

## ICANN Strategy Panels – Draft Reports - Webinar

Alice Jansen: Greetings. My name is Alice Jansen, and it's a pleasure for me to welcome you to the ICANN Strategy Panel's Draft Reports Webinar.

Before we begin, I'd like to briefly remind all participants of housekeeping items. This webinar is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. This session is being steamed via the Adobe Connect Room. If you intend to voice comments or questions during the Q&A, please join the Adigo Bridge. Up on the screen you will find the agenda, and it's also available in the notepad.

My colleague, Grace Abuhamad (ph) will be our timekeeper today.

Participants' lines are muted throughout presentations and will be opened for the Q&A. During presentations you may submit questions using the Adobe Connect Chat pot. At the end of presentations you will be given the opportunity to voice your comments and questions. All lines will be unmuted for the Q&A. If you are on the Bridge, please remember to mute your computer speakers once the floor is open to avoid echo.

Should you not be seeking, please mute your line using \*6; dial \*7 to unmute. If you wish to speak during the Q&A, please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room, to be added to the queue. Slides, recording and transcript will be made available following the session. You may find these housekeeping indications in the Adobe Connect notes.

With that, we'll turn to Beth Noveck.

Beth Noveck: Great. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here, and thank you, for organizing this. It's a great opportunity for us to present the work that we've been actively engaged in, in the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel, which is, and we are rapidly coming to a close.

So let me jump right into the presentation, and set the stage a little bit, by going to the first -- skip into slide four (ph). So there's a wider conversation going on around the world in many different venues about how we are actually going to continue to maintain a thriving system, of distributed network, yet, coordinated governance of the Internet.

It's going to require us to make some very hard decisions and to deepen our understanding about how do we decide, and who decides, and whether the topics, and when and how. So if we are to have a truly global coordinated system it requires answering a lot of important institutional questions that will be touched upon today, and are being dealt with in many venues.

But to begin to answer that question and to understand what are the possibilities for who decides, and when and how, we really to understand how technology is transforming how we make decisions, and how we can work at a distance using the technology to solve problems in new ways. So this is really the premise that's informed the work of this Panel, is trying to focus very

much a the set of recommendations we might make to the ICANN Community around the new strategy for decision-making that, in turn, might inform new kinds of institutional arrangements and innovations.

If we go to the next slide about the Panel Members, you'll see that the panel is comprised of very delightful, and wonderful, and accomplished group of people from around the world, whose faces and pictures you'll see here, that range from Joichi Ito, the Director of the Massachusetts Institute for Technology Media Lab; to Guo Liang (ph), the Director of the China Internet Project; Karim Lakhani, who is an Expert in Open Innovation from Harvard Business School; Geoff Mulgan, the Head of the UK's Innovation Institute called NESTA; Bitange Ndemo, the Former Minister of Communications of Kenya; and Alison Gillwald the Executive Director of Research ICT in Africa. So, representing a wide range of geographic in disciplinary perspective in combining both expertise in Internet Governance, and expertise in innovations and governance more broadly.

On the next slide you'll see, and just to remind you, we had a Charter which asked us to look at these new models for international engagement, and to design processes and tools and platforms, again, to think about what are the mechanisms by which people are newly making decisions today and working together that might inform ways that ICANN might innovate in how it works.

If we go to the next slide, you'll see that over the last few months we've been very busy, the Panel has developed 16 concrete proposals, 16 concrete recommendations for experimental pilot projects that ICANN could undertake over the next year, in order to test some of the new innovations and governance. And that was the promise that we made to the group when asked to do this. Is that we wouldn't simply put out a set of principles, or a set of vague ideas, but what we would actually try to do is to develop recommendations that are specific enough, that if the community so chooses it has the wherewithal to take forward the proposals and develop them further and more concretely, into something that is ready and capable of being implemented.

Again, we are only making recommendations but we want to make recommendations that are concrete and specific, and therefore of creative use. You'll find everything that we've done on the GovLab Blog as well as on the ICANN Project Page, the links for which are included in the slide deck. And we have our own Panel page, where you can review all of the 16 recommendations that we've put together.

We've been capably and ably supported in this effort, as you see on the next slide, by the research origination I Head, called the Governance Lab, whose goal it is, is to think about exactly how we can take new technologies to help us to govern better across the wide range of contacts and institutions, so we are able to bring, again, the expertise, and the case studies, and the know-how and the knowledge of how other people are innovating in the way that they govern, to the recommendations that we've put together for ICANN.

Keeping in mind though, and cognizant of the fact that we are outsiders very much to this process that we have been -- I was asked and honored with this role, very much in order to contribute this perspective on governance innovation more broadly, we wanted to get very smart, as smart as we could about the workings of ICANN in the time that we had.

So you'll see that we've put together, and we welcome you to read and to give us feedback on a primer -- two primers on ICANN that the team developed. I believe that Jill Raines and Anthony DeKlerk, who've worked with me tirelessly on this project, are on the line as well.

They've developed both these primers to help us ensure, in our conversations, that we understood the means and the mechanisms that we were talking about, that we understood the details of how ICANN works, in order that the recommendations that the Panel makes are as -- again, as specific and concrete as possible, as capable later of being implement by others.

We put out every week -- because we are trying to get smart about ICANN we read widely in the Internet Governance literature and we share what we read with others in a curated and annotated bibliography, that we call the GovLab SCAN. So SCAN stands for Selected Curation of Articles in Net Governance, and I'm pleased to report that you'll find on the GovLab website, the 17 suggestions of the SCAN, we put it out weekly and it's really a tremendous resource of readings around Internet Governance from around the globe.

In the next slide what we go into is the process by which the panel unfolded. We did all of our work in the open. We developed a three-stage process what we nicknamed The Brainstorm in a Box, where we ask people online to give us ideas for the kinds of recommendations we might make. Then we took each of those ideas and distilled them into the 16 buckets of proposals that you've seen, and we took each of those and blogged about them in more detail, in order to solicit further comment and input. In addition, during these two phases, we did interviews, we received comments from people. We talked to people in a multiplicity of ways to inform the work of the panel, and of course the panel collaborated and worked with each other, in order to develop the set of recommendations that we have put up online now, and which are capable of being annotated and edited using a collaborative annotation tool.

To summarize, the Panel has put out a set of recommendations that really fall into three categories, and you'll see the graphics of these three -- it gives you all the recommendations at a glance, but let me skip to the slide which says core principles.

What the Panel discussed is that a 21<sup>st</sup> Century organization, and the kinds of recommendations we want to make around what it means to have a 21<sup>st</sup> Century organization, is that institutions are - - to bring institutions really up-to-date, it needs to be effective in the way that it works. It needs to solve the problems that it's tasked with solving. At the same time it also has to do so legitimately, particularly institutions that operate in the public interest, it has to be inclusive of those people who are affected by its decision-making processes, have to be involved in those decision-making processes.

And at the same time recognizing how fast technology is changing, and how data and new data tools are giving us the ability to measure what we are doing in new ways, and institutions today have to be evolving. You have to use the information that's available to us to change how it works, to evolve how it works in order to do so better.

There are 16 proposals which arrange across three buckets, if you will, and they are summarized, if you go to the slide that says Effective on the top, if you scroll through the next two or three slides, what you'll see is the range of what these proposals are, essentially, summarizing briefs.

For example, to get smarter, to smarter, to get better information in, we proposed and made the recommendation that ICANN should experiment with the use of what are called expert networks. New platforms for getting expertise in from outside. At the same time, ICANN might consider embracing the principles and the practices of open data and open contracting, as many institutions are doing, by putting up their own data online, and inviting third parties to use it, to scrutinize their work, but also to develop new visualization, new models, new analysis, et cetera. And institutions also have to be agile, and collaborative drafting tools can allow ICANN, for example, to open itself to broad-based collaboration in new ways, working in between meetings across the distance to draft together.

There's a set of proposals again under Inclusive, and I mean -- just to sort of highlight some of them very quickly. Again, these are recommendations for experiments, and above all, recommendations to undertake pilot projects to try and see what works. So, one example is, are there new ways to actually tests some of the new crowd sourcing platforms to get in new ideas to get more people involved in decision-making.

Might we try moving from a system which is largely organized around stakeholder engagements to one in which there is more topic-based or working group engagements. Could we try using rotating term limits? Or experimenting with the term limits of members in different groups, in different context within ICANN, in order to see whether that helps to create greater legitimacy, and bring new voices and ideas into decision-making processes.

Under -- I'm going to go forward, in the interest of time, and point out under Legitimate that, again there are one or two ideas here. The ideal of establishing a citizen jury, a technique that has been pioneered elsewhere, which essentially uses the concept of the jury, that we all know, but creates random groups, or sometimes topical groups of citizens who, essentially, might sit in a term-limit fashion, in sort of performing an oversight function over a bureaucracy, or over a particular official, as a way of creating both accountability and legitimacy in a process, but also bringing in new voices.

And above all, let's go on to evolving. We want to emphasize this recommendation of the importance of being experimental, of the idea of learning from what we do, of using data to drive, of using new kinds of experiments in order to improve and test above, all, what works. So you can see there's more on the slide here in-depth on some of these particular proposals which, I've already touched on. The idea of topic-based decision-making, embracing evidence, which I've already discussed, and opened data which I've also mentioned. You can see some of the details here on the slide, but I invite you to go back to the links and to read each of the proposals.

There is a summary proposal -- excuse me -- a summary blog post which outlines all of the 16 proposals, and each one of them is detailed in about two to three pages. So they are readable, the recommendations are really readable.

So where do we go from here? Our goal is to view what we can to provide these recommendations, to inform the strategic plans, to communicate what we've worked on to the community, through dialogues like this, and in others, to capture the learnings from the Panel, and to share them with the wider public. And I would put a set of questions to you in closing, a set of questions that is part -- to wrap this process would be very helpful to us. If we want to understand, in order to make the most specific, and concrete and useful recommendations possible, which of these proposals do you think may work best in the ICANN context?

Which of those don't make sense and why? And how we might prioritize piling them with ICANN. In other words, we want to provide as much detail in the recommendations to help you decide which ones to take forward, and what we need a lot of help with, because has not allowed us to do so, is to really figure out how these recommendations apply in the context of ICANN.

So we welcome your feedback, and welcome the discussion, and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much.

Alice Jansen: Thank you very much, Beth. We will ask that the lines be unmuted for the Q&A. Operator, can you please unmute the lines?

Operator: Listen-only mode is now off.

Alice Jansen: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions or comments? Steve Crocker has his hand up. Steve?

Steve Crocker: Hi, there. Beth, really spectacular work. I'm very impressed and energized, which is separate, and maybe even more important attribute. You asked for prioritization, and how well these fit into the ICANN world. I'm turning that over in my mind and thinking that if I was going to go down a checklist of the 16 proposals, I would probably try to respond in two ways to each proposal. One is a degree of warmth as to how it will fit in, as you're asking for. And the other is, how will I

understand these -- some of these are crisper and clearer than others, and I'd be inclined to take a few of them and say, "Hmm. I don't understand that well enough to be able to react to it."

If you want to put out a template that has a way to respond quickly on those two dimensions, you may be able to get, certainly me, but others to respond to a survey, and then leave plenty of room for commentary, for course, because it's the anecdotal responses that are sometimes even more useful.

Beth Noveck: So, I think that's a -- if I may respond -- I think that's a fabulous idea, as a thing that we can do towards (inaudible) is to create some kind of heat map, or Likert scale, or something, to get people to respond across each variables, and then in turn to -- it might provoke some additional feedback and more detailed discussion either during the lifetime of the panel, or thereafter, but I think that's a great idea.

Steve Crocker: Yeah. And just to put one little detail in here. There are two tool-oriented things that I was turning over in mind and asking, "So are these significantly different, and if so, how?" One was the -- I've got to flip through here -- experts I think, and the other -- oh, shoot, I lost track of it -- but the form of my thought was that there were two of these that I was not entirely sure that they were -- how different or similar they might be. It's for networks and collaborative drafting. I was trying to understand what the mechanisms were underneath both of these. No need to answer, I was just sort of sharing what--

Beth Noveck: I will try -- well I'll give a -- I'm trying to monitor the queue and see whether -- but let me just use one line which is expert networks. If you think about some of the platforms, even like a LinkedIn that help us identify who knows what, and there are many neutral -- hundreds of them that are out there to actually pinpoint who has what kind of expertise, and make it possible to then invite folks to participate based on their specific qualifications or learning.

That expertise might be based on credentials, but it might also be based on what people's interests are, what people's talents are, or skills are if you thought about the type of people who are successful at answering questions in a Q&A platform -- a Q&A coding platform, or that's a different type of mechanism that's a collaborative drafting. The two would work very well together, where you could invite certain types of people -- target certain types of people to participate, not to the exclusion of others, but to try to target, people with specific kinds of technical knowhow, and then use the collaborative drafting tool to create something together. It's really just a technique in some sense. We are trying to market to some of the audiences you want to reach, who might have significant practical expertise.

Steve Crocker: Got it. Thank you.

Alice Jansen: Thank you. Next in the queue is Mike Nelson. Mike? You may be on mute, Mike? Okay. Mike, please try joining the Bridge. In the meantime, Elliott Noss? Elliott? Okay, we are also having trouble hearing Elliott. Elliott, please the Bridge. Vint (ph), is in the queue.

Vint Cerf: Sorry. I had to unmute. I have two comments. First of all, thanks very much, Beth, for an excellent presentation. Second, I wanted to endorse the idea of experimenting with different ways of coming to policy conclusions. The working group idea in analogy to IETF, is very attractive given the complexity of the existing stakeholders supporting organization structures for doing policy development but it's clear that you're just suggesting. We know what alternatives will work, and so experimenting with them, I think, is a very good idea.

And the third point, regarding shared documents, that you can co-edit, I can tell you that the Ecosystem Panel made very heavy use of the Google Docs which has that feature, and it allowed us, to very quickly, come to some conclusions. So we can recommend those as very useful practices. Thanks.

Beth Noveck: I think that's great. And just about last -- spoke to both of these points, you know, collaborative drafting can really help to improve workflow across the distance. Most of us use it in our domestic context, but I think the opportunity to look at how to use more at scale. We've been experimenting with document annotation as well, and we've found that very useful. It's different than the, you know, sort of working group idea of using new technologies to get the right people into a group, but there are new platforms to do either of those.

And again, I can't second enough the kind of concept of experimentation and really testing what works as the best way to -- you know, as a great way to try to -- again, see what new mechanisms are out there, because only if we understand what the new mechanisms are for working and doing and deciding, can we then think about the new institutional innovations.

We'd make more -- we do use more detail in the recommendations to describe the different context for decision-making, and that was the last point, Vint, to which you alluded. So the notion that what you might do in the context of what you're trying to do is brainstorm a lot of ideas, or just to figure out what topical solutions are, might be a different set of mechanisms than you're trying to hone in on choosing one proposal. Or even implementing. So there are stages of policy-making processes we know, and part of the recommendations we make have to do with what kind of techniques might apply when, and that's, you know, additional expertise that we might try to share as we join (inaudible/audio skip).

Michael Nelson: This is Mike Nelson. I'm really glad you're focusing on these issues because there's Nelson's law of listeners, which, the people with the least to say have the most time to say it. And so, finding ways to tap the wisdom of the ICANN Community without a few voices drowning everyone else out, or chasing away, is really important. But there's another really important issue that I have observed at ICANN, which is that by embracing Multistakeholder Model the way that we have done, and setting up these different committees that are supposed to separate, and represent each different interest group, we sometimes polarize the debate, and so we end up with advocates for different positions who take the strongest possible position whether it's on copyright, or law enforcement needs, or the concerns of the registrars.

Is there any thought on how to push consensus more effectively so that things can be -- compromises can be worked out earlier than they are today, and we can move more quickly without --? Often the Board, instead having to be the referee, because the different constituencies are all off in their corners taking the most extreme positions possible.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. I apologize. Time is up. Perhaps we can answer these questions in the chat. We need to move on to the next speaker.

Beth Noveck: Saved by the bell. Thank you. Thanks, Mike. I will -- I'll type in the chat a little bit, and we can also take this offline, or blog a little bit more about it.

Michael Nelson: Right. Thank you.

Beth Noveck: Bye.

(Long Pause)

Beth Noveck: (Inaudible)

Alice Jansen: Beth, I'm sorry for the interruption. This is, Alice, and just to clarify that we are having a problem with Paul's line. We are connecting back, and we'll be online shortly.

Paul Mockapetris: Hi. It's Paul here.

Alice Jansen: Hi, Paul. Thank you.

Paul Mockapetris: I don't see my slides up. Are they?

Alice Jansen: They are (inaudible) -- it's up here. Are you having trouble seeing your slides, or are they appearing now?

Paul Mockapetris: I'm seeing slide 22, Panel's questions.

Alice Jansen: Okay. Let me reload the presentation for you.

Paul Mockapetris: I have the actual deck, so I could kind of do this, by (inaudible) reckoning, if you'd like, if the other people are seeing the slides.

Alice Jansen: Yes. Please do.

Paul Mockapetris: Okay. I think I've gotten slide number one up now.

Alice Jansen: Okay. Here we go. Paul, do you have everything to start?

Paul Mockapetris: I can start, but my display is still showing me only slide number one. I don't know what other people are seeing. Ah, here we go.

Alice Jansen: Okay. Perfect.

Paul Mockapetris: Yeah. Fine. Hi. Welcome. I'm Paul Mockapetris, and I'm going to speak to you about the Identifier Technology Innovation Panel. That title was purposely picked, because we wanted it to be broader than just DNS issues. Due to some schedule compression, we didn't spend as much time in the other parts of the identifier space as we would have liked, but we still managed to spend some time there.

Next slide, please. The people involved are shown here, from A to Z, from RE to (inaudible). RE is, for example, the IETF Chair; and, Rita (ph) is for example, a Professor at UCLA. We all participated as individuals rather than using our titles, and hence the titles aren't shown here. So I think it was a very good cross-section of people. Both from the standpoint of people with practice, overviews, and the research community. I know I never felt that I was the smartest person in the room when those guys were around.

Next, please. One of the things to do is, say, consider sort of the future of the identifiers we have, and in particular DNS, and I think one of the things we were very conscious of, is that the race doesn't necessarily go to the most elegant or the most standardized or whatever. So that it's a very, kind of, Darwinesque struggle, and if you take a look at the DNS, there's factors that will tend to expand, and factors that will tend to contract.

Oh, that's nice and bigger now.

You know, on the expansion side we have organic growth, and we are the Legacy system, and every computing device on the Internet understands the DNS, so that's a pretty powerful set of advantages. We know the new TLDs are certainly going to be out there and marketing new ideas, and I'm sure there will be some innovation despite what the new skeptics say. One of the ways to get expansion, I think, would be new capabilities or new data in that DNS. At the recent IETF Meeting, one of the things that became apparent is there's a lot people we are trying to add to this space. The Dot online people, the Dot local people. There's a lot of you using Dot local, whether you know it or not, because you're on a Macintosh.

There's this question about the relationship with other systems, and what exactly is the domain names, that's been debated quite a bit as last week's IETF. On the side of the ledger, it's certainly

the case that the global world is where a lot of the growth is at, and people are going to be using general English language queries, or speech or whatever. And at the user interface, you are there, and a bunch of things that makes typing domain names are not so convenient.

Another big concern we have, is that there's a lot of people who feel that there's protocol and process, ostentations in other words. It's impossible to innovate in the DNS protocol because there's so much legacy out there. The legacy is both on the expansion and contraction sides of the equation here. There's commercial identifiers with regard -- that's your Facebook ID or your Google ID or whatever, those people want their identifiers to be successful. And lastly, there's a bunch of new systems from the research world, and we'll talk a little bit more about those.

Next slide, please. You know, in the research world today names are very hot, they are very popular. Name-based, networking, content-based, networking, information-based networking. There's usually a dozen different variants on the same idea. The only thing they seem to not be able to agree on is the name for their field. The common themes there though are access by name. It's sort of one step beyond the ID locator split kind of arguments that have been made for a long time in the IP world, and it just says, you name you content, and you look for the substrate find it.

Opportunistic caching will improve the performance. The common ingredients there are self-certifying or flat names, public key infrastructures, et cetera, so one of the questions is whether or not we can either accelerate the DNS upgrade, in other words, take some of these ideas from the research world, and add it to the current DNS. Or dare I say it, figure out how to accelerate the transition to a newer system, because the DNS won't live forever.

Next slide, please. So I think the roadmap question for ICANN, is to form a roadmap for what we see in the DNS. I think that, you know, the present limitations are a bunch of operational and protocol at process names. One of the examples of this is there's a DNS Ops (ph) Working Group in the IETF, who does, what I would regard as protocol work, but they call it mechanisms, because they are allowed to do mechanisms and not protocols, to avoid the process. Interestingly enough there's probably half-a-dozen or 10, IETF working groups that are adding facilities to the DNS, or mechanisms, perhaps, but the DNS extensions working group, per se, is closed -- You'll have to excuse me I have a bit of a cold.

So one of the questions is, are there particular aspects of it, that ICANN should try and preserve and enhance the DNS aspect? That's one of its big missions in life, how to try to disperse and detoxification.

Next slide, please. One of the ideas that we explored was hardening the root. I think that there's two major opportunities there. One is the generation of the Root Zone itself. Some people suggested that we should look at more secured components. We talked about that a little bit, but that seems to be mostly a small part of the problem that might be in some of the components. A larger problem would be to kind of globalize control of the Root Zone, and we came up with a concept that I call shared Zone Control, that we'll talk in the next slide. But it's a basically a technical way to share control that the policy-makers could configure however they want.

I just want to repeat that one more time. We are not trying to tell you what rules you should be using, but we are telling you that we think that there's a number of technical ways to distribute control that would then make life a whole lot easier.

The second part of this is distributing the Root Zone itself, and the basic idea here is that we should be distributing copy into the Root Zone to anybody that wants them, rather than relying on the root servers. This takes away a hard target for the people like Anonymous, who will want to try and attack the root servers with DDoS attacks, or like attack the routing system or whatever. The basic rule is, if you have you copy as a root, then the fact that you can't access root servers or ICANN, or whatever, it doesn't matter because you have what you need. And there was on



concrete proposal for that included in the Panel Report, and there's a bunch of other ideas particularly from those research systems that I think would enable us to go that.

Next, please.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

Paul Mockapetris: The basic idea behind Shared Zone Control is, could we imagine the workflow language that allows multiple parties different rights for the same zone? This could be the root, but it doesn't have to be. For the root, we can make it possible to split control, and implement change in the distributor or algorithm, and avoid the whole thing of authority issue. So this is, for example, you see this idea out there, in Netcoin (ph), and other Byzantine consensus algorithms. You could have an algorithm out there that has that aspect of voting, and an aspect of workflow, and you just decide how you want to coordinate the various parts of a particular DNS zone.

Beyond the root, it's good for example, coordinate the glue. In other words, the parent versus child synchronization, the forward versus reverse address synchronization. Or the DNS of that (inaudible) stuff. We have some limited history there. For example, the DNS ops people are working on synchronizing parent-child DNS keys, and there's been suggestions for (inaudible) voting and so forth. We are just saying if we had a general facility we could use it for many things including sharing the Root Zone Control.

Next slide, please. Rethinking the DNS fundamentals, one of the arguments that people make is that there's all of these -- all sets of (inaudible) mask to -- we have to deal with in order to move the DNS forward. There's the database structure. There's query in other operations. We explored all of these. One of the things that I think we agreed on, was that it would be nice if we had a consistent effort to try and think about whether or not there's a way to move the whole architecture forward. I think that part people -- part of the panel thought that that was very important, so that we could actually do it. And another part of the panel frankly thought that history had suggested that this is a very difficult task, and it's time to try it one time, and either give up on it, or move on.

Well the big question here, I think, is how to make the effort worth doing? There has to be a reward concomitant with any expansion of the technology. For example, going back to the issue of hardening the root, or distributing control of the root. Those are objectives we think are worthwhile, and hence the technology expansion could be justified there.

Next slide, please. So, the overall recommendations, very focused, and we would like to see ICANN publish more database or reserved labels, et cetera, perhaps through the DNS. Today, for example, the reserve labels come in multiple languages, and there's references to -- basically PDFs or paper documents, where people who are actually implementing the codes to do these reservations, have to be able to transcribe multiple languages into their code. There should be just a conical version that's available online.

The same thing could hold mnemonics, for ASNs, or whatever. The study to define a decision, in other words, there's this overall question about, is there a way to facilitate a breakthrough and we should do that. We think that it's time to think about prototyping the open root publication or in the shared zone control, those are two sort of specifics ball exercises.

And lastly, although I didn't talk about it here, we are aware of the collision concerns that people have, and we think that the suggested remedies that are out there, we should do some exercises to actually try and apply them in certain environments, just to gain more confidence in their efficacy.

So, I think that's all the slides. We should go to Q&A now.

Alice Jansen: Thank you, Paul. We'll unmute the lines for Q&A. Do we have any questions or comments? I see Vint has his hand up. Vint?

- Marilyn Cade: I'm not sure -- it's Marilyn -- I'm not sure -- Can I get in the queue?
- Paul Mockapetris: I think you are at the head of the line.
- Alice Jansen: Vint was first in the queue.
- Vint Cerf: Yes. Thank you.
- Alice Jansen: Vint in the queue, then Marilyn.
- Vint Cerf: All right. It's Vint Cerf. Thanks very much, Paul. A couple of observations. The first one of course is that it's possible to develop any number of different ways to finding identifiers to IP addresses, this doesn't have to be DNS. And so I welcome the idea that we might explore other alternatives. There has already been some discussions about making it harder for the ccTLD to be modified without double confirmation from both ICANN and the ccTLD operators, in order to avoid some of the concerns that people have had, with regard to arbitration as made by the ICANN DNS management process.
- So, I just wanted to mention those two things as interesting possibilities. I appreciate very much the work that you do on Panel.
- Paul Mockapetris: Thanks, Vint. That's very nice. Yeah. One of the things that was pointed out to me by people, is that there is some U.N. rule that countries should be able to change their ccTLD data unilaterally. And I think it's a good example here, because one of -- we talked about (inaudible) voting if we have -- if N is 1, then that means that unless a country votes against its own proposal it's going to go forward. So, I just want to emphasize again, that we did not suggest any particular policies out there. There are several people who felt that they were already very strong policies there, and we were just going to implement whatever you wanted in a more efficient way. Thanks.
- Alice Jansen: Thank you very much. Davey (ph)? Davey you need to be on mute? Davey, we cannot hear you, please make sure to join the Bridge. Marilyn in the meantime. Marilyn?
- Marilyn Cade: I'd be happy to make my comment. I will just say, I think we need to be a little respectful of different roles in these conversations, and so, since I represent the Business Community, I'd like to make that clear, that I'm speaking as a Business Community representative. I think I've see a lot of comments without a clear definition of who players are, and I think we need to be -- we need to be careful about that. And when we speak in an individual capacity, let's make that clear.
- So I'm speaking as a Business Representative, and I've got a real concern about -- what I really want to appreciate comments that have been made, and submissions that have been made, and to ask -- we are, as business users, we have a number of very sophisticated players, but we also have a number of business users, and I think we'll be providing comments as the (inaudible) on all of the Strategy Panels. This one is particularly interesting to us that most of the businesses that build and operate the Internet are actually operating there, because of servers. They are operating a number of other parts of the Internet.
- And I mostly wanted to say how much I appreciated the briefing, but to say, we need to bring your voice more clearly into the TSP, and I'll be -- the commercial stakeholder agreement -- Commercial Stakeholder Group, and I'll be sending an invitation to you to come and speak to us while we are in Singapore, because I think it's kind of ignored right now that most of the people who run and operate and build the Internet are aware of the this particular Strategy Panel. Thank you.
- Paul Mockapetris: Well, I thank you.

Alice Jansen: Davey has this question in the Adobe Connect chat pod. His question is, "How ICANN is expected to do in its five year span, and technical aspects, especially for IPv6, just cooperating with IETF to set up Technical Working Group in ICANN itself? How technical group can join such discussion of ICANN on how to do contribution?" The comment is available in the chat box.

Paul Mockapetris: Yeah. I mean I think that -- let me give you one example. The IETF just recently wrote an RFC that sort of recognized that Dot Local should be a TLD, that there might be other technical TLDs that they would allocate in the future, or the reserve. And this came on the heels of previously -- you know, the example top level domain. And meanwhile, the ICANN is -- ICANN is doing its own allocation to top-level domains, and people were going, "Oh, my, goodness, aren't these gears going to clash." I don't think it necessarily is the case. I think we need to work together, and in this particular case I think -- you know, this is the Internet Governance style of things so I'm not really the expert, but I'll observe that there were a lot of people on both sides that thought that they either -- the IETF reserve -- thought these would clash with the ICANN reservation of the TLDs.

Then in reality, if we work it all together, and address both the technical concerns and the political concerns, I don't think it has to be a problem. Certainly, if we were going to do a strategy to try and do a more architectural approach to ICANN, between ICANN and the IETF to try and architect a vision for DNS. You know, you'd have to have, I think, both sides involved, because ICANN has a certain set of expertise for collecting information, and so does the IETF.

It's not an accident that I had the Chairman of the IETF on my panel, and we were both trying to work on this issue. So I think the answer is, moving forward is, I think both bodies have things to contribute, and in some cases they don't overlap, and the best way forward would be to have a joint effort of some sort. And I don't mean to exclude anyone else. Just merely to say that, if we are going to follow the Panel's recommendations to do that study those two parties, at least, would be concluded.

With regard to IPv6, we didn't really discuss that that much, because one of the things we try to do in the Panel was to avoid revising issues where there's an awful lot of ongoing work, and we would probably just be duplicating other stuff. Maybe that was right, and maybe that was wrong, but that's what we did.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, everyone. We are going to move on to the next speaker.

Alice Jansen: Thank you, Grace. Next speaker is Nii Quaynor.

Nii Quaynor: Yeah. I'm here to speak on the Panel. The Strategy Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. The Panel that comprise myself and six others, but we happen to come from very diverse backgrounds. At least five different regions, and we are very multilingual and (inaudible) the industry, governance and developments represented. So, I'm looking forward to getting some inputs from you on this work. The document itself has formed in part, so there's a framework in some definitions part, and there's a part on ICANN's current public responsibility work at the department level, and also there's the engagement strategy function. The third is the ICANN's initial public responsive framework areas, of focus that we recommend them in our recommendation.

In the draft (inaudible) used for discussion, we are looking at the timing and the public interest, vis-à-vis ICANN -- things that are common, and detailing the target areas, and augment it, for ICANN's public responsibility approach. Also detailing how ICANN can promote the global public interest in relation to its mission, and core bodies, but building out of these as a diverse (inaudible) and engage ICANN's stakeholders, as well as advising on the operational activities and finding approaches to ICANN's public responsibility programming outreach.

In the definitions area, as an independent global organization, ICANN is one of the originations charged with responsibility on increasing important (inaudible) by resources of the Internet. As

one of the cores of this resource, ICANN recognizes it has a responsibility to protect and promote the global public interest both throughout this work, in collaboration with other entities.

ICANN's public responsibility permits all areas of its work at the core of (inaudible/audio skip). ICANN defines the global public interest in relation to the Internet as ensuring the Internet becomes and (inaudible) between table, inclusive, and accessible across the globe, so that all the (inaudible) Internet is of a single and open discussion.

In addressing its public responsibility, ICANN must build trust with the Internet, and governance - and each governance ecosystem. (Inaudible) essential to ICANN's public responsibility framework. However, there's need to define particular areas of focus, and target package, region and stakeholders that need to be addressed in relation to ICANN's responsibility to serve the global public.

This framework document further defines these focus areas, and prioritizes for ICANN mixed (inaudible) region to ensure better Internet openness and accessibility.

Alice Jansen: Nii. I'm very sorry to interrupt you, but it seems that some participants are having trouble hearing you. Could you please speak up.

Nii Quaynor: Okay.

Alice Jansen: Thank you very much, Nii.

Nii Quaynor: I'm now looking at current activities, this next slide. The current activities at the departmental level, include external projects that are carried out by ICANN in the Internet ecosystem through various departments and regional strategies. There's public responsibility as capacity building, there's funding and partnerships. There's public responsibility as communication awareness and engagement. There's public responsibility as education.

Next? So in current activities. Within the four focal areas of ICANN, there are regional strategies. The four focal areas are core operations, including Internet mailing and addressing concerns, ensuring adequate levels of stability, security and resiliency of the DNS. Competition, consumer trust and consumer choices. And help with Internet ecosystem.

The regional strategy is building out of each four focal points, and this is for the Middle East, Latin America and Caribbean and Africa. I'm sure soon, Asia. The common themes within there are capacity building, funding and partnerships, communication, awareness and engagement and education.

Next, please. The proposed initial focus areas are as follows. Having reviewed the current work ICANN carries out in support of this public responsibility, it is recommended that the public responsibility framework takes focus on four initial key areas to further understanding ICANN's commitment to the global public interest. In (inaudible) consist of projects carried out by ICANN independently with, in fact, international, inter-governmental organizations, or in partnerships with other foundations. The four areas in mind, are education, globalization and inclusion, next-generation projects, and conclusive Internet Governance Ecosystem.

Next. Education. The strategic objective, ICANN should address its public responsibility through programs and projects that work, one, are effectively communicate ICANN's role and mandate through awareness raising, and educational efforts. To increase accessibility to ICANN's work through technical education and capacity building, workshops, and initiatives, both online such as the (inaudible) and offline, locally. Then three, engagement with academia, research facilities, and educational institutions.

Next, please. Localization and inclusion. The strategic objective is, ICANN should continue to force to make information about the organization and its work accessible to those who speak languages other than English, in ways that enhanced participation in, and the effectiveness of the Multistakeholder Model. This allows stakeholders to understand and participate in ICANN's activities, as well fulfilling ICANN's public responsibility to communicate its work effectively in an inclusive and accessible manner. This also is important to ICANN's commitment to delivering all documents in plain English, to ensure accessibility and enhance speed in translation.

ICANN should also explore how it can better serve the internationalization of the Web through encouragement and promoting the accessibility of languages, scripts other than English, and the Latin (ph) off of it.

Next, please. Next-generation; the strategic objective is to raise awareness and encourage participation of the next generation regime and offer opportunities to get involved in ICANN's contribution, and raise awareness and offer opportunities to get in ICANN's activities, and raise awareness about improved Internet Governance, supporting participation where applicable. ICANN should also engage with capacity building and training within this (inaudible).

Nest, please. Inclusive Internet Governance Ecosystem. The strategic objective is ICANN should interact with governments from developing and underdeveloped countries -- or underdeveloped countries to build trust and encourage participation with the ICANN model in back. ICANN should also encourage and guide the evolution of the private sector and civil society plays in these countries, and work in collaboration with their governments on national Internet Governance challenges. Recognizing that not all Internet Governance issues may be solved using a global approach.

ICANN should seek out collaborations with other institutions and organizations that seek to ensure the stability of an open and single Internet, and bridge the cost on ensuring the Internet increases to use global accessibility.

Now on recommendation. What are our recommendations? Strengthening current regional engagements strategies, commission research to enhance the understanding of the links between Internet Governance and development. Continue to both strengthen existing platforms in the Internet Governance ecosystem, and promote global collaboration with a wide variety of organizations that ensures the Internet remains stable and accessible. Support the internationalization of the leg for increasing global accessibility and promoting local (inaudible).

Next, please. Strategic recommendation. Explore establishing an external foundation that can operate in the philanthropic space and send out work to fulfill accounts responsibility and obligations in relation to its mission, recognizing that less than 40% of the world's population is connected to the Internet, and the important link between the Internet and development, especially on economic growth, ICANN should link the Internet policymaking to development, particularly since developing and emerging countries and regions. Streamline all public responsibility that was currently undertaking internally.

Structural recommendation. ICANN should establish the public responsibility department as to guiding ICANN's approach to fulfilling its responsibility obligations with an operational plan ready by mid 2014. A department should review and where appropriate formalize the approaches, programming and projects serving the public interest and are taken throughout ICANN's department.

Seek out partnership in the Internet ecosystem that will strengthen and support ICANN's work in serving the global public interest. Create specific public responsibility programs which falls within the scope of the four focus areas outlined in this framework. Continually remove -- review how best ICANN can engage and communicate with the public in relation to serving the public interest. Entail restructuring recommendations, their department operational plans should include a clear

and concise vision -- mission and mandate for the new public responsibility department developed in consultation with all relevant ICANN departments.

A five-year timeline including organizational structure key objectives, targets, milestones and benchmarks, indicators of success (ph). This should also include the text and information that would lead to the information of action plan and knowledge, action plans and targets for the four focus areas. A detailed work plan for the first year of the department's operations including outcomes and outputs, key activities and inputs, as well projects and human resource allocations. (Inaudible) pilot programs, best practice research indicators and monitoring mechanisms for the new department should also be identified and developed.

Conducting and collating research on best practices for partnerships in collaboration. Outlining criteria for establishing and strengthening partnerships including funding information. This should result in a well-founded criteria for the Department moving forward. Thank you.

Alice Jansen: Thank you, Nii. We are now open for questions.

Alice Jansen: Vint Cerf has his hand raised in the Adobe Connect room. Vint?

Vint Cerf: Thank you. Thank you very much, Nii. I think that you've put together -- your team has put together quite an agenda of work for ICANN, if we can actually see five years ahead, I will be pretty excited. One thing I would like to observe is that many of the things that Beth suggested strike me as contributing to some of the objectives that your team recommended, and so I hope that the two Panels in their recommendations can be absorbed by the rest of the community and shaped into a set of actions that ICANN can pursue. So thank you, again, and your team for providing this input.

Alice Jansen: Thank you, Vint. Do we have further comments or questions? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: It's quite confusing. Can we figure out who could be in the queue and can't be? Is that helpful?

Alice Jansen: Marilyn, you have to use the--

Marilyn Cade: I understand I'm in the queue, but I see a lot of participants, so I'll speak but I want you to be able to -- there's a lot of other people saying they want to speak. And I'll make my comments and then you can organize the rest of the queue.

I'm an Officer in the Business Constituency, and I will make my comment as an individual speaker. I really welcome the opportunity to hear from the panels that were created by the CEO and are now coming forward to the community, all of these panels are actually not fully aligned with work that is going on in the community, and I'd like to make that point and then we could come back to how the panels might be aligned with the rest of the work of the community. My comment is I see there's an effort to bring input into the Singapore Meeting, recognizing that our face-to-face meetings at ICANN are limited in participation.

It's really a priority to ensure that all meetings are taking into account those of us who can come to a face-to-face meeting will do so. That we cannot consider any discussions in a face-to-face meeting definitive, and we need to have the opportunity to take into account our concern from our communities that are not travelling. And so I wanted to hear what the timeline ideas are. And secondly, I would just like to say these four panels are magical, mystical workshops -- sorry -- magical, mystical events are -- these reports are very, very helpful, but we need to understand our community has to have full time to address those reports. Thank you.

Nii Quaynor: I guess what I can say is that, kind of like before, but you'd like to get more input from the community, and we are very open to receive them from many of the different ways the community

interacts, but our face-to-face, we will also do our best to receive some of the (inaudible). I think that's all I can say for now.

Alice Jansen: Thank you, Nii. We have a comment from Alison Gillwald, and it says, "I think this complements the Multistakeholder Panel very well."

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, could you please repeat that, I didn't hear you.

Alice Jansen: Alison Gillwald's commented on how that, she thinks this complements the Multistakeholder Panel very well.

Nii Quaynor: Thank you.

Alice Jansen: Would anyone else like to intervene. And Pindar if you wish to comment? Okay, thank you, Pindar. If there are no further comments or questions, Nii, would you have some closing remarks?

Nii Quaynor: Sure. It's just I'm looking for more input so that we can make further representative as the communities desire, and (inaudible). It does depend on that.

(Background Echo)

Alice Jansen: Okay. Thank you. If there are no further comments or questions I think we can move on to the next agenda item, which is ICANN's role in Internet Governance Ecosystem. Vint?

Vint Cert: Yes. Thank you very much. Am I audible?

Alice Jansen: Absolutely.

Vint Cert: Okay. Thank you, so much. Could we go now to the next slide, please? First of all, I just wanted to remind everyone that we continue to make use of the layered model of the Internet, and try to use that as a way of understanding the roles and responsibilities of the various parts of the Internet ecosystem. Much of what ICANN does is down in the technical layer which is, we consider it a component of both logical and infrastructure layer. Where Internet naming and numbering take place. But if in truth, the value of the Internet comes from the way it uses (inaudible) found in the content layer and above that social layer. Another thing I would observe about this model is that it helps us focus some attention on what kinds of mechanisms might be needed for governance, concerning activities taking place in the content and social layer, as well as the technical ones.

We'll come back at the question momentarily, when we get to the rest of the slides. So keep in mind that the layered model is still informing much of our thinking. Could we go on to the next slide?

Internet Governance has been the subject of a lot of debates, and I hope all of you can see this definition which we adopted as a working definition which we adapted as a working definition from the world summit from the information society. And as you can see, the private sector, the civil society and governments in their respective roles, have responsibility for the shared principles, norms, rules and position-enabling procedures that shape the evolution and use of the Internet, and that's the general notion of governance here.

Please go on to the next slide. Could we go on to the -- Yes, thank you. So, this picture is not intended to be literally regarded in any particular way, it's simply intended -- Yes, somebody there -- this Vint Cert, I am speaking about the Multistakeholder Panel. The picture you see now, Figure number five is -- I'm hearing a lot of echo and it's I suggest somebody may have a speaker still turned on in the Adobe Connect. But I'll continue anyway.

The picture you see is simply representative of a Web of relationships among many of the players in the Internet ecosystem. Please don't read anything specific into any of the particular parties listed or the (inaudible) to connect them, it's simply to give you a mental view that many, many of the participants in the Internet ecosystem have various their interests on the relationships with each other, and we took this to be an opportunity to try to make more transparent and visible those relationships.

So if we could go on to the next slide. The thing that the panel uniformly agreed right upfront, is its stewardship if a very, very important part of the ecosystem's nature, and that, for us anyway, it meant caring more for good management use and evolution, and shared resources than for any individual stake in them. And this is our (inaudible) a distillations (ph) of the belief that the Internet is a value, because all of us participate in it, and support it and try to keep it running in an open and transparent and useful way. And that should inform all of the choices that we make in terms of Internet Governance.

If we could to the next slide, please? Here, we started to explore various kinds of models for governance and some concepts associated with them. We all strongly agreed on the panels that the Multistakeholder Model was by far the most preferable choice for Internet Governance, and here we assume that meant that the effective parties, by any policy decisions participate in the policy development itself. And so the policy development is informed by those who are affected. Stewardship, again, a major and important component of what we consider to be good governance models.

Globalization is important to us, especially because we were hoping the people would recognize that internationalization usually leads to intergovernmental models. Globalization on the other hand, takes into account the Internet is itself a non-national, and rather a transnational kind of structure, and of course it leads to all kinds of interesting side effects, because it doesn't follow the typical Westphalian Models, which we think is now no longer applicable in the Internet space. Or at least less applicable. Layering continues to be and do inform our thinking about governance models, the web of relationships, again, is a key element of all this.

And finally, I'd like to say that we seized upon the Affirmation of Commitment which is the evolution of the relationship between ICANN and the U.S. Government, as a very powerful tool for eliminating the nature of relationships among parties in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. And accountability needs to go along with that, since the affirmation of mutual commitment by the parties, who are part of this ecosystem. So those two form an important pair. We don't want to have parties agreeing to commitments that they make to each other without having some mechanisms for assuring accountability that both parties meet their obligations.

Next slide. We identified a set of principles or what we thought was good governance and we broke them down into five RAA Studies, and two of them you see here, reciprocity and respect. In the case of reciprocity we are very quick to borrow John Parcell's notions, "Please don't do any harm onto anyone in the course of trying to carry out Internet Governance, and keeping -- take into account that whatever you do may come back to reflect on you based on what others perceive your governance use to be." And so we want this to be a mutually harmless and nonthreatening environment.

Second, respect is a very important part of governance. We believe that we should own the freedom of choice, and diversity. We should focus on inclusions, and cooperation and collaboration, all of which have contributed to the Internet's evolution over the past 40 years.

Next slide. The next are in the series' robustness, and ensure that everyone will appreciate that the Internet is nothing if it can't be relied upon to be functioning, and robustly. And so, again, Parcell's model says, "Be conservative in what you say, and liberal in what you accept." He was speaking about protocols, and the idea there to be as careful about what you're sending, but be thoughtful about receiving.



Steve Crocker correctly points out that this may not be the best idea in the case of security where you want to be pretty careful about what you both send and receive. The system needs to be technically rational, you can't have a governing system that insists on things that we don't know how to implement. We are very attracted by the idea of loose coupling (ph), which simply means that the system is not so rigid that any change or stress in it breaks it. What we want is a system which is capable of evolution, and capable of adapting to new technologies and to new applications and new requirements, and loose coupling is a shorthand way of saying that.

Similarly, evolvability (ph) and business excellence is essential to ICANN's role in the operation of the Internet, if it doesn't perform its job well, then other parts of the system will suffer.

Simplicity and scaling are, I hope, also obvious, is anything you can do to avoid complexity should make things work more reliably, and finally whatever the designs of the Internet are, and whatever we do with Internet Governance is going to have to scale, because the Internet isn't over yet, its world continues.

Next slide. The last two Rs, in our five Rs, are reasonableness and reality. We believe that Internet Governance has to avoid capricious and arbitrary actions, and in order to achieve that objective, we think that transparency and accountability are essential. Two of the things that have been very important in our discussions, there's subsidiarity (ph) and fairness. With regard to subsidiarity, we believe that if there is a problem you should try to solve it as close to the origin of the problem as you can. And that's a very attractive way of trying to localize governance issues, and resolve them without allowing them to expand unnecessarily in fairness. I hope it's obvious.

With regard to reality, we believe that if you have theories about governance you need to test them, and you evaluate how well they work in practice, and I think you've heard those themes from others who made presentations before me. We think that form follows function and not the other way around, and so if we have functions we need to perform, and we should shape the Internet Governance system in accordance with what those needs are, and plainly, effectiveness is everything here. And finally, we should learn some history, because we've made mistakes in the past, and we surely do not need to make them again.

Next slide. So ICANN, in this ecosystem has three specific coordinating roles, all of which I'm sure everyone on this call is familiar with. One of them has to do with the avocation and assignments as unique identifiers for the Internet, and it carries out this function on behalf of the Internet. And the Internet engineer -- and engineering. Creation and evolution of the DNS root name server system, and it coordinates policy development by means of the current supporting organizations, and various committee structures that already exist.

Next slide. Here, you see just a kind of graphic to show different kinds of relationships that we thought ICANN exhibits. The stewardship function is very tightly coupled to entities that are very much part of ICANN's daily operations. The RIRs the GAC, the supporting organizations, the advisory committees, the registries and the registrars -- I misspoke the RIRs are around in the coordination side, because they are outside of the specific ambits of ICANN's structures that were created within the ICANN organization. The coordination part, of course, matches a lot of activities that ICANN contributes to, but which is further executed by others, that are a part of the Internet environment.

And then finally, ICANN participates in broader interactions with national and international organizations. For example, its cooperation with World Intellectual Property Organization in order to created mechanisms for dispute resolutions.

Next slide. This picture was intended to characterize ICANN's specific relationships to many different organizations. Well, we recognize that the layered structure isn't perfect, it helps us focus intention on what those organizations might be most interested in, and you see many of them

familiar to all of you in a technical layer, but the content and social layer has become equally if not more important in the Internet Governance space and therefore ICANN has much (inaudible) with those as well. We could draw pictures like this for other organizations, but we only chose ICANN because our Committee was focused on ICANN's role, in this ecosystem.

Next slide. This is a reminder that there's a specific interaction between the Department of Commerce, and TIA, and ICANN, and Verisign for the production and distribution of the domain name system, and one of our recommendations is that we examine, again, this whole process to figure out if we can't make it considerably more efficient and more secure.

Next slide. Again, a reminder that this notion of web of relationships is very important and we got very excited about the possibilities that for any particular pair, or possibly groups of entities, we might actually describe what the commitments are that the two or three or multiple entities make to each other. And to also have them agree on an accountability mechanism. So we should document these relationships and make them more transparent, and we think that would certainly give priority to the way in which the Internet Governance system actually functions.

Next slide. So here, are specific recommendations for a roadmap. First, is to continue to globalize ICANN's operations. As you know already, ICANN has set up facilities in Istanbul and in Singapore, and in the United States. Second, we think it's timely to reexamine Root Zone managements, and to look at better ways of functioning to make it more efficient and more secure. And finally we strongly recommend that we begin documenting a web of Affirmations of Commitments among parties that are part of the existing Internet Governance system.

And where they don't have accountability mechanisms we recommend that those be considered, and that we also recommend that there be an extension of the Affirmation of Commitments that presently exists between the United States Government and ICANN, to create a common text that could be agreed by governments in addition to the U.S. Government, so that any government that's interested in having a formalized relationship with ICANN could agree on this common text Affirmation of Commitments, and we think that with regard to the nongovernmental organization, that's similar affirmations that mutual commitment could be made, but they would have to be tailored to the functions that ICANN and the selected party actually performs.

So we believe those three things are positive steps in the direction of improving the operations of ICANN in the governance context. I think that's the last slide. So we are ready for Q&A.

Alice Jansen: Thank you very much, Vint. Do we have questions or comments?

Vint Cerf: I want to respond to JP who says the relationships were complex, and he's right, it does look like a complex map, and any particular pair of relationships can actually be quite straightforward, a simple affirmation of mutual commitment between the parties, a statement of what the accountability mechanism is for this, in the event that the two parties, and one of the two parties believes that the other isn't meeting its obligations. And so looked on a pair-wise basis, it doesn't have to be complex, it just looks complex when you put all of them onto the same chart.

Alice Jansen: Thank you. We have from Amrita, in the queue. Amrita? I see Amrita has posted a question in the Adobe Connect room. Let's go with Renate's question. "What does globalization of the IANA functions translate into?"

Vint Cerf: So in this case, two things. The first one is a continued distribution of responsibility among the three locations of ICANN. Second, it is finding a way to establish this Affirmation of Commitments on the governance (inaudible). A common text for pair-wise, a common text for all governance used -- that wish to agree to, is another element in globalization. And the third one is establishing documented relationships among all of the various parties that have to do with ICANN in particular, many of which are not in the United States but are elsewhere.

And so I -- if it's all right with you, I'd like to respond to the questions that I can see on the list. Is that okay?

Alice Jansen:

Yes. Absolutely.

Vint Cerf:

Okay. I see Fatima that, "What do you think the good governance principles--" do I think they are applicable to the NETmundial meetings?

I certainly hope so. I don't know whether we will ever end up with exactly one set of principles, but I do hope that out of NETmundial we will see which of the principles appear to be commonly appreciated by the people who are participating in that meeting. Ultimately, all of these principles have to be turned into something we can actually implement. And for my Panel anyway, I think we thought one way to do that, was to establish these common Affirmations of Commitments that are essentially based on the principles that we all agree are essential for ICANN operation.

Let's see. Amrita says, "How can the Multistakeholder Model take care of issues related to governance, such as cyber crime issues where multiple countries get affected?"

A very good question, and I think there are two ways to go about this. I see now they already exist some 3D- like arrangements, like Interpol, in which multiple governments agree to cooperate with each other. I think we can also imagine some pair wise interactions along those same lines. It's very important as your question implies that the terms that take place in the Internet may originate in one country, and have victims in other countries, and so they has to be some way of dealing with that. And that suggests that there have to be Affirmations of Commitments and agreement with regard to law enforcements that are transnational in their character.

There's a question from Sunish Gupta (ph) who said, "How can Africa benefit from all this, when the IFC is located abroad?"

My honest reaction to this, is let's get more IFCs in Africa. That's one point. And second, if it turns out that you have relationships between IFCs that are not in the same country or continent, there is nothing stopping IFCs who are interconnected from establishing an affirmation of mutual commitment to each other, and an accountability mechanism. And so I'd actually encourage an attempt to make such -- to define such commitments to see if we can make them work.

Marilyn says, "NETmundial shouldn't be a singular event."

And I agree with that, since it isn't, as should be clear to everybody. There are a whole series of meetings related to Internet Governance with are taking place, this being one of them. Others will take place in South America, and additional Panel meetings will take place, the High-Level Panel which met a couple of weeks ago in California, will meet again in Dubai and possibly another time as well. Then comes the IGFs, and then comes the (inaudible). So there is still much more work being done, and all of the suggestions that are being produced I think are helpful in showing us the kaleidoscopic view that we all have to sort out in order to make for a workable Internet Governance environment.

Rinalia asks the question, "Would these changes result in the removal of USG authorization?"

I don't know for sure that that is what will happen, but it is something very much worth contemplating since that unique position of the U.S. Government is inconsistent with the idea that most stakeholders should have any special or unique authority over any other.

I'm not seeing hands up, and I'm not seeing -- Oh, we are. Marilyn. Let's see. "The High-Level Panel is the fifth Panel that was created."

Fifth Panel and High-Level Panel are the same thing, that's the one that's Chaired by the President of Estonia.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible/no microphone)

Vint Cerf: I just ran into a serious problem. My screen has gone black, and I can't get logged back in again. You can probably hear me typing furiously. Wow. I can't get back into my own computer. This is a serious problem.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible/no microphone)

Vint Cerf: Well, I'm blind right now as, it's Vint. So this is bizarre, I've not seen this happen before.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, everyone. We are actually out of time at the moment. So we are going to have to end the call today. Thank you all for participating in today's webinar. If you keep your chat open, I'll pop in request -- the emails for the Strategy Panels, so that you can email them directly with your questions. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Alice Jansen: And may I also remind everyone that the public comment series on Draft Reports will run through April 30<sup>th</sup>, and that we are having a public discussion with Panel Chairs in Singapore on March 24<sup>th</sup>. Thank you very much, all, for your time.