, to NCSG folks, to registrars and registries, and encouraged them to have a look and provide feedback.

What we also hope is that this will stimulate discussions within the community, and between community groups, about issues impacting registrants, not just the ones that we have outlined in our report or we have identified, but other issues, to create awareness and raise the level of awareness amongst the community, talking about these issues.

We – yeah … I think that's it on the update on the program. On the report, I had a couple questions to stimulate you guys. If there is anyone from ALAC who wants to speak to some of the issues and challenges that ALAC believes registrants are having, hopefully we can start a dialogue. I will listen and try and follow up and take forward this discussion and any challenges where you think that collaboration between different community groups could help or is necessary to resolve these issues and challenges.

So, that's all I have from the presentation side. Happy to answer any questions or … Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Brian. I'm in the queue, and we have Eduardo. Anyone else, please let us know. We have about 13 minutes left in the call. We have Holly and Olivier also, apparently.

Assuming you consider registrants a client or a part of your whatever, any regular business would try to profile them. Have we ever tried to figure out who registrants are? I can come up with categories. We have individuals, businesses, domainers, malfeasance. I'm not sure we want to know how many of the latter are doing it, but have we ever attempted – with GDPR, it's almost impossible now, but you've had a few months. Have we tried to figure out just who registrants are?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Well, that's been something that we've not struggled with but grappled over in terms of who we want our audience to be from the ICANN org

education perspective of what we're putting out there for them. We did have a slide that GSC had put together that sort of profiles what they believe is their typical registrant who is coming to ICANN with – so, that has been helpful, and we've gotten insights from those who do have touch points – again, this is Compliance and GSC – from an ICANN perspective.

However, putting together a better profile I think would be useful. I don't know of any initiatives happening in the community to do that specifically, but I would take that on as a good suggestion and something that we would obviously [inaudible] to help with.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, looking at people who come to you, we're going to presume there are zero botnet operators in the world, based on that.

So, next we have Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. So, sorry to say this, but I didn't know that something like this was in ICANN. But, the department, or … is this a place that gathers information? You just gather information and inform the registrants about their right? Or are you there to resolve problems if I complain?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: So, we work closely with our compliance department. If you wanted to file a compliance complaint, you would go to our compliance department. If you wanted to e-mail or call our Global Support Center,

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

which is working around the clock, handling inquiries and issues from not only registrants but from anyone, there are ways to contact them.

We are doing both. We are interacting with our colleagues within ICANN to better understand these problems, and we are proactively publishing educational materials to complement what registrants might be getting from their registrars and who they register their name with.

But, there's lots of educational materials out there, but we are trying to write specifically, for example, about ICANN policies and little, short tidbits, things that we think registrants should know to help them better navigate the domain name system, learn about ICANN, etc.

So, we are within GDD. We work collaboratively with all of ICANN org. There's many different channels registrants can go through to hopefully get their issues resolved, the first one being their registrar, usually. So, hope that helps answer your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Feel free to put your card at – I'm closing the queue right now, but if you want to speak and haven't, put your card up. Put it up and we'll accept it if we have time left.

Olivier?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Two quick questions. The first one is a simple one. Do registrants understand the difference between a gTLD and a ccTLD?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Again, I can't speak for every registrant out there. I would agree with your – I think the point you're trying to make is that there's a huge scale of, in terms of understanding the DNS and what ICANN does, understanding, in terms of education levels. I would say, for the majority, no. I think I would agree with you. The majority, no.

So, these are sort of the things that we – we have tons of content and resources on ICANN.org about these things, but do registrants do know where to find it? Usually, they don't. So, you make a good point, and this is what we're trying to do: stimulate and raise awareness that, in fact, most common registrants who have a domain name don't know any of these acronyms and things like that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That leads me to the second question, actually. How does one find you? Because I looked at the ICANN website just now. I scoured through it and I can't find you. Or, maybe you don't exist yet.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Well, if you go across the top, it says domain name registrants. That's where you will find where I pointed to in our resources, our slide. ICANN.org/registrants. So, again, any help that ALAC can provide and

the community can provide in promoting this material, which is educational and intended for registrants who need the material, we would love that support and promoting –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: On the main ICANN website, it doesn't. It says Get Started, News and Media, Policy, Public Comment, Resources –

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Oh, you have to go to Resources first, and then it'll be there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ah.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Good point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Good point.

HOLLY RAICHE: I bet the registrants, half of them, don't even know their registrants.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, if it was your time to speak, then you should use the microphone. And, miraculously, Holly is up next.

Holly is off the queue. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Thank you, Brian, for pointing to the report. It's very useful to see the tables and look at the numbers. My question is about what exactly you are going to educate at least those folks … when you go through the tables, there are very specific issues raised. So, those are registrants who know issues. Here, for example, in the tables, there is specifically the number of inquiries related to rights protection and ownership. So, people know exactly what the problems they have are, and that's a good classification in terms of you capturing this data.

I think it would be useful to work with us in terms of how we can get more information and how you can capture, as well, information that we don't have, because the number of complaints is – I wasn't expecting for you to receive, or ICANN to receive, 4,500 complaints. I think that's from registrants. That's a big number. So, there's lots of people know ICANN's role, and they're already inquiring about the issues that they face with their domains.

So, we shouldn't assume that people don't know ICANN's mission. There's lots of people who know exactly what ICANN does.

So, maybe we need to work with your team to at least try to use At-Large in terms of a vehicle to raise issues and figure out how we can educate

the registrants and how we can distribute multilingual materials as well.

It's very difficult and hard to find your contact on the website. I tried to Google. There was a search, saying, "ICANN Call Center," I think you were the third in terms of the results. So, I think that maybe visibility is important for end users.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Thank you for that. We would absolutely welcome working together with you on these issues and moving forward. We also acknowledge that is sometimes difficult to find these resources for registrants who aren't already part of the ICANN community or know about ICANN and find not only the resources that we're putting out but how to contact the Global Support Center or a file a complaint with Compliance.

Across the organization, we're working on promoting that and making that more available to the best we can.

Something that we do is translate most of our blogs and our educational articles into the six U.N. languages, so we are proud of that. There's much more that we can do, but at least – again, it's not the easiest to find. We acknowledge that, too, but we have been making an effort to translate them, at least into six U.N. languages, to try and reach the widest groups of registrants out there.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have John and Humberto and two minutes left. And, we have Satish, if Ana hasn't come in by then. Or … I don't know whose card it is. It is Satish or Eduardo's?

John, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Hi, Brian. Thanks very much for coming in and presenting today. So, in ICANN's past – this is going to be crossing a few topics – we know that there's a lot of bad registrant data out there. You are a point of contact for ICANN with registrants. Does your office do anything in terms of, say, when someone calls in verifying their information to make sure it's up to date and that kind of thing?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Sorry. Are you talking about bad actor registrants, or – oh, registration data. No, that would not be our sort of department. WHOIS inaccuracies, of course, are called into our Global Support Center and to our compliance department very often. It wouldn't be my group doing that. So, I hope that answers your question.

JOHN LAPRISE: Sort of. Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Testing. Okay. Thank you so much for your presentation. I have read it very quickly, and I have two questions. First, on page 7, it talks about intellectual property rights protection. I see several complaints by people who say they have ownership over intellectual property rights.

So, my question is, do you have any cases of reverse domain name hijacking? Is there any complaints by registrants? Is there any revocation of domain names and a complaint about that and they go to you because they have no money to go to lawyers?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Thank you for your questions. So, the data that you're looking at is regarding inquiries from registrants around the world to our Global Support Center.

In terms of reverse domain name hijacking, that isn't something that our Global Support Center would be able to help with. What they would do, if somebody came with those sorts of issues, is try and point them to someone that could help them.

I know that these problems certainly do exist, and that is happening. And, I agree with you that registrants who sometimes might not have the resources to defend themselves in court, are at a disadvantage in some situations.

So, that is an issue that we are aware of. I wouldn't say that we have compelling data to show from this limited set, but it's a good point you make. It is something that should be, I think, discussed widely at ICANN, in ICANN's space. So, thank you for that.

[HUMBERTO CARRASCO]   And, I thank you.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Thank you. You can … I don't know. I'll stick around after this session, and I'm happy to – oh. Did you have one more? No?

ALAN GREENBERG: We did, but we're out of time, and we have another guest here. Perhaps you'd like to go to the back of the room and speak offline.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Yes. Please find me after the session. I'm happy to continue this dialogue. Thank you, again, to ALAC for the opportunity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

This is a somewhat momentous occasion. If you go back and look at records of the ALAC, in one of the very first meetings in 2003, there was a discussion of having a liaison to the GAC. It happened a few years ago, finally, with Yrjo appointed as our liaison to the GAC.

At the time we decided to that, we actually decided to have liaisons in both directions. The decision, however, was made at the time of, "Eh, Yrjo is a good guy. He can do it in both directions."

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

I am delighted, however, to say that we're talking Yrjo out of that job – well, the GAC is taking him out of that job – and Ana has been appointed as the liaison to the ALAC.

I'm going to turn it over to Yrjo to chair the rest of this session and introduce Ana formally. And, then we'll turn it over to Ana.

ANA NEVES: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or, he may turn it over to you. We don't know.

ANA NEVES: Okay.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, at the last meeting we got the good news that there will be a GAC liaison to the ALAC. And, now, it's my enormous pleasure to introduce her, Ana Neves, who is the GAC representative of Portugal since at least 2008. We were colleagues on the GAC at that time, and she's the Director of the Department of Information Society at the Fundacao para Ciencia e a Technologia.

Also, if I'm correct, she was elected or selected as the CIO of the Year, 2018, this year.

ANA NEVES: May I correct? Two awards. CIO of the Year, and European Digital Leader of the Year.

YRJO LANSIPURO: All right. Thank you for correcting me.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we were honored already, but now I'm really impressed.

YRJO LANSIPURO: But, we came here for business. Of course, we have very little time. On the screen, we have something that Ana and myself have done already, actually starting in Panama. That is a draft follow-up to the joint statement we made in Abu Dhabi about the informed participation in ICANN matters. But, we'll come to that later.

Perhaps I want to give, now, the floor to Ana. Please.

ANA NEVES: Well, it's a pleasure to be here. I must say that I thought about this close cooperation between GAC and ALAC for several years. Why? Because I think that our [inaudible] and objectives here in ICANN are very similar.

I always felt that our joint meetings were not really joint meetings because there was not dialogue. It was a presentation of the work then. I think that we can add some value to ICANN if we work together and we find our path together.

So, I don't foresee that, in the next meeting of ICANN, it'll be a close cooperation between the GAC and ALAC. But, I hope that we can start to learn how to discuss together. So, that's why, when I and Yrjo were discussing how to manage these meetings for ICANN, I felt that we should have a question to discuss between GAC and ALAC.

Because we are discussing, always, the plan of ICANN, we are not never discussing, at least at the GAC, what GAC really needs to discuss. We are discussing and debating the next round of the gTLDs, but I think that we should stop and think together if we really need gTLDs. So, I'm not against the gTLDs. I think that the end user, the consumer, with the governments, should discuss this.

So, what was the added value? What changed? Well, I still use a browser to try to find anything. So, I don't care if it is a gTLD or not. So, it is like a business for some, but it was useful for society. So, I think that this kind of question is one we should have for a good dialogue between ALAC and GAC delegates.

We are not used to this kind of work because we just show work and, if there is a person that, well, wants to talk, they talk. But, there is nothing coming from that meeting. In the GAC community, it says, well, "GAC had a joint meeting with ALAC." Period. Well, I think that we could do much better.

So, we have this draft joint statement, plus a question. It's our proposal for the discussion that we'll have on Tuesday. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two comments. I'm known a little bit as a micromanager and nitpicker.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nooooo.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a little bit in this community. And, I must admit, I read that statement, went over to Yrjo, and said, "Sounds good," with no comments whatsoever. So, thank you.

In terms of the question to be discussed, it's going to be timely because, first thing in the morning on Tuesday, we meet with the Board. The Board has asked us questions, and our question to the Board is essentially, "The GNSO has a big PDP that we're all working on on new procedures. Who's going to decide if we really need? Who's going to decide if we can afford them?"

So, by then, we might have answer from the Board. I'll be delighted to share it if we actually get a good answer.

ANA NEVES: Yeah. Good. Very good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Open questions. Anyone?

Yrjo, back to you, then.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Ana. It was Ana's idea to take up the basic question of who needs new gTLDs at this time. Of course, there is now an excellent background material for discussing that question. The CCT Review Final Report is out. It's only 200 pages, so you can easily take a look. But, I really hope that you all come to the joint meeting on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's mandatory. They better come.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Sure. Okay. [Shall I, Alan?]

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Olivier and Holly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. This question of who needs gTLDs, or do you want new gTLDs? probably has to be the most asked question in ICANN. I had three people today that asked the question and answered it right away, and said, "So, does anyone in ICANN, in At-Large, want the new gTLDs? I heard they don't. I heard At-Large doesn't want any new gTLDs ever." I was like, "Okay. That's an interesting one. Haven't heard this one."

It's not such a clear-cut thing, in my view. My personal feeling on this is that there are some communities that will benefit from new gTLDs, and, of course, it's all going to be down to the details. I don't think anybody

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

– or, maybe there are some people who are saying, "No new gTLDs ever. The current round has been such mess. We don't want anymore." I'm sure some are saying that. I can think of people in our community.

That being said, it's really going to be down to the next round – whether that will be an open round, whether it'll be a round restricted to community TLDs, or to geographical TLDs, or to brand TLDs. Maybe one of the things that our community, or least the people that I speak to, are concerned about is, if it was a completely open round, free-for-all type thing, as the same type as we've had so far, based on the earlier version of the 2007 version of the Applicant Guidebook, where all the progress that the GAC had done and the community had done working on these things – it just goes straight out the window and we have, again, a Wild West application round, which I certainly heard many of my colleagues concerned about, and me included. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

Ana, did you want to have any comment on that, or just go to Holly?

ANA NEVES: No.

ALAN GREENBERGL   Holly, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to go more broadly. I actually welcome your statement about a conversation because I would actually share your view, which is we haven't had a lot of conversations. We've had a lot of faces talking to faces.

I think we can do a lot better. I think, just on the new gTLDs, that many of the issues that GAC raised we've raised. What I would hope is that would be a lot of dialogue before the subsequent procedures. The problem with that was, "Well, if you don't come up with better answers, we're going to go ahead with the Applicant Guidebook as it was," which is threatening because it's such a huge topic. So many of the issues that we raised and you raised haven't been addressed, or not as fully addressed as we would like.

So, I really think there's a fair scope of conversation to be had, and I welcome you wanting to have it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's some debate on whether the default is the Applicant Guidebook as it was, or the gTLD round as it ended, subject the various things the Board did with respect to the GAC. It's probably the latter, not the former.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maybe it's the latter, but I can remember … I forgot who stood up in the beginning of the discussion. They said, "You participate and come up with change, or it ain't."

ALAN GREENBERG: I said there's some debate at this point. Two quick comments. Although we in the GAC have said, "Let's work together" a lot over the years, we rarely have done that. The EPDP is proving to be a different case, and we are actually talking to each other. So, it's really interesting.

The other comment I'll make is that, on the GNSO PDP and the Board's ability, the Board, when they get the results, whatever the results are, can adopt them or reject them and send them back. They can't pick and choose bits and pieces. So, there's going to be all sorts of parts that, if we don't get our input into them, it's going to be really challenging.

One of the things is – and Olivier alluded to that but not quite – the price. If the GNSO says, as they did last time, that it must be a cost recovery operation – that is, it must pay for the application process but nothing else – there's interesting implications of that. Can I afford to have a major new round, where they may incur costs associated with them? So, it's a good discussion to have.

ANA NEVES: May I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

ANA NEVES: Well, it's exactly these kinds of things that I think we have to discuss. I feel that ICANN is really profit-oriented … well, I can understand, and I'm not naïve. But, I'm thinking about a better world and blah, blah, blah. I'm a dreamer – no. Come on. But, I think we can change some points here at ICANN.

I think that, not in the next meeting but the meeting after, perhaps we'll be able to construct and build a joint agenda for our meeting, and we will not have only 45 minutes for the joint meeting, but we will have, like, one-hour-and-half, because everybody will see, "Okay. These guys really have a dialogue to discuss."

And, we should have our own agenda and not to try to run behind ICANN. So, we should have an agenda. We are governments. We are end users. We are consumers. So, we should have a joint agenda.

So, that's really what I would like to have. If this discussion about new gTLDs will be first step? Well, I hope so.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] hands, and I hadn't noticed them. John and Marita, who was first? John?

JOHN LAPRISE: So, I also have a cost and a money concern in this, but my concern is more the goldrush mentality of the new gTLDs, where people are investing them as speculative purchases. And, from an end user perspective, that's not so good.

Yeah, I don't know where to go with that, but that's my biggest concern: we're creating a fake market, in a sense, and inflating it. I think that's very bad.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to have to interrupt. We will give Marita a moment to comment. We're several minutes over, and we have a 15-minute break. We must let the interpreters go off for a few minutes. Or, we can say we're going to stay – what's happening on the next session?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ccNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: ccNSO. So, we can't start very late on that, so, Marita, a very quick comment, and then we're going to have to cut it off.

MARITA MOLL: I just wanted to point out something that I find is kind of sorry. I'm in the Work Track 5 discussions, and I often hear criticisms there that say government is our enemy. Government is not the end user. Government is representing powers that are trying to do things over us.

I find that wrong and unfortunate, but it's there. And, it's quite strong. So, I just wanted to point that out. I don't know what you do about. But, I guess you keep on working against it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a shame if people use a word like that. That being said, we don't have to always agree.

ANA NEVES: Well, it's really a pity. Well, it was not expecting to feel that when I become a delegate to the GAC. I was really – well … and it is a bit weird because governments are supposed to help the consumer, the company, the technical community, the academia. So, the government should have this kind of public policies addressed to everyone. So, it's so strange to feel that we are the enemy. So, I don't understand why.

Well, for me, I think that GAC and ALAC have a lot of things to do together. I hope that we will build a joint agenda. That is the most thing for us to do jointly. Thank you so much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Marvelous words to end with. Thank you very much, Ana.

ANA NEVES: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll adjourn for a few minutes. I'm off to an EPDP, so Maureen will be taking the chair. I wish you a good rest of the day. I think I will see you back as a group on Tuesday.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That adjourns this session. We will start at 5:00 with the ccNSO joint meeting [inaudible]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]